

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 1

Juror 1

Design – stated design objective of the building's materials serving as a metaphor for the body's muscle and structure was very well projected in the finished product. Quality of light in the interiors was exceptional along with well executed interiors. A very nice project.

Presentation – a little too much emphasis on the monument sign in the two front photos. Would have been better to close out presentation with stronger photos. Overall photo and graphic presentation was good.

Juror 2

Carefully considered and competently reconciled relationships between light and structure (with anecdotal reference to Will Bruder's Phoenix Library). Lively assembly of required volumes.

Detailing commensurate with project type.

Juror 3

I really liked this project. The interiors were particularly well developed. The simple palate of materials – concrete floors, painted steel structure, stained wood roof deck, and CMU walls were straightforward, honest and handsome. The skylight detail centered over the column was a very nice detail. In contrast to the straightforward honesty of the rest of the materials, the vaulted ceiling grid, however, seemed a little forced.

The exterior had some really nice moments, especially, the entrance but in general, didn't exhibit the same degree of restraint and elegance of the interiors.

The presentation was sufficient, however – the plans were too small. Also, the last three images almost cost the project an award. They were clearly of lesser quality and did not show anything flattering about the design.

Jurying Observations

More sophisticated interior than exterior

Last 3 slides unnecessary – take out last 3 slides

Nice shot of entry

Forced ceiling configuration; if it's ugly don't show it

Not necessary to show every elevation

2 sign shots not necessary; in love with sign

Photo composition needs improvement

More shots of objectives as they are stated

Shots at odds with what its comments taken with interiors

Text should be large enough to read from table (jurors had to stand at screen to read)

Strong interiors, strong detailing but building doesn't come through, doesn't hold up as a form

Upper level very well done

Rest of building shouldn't have been that honest

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 2

Juror 1

Design – plan was clear and well organized but gesture of “kid oriented” design elements was a little heavy handed and left the jury wanting to see the color and detail expanded throughout the building. Again, the design concept of primary colors and formal elements associated with children begs the question of whether or not the designer (or owner) is being condescending to the occupants. Presentation – good clear graphics and quality of photography. Choice of insertion of children’s fonts in text is questionable.

Juror 2

The use of children’s blocks as actual building elements for entry and aedicule was considered to be, ironically, condescending to children. Well-built however, even if these themes only dealt with the public spaces.

Juror 3

I think that there was a general sense that the sheer literalness of the design concept was insufficient to develop a truly noteworthy design. One thinks of sophisticated, yet playful children’s spaces such as Koning Eizenberg’s Children’s Museum of Pittsburgh as an approach that inspires imagination and curiosity. In contrast, after the initial ‘ah hah’ the children might experience after seeing the building blocks writ large, one imagines that the children are only disappointed that they can’t crawl around and play on the colorful blocks.

Jurying Observations

No need for text slides
Funny parking connection; wasted space
Awkward entrance
Lobby blocks not a place for kids; condescending to them
Straight educational building; no children things going on

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 3

Juror 1

Design - Exceptional project very well executed restoration...the citizens should be very proud of the jewel. Demonstrates the importance of this often underappreciated field of practice.
Presentation – a major drawback was the total absence of “before” or “during” restoration photographs. This omission could jeopardize the success of the project at higher levels of awards programs. The photography was exceptional.

Juror 2

An extremely beautiful and expertly executed reinvigoration of an already lovely 1912 Ayres courthouse. Painstakingly resolved integration of new systems with high sensitivity and deft display of architectural skills.

Juror 3

I have had the opportunity to visit and see presentations of dozens of the recently restored county courthouses. The interior restoration of the Dancy Building is on par with the best. The exceptional photography really conveys the sense of the spaces that have been remarkably restored. This is truly an excellent project.

Jury questioned color of columns in jury room; wondered if that was original color.

The presentation could have been much improved with the inclusion of ‘before’ images. Finally, the exterior lights around the perimeter should be removed as soon as possible!

Jurying Observations

Wow! Deserves an award
Where is before or existing shot? Where did they start?
Evident that this is a great job
As good as any restoration project, outstanding
Should have more understated exterior lighting – remove them!
Great photography
Looks like a \$10 – \$15 million job
Wish process had been discussed
Every picture should have had a before/after
Seating arrangement could have been different in office rather than pushed against wall

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 4

Juror 1

A good working plan that met the design objectives but seemed to be at odds with the indoor / outdoor / street relationship.

