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INTRODUCTION

THE PROJECT

The Ancient Theatre A’ of Larissa is an open-air theatre, built in the second half of the 3rd century BC. The largest in Thessaly-Central Greece, built for a 10.000 audience capacity, it lies on the slope of Fortress hill or ‘Frourio’ coinciding with the fortified citadel of the ancient city-in the center of the city of Larissa. The theatre has been recently almost entirely brought to light after a long period of expropriations and excavations. Its restoration works, which are gradually being completed will allow its full functionality.

The Promoter (the Municipality of Larissa) recognizes the significant meaning and value of the Ancient Theater A’ of Larissa as well as its impact on the identity of the city. The Promoter’s intention to give the theatre to the public and make this ancient monument an active part of the contemporary life of the city necessitates the reconsideration of its surrounding area and its connection to the other important landmarks and land uses. The future operation of the monument as a theater with an expected capacity of 1500 spectators will bring beyond its operational needs new balances and create new dynamics throughout the city, which will significantly affect the city’s identity.

The challenge of the competition is to convert an inactive ancient monument of major value into an active point of reference for modern city life, creating new balances and correlations. At the same time, by means of redefining, redesigning the open public spaces surrounding Ancient Theater A’, designing those that may result from the expropriations, as well as the location of its main facilities, the contestant is requested to succeed in the enhancement of the emergence of a new active landmark of civilization which will not only bring worldwide exposure and recognition but also visitors from around the world. Moreover, the location of the monument at the heart of the city center combined with its future operation makes the occasion unique.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The major goals and objectives of this competition were as follows:

▪ To find the best inspiring proposals, first for the landscape design of the existing adjacent to the Theatre public open space of the Area 1, as well as the open space to be possibly created after the expropriations of the 2 blocks to the south of the Theatre, and secondly for it to consist the main canvas for any future development projects of the theatre’s reflection in the area.
▪ To help position the city of Larissa on the national and international scene of city competitiveness, enabling it to carve and find its new character and niche compared to other cities of the region and attract more visitors.
▪ To enhance and enrich the value of the theatre as a major landmark of the city.
▪ To reclaim for the city a strategic feature of its public domain by accentuating the Theatre’s role as a monument as well as an active cultural attraction.
▪ To establish a fresh ‘identity’ anew connecting the city’s past to its future. This will be derived both from the design and the proposed land uses.
▪ To resolve the functional issues that will be revealed from the theatre’s operation.
▪ To establish a new modern place attraction
▪ To achieve meaningful connections between the theatre and other important landmarks within the city center, such as the river Pinios, the central square, the Fortress hill, the Ancient Theatre B’ etc.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

▪ Adequacy and clarity of the overall concept
▪ Integration of the Ancient Theater A’ in the contemporary city
▪ Potential to support the public awareness for the heritage value and historical site
▪ Coherence of proposed urban interventions
▪ Design quality of the public spaces and the proposed installations
▪ Feasibility, functionality, and user-friendliness
▪ Potential to mark the identity of the city

TYPE OF COMPETITION and UIA ENDORSEMENT

The competition for the “DESIGN OF THE SURROUNDING AREA OF THE ANCIENT THEATRE A’ IN LARISSA” was an Open International Architectural Ideas Competition endorsed by the International Union of Architects (UIA). It was conducted according to the UIA /UNESCO regulations for international design competitions and the UIA best practice recommendations.

ELIGIBILITY

The Competition was open to architects from all countries of the world, who are entitled to practice in their country of residence or country of origin.

Due to the importance of the competition site and its size, the Promoter encouraged multidisciplinary teams to do justice in integrating the multiple sides of the task including, landscape, urban design and planning, archaeology, history, sociology, etc. A professional of any discipline could only be part of one participating team. Each participant was allowed to present only one project. Variants were not admitted.

All applicants for the competition should meet the following criteria for both registration and submission:

No individuals involved in the Jury, Technical Committee, Professional Advisor, or otherwise in the organizing of the competition were eligible to participate in the competition. Close relatives, partners and employees of the jury members and the Professional Advisor were not allowed to participate either.
THE INTERNATIONAL JURY
The jury consisted of five (5) regular jurors and one (1) alternate, as listed below:

Renato Rizzi, Prof., Architect, Chair, Italy

Deniz Incedayi, Prof., Architect, Turkey

Rainer Mahlamäki, Prof., Architect, Finland

Aristidis Sapounakis, Prof., Architect – Urban Designer, Greece

Christian Sumi, Prof., Architect, UIA Representative, Switzerland

Jacek Lenart, Architect, Alternate Juror-UIA Representative, Poland
JURY SESSION

The Jury of the “International Open Ideas Competition for the Design of The Surrounding Area of the Ancient Theatre A’ in Larissa”, met at Hatzigiannio Municipal Cultural Center in Larissa for a 3,5-day jury session from 16.03.22 – 19.03.22, to examine the 52 submitted proposals.

