

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Thesis title: | Architectural Intervention to Combat Homelessness in Prague |
| Author's name: | Naďa Mladenović |
| Type of thesis : | master |
| Faculty/Institute: | Faculty of Architecture (FA) |
| Department: | Department of Architectural Modelling |
| Thesis reviewer: | Prof. dr. ir. Henri Achten |
| Reviewer's department: | Department of Architectural Modelling |

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Assignment | challenging |
| <i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i> | |
| In Czech Republic there are over 100 000 homeless people, and the number of homeless shelters 217 for the whole country (capacity 7265 beds) plus 78 short-term shelters. Other than shelters, the city of Prague (and other municipalities) use aggressive architectural measures to make it impossible for homeless people to sleep at certain locations (mostly city centre). Architectural proposals for alternatives are often ideological, resulting in single units (which are highly expensive) that can be placed anywhere. Thus the assignment requires novel approach to combat homelessness to the existing solution of homeless shelters. | |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Fulfilment of assignment | fulfilled |
| <i>How well does the thesis fulfil the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.</i> | |
| Naďa Mladenović came up with a novel strategy and application to combat homelessness. Apart from designing shelter units, she also embedded these units in an approach that adds value to brownfield situations and buildings that are unused. | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Activity and independence when creating final thesis | B - very good. |
| <i>Assess whether the student had a positive approach, whether the time limits were met, whether the conception was regularly consulted and whether the student was well prepared for the consultations. Assess the student's ability to work independently.</i> | |
| Naďa Mladenović has very good analytical skills, which helped her a lot throughout the design project. In the beginning it was necessary to shift focus from design of single units (and their location) to formulation of the strategy, after which Naďa Mladenović could return to the design of units again. | |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Technical level | C - good. |
| <i>Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?</i> | |
| The novelty of Naďa Mladenović's concept is to form a community of homeless people in a brownfield location of an unused building (she researched several options throughout all Prague). With a fairly low investment, the degradation of the building can be stopped and at the same time it provides shelter for a large number of homeless people. Through allocation of activities like repair workshops, the space will not only function as purely shelter but also activate the homeless people and provide a social interface with the immediate surroundings of the people. This aspect of the design is arguably speculative and it can be argued that it may or may not work. In my view, the value lies in offering a strategy that is much less costly than a homeless shelter, much more realistic than exclusive single units seen in alternative approaches. | |

Formal level and language level, scope of thesis
A - excellent.

Are formalisms and notations used properly? Is the thesis organized in a logical way? Is the thesis sufficiently extensive? Is the thesis well-presented? Is the language clear and understandable? Is the English satisfactory?

The thesis is carefully designed and graphically well-conceived. From the graphics part, I would say it is quite outstanding compared to regular thesis reports.

Selection of sources, citation correctness
E - sufficient.

Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student's original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?

Although it is clear from pages 7 – 36 that Nađa Mladenović supports her analysis on many sources, the list of references itself is actually missing from the thesis text.

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student's skillfulness, etc.

Please insert your comments here.

III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Homelessness affects some 100 000 people in Czech Republic and forms an acute and serious problem. The institutionalized approach through homeless shelters is by far inadequate in terms of numbers. Aggressive architecture only pushes homeless people away but does not solve the problem. Fanciful single units designed by architects are more like gestures of good will than real solutions. Nađa Mladenović provides a novel temporary strategy that gives shelter to homeless people and at the same time revitalizes unused buildings in brownfield locations.

The grade that I award for the thesis is **B - very good**.

Date: **29.5.2025**

Signature:

