

Topic: **Palata Community Centre, Prague 5**

Author: **Arch. Anđela Ratković**

The elaboration of the project was preceded by a diploma seminar; the graduate based the design on an analysis of existing facilities of a similar nature and a detailed analysis of the area. However, in order to understand the presented work in context, the author's report is missing, in which the starting points, development and principles on which the design of the buildings is based are explained. From these considerations, the author presents only an initial analysis of future functioning.

Urbanism and architecture

The building is conceived as a cluster of smaller masses, between which public pedestrian routes pass. The axes of these routes intersect in the middle of the small courtyard area, which is surrounded by the masses of buildings, and point in different directions in the surrounding area. The interconnections smartly create a community centre in the reflection of urban contexts.

Work with scales is also successful. The cluster of buildings looks compact on the outside and suitably complements the larger buildings at the foot of Strahov Hill (Domov Palata, Pernikářka and other estates), while the size of the buildings themselves reflects the prevalent volumes of more luxurious villas in this residential area.

The architecture of sloping roofs and the sober cladding of buildings are suitably chosen not only in relation to the surroundings, but also for the purpose of the building, for which it is not appropriate to choose a confrontational expression. An obvious shortcoming of the design, however, is the imperfect reflection of the dominant skylights in the layout of individual buildings.

Layout solution

The pleasantly conceived mass solution is spoiled by certain disorder in the concept of entrances to the individual buildings. The ambiguity in access to buildings feels awkward and would undoubtedly be confusing for users. The inhospitable access to the co-housing part is a real error.

The mixing of units of individual and shared housing in two masses is rather detrimental in this concept and disrupts the architectural purity of the layout. Shared housing lacks spaces with a significant overlap to joint activities and meetings. Deficiencies of the design, e.g. in the missing kitchenettes in some housing units, inadequate arrangement of furniture, dysfunctional arrangement of fixtures in wheelchair-accessible bathrooms or insufficient ceiling heights in attic bathrooms are not fundamental, but should not be present in the project developed at the end of the study.

The arrangement of garages is not rational, the functional content and the operation of the remaining areas in the basement is not explained at all.

Construction technical solution

The basic construction system and height relations in relation to the terrain are not sufficiently explained.

The detail characterizing the building envelope is missing: facade-roof-skylight.

The solution of escape routes shows errors and the necessary adjustment in the next stages of the documentation could disrupt the openness of the interior conceived by the author.

The design does not show consideration of sustainability and operational principles of the construction.

Conclusion

The diploma thesis represents a good-quality conceptual solution, but some details would still need time for more detailed thought and finalization. I see the quality of the design in working with the scale of the proposed masses and in positioning the complex in the context of the place. I recommend the submitted thesis for defence.

Evaluation: **D**

Prague, on 08/09/2020



prof. Ing. arch. Irena Šestáková