



# Makasiiniranta quality and concept competition

Evaluation report 2021-2022

Helsinki



# Table of Content

## 1. Description of the Competition 10

1.1.	Organiser and purpose . . . . .	10
1.2.	Panel of Judges. . . . .	10
1.3.	Preparation group. . . . .	12
1.4.	Participants . . . . .	12
1.5.	Received competition entries . . . . .	13
1.6.	Evaluation criteria. . . . .	14

## 2. Evaluation of 1<sup>st</sup> Phase 18

2.1.	Evaluation process . . . . .	18
2.2.	General observations . . . . .	18
2.3.	Ahti . . . . .	32
2.4.	Boardwalk. . . . .	42
2.5.	For Generations . . . . .	52
2.6.	Helsinki Design Promenade . . . . .	60
2.7.	Makasiinipromenadi . . . . .	68
2.8.	Merimaili. . . . .	78
2.9.	Punelma . . . . .	88
2.10.	Saaret . . . . .	96
2.11.	South Park . . . . .	106

## 3. Selection for the Second Phase 116

## 4. Evaluation of 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase 118

4.1.	Evaluation process . . . . .	118
4.2.	General observations . . . . .	118
4.3.	Ahti . . . . .	122
4.4.	Boardwalk. . . . .	132
4.5.	Makasiinipromenadi . . . . .	142
4.6.	Saaret . . . . .	152

## 5. Selection of the Winner 162

## 6. Approval of the Jury Report 164



# Makasiiniranta quality and concept competition 2021-2022



Makasiiniranta - Evaluation report  
© City of Helsinki 2022

Layout design: Heidi Peura (City of Helsinki)  
Cover images: "Saaret" proposal





The competition planning area



# 1. Description of the Competition

## 1.1. Organiser and purpose

The City of Helsinki held a competition to find a partner for the development and implementation of Makasiiniranta at the South Harbour. The competition was launched on 12 May 2021.

The aim of the competition is to develop the Makasiiniranta area as part of the pedestrian city centre and the seaside trail around the shores of Helsinki, and as a location for the new Architecture and Design Museum. The two-stage quality and concept competition was intended for operators in the real estate and construction industry.

## 1.2. Panel of Judges

### Representatives of the City of Helsinki

- Juhana Vartiainen (chair) – Mayor
- Anni Sinnemäki (vice) – Deputy Mayor for Urban Environment
- Ville Lehmuskoski – Executive Director, Urban Environment Division
- Marja Piimies – Head of Detailed Planning
- Salla Hoppu – Chief Architect
- Jussi Luomanen – Head of Urban Space and Landscape Planning
- Sami Haapanen – Head of Land Property Development and Plots
- Johanna Björkman / Sari Saresto – Head of Cultural Environment
- Marja-Leena Rinkineva – Director of Economic Development
- Outi Sääntti – Urban Development Manager

### Senior specialists in architecture

- Kees Christiaanse – Professor Emeritus, Architect, KCAP
- Leila Strömberg – City Architect, Head of Town Planning for City of Jyväskylä

### Representative of the Finnish Association of Landscape Architects

- Aino Aspiala - Aino Landscaping Oy

### Senior specialist in real estate development

- Markku Hietala – Senior Advisor, Realidea Oy

### Competition secretaries (not jury members)

- Valtteri Vuorio (GSP)
- Katharina Mead (City of Helsinki)
- Heidi Peura (City of Helsinki)

### Competition organiser (not jury member)

- Mia Kajan (City of Helsinki)



### 1.3. Preparation group

The meetings and decisions of the Jury were prepared by a multidisciplinary preparation group. Representatives of Urban Environment Division, City Executive Office, Culture & Leisure Division, Port of Helsinki, Helsingin Kaupunkitilat Oy and the new Architecture and Design Museum project team have participated in the preparatory work.

