Review of the Diploma Project HLOUBETIN SQUARE REVITALIZATION

Author Sugandha Chaudhary

2

Faculty of Architecture of the Czech Technical University in Prague Atelier: Achten-Pavlíček June 2019

Opponent Ing. arch. Hana Oľhavová This diploma thesis deals with the revitalization of Hloubětín square in Prague. Presently, there are few separated buildings with different functions and not very welcoming public space. In proposed design existing functions remain, but they are integrated in one new building. Public square is sunk under the road level and above it are designed floating pathways.

N

The thesis includes very brief analysis of the history and context, but it lacks plan and analysis of wider context and surroundings. It doesn't explain, what is the conclusion from the analysis and why does the design look the way it does. It names the main issues, but it doesn't say, how they were considered in the design. Complex topic as revitalization of a public space would require more detailed analysis and the presentation should be more explanatory.

On the other hand, analysis of existing functions is very detailed and the same functions are used in proposed design. Why did the author decide to keep them the same? When reconsidering the whole square, shouldn't it be considered also to change the functions?

The movement on the proposed square seems to be working well, but is there so much pedestrian traffic, that it is necessary to create a pathway on separated level? Wouldn't it work better if people were walking through the square?

Placement of the building next to the big road is good, it acts as a buffer, separating the public space from the noise and pollution from the road and creating more pleasant and peaceful public space. In this light, I don't think it is necessary that the square should be also sunk under the road level. The square surrounded by stairs and kiosk could be a pleasant public space, but the floating paths above make it feel slightly underground, which is not good for the safety nor the accessibility.

The layout of the building is well designed- it is clear and flexible. Question is, if this kind of building requires parametrically designed façade, but the overall architecture of the building is good.

As for the presentation, graphic style of the project is nice and the content is adequate, but it could include more detailed explaining of the specific goals of the project and how they were achieved.

In conclusion, the visual of the design is good, but it would fit better in bigger square with much more people and traffic. In this case, I find separating the pathway on a different level unnecessary. It breaks the space instead of unifying it and bringing people together.

In the view of facts specified above, I evaluate this diploma thesis with the grade C.

Ing.arch. Hana Oľhavová, in Prague 4. 6. 2019

Olhand