



Jury report

# AM I Included? Open Call for Innovative Ideas for the Inclusive City

25 September 2018



## **Preface**

On 5 June 2018, area developer AM launched a public competition entitled 'AM I Included?' AM wants to generate innovative proposals that shed new light on ideas behind the inclusive city, and to that end it wants to link up with designers with a vision of the inclusive city beyond building commissions. In collaboration with these parties, AM wants to arrive at (design) proposals in which the hallmarks of the inclusive city can be developed into an applicable working method, which it can then test in practice. Participation in the competition was open to anybody who felt called upon to enter, either individually or as a team.

### **1. The competition**

The competition, an 'Open Call on the basis of a vision', was organized in accordance with the 'KOMPAS light Prijsvragen' manual and according to the regulations issued on 5 June 2018, consisted of three phases: (1) selection based on a vision, (2) presentation and (3) a Studio aimed at matchmaking.

Information about the competition was communicated through the [www.arch-lokaal.nl/am-open-oproep-inclusieve-stad](http://www.arch-lokaal.nl/am-open-oproep-inclusieve-stad) web page in both Dutch and English.

AM collaborated with Architectuur Lokaal on the first two phases of this competition.

Appendix 1 outlines the competition procedure.

### **2. Assessment**

The entries were assessed by a jury.

On the basis of the assessment criteria, the jury examined how the entries responded to the brief and the specified points of interest (in random order):

- the extent to which the spatial possibilities of the inclusive city are convincing
- the relevance of the references of area concepts and/or living concepts
- the extent to which entrants acknowledge a feeling for involving stakeholders from other disciplines outside of design, and in particular AM
- the extent to which the vision convinces in terms of viability, feasibility and sustainability in the broad sense
- the challenges expressed by the proposed working method.

An integral overall assessment was applied.

The jury consisted of:

- **Hilde Blank**, urban designer BVR, master builder to AM (chair in non-voting capacity)
  - **Elma van Boxel**, landscape architect ZUS
  - **Like Bijlsma**, spatial researcher at Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, Department of Spatial Planning and Quality of the Local Environment
  - **Emilie Vlieger**, city maker / location marketer and programmer at Vliegerprojecten
  - **Edwin Oostmeijer**, developer at Edwin Oostmeijer Projectontwikkeling bv
- Secretary **Vincent Kompier**, Architectuur Lokaal, with **Margot de Jager** (in non-voting capacity).



*The jury (from right): Elma van Boxel, Emilie Vlieger, Like Bijlsma, Hilde Blank, Edwin Oostmeijer, Vincent Kompier, Margot de Jager. Photo: Diego Rosero, AM*

This jury report contains the results of the first two phases.

Appendix 2 contains an overview of the procedure followed in the first phase of assessment.

The publication of this jury report marks the end of the collaboration with Architectuur Lokaal.

### **3. First phase**

#### *Entries*

A total of 52 visions were submitted in the first phase. The visions came not only from the Netherlands but also from Denmark, England, France, Hong Kong, Gibraltar, Namibia, Russia, Spain, the United States and South Korea. After reviewing the entries for compliance with the regulations, AM eliminated 9 entries from further participation in the competition. 43 entries were then presented to the jury for assessment.

Appendix 3 includes an overview of these entries.

#### *Selection*

In the first phase, the jury jointly selected eight entries on the basis of an anonymous assessment. Before assessing the entries together, jury members received all entries in digital form and studied them individually. None of the jury members knew the identity of the entrants, and none of the entrants sought contact with AM, the jury members or Architectuur Lokaal.

#### *General impressions*

In view of the high number of submissions, the jury notes that the topic of inclusive city appeals. She is pleased that it is clear from the total number of submissions that people with different knowledge fields have submitted. The international character of the competition is also expressed in the visions. In broad terms, the theme of the inclusive city has been raised to a higher level: it ranges from a purely theoretical approach of inclusiveness to a product design. The jury notes that the concept of