### 1.4. Participants

The competition started with a registration phase. Of the competition applications received by the deadline, 9 groups met the competitor eligibility requirements. The design groups accepted into the competition were:

- AALTO Development, Lahdelma & Mahlamäki architects, Landscape architects NÄKYMÄ Oy, Sitowise
- Elävä Eteläsatama: Ålandsbanken, Tommila Architects, Architects Rudanko + Kankkunen, A-insinöörit, VSU Landscape architects
- Foster + Partners, Planetary Architecture, Maanlumo landscape architects and Ramboll with Hines Nordics
- HGR Property Partners, PES-Architects, VSU Landscape architects, WSP, Sweco
- Konsortium Gran: Niam, Taaleri Infra, K2S Architects, White Arkitekter, Ramboll Finland, Rakennuttajatoimisto HTJ Ltd.
- Merellinen Helsinki 2030: JKMM architects, Loci landscape architects, Ramboll
- NCC, Arkkitehdit Soini & Horto, AOR architects, MASU Planning, Destia, Ramboll Finland, Salsa Concept)
- Skanska, ALA, Architects, SLA S/A, Sitowise
- South Harbour: NREP, SRV, Anttinen Oiva Architects, Nomaji Landscape Architects, Sitowise, Suunnittelutoimisto Amerikka Oy

### 1.5. Received competition entries

Nine proposals were submitted by 10 December 2021, which was the deadline set for the first phase entries of competition. Proposals were left with nicknames that are:

- Ahti
- Boardwalk
- For Generations
- Helsinki Design Promenade
- Makasiinipromenadi
- Merimaili
- Punelma
- Saaret
- South Park

The preparation group noted that

- All of the entries were submitted on time.
- All of the entries fill the minimum requirements.
- All of the entries deviate from the planning principles in some way.

The jury decided to accept all of the entries for evaluation.

The whole material of each proposal is found on website:

<https://kerrokantasi.hel.fi/makasiiniranta-kilpailuehdotukset>



## 1.6. Evaluation criteria

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

- The quality of the plan in terms of cityscape, architecture, and landscape architecture, as well as its suitability for the national landscape of maritime Helsinki, the buffer zone of a UNESCO World Heritage Site, the cultural and historical values of the area and the cultural environment. The suitability of the plan as an area expanding the historical centre.
- The balanced relationship of the new construction with the facade front of South Harbour and the current cityscape of Kaartinkaupunki, Ullanlinna and Kaivopuisto. Integration into the current urban structure.
- Attention to the importance of the area and solutions that strengthen and create the identity of the area, as well as the overall landscape architectural solution.
- The creation of a high-quality urban character and an attractive environment for all residents: distinctiveness and comfort, scale and atmosphere, nature of public spaces, street views and openness.

### Overall functional solution

- An operational concept that promotes the vitality of the centre of Helsinki: the evaluation will value the diversity of functions presented for the area and activities that increase the attractiveness of the entire city centre.
- The content, location and credibility of functions, the functional nature of ground floor premises and the comfort of the pedestrian environment.
- Relationship with the existing environment and the identity of the area.
- Connection of the area to its surroundings: functionality of connections, continuity of the seaside trail, natural pedestrian routes, functionality of traffic.
- Functional quality of outdoor spaces: seaside accessibility, street-level activation, pedestrian perspective.

### The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings

- The functions presented in the plan for the Old Market Hall and harbour buildings shall be taken into account in the evaluation of the functional quality of the plan and in the overall evaluation, provided that the functions presented are commercially and otherwise feasible.
- Any new use of these buildings of cultural and historical value must be appropriate to the characteristics of the buildings and support the preservation of their conservation values.

### Architecture and Design Museum

- The connection of the Architecture and Design Museum to the area and the public outdoor spaces surrounding it and the feasibility of the project independent of the rest of the area.
- The museum supporting the Helsinki Maritime Strategy and the museum's natural role among other public spaces in the area.
- Functions supporting museum activities.

