

EVALUATION: DIPLOMA PROJECT

Student: Bojana Culafic
Project: "Immersive, Experimental and Sensory Center for Children"
Ústav: Prostorového plánování, 15121
Advisor: Henry W. A. Hanson IV
Opponent: Klára Doležová
June 8, 2018

Introduction:

The following review is based on the timely submission of a portfolio, poster and models in accordance with the submission requirements and the assignment.

Both the project topic and location were the choice of the student based on their particular interests. The location of the island was also based on some recent work with Prague 7 focusing on Child Friendly Cities. The island location was determined to be central to the City and reasonably accessible and also a particularly unique and sensory oriented environment in the City. Although the programmatic intention and choice of location are not expanded on in the portfolio, they are thoughtful, sensitive and appropriate.

Portfolio:

Generally, the portfolio is well organized and graphically very well done. The flow of the portfolio contents is clear and helps the reader understand the process and rational basis of the design proposal. Better editing of the text would dramatically reduce the simple yet distracting errors. Additional annotations and legends would enhance drawing value. Going through the portfolio with a 'fine tooth comb' to correct inconsistencies such as missing page number etc. could make this an exquisite portfolio work.

Research & Analysis:

The research and analysis portion of work is well developed, recognizing both pragmatic as well as programmatic issues for consideration to the development of a design proposal. The sight map and the sound map are particularly interesting efforts to recognize both the programmatic intentions as well as the local conditions of the area. The representation of both of these analytical sensory layers could be further pursued with more explanatory graphic and notational information. The analysis also lays solid groundwork for the development of design principles to be integrated into the proposal.

The Design Proposal:

The design proposal successfully negotiates a relationship with the existing terrain of the site, molding it with the design. The design principles defined in the analysis are reasonably well developed in the design proposal. The drawings of the proposal are complete and generally very descriptive. A few suggestions would be to include the City side of the river in the site axonometric on pages 41 & 42.

The connection with the river on the North channel below the waterfall has some interesting qualities that unfortunately are not well represented in the drawings. This is an important part of the design and more description of it can only strengthen the persuasiveness of the proposal.

The visualizations are very communicative within the limits of paper. It may be worth considering other forms of communication or the design proposal since it involves the full compendium of human senses. This would of course be outside the conventional requirements of diploma project submission requirements.

Conclusion:

It has been a pleasure to work with Bojana through her study at the Faculty of Architecture. She is clearly a talented young designer full of great promise. She will represent this Faculty and University well as she begins her professional practice. Bojana has demonstrated an excellent command of the design process with the development of this diploma proposal. In my opinion this clearly demonstrates her preparedness for the profession of architecture.

Therefore, my evaluation of the Diploma Project of Bojana Culafac is A; Excellent.



Henry W. A. Hanson IV
Head, Landscape & Architecture Studio
hansphen@fa.cvut.cz