inclusiveness is not an easy concept to implement, given the large differences between the visions. In many visions a link is made between inclusiveness and collectivity as a means to connect different groups from society with and to each other. The scale on which this is proposed differs greatly. Sometimes this is on a building and even gallery level within the building, sometimes on the scale of the housing block, and occasionally on the scale of the neighborhood. Attention is also paid to innovative working methods, says the jury: innovative strategies, such as thorough research into the genius loci that in many views is seen as the basis for a (design) strategy to achieve greater inclusiveness. Inclusiveness is sometimes translated into spatial concepts, where the emphasis is on housing, where public space, facilities and communication are sometimes forgotten. Other visions emphasize the change of traffic function in a meeting function as a means for more inclusiveness. Who actually has to meet each other is not always thought through consistently, just like who should organize it: designer, local resident or developer AM. Function mixing is also mentioned as a means to shape inclusiveness, in the form of a mixed program for building and public space. Other submissions focus on the potentially different role of the developer; other forms of organization as a cooperative are also proposed. The jury is surprised by visions in which technology is introduced to make room for specific target groups more inclusive. Often the visions are idealistic, but they pay little attention to the realization and affordability of the proposals. With some submissions, the emphasis is on the text, where the relationship with the references is not always revealed. Finally, the jury finds it gratifying that the tone in the visions has arisen, and that appreciation is expressed for AM, who has put the topic of inclusive city on the agenda.

#### *Assessment procedure*

The 43 entries were assessed in four rounds.

Before assessing the entries together, each of the jury members indicated their individual preference for 12 entries. This resulted in a provisional selection of 25 entries. In the first round of deliberations, 16 entries not selected by the jury were discussed. These entries were eliminated because they offered no convincing answer to the question for a vision of the inclusive city.

In the second round, the 25 selected entries were discussed. Of these, 13 were eliminated. In the third round, the 12 remaining entries were discussed. In the fourth round, the jury unanimously selected eight entries. After this, the anonymity of the entrants ended, and their identities were revealed. They were invited to present their proposals to the jury in the second phase.

Appendix 4 includes a summary of the assessment of each entry.

#### *Jury assessment of the selected entries*

The selection of the following eight visions was made on the basis of an integral total assessment. These convinced the jury the most because of their stimulating and surprising development concepts and elaboration of specific aspects, and their original vision of the inclusive city.

### **06. Circle of Life**

Intriguing solution for the problem of inclusivity, with a strong emphasis on the inclusivity of seniors, with a characteristic typology: a spiral-shaped residential building that contains a wide range of housing typologies. It proposes a link between a technological environment, in the form of an app, and a physical environment, which arouses curiosity. The jury wonders whether modern electronic means lead to different arrangements for buildings and surroundings. A clear vision.

### **13. Inclusive Habitats**

This vision makes mention of many aspects of inclusivity in an interrogatory manner. That demonstrates an inquisitive attitude that the jury appreciates. The proposed method is stimulating and challenges to look at the design and development of an area in a different way. This vision sets other than standard questions. The jury is curious whether this also yields a different approach.

### **24. Sharing is caring**

This vision presents cooperation as a tool for more inclusivity: co-living. It gives a view of another role of a developer. The references are convincing, but they all respond to a non-Dutch setting. The jury is curious whether the refined way of looking in this vision shown, could also be applied in the Netherlands.

### **26. COMM"IN"**

This vision is clearly described. It proposes a neighbourhood made up of various communities. It includes intriguing concepts such as the 'waiting garden', the 'common' and the 'district-scraaper'. Appropriating outdoor space facilitates inclusivity outside the built environment.

### **30. Niche for misfits**

The idea of making use of leftover spaces for 'misfits' intrigues the jury. This vision addresses various aspects at a big and small scale. It is a very precise and well-elaborated concept, with a focus on vulnerable groups. This vision links agriculture to the city, which could be interesting. The jury has doubts about the feasibility, but is sympathetic to the idealism expressed.

**36. inclusiviteit is een werkwoord.** The vision proposes a working method to work on assignments in different ways at the start of projects with different stakeholders and area parties. The jury thinks that this alternative view might achieve greater inclusivity.

### **37. BuurtBlok**

The jury thinks that the proposed approach in BuurtBlok is very interesting, because it goes beyond simply adding new buildings to an existing context. The question whether the proposed approach could also be applied on a larger scale also intrigues. First programming and then building is a strong idea; this approach arouses curiosity. The clear presentation inspires confidence in the collaboration among the team.