### Feasibility and techno-economic quality

- The techno-economic feasibility of the overall idea and concept.
- Financial feasibility, feasibility of business ideas.
- Functionality of maintenance and parking.
- Functional quality at different implementation phases.



## Climate-smart construction

- Realisation of the Carbon-neutral Helsinki 2035 action plan.
- Solutions that increase energy and eco-efficiency and other innovations that promote carbon neutrality.
- The lifecycle flexibility of the solution, the functional flexibility of buildings.
- Solutions that take sustainable development into account and promote circular economy.

In the first phase, the evaluation will focus on the overall solution and the idea of the plan and its integration with the values of the surroundings and the landscape.

The functionality of the overall solution and its potential for development is considered to be more important than any of the individual evaluation criteria.



Image: Suomen Ilmakuva Oy



## 2. Evaluation of 1<sup>st</sup> Phase

### 2.1. Evaluation process

The Jury met three times, 20 January, 4 and 17 February 2022.

The preparation group met three times and, also had several meetings divided into smaller groups by different topics. The preparation group, as well as the Jury, was provided with a Review of Real Estate feasibility of the entries by Newsec and a summary of the Voice Your Opinion public hearing. The evaluation was carried out anonymously.

### 2.2. General observations

#### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

The competitors have studied the competition programme's extensive materials in depth and have met several of the prerequisites. This has led to a certain homogeneity regarding the proposals. However, despite this overall similarity, a closer inspection of the entries reveals major differences between them. All of the proposals had been carefully prepared and all of them had merits, as well as weaknesses.

The competition assignment was challenging and required design and planning in many different fields. Solutions were needed not only in sectors of city planning, architecture and landscape architecture, but also in areas of traffic planning, technical and financial planning, retail and concept design and climate-awareness. In the best proposals, all of these different areas had been addressed in balanced ways and in cooperation with experts from different fields, making them into more than the sum of their parts. The evaluation of the first stage focused on the assessment of solutions related to city structure and urban landscape. The objective is to find a plan based on which the City of Helsinki can develop a charming and attractive Makasiiniranta as a part of a more extensive national landscape.

The competition area is divided into three sections: the northernmost area includes Lyypekinlaituri, the Old Market Hall and Vironallas basin; the central area of Makasiiniranta, where most of the new construction will be located; and the southernmost area of Olympia Quay and Armi Ratia Park. Naturally, the competition proposals have mostly focused on the Makasiiniranta area. The change in this area will be the most notable with regards to the urban structure and landscape, and, therefore, it is also emphasised in the evaluation process. The proposals presented many great ideas

for operations in the Olympia Terminal and the Port House buildings, as well as the facilities below the deck and along the railway shaft, mostly focusing on operations in areas of culture, sports, wellness and the restaurant and hospitality industry. New alternative operations were not proposed for the Old Market Hall. The historical building is considered to maintain its value best in its original purpose of use. Different pavilions and other new arrangements were proposed for Lyypekinlaituri to improve the pedestrian connections and the area's use during events.

In the evaluation of individual entries, emphasis has also been put on their potential for further development. The idea and concept of the proposal must remain in further development, in the second phase of the competition and, finally, in the implementation of the Makasiiniranta area.

The new identity of Makasiiniranta has been developed either based on its local history and cultural environment (Makasiinipromenadi) or by creating a new and recognisable identity in the area (Boardwalk, Helsinki Design Promenade). Some successful solutions have been proposed for both of these perspectives. The architecture is mostly contemporary and of a high standard and quality, but also monotonous and generic. This harmonious homogeneity serves as a peaceful background to Tähtitorninvuori and the future museum annex. The future status of this annex as a new attractive feature of the South Harbour shore's urban landscape has been understood well. The challenge in this planning work is to find the balance between fitting in with the cultural environment while building a new identity, without any blatant overkills, while also avoiding boredom. The best solutions have managed to create a new interesting urban structure in the area without compromising the current value of the surroundings.