Presentation – the heavy emphasis on the adjacent context as indicated in the opening photos seems to hold an importance to the designer that isn't demonstrated in the explanation of the design.

Juror 2

The jury understood the contextual difficulties, but believed that the residence might have responded in other, more restrained, ways. A bit too busy.

Juror 3

It was very difficult to understand the factors that drove the design for this residence. The steeply pitched roof appears more appropriate for an alpine structure than a valley residence. The photography, particularly of the interior, was not up to par with the rest of the submissions. Also, the images of the surrounding context were too small and did little to explain the design response that the architect made.

Jurying Observations

Out!

Aerial site plans annoying

Multiple images meaningless

Steeply pitched roof unnecessary in the Valley

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 5

Juror 1

Design – clearly an exceptional house in the neighborhood. While the design seems to meet the design objectives and presents an appealing street presence, it suffers from the need for further editing. The courtyard space between the primary wings was a missed opportunity, the house was very well detailed.

Presentation – photos were generally good, but some interior shots could have been better selected - or eliminated.

Juror 2

While quite competently executed, the jury was not convinced that the environmental philosophy espoused was manifest in the built residence in any meaningful way. A sophisticated sense of proportion was ultimately trapped between two architectural genres.

Juror 3

Another jury may be more appreciative of this project. The house was nice, but, in the end, several nagging details made it difficult for this group to award. The massing and the elevations were well composed; however, the parapeted gables and the inexplicable white patches of stucco muddied the composition of what could have been a very elegant, simple, and honest composition. The stone columns on the rear porch were another non sequitur. The project lost an opportunity to create a really memorable courtyard in the rear by dividing its space into slivers of porch, path and landscaping.

The 'green' features, especially the ventilation that was promised were appreciated, however, the effectiveness of the ventilation concept could not be deciphered from the presentation.

Finally, computer models of projects that can be shown in photographs do little to explain the project. A better use of the model images would be to illustrate sectional ideas such as the airflow pathways for the natural ventilation that are not easily shown with photographs.

Jurying Observations

Floating shadow plan annoying and insulting

Pool in courtyard would have cooled area more than where it was actually placed; after discussion it was determined that it is better where it is to prevent moisture into house because of extreme Valley humidity

Computer models not helpful

Stone columns odd, clashing with design

Heart of the house shot could have been taken from further back

Colliding shed roof at back entry

No windows to capture southeast breeze – conflicts with sustainability statement – how is it effective in moving breeze if there is no chimney effect?

Air is not pulled through

Clever detailing but not a big idea

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 6

Juror 1

Design – very well executed details and proportional massing. The jury questioned the emphasis solution clearly directed to a particular style.
Presentation – good photography, and I particularly liked the beautiful photo of the mesquite floor with the grid of light.

Juror 2

A curious, if competent, relocation of New Mexican vernacular to the Texas border. A gratuitous stone arch.

Juror 3

The interior finishes were indeed elegant. Beyond that, the lack of temporal interpretation would make the project inappropriate in Santa Fe. The importation of a southwestern high-desert aesthetic to the coastal climes of the valley is simply unjustifiable.

Jurying Observations

Wish masonry arch were not there
Annoying materials
Interesting materials used in ordinary ways

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 7

Juror 1

Design – the exterior of the building has beautiful detailing and the limestone cast into the tilt-up was intriguing. The shade canopies were detailed and striking.
Presentation – the text of the presentation was very confusing and didn't support the design effort very well. Very good photography.

Juror 2

Excessive hyperbole in the written description appeared not to align with the actual built artifact. The stone / concrete panels were interesting although the overall structure was not terribly site-specific.

Juror 3

Another jury will likely find this project award worthy. In the end, I couldn't quite bring myself to honor it – primarily because it made a big point of being sustainable by placing large windows on the north side for natural light and then carried the same windows with the same overhangs around all sides of the second floor. The valley (as do all places in Texas) needs to develop a truly sustainable design ethos. Gestures are just not sufficient.

I did appreciate the technique of casting the limestone into the exterior tilt-walls.

Finally, the cost per square foot listed was not helpful. It was not at all clear in the presentation that the low cost of the project was a result of the inventiveness of the architect. The final impression was only that, if the cost is actually correct, the contractor should be commended (or not) for getting some deals on materials and labor.

Jurying Observations

Were \$ to square foot stated to impress?

No clarity to plan

Back to back stairs not allowed by code

Dead end corridors not allowed

Should show circulation

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 8

Juror 1

Design – project does an outstanding job of answering the design objectives and projects well the sentiment of reaching out to the public literally and figuratively through a very well massed and configured facility.

Presentation – the presentation was woefully short of information – from the undeveloped site plan to the lack of interior shots. Frankly, its eligibility to stay in the program as presented is questionable. It survived purely on its promise.

Juror 2

In this time of hyper-sensitized ‘homeland’ security, this open police structure in a park contiguous with a residential neighborhood is very refreshing. The detailing was very nice. We wish that a site plan and building plan were included as well as a simple photo of the community room.

Juror 3

The openness of this project to the community was the single most influential factor in its designation as a merit award recipient. Both the Owner and the Architect should be commended for resisting the rising urge toward a bunker mentality in public architecture. The design also exhibited some very nice detailing in the roof structure.

The lack of photographs of the interior (especially of the main space), lack of a site plan, and the inclusion of some rather unflattering views at the rear almost sabotaged the submission. The photos on the printed sheet also show some awkward arcing awnings along one elevation that appear clumsy and out of place beside the more elegantly detailed entrance canopy.

Jurying Observations - Merit Ward

Where are shots of the interiors?

Sad that parkland was used for a parking lot

No, it looks like existing parking area shared with park

Columns with lighting enticing

Intrigued by trusses, bare CMU

Meets goal of being publicly accessible building

Wish there were slides of interiors, plan, site plan

Finish presentation and re-enter next time (before award was given)

No mention of plan in registration form. Follow directions!

How does public meeting room relate to park?

Where is building in parking slide?

Does not need back wall screen shot

Slide 8 is beautiful

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 9

Juror 1

Design – a good clear plan and striking exterior. Unfortunately the arching gesture of the façade seemed superfluous and without basis. And the circuitry diagram in the flooring while intriguing was a little too literal.

Presentation – good photography and graphics.

Juror 2

Carefully organized in plan, but the jury believed the “wiring” metaphor and large-scale formal gestures were somewhat misplaced and over-simplified as an architectural expression.

Juror 3

The entire premise of the design concept is really problematic. There are so many urgent issues in building – appropriate response to climate, creating enlivening spaces for people, fitting into a unique social and cultural context, honestly employing the materials and technology available within a region, etc... – that there is no need to resort to ultimately arbitrary tricks to derive a meaningful basis for a design. It simply does not follow that if the floor finish pattern looks like a chip that is hidden inside the computers hidden inside the building the design is a success.

Jurying Observations

Literal interpretation of idea

Very clear in plan

Cleverness on outside does not reflect clarity of plan

Could do without cubicle shot

Jury Comment Sheet

Project Number: 10

Juror 1

Design - A very interesting project and the preliminary designs show potential for great buildings. It would have been helpful to see more information on the process of the master plan development and/or more emphasis on the specific design of some of the buildings. I think I see potential but want to see it in the final product. I found myself wanting more. The –D renderings were great (the trees could have been presented better) maybe more integration of computer modeling with photos of existing structures would better sell the designer's intent.

Juror 2

An overall site plan (not isometric view) of the site plan would have helped; but the jury felt little relationship of the proposed work to Ford's campus. The "sprinkling" of colored glass from the original chapel onto new structures was not sensitive to Ford.

Juror 3

This project may indeed be worthy of an award upon completion, however, I think the jury was unanimous in the opinion that for an un-built project to be honored, it had to be exceptionally remarkable in concept and presentation. The presentation simply leaves too many gnawing uncertainties at this point. Missing columns among other things made it difficult to be certain that the end project would be realizable as presented. I personally had a real uneasiness with the way the student dorm living areas on the ground floor opened onto the public atrium with so much glass. There was also no context shown that would allow us to judge the suitability of the proposal for the campus.

Jurying Observations

Where are the supports for the roofs?

Not sophisticated drawings

Get rid of colored glasses; Neal would be proud of the interpretation but would cringe at knowing that one element was carried throughout project – he made many contributions to the profession

Thin that roof up!

Isometric view not very descriptive

Bothered by skewed angles – maybe something in the site plan merits it

Looked at too many David Chipperfield buildings with that brick

Ground floor living space against outdoor space will be uncomfortable, Holiday Inn-like

How does it relate to O'Neal Ford's original plan

Where are the before photos?

How do the existing buildings look?

Add believable structural system

Get rid of cranked plans, colored glass

Read *Texas Architect's* unbuilt comments and rules

Does not communicate "Big Idea"

That much air-conditioned atrium should have been better designed; how is it energy efficient?