### **47. wrijven van subculturen**

Drawing on the idea that everybody now lives inside their own bubble, this project promotes contact with others. The idea of deploying friction as a catalyst for encountering other people is exciting; a completely different than usual way of approaching target groups. Using temporariness as a way of achieving this is made concrete with the example of Nantes, and reflects the idea of making public space more inclusive. The visual presentation and imagination is refreshing and makes you curious.

## **4. Second phase**

In the second phase, the eight selected entrants presented their vision to the jury. On the basis of this, the jury selected four entrants (teams and/or individuals) for the third phase: the Studio.



## 06. Circle of Life

*Roy Plevier, Jos Hoop and Sanne Knobon (HOOPE+PLEVIER)*

The jury appreciates the pleasant presentation from which speaks professionalism. However, where the jury expected the influence of the technology on the spatial configuration, this was not realized. The vision concerns the design of an app and a concept with a fairly formalistic building with a compelling circular shape. The jury wonders whether the proposed combination of technology and design should actually lead to the circular typology. There is talked about a sweet spot that is not completely clear to the jury.



## 13. Inclusive habitats

*Flavio Martella and Maria Vittoria Tesei*

The inquisitive attitude of the entry is appealing, and provokes unexpected questions in a Dutch context. The proposal is carefully thought through and the general frame of reference is interesting. The vision is supported by research. The proposal to test the methodology in practice arouses curiosity. The vision is inspiring in its analysis of how the system of public space is constructed. An important aspect is the context of the place: starting with a building as a guide that influences the other buildings.



## 24. Sharing is caring

*Stephanie Zeulevoet*

The submission is strong in indicating possible collaborations, but how that works out spatially is not sufficiently clear. The references shown are all locally rooted. The system behind the shown references is dated and it is not clear how it is now applicable in the Netherlands. The approach is certainly interesting but still insufficiently thought through.



## 26. COMM"IN"

*Laurens Boodt*

A refreshing vision that interprets inclusivity as diversity. Starting from a building plot, the project seeks to roll out a plan by drawing on the collective quality of a group at the scale of a small grain. The term 'waiting garden' is provocative, and can offer an interesting point of departure for the assignment in terms of both organization and space. The examples are applied at various scales, ranging from a wider staircase to a park.



### 30. Niche for misfits

*Kin Yoon Ji and Sungjin Lee (Seoul National University) and Myeongjae Kim (Kyung Hee University)*

A fine story about how food can bring people together. The starting point is the weaker sections of society and how integration works in the neighbourhood. The jury considers this an interesting point of departure, but it is based on the situation in Seoul. The jury is not convinced by the answer to the question how this can be implemented in the Dutch situation. The story is stronger than the image.



### 36. inclusiviteit is een werkwoord

*Bjorn van Raay and Esmee Mankers (Zeewaardig) and Sander van Schaik, Jip Pijs, Merel Paes (Personal Architecture)*

The jury has the impression that the team is insufficiently aware of the level of expertise among area developers, where many elements of the proposed working method from 'service design thinking' are already employed. The aspect of prototyping as a method was less convincing. The link with inclusivity and how to achieve it didn't convince either.





### **37. BuurtBlok**

*Ard Hoksbergen, Ivar van der Zwan, Art Kallen (Workshop Architecten), Emilie Kröner and Bart van Heesch (LOLA) and Ivan Nio*

This interdisciplinary team approaches the assignment of the inclusive city in an investigative manner (design research). The jury was convinced by the proposed approach, to first carry out a social-spatial analysis and then to build on existing qualities. The inclusive city is viewed as everybody who is a member of one of the various groups. The project proposes small context-specific interventions in existing neighbourhoods. The intermediate scale mentioned as a scale solution is interesting. It is exciting to see how the application of the BuurtBlok as an intermediate scale typology does not necessarily lead to new segregation.



### **47. wrijven van subculturen**

*Camila Pinzon Cortes and Pepijn Verpaalen (URBANOS)*

The vision is strongly based on adapting and programming public space in the city to make it more inclusive. Emphasis is placed on activating various subcultures and not so much on the space that is claimed. That distinguishes this entry from many others. It starts with the public space and how it can be divided and programmed. The notion of friction intrigues and makes one curious about its practical applications.

### *Result*

The jury unanimously selected four participants, who will be invited by AM to participate in the Studio (third phase).

**13 Inclusive Habitats**, Flavio Martella and Maria Vittoria Tesei

**26 COMM"IN"**, Laurens Boodt

**37 BuurtBlok**, Ard Hoksbergen, Ivar van der Zwan, Art Kallen (Workshop Architecten), Emilie Kröner and Bart van Heesch (LOLA) and Ivan Nio

**47 wrijving van subculturen**

Camila Pinzon Cortes and Pepijn Verpaalen (URBANOS)

In the Studio, each of the four proposed work methods will be individually tested, 'in company' at AM and in dialogue with property developers and development managers, on a specific location. Based on the results of the Studio, AM will select one team for a follow-up. AM will involve this team in a real design commission from its portfolio.

## **Appendix 1. Course of the first and second phase of the competition**

### *First phase*

5 June 2018	Announcement of Open Call by AM at PROVADA Amsterdam
19 June 2018	Launch of competition, publication of regulations
26 June 2018	Information meeting, AM, Utrecht
29 June 2018	End of round of questions
6 July 2018	Publication of summary of additional information 1
7 July 2018	Additional information 2
27 August 2018	Closing date for entries and review of entries
28 August 2018	Publication of summary of additional information 3
3 September 2018	Selection of 8 entries, Rotterdam
4 September 2018	Announcement of results of first phase; invitation to participants for second phase

### *Second phase*

10 September 2018	End of round of questions
11 September 2018	Publication of summary of additional information 4
17 September 2018	Presentations and jury assessment, AM, Utrecht
25 September 2018	Announcement of result of second phase, publication of jury report

## Appendix 2. Course of evaluation of first phase submissions

*In the right-hand column is indicated in which round the jury has decided on the entry*

6	Circle of Life	4	selection
8	I Care I Share	3	
9	ALL-IN	1	
10	Blauw NL	3	
11	Green Terraces Initiative	1	
12	PLAY Children co-design the inclusive city	2	
13	Inclusive Habitats	4	selection
14	Inclusivity = recognizing the individual	1	
15	Maximaal 10 jaar	2	
16	Pair diversity with density to include more	1	
17	Let's include the homeless	2	
19	Amsterdam/Delft/Deventer	1	
20	De inclusieve stad is de integrale leefruimte van mensen	1	
21	Three Ideas [for now]	1	
24	Sharing is caring	4	selection
25	All Hands On Deck	1	
26	COMM"IN"	4	selection
27	Live over a green park, without interfering with sunlight	1	
28	This Friday	2	
29	Urban living room	3	
30	Niche for misfits	4	selection
31	3 dimensionals city	2	
32	Thuis in de stad	2	
33	STAD A LA CARTE	2	
34	Het Themablok	2	
35	WE ARE INCLUSIVE	2	
36	inclusiviteit is een werkwoord	4	selection
37	BuurtBlok	4	selection
38	All Exclusive	1	
39	I am Home	2	
40	onze STEK	1	
41	De inclusieve stad, archipel van collectieve-figuren	2	
42	Een stad van betekenis - een stad van (ver)binding	3	
43	VERTICAL EXERCISE	2	
44	Typisch Atypisch	3	
45	In de Inclusieve Stad kun je ontsnappen aan jezelf.	1	
46	SUR+ de stad van overschot en toevoeging	1	
47	wrijven van subculturen	4	selection
48	Inclusive cities are made Inclusively	1	
49	Sturing geven aan de inclusieve stad	2	
50	Athas, het complex met de vele gezichten	3	
51	Sociale Ruimte	1	
52	HOST	1	

### Appendix 3. Overview of entries and entrants

6	<b>6 Circle of Life</b> Roy Plevier, Jos Hoop, Sanne Knoben Hoope+ Plevier
8	<b>I Care I Share</b> Richard Breit Dutch Urban Solutions
9	<b>ALL-IN</b> Tonko Leemhuis, Martijn de Potter, Wietze de Vries (Studio Wieb) NwA architecten
10	<b>Blauw NL</b> Arman Kayhan Arman Kayhan Architecten
11	<b>Green Terraces Initiative</b> Grahame Cullinan
12	<b>PLAY Children co-design the inclusive city</b> Sukanya Krishnamurthy, Chris Steenhuis, Daniek Reijnders
13	<b>Inclusive Habitats</b> Flavio Martella, Maria Vittoria Tesei
14	<b>Inclusivity = recognizing the individual</b> Winfried Holze Winfried Holze Urban Design Architecture
15	<b>Maximaal 10 jaar</b> Jos Roodbol, Mathieu Derckx (Stedebouw en Landschapsarchitectuur) Jos Roodbol Architect
16	<b>Pair diversity with density to include more</b> Soran Shangapour
17	<b>Let's include the homeless</b> Seidawan Hosseini
19	<b>Amsterdam/Delft/Deventer</b> M.D. Bredero Architect Maarten Douwe Bredero
20	<b>De inclusieve stad is de integrale leefruimte van mensen</b> Jaap van Velzen Sprekers- en adviesbureau Brain Management International
21	<b>Three Ideas [for now]</b> Ruth Massias Greenberg Gamma Architects
24	<b>Sharing is caring</b> Stephanie Zeulevoet
25	<b>All Hands On Deck</b> Efe Ulucay University of Washington
26	<b>COMM"IN"</b> Laurens Boodt Laurens Boodt Architect
27	<b>Live over a green park, without interfering with sunlight</b> Michael Manukhin
28	<b>This Friday</b> Taylor Stahle Utility Works
29	<b>Urban living room</b> Marta Marotta

	MASatelier
30	Niche for misfits Yoon Ji Kim, Myeongjae Kim (Kyung Hee University), Sungjin Lee Seoul National University
31	3 dimensionals city Jean Christophe Petillault, Hébert Antonin JCPCDR Architecture
32	Thuis in de stad Caro van Dijk Caro van Dijk Architectuur
33	STAD A LA CARTE Martine Leroi, Eva de Graaf, Mattijs van 't Hoff ( MvtHoff stedenbouw) Urbanext stedenbouw
34	Het Themablok Anton Zoetmulder Zoetmulder
35	WE ARE INCLUSIVE Iren Koomen, Gert de Graaf, Pieter Sprangers, Eric Rijper, Madelon Pluis, Chris Luth (Volt Europa) Groosman
36	inclusiviteit is een werkwoord Bjorn van Raaij, Esmee Mankers, Sander van Schaik, Jip Pijs, Merel Paes (Personal Architecture) Zeewaardig
37	BuurtBlok Ard Hoksbergen, Ivar van der Zwan, Art Kallen, Emilie Kröner en Bart van Heesch (LOLA), Ivan Nio (stadsocioloog) Workshop Architecten B.V.
38	All Exclusive Robbert Guis, Soesja Boode (de Kleine Ambassade) Flocks
39	I am Home Mieke Latijnhouwers, Anneke Rommers, Aron Straver, Nasim Duives, David van Uden BTL Advies
40	onze STEK Maare Zondervan, Kirsten Bekkers, Max Visser Sweco
41	De inclusieve stad, archipel van collectieve-figuren Michael Daane Bolier, Dorus Meurs M & DB architecten
42	Een stad van betekenis - een stad van (ver)binding Mariette Broesterhuizen, Ruben Abels (Designarbeid), Anna Dekker (Placemakers), Bengin Dawod (zelfst stedenbouwk. Ontwerper), Martijn Veenstra (zelfst. Stedebouwkw. Ontwerper) Common Affairs
43	VERTICAL EXERCISE Rombout Frieling Rombout Frieling Lab
44	Typisch Atypisch Jan van Vlerken, Mieke van Herwijnen, Daniek Reijnders, Myrthe Coppers, Jan van Vlerken, Michael Verheijen (Vereniging Kleine Kernen Limburg) Pauwert Architectuur
45	In de Inclusieve Stad kun je ontsnappen aan jezelf. Marieke Schoonderbeek, Matthew Murphy, Martijn Berk
46	SUR+ de stad van overschot en toevoeging Ferry in 't Veld, Nina Aalbers, Roos Pulskens, Studio ArchitectuurMAKEN

47	wrijven van subculturen Camila Pinzon Cortes, Pepijn Verpaalen, URBANOS
48	Inclusive cities are made Inclusively Timothy Whitehouse, Laurence Flint B2B Design
49	Sturing geven aan de inclusieve stad Robbert Jan van der Veen, Abel Coenen, Tjerk Wobbles, Stella Groenewoud plein06
50	Athas, het complex met de vele gezichten Bram van den Heuvel bramvandenheuvel.eu
51	Sociale Ruimte Tim Peeters
52	HOST Lisa Harmey L1 Architecture