Before the beginning of the session, in the morning of 16.03.22 the jury visited extensively the competition site.

Evaluation Process - Orientation Round

Present at the meeting was the alternate juror and 4 of the 5 voting jury members:

1) Mr. Renato Ricci (Italy), Chair of the jury
2) Mrs. Deniz Incedayi (Turkey),
3) Mr. Rainer Mahlamäki (Finland),
4) Mr. Aristidis Sapounakis (Greece) and
5) Mr. Jacek Lenart (Poland), Alternate Juror-UIA Representative

The voting juror and UIA Representative Mr. Christian Sumi (Switzerland) could not attend the jury meeting and was substituted by Mr. Jacek Lenart who became a voting member of the jury.

Present at the meeting were also:

1) The Professional Advisor of the Competition Mrs. Vasiliki Agorastidou, Architect
2) The members of the Technical Committee, Mr. Athanasios Argyrakos (Architect), Mr. Dimitris Karagounis (Architect)
3) Mrs. Aglaia Skoura (Architect), Mrs. Sofia Dolamoudi and Mrs. Evridiki Tsiola (Urban Planning Students) responsible for drawing up the minutes of the jury meetings.

The latter attendees, not named in the competition brief, were admitted to assisting the jury, and were thus present during the jury session.

The Professional Advisor Mrs. Agorastidou welcomed all those attending the meeting and informed the jury about the following:

Anonymity of entries
Some entries delivered by courier services carried the name of the expeditor on the wrapping paper which was immediately destroyed upon arrival by the receptionist as advised by the UIA in order not to be able to make a connection between the entry and its author. The principle of anonymity was thus respected according to the rules.

All entries’ PIN Number has been randomly covered by a new number from 001 to 052.

Completeness
All entries were complete according to the submission requirements of the Competition Brief.
Notes on calculations
The Technical Committee reported that some projects had minor derogations according to the minimum floor area required for the theatre’s facilities. The jury decided to admit all projects for the evaluation process and reserved the right, after having studied them, to exclude from the allocation of prizes those with important derogations.

Post delays
The Professional Advisor confirmed that all entries had been posted in time. However, because of the global situation (Covid19, Ukraine war) there were some post delays. Moreover, some competitors, despite the instructions in the Competition Brief, have indicated a value on their packages and were therefore taxable. The Municipality along with the Technical Committee had undertaken special efforts with the Greek customs and Post/Courier services to ensure that all packages arrived at their destination. The jury agreed to accept all packages that arrived after the deadline (14-3-2022) and until the 16th of March 2022, to allow all entries submitted within the submission deadline to be evaluated by the jury.

It was confirmed that the 5 prizes must be allocated at the latest at the end of the last meeting on Saturday noon (19.03.22).

The jury discussed details about the procedure and evaluation rounds and took decisions on how to apply them.

The Jury worked as a group. The evaluation of all Entries was done in the presence and with the contribution of all jurors. The evaluation process was conducted with successive evaluation rounds dismissing each time the less good proposals. Each Entry was discussed in detail by all jurors.

In order to get an overall idea of the entries the session started with a general orientation round, following by an in-person examination of all entries.

1ST Evaluation Round
The jury proceeded to the 1st Evaluation Round by jointly reviewing and discussing each entry from number 001 to number 052 based on the evaluation criteria stated in the Competition Brief.

At the end of the 1st Evaluation Round, the following numbers were unanimously dismissed, as they did not meet or satisfy partially or completely the goals expressed in the Brief and the Evaluation Criteria:

001 (SG2317) 010 (LA4232) 024 (BB1010) 035 (AD1928) 044 (DL5410)
003 (DE8588) 013 (SO9471) 025 (TY1502) 036 (MM0904) 048 (AC8989)
004 (MK1507) 014 (GC2677) 028 (DR8088) 037 (FJ1820) 049 (KL2468)
006 (TA1999) 016 (KA8922) 029 (MC3049) 038 (AN6712) 050 (WE8996)
007 (LS9339) 019 (UE5432) 031 (TT3330) 039 (JJ2181) 051 (PZ0000)
008 (SS4321) 020 (VS8653) 033 (CL2222) 042 (FC2007) 052 (VV4201)
009 (KE3386) 022 (KC7581) 034 (RS3101) 043 (NC3872)

18 projects, numbers: 002, 005, 011, 012, 015, 017, 018, 021, 023, 026, 027, 030, 032, 040, 041, 045, 046, 047 were qualified to the 2nd Evaluation round for different reasons, mainly for:
- satisfying the criteria of the competition
- use of a dominant and unifying language
- respect and support of the public awareness of the heritage value and the archaeological site.