Maintaining the views required by the competition programme is important both for the scenic spot in Tähtitorninvuori and for the scenery from Laivasillankatu street. New construction will inevitably change the area, and only a few of the entries have managed to maintain the required views. At their best, the views have been established as the basis for the solution related to urban structure (Saaret). The silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori, rising up from behind the new construction, has been successfully maintained in most of the entries. For the most part, the proposals follow the required new construction heights.

The nature, character and spatial diversity of the public outdoor premises have been interpreted in different ways. In many of the entries, the fairly generic facades have



been balanced with diverse landscaping. In addition, some entries had a weak landscape architectural part, and the architecture was dominating (Boardwalk, Helsinki Design Promenade). Excessive forestation and extensive green roofs and terraces serve as answers to the public debate on the demand for more parks in the South Harbour, as well as the City's CNH programme. However, this makes the area lose its character. The South Harbour is the historical marine centre of Helsinki, and the goal is to continue the pedestrian centre from the Market Square to Makasiiniranta. The harbour grounds have always either been paved or covered with asphalt due to their functional requirements, and the Makasiiniranta area is largely covered by filling soil. One valuable characteristic of the landscape that should be maintained is the green Tähtitorninvuori park rising up behind the harbour area. The contrast between the built waterfront areas and the surrounding park-like greenery is a recognisable special characteristic of Makasiiniranta.

The currently closed areas in Makasiiniranta reserved for harbour operations cuts off the shoreside trail around the peninsula of Helsinki. The best entries have been able to understand the value of an uninterrupted seaside promenade, and it has been designed into an attractive, accessible and functionally diverse route.

The character of Makasiiniranta as an extension to the city centre's pedestrian environment has been understood fairly well, and the proposed activities liven up the urban space intended for pedestrians. At their best, the height differences between the seashore and Laivasillankatu street have been resolved naturally and accessibly (Saaret). In some entries, the beach promenade and pedestrian area have become lost, and various difficult arrangements have been proposed for the accessible route (For Generations, Merimaili); either the route travels through narrow, zigzagging pathways or the height differences have been compensated for with flights of stairs or ramps that do not fit in well with their surroundings.

## The cultural landscape

The Market Square is the centrepiece of the maritime façade of Helsinki city centre; an urban landscape of nationwide significance. The historical urban space continues towards the south beyond the Old Market Hall and the Palace Hotel. The Observatory Park (Tähtitorninvuori) is also a part of the national landscape. The park and the observatory building both form a vantage point towards Katajanokka and the Market Square.

The competition entries will have to reach a balanced co-existence with this cultural landscape. There are apparently many possibilities to reach this target: either by adapting the new buildings completely to the existing townscape, or by creating visible new elements, even landmarks. The most adaptive entries, "Makasiinipromenadi" and "For Generations", rely on relatively low horizontal volumes parallel to the quay. Because of this, there are no major dissonances with the landscape of the harbour area. "Makasiinipromenadi" would also create new town squares between the buildings; "For Generations" has a more intimate character.

The four slightly weightier entries, "Merimaili", "Punelma", "Ahti" and "Saaret", also strive for harmony. "Saaret" is the most balanced of these, with its skilfully placed building volumes and interesting internal and external views. "Ahti" has similar qualities, but the unbroken chain of volumes and a 45-degree angle to the shoreline are somewhat heavy-handed. The downside of "Punelma" is the sloping pedestrian route from the Olympia Terminal to the quay, adding a large and rather dull element to the façade towards the sea. The volume of the new construction closest to the Market Square is also a little too high. The green, almost woody, terraced volumes of "Merimaili" would be difficult to create on the stony and dry ground.

There is a greater risk of failure if large sculptural volumes are chosen as the main theme, not to speak of exceeding the maximum height of the new construction. "Boardwalk" has taken on the challenge and succeeded; the combination of high and low buildings also gives the Observatory Hill the breathing space it needs. The large size of the museum building can be a risk; as the visible starting point of the new area, it must be an architectural masterpiece. The sculptural "South Park" has a closer affinity to the Kaivopuisto villas than the Market Square blocks. "Helsinki Design Promenade" fails to catch the spirit of the place; the streamlined houses would be better suited to tropical beaches.

The most balanced relation with the historical landscape is reached in "Makasiinipromenadi", "For Generations", "Saaret", "Ahti" (with a slight reservation) and "Boardwalk".



In terms of vegetation, the relationship of the proposals to the historical context varied. The shoreline around the bay has traditionally been free of vegetation. In the background of the Makasiiniranta rises Tähtitorninvuori park, which is of great historical significance with its cultivated plants. The proposals focused on biodiversity-friendly vegetation, which doesn't have a historical context in the area. In some proposals, vegetation had been brought into the competition area in abundance (For Generations, Merimaili). This was considered to be an inappropriate solution for the cultural-historical environment. In the best proposals, the spirit of the place was also understood in terms of plant species and the amount of vegetation (Saaret).

### **Overall functional solution**

The aim of the competition is to provide the area with diverse, attractive and distinctive functions, which will create an active, comfortable and interesting urban environment around them, taking advantage of the maritime opportunities of the area. The facilities at ground level, along streets and in connection with squares, in particular should feature functions that are open to the public. Many of the entries have succeeded in this, and many have even proposed large-scale terraces that offer new perspectives for viewing the city's façade.

One of the goals set for the planning has been to strengthen the attractiveness and vitality of the city centre and integrate the area into the surrounding urban structure. In order to liven up the entire area, activities that attract visitors to the southern end and the harbour buildings have been considered to be important.

The overall concept and value proposition of commercial and non-commercial activities should be determined and narrated more clearly in proposals in the next phase. Most proposals have approached the retail and services aspect through functions, categories, locations and sizes. It would be advisable to take a step back and also focus on the conceptual level of the new, vibrant district of the city centre. Functional and operational solutions and concepts will, indeed, follow. A strong and distinctive concept will have a connection to the architecture and built environment and it will draw people to leisure, work and activities.

The operational concepts of the proposals include functions, such as office, hotel, retail, and, in some entries, also spa, sport, and event functions. Most of the plans have a balanced division of type-of-use, and presented functions fit well to the area.

The mix of functions is targeted towards different user groups, such as people of different ages, and functions that support the museum activities have been presented most successfully in the entries Ahti and Makasiinipromenadi.

In some entries, the overall volume of different functions is moderate, and the estimated demand would allow higher volumes. Therefore, the vitality-increasing effect of, for example, For Generations and South Park, is considered to be lower than other proposals. On the contrary, in Helsinki Design Promenade, the overall volume of retail is considered to be above demand and will, possibly, intensify competition with the centre's operations.

In most entries, retail activities are generally well located, creating a clear continuous route along the shoreline. However, in some entries, the functions' mutual location in different parts of the region decrease synergies between operations to some extent. For example, many parallel routes are seen as dividing the pedestrian flows.

In addition to commercial services, the aim has been to provide the area with opportunities for non-commercial activities and recreational use with different age groups and the residents' varied needs taken into consideration. The comfort of the seaside trail needs to be considered not only from the perspective of functional connections but also as a place for dwelling and enjoying the high-quality public spaces.



## The Old Market Hall, the Port House and the Olympia Terminal

All of the competition entries have chosen to keep the Old Market Hall in its current use, as a food market, and no major alterations are shown there. Some entries (Ahti, For Generations, Helsinki Design promenade, Makasiinipromenadi, Punelma, Southpark) have placed a restaurant pavilion or a canopy in front of the Old Market Hall at Lyypekinlaituri. Boardwalk has placed an optional new (ferry) terminal at Lyypekinlaituri.

For the Olympia Terminal, most entries have proposed an exhibition or an event space. It is not clear what kind of changes this would require inside the buildings, but museums generally require, partly at least, special conditions and must be accessible. Generally, no large alterations are shown in the exteriors (except in the underground levels, which are more freely planned). Some entries have suggested solar panels on the roof or new windows on the roof.

Entries Ahti, Boardwalk and Saaret suggest a new building between the Olympia Terminal and the Port House, which will mean alterations and new openings on the exteriors of the existing buildings. In addition, Ahti has placed an exhibition pavilion in front of the Olympia Terminal and Port House. Makasiinipromenadi has a scenic bridge in front of the buildings.

For the Port House, most entries have proposed its redevelopment into a hotel (Ahti, Helsinki Design Promenade, Punelma, Southpark) or a hostel (Merimaili) or a hotel conference centre (Boardwalk) and/or offices and co-working spaces, and a restaurant with necessary facilities. Helsinki Design Promenade propose a tall extension building with 5 stories (+20,20) in front of the building near Ehrenströmintie. There are no large alterations shown on the exteriors.

For both the Olympia Terminal and the Port House, in the underground levels the suggestions for new functions are more varied: there are, for example, spaces for cultural activities and sports facilities. More alterations are proposed there than for the street side level. The potential of existing underground spaces and the railway shaft area has been recognized as many proposals have produced highly unique and creative ideas for new development.

## The UNESCO World Heritage Site buffer zone

At the UNESCO web site, the buffer zone of the Suomenlinna fortress is indicated as follows: “The buffer zone of Suomenlinna ends at downtown Helsinki to the north and the military district to the east and south. The island-based fortress is not threatened by city planning or traffic.” According to this, the competition entries are unlikely to create major risks to the integrity of the site.

## Architecture and Design Museum

A new building for a new internationally prominent architecture and design museum is planned to be located in Makasiiniranta. More specifically, the location of the museum is set to be the northernmost new building in Makasiiniranta. According to the planning principles, the museum must be reserved adequate space for a building of approximately 9,000 m<sup>2</sup> (net area). Other main guidelines regarding the museum are that it must be possible to implement the museum as a separate, independent project, without the museum project incurring unusual costs or other difficulties due to other construction. A separate architecture competition for the museum will be held later.

Most of the entries follow the given guidelines, but in two entries the museum is located in Olympia Terminal. Especially, in Helsinki Design Promenade, the museum is well presented, but there are several reasons, both functional and financial, why this option is not feasible. For example, the goal is to open the museum while the port of Helsinki is still operating in the south. In other entries, the museum is placed as instructed, but it remains somewhat unclear if the preserved area is of sufficient size.

In many of the entries, the museum building has been presented in an unsure or even in a quite detailed way. Only one entry has left the museum site open. As the museum must be able to be implemented as a separate project, it is slightly problematic, if the museum is structurally or functionally connected to the project's other buildings. Furthermore, the entries' other buildings should also work on their own. It needs to be considered, if the buildings fit to the environment on their own, but also, what kind of background they form for the museum.

Another aspect to be considered is how the presented functions support the museum's role in the area. Other cultural actors, for example a museum, would be desirable from the museum's perspective. Functions that attract diverse groups of visitors to the area are encouraged.



## Feasibility and techno-economic quality

From the point of real estate economic feasibility, all of the entries were generally feasible. However, in all the entries, there were also some functions and complex structures that would require further elaboration. In several proposals, the functions are presented in excessive detail, considering the long schedule for the implementation. For this reason, the functions have been evaluated on a more general level.

The vitality-increasing effects of different projects in the city centre area have also been evaluated. The evaluation has involved examining aspects such as the numbers of visitors brought to the area by different functions and the timing thereof at different times of the day. The numbers of visitors and their timing are based on surveys and materials collected by Jones Lang Lasalle over a long period of time. It is estimated that all of the entries will increase the vitality of the city centre in various ways through the increasing number of jobs and services. The functions and presented volumes correspond to the estimated demand in most of the entries.

In all plans, there are some technical issues to be elaborated. Underground and under the deck –structures will require further examination, as well as the elevation and flