

DIPLOMA THESIS REVIEW

Mixed Use Building – Office + Community Centre, Prague

THESIS AUTHOR
Bc. Idil Küçük

CTU in Prague, Faculty of Architecture
Design Studio: Prof.dr.ir. HENRI ACHTEN
Summer semester 2018/2019

Written by: Ing. arch. Jan Kvita

The assignment of the diploma thesis is mixed use building with offices and a community centre. The project is located in Prague 4 - Michle, next to a business centre Brumlovka. The longitudinal parcel is bordered by the north-south highway from the southwest, office buildings from the west, a park from the north and a residential area from the east.

The beginning of the thesis contains analytical part with site research and a proposed programme. The building program is focused on increasing interaction between office and residential spaces. The inclusion of a Community centre aims to bring life into otherwise monofunctional office building. However, there is not enough clarification how the proposed program affected the design.

The Urbanism is designed very simply. Three office blocks blend into one large building along the highway. While this shape protects park area from the highway, it also acts as a barrier towards the park. More articulated spacing facing the park would provide better interaction. Another disadvantage of the longest facade facing southwest is a potential to overheating of the building. Solution of heating, ventilation and air-conditioning that would clarify the concept is missing.

Floor plans are designed adequately. Ground level offers public spaces towards the park. The community centre is situated in the ground floor and first floor in the centre of the building. The rest is dedicated to offices. Office and community centre could offer less separation to further encourage mixed use of the building.

The construction system ensures maximum flexibility. Author states that increased structural height of the building floor to 4 metres will provide sustainable solution due to increased natural lighting. Nevertheless, increased construction, heating and cooling costs associated with this solution were not considered.

Because of sufficient park area surrounding the building, the rooftop tennis courts would probably enable more public interaction and cost effectiveness if they were built on the ground.

The graphic part of the project is not convincing and would require further detail, for example the solution of the facade shading and of safety nets on rooftop tennis court.

Overall, I propose that the diploma project is passed with mark D - Satisfactory.

Prague, 6. 6. 2019

Ing. arch. Jan Kvita