2nd Evaluation Round

The jury, after reviewing the evaluation criteria and discussing about the theatre’s values (historical, memorial, symbolic) and its potential future role through the competition proposals, proceeded to the second evaluation round by studying thoroughly the 18 selected projects, numbers: 002, 005, 011, 012, 015, 017, 018, 021, 023, 026, 027, 030, 032, 040, 041, 045, 046, 047.

The following projects numbers:

011 (CK6000) 017 (JJ4321) 023 (PT7077) 040 (KT1996)
012 (JJ4343) 018 (KA9731) 030 (RT7337) 041 (VN6458)
015 (LA2122) 021 (BS7210) 032 (GG1300) 047 (CS8889)

were unanimously dismissed, as they were not following partially or completely the Evaluation Criteria as expounded by the jury:

adequacy and clarity of overall concept
the projects should appreciate the character and embrace the entire span of ancient history and western culture.

integration of the ancient theatre A’ in the contemporary city
The relation between the ancient theatre and the overall concept of Point 1 should be made explicit. As theatre in Greece was born precisely as a reflection on the birth of the polis, the place of collectivity, that meaning should pass through the projects to the new vision for the competition area. The processing projects should face the conflict and answer to that meaning.

potential to support the public awareness of heritage value and historical site

coherence of proposed urban interventions
having in mind that the form of the theatre is instead the critical point on which the projects should reflect the distance between the past and present; a challenge that must be faced successfully.

design quality of the public spaces and the proposed installations
The project proposals should have a particularly sensitive language (not self-referential or entertaining); the dominant form of the ancient theatre should not be absorbed by any contemporary formlessness.

potential to mark the identity of the city
To mark the identity of Larissa, the strength of the historical unitive value should be compared with the overbearingness of the dissolutive force of the contemporary city. From this contrast (cultural awareness) should the proposals arise.
The following 6 projects unanimously proceeded to the 3rd evaluation round. Numbers: 002, 005, 026, 027, 045, 046.

3rd Evaluation Round

After discussing the pros and the cons of the remaining six (6) projects, the jury decided that project number:

045 (CK1802)

clearly failed to meet the standards of the first five, mainly because of its inability to establish a pattern strong enough to support the dominating role of the ancient theater.

The following 5 projects unanimously proceeded to the 4th evaluation round. Numbers: 002, 005, 026, 027, 046.

4th Evaluation Round

A general discussion took place about the way each of the 5 proposals has developed the central idea and their main implements. The qualities of the 5 shortlisted projects were thoroughly discussed and compared to each other.

Then the jury ranked the 5 shortlisted projects and allocated the five prices as follows:

1st prize Entry number: 026 (LC1887)
2nd prize Entry number: 005 (AB4817)
3rd prize Entry number: 046 (FR1497)
4th prize Entry number: 027 (QY8520)
5th prize Entry number: 002 (BB8888)

The ranking list was approved and signed by the jury.

At this point the jury discussed and formulated general remarks and recommendations.
PRIZES

Five prizes were, as announced in the Competition Brief, attributed by the Jury. The following prize money will be awarded to the Competition prize winners:

- **1st prize 30.000 Euro** to Entry Number 026
  (LC1887: ARMANDO DAL FABBRO, Italy)

- **2nd prize 15.000 Euro** to Entry Number 005
  (AB4817: EVANGELOS POURNARAS, Greece, AMALIA VRANAKI, UK, AIKATERINI MARGARITI, Switzerland, NELLA GOLANDA, Greece)

- **3rd prize 10.000 Euro** to Entry Number 046
  (FR1497: FATIH YAVUZ, ÖMER EMRE ŞAVURAL, BILAL UĞUR LIMAN, GÜNEY GÜRSU TONKAL, MUHAMMED TALHA YAZICI, CEYDA TOKCAN, Turkey)

- **4th prize 5.000 Euro** to Entry Number 027
  (QY8520: ANTONIO NITTI, VINCENZO BRUNI, Italy)

- **5th prize 3.000 Euro** to Entry Number 002
  (BB8888: ALEXIOS TZOMPANAKIS, Greece, MANUELA RAITANO, ALESSANDRO LANZETTA, ANZELA FIORELLI, BENEDETTA TAMBURINI, LAURA TERRONE, BEATRICE PIA PIZZICAROLI, STEFANO PANELLA, Italy)
REPORTS ON THE 5 PRIZES

1st PRIZE number 026 (PIN NUMBER: LC1887)

The jury decided to give the first prize to the entry number 026, because of its comprehensive and simple approach to the issue. The competitors use smart and pure architectural language. The main idea of the project is about supporting the unique value of the theatre as the most important heritage value. The project offers the municipality, the possibility to develop the city around the theatre with an architectural vision, which will support the form and the symbolic meaning of the theatre.

The proposal has a strong identity, and pure comprehensiveness, without fragmented themes and details. The concept is strong having the capacity to be developed during the next possible planning phases. The theatre has been the starting point for the design process. The author has created a “low tower” being in a dialog with the theatre. The new space created between those 2 elements is absolutely impressive, without any other architectural elements. The entry corresponds to the criteria and the questions set to the competition programme.
The project aims to organize the surrounding area of the ancient theater based on the need to respect the ancient monument and to underline its significance for the city. This is attempted through the restructuring of the pedestrian walkways linking the theater to the city center and other important elements such as the city squares and the river, and above all by developing the area next to the fortress hill as an important focal point for the local community. Unlike a sizeable number of the other proposals, the specific composition emphasizes the need to strengthen the imagery of the southbound pedestrian access to the theater, by keeping it clear of all built elements. The approach to the surrounding area, the orientation to the theater and the combination of the park areas have been seen as positive contributions. It is a well-organized but rather conservative project which remains a fairly modest approach to the requirements of the competition. It must further be noted that the jury has questioned the need for the round pool of water that the project incorporates in the center of the communal space on the fortress hill.
The work very well recognizes the crucial city spaces to be clarified as the connected net in the future. The presented idea is based on the symbolic value of the ancient theatre, creating it as to the center of the many interventions in surrounding places. The choice of points to be altered is very proper. The project concentrates on the main decisions which define remarkable results, but does not leave other spaces without decisions. Debatable is the scale of proposed new buildings surrounding the theater, as well as their strong architectural shape so close to it. The proposed new path parallel to the former bakeries building seems to be under discussion, for several reasons, plus from the compositional point of view.
The specific project focuses on a sort of stratified city and aims to establish structures in the urban environment that will make this multiplicity comprehensible. To achieve this, it keeps the ancient theater itself clear of interventions, while elaborating the pedestrian route that provides its main access from the city center. After clearing this access from the existing buildings, the project proposes a long and narrow new construction that will shelter the needed functions such as the theater’s public services. Functions directly related to the theater and the actors are provided at the basement level and are directly linked to the skene of the theater. Overall, the above linear construction has been evaluated as being a strong element of dubious character, which confuses rather than benefits the aims of the project.
The presented idea is based on the well-recognized conviction that only the few new interventions will give a strong impact to the city creating landmark spaces in the contemporary city. The new facilities seem to be well located being proper and considering the scale of the city context. But forms and functions chosen for this area (metal canopy - kiosks), impose a different architectural language too close to the monument.
JURY GENERAL REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General remarks addressed to all participants
First, the jury would like to thank the Competition Organizer for having organized an international ideas Competition for this important topic in the center of Larissa.

Further, the jury would like to thank all the competitors for their effort and valuable contribution, which showed to the jury different approaches and gave the assurance that the ancient theater can become an important component of the identity of the contemporary city.

Recommendations about further steps the Municipality of Larissa could do for the implementation of the 1st Prize
In the process of developing the ideas for the implementation phase, the jury recommends seeking integration with the city and to support the idea of creating awareness for the unique heritage value. It is understood that the project’s architectural language will be sustained in the new proposed urban design and interventions process.

The jury also recommended that the “tower” designed as an enclosed monolith shouldn’t be seen as a landmark dominating the ancient theatre. The proposed structure should be used in reverse as one instrument to strengthen the crucial importance of the city’s heritage, defining an axis towards the ancient theatre and reflecting it to the rest of the existing city structure.

The emptiness of the open space between the theatre and the monument should be reverently preserved and respected against local interventions.
*Mr. Christian Sumi was unable to attend the Jury Meeting and, therefore, was replaced by the Alternate Juror, Mr. Jacek Lenart.

The Professional Advisor of the competition, VASILIKI AGORASTIDOU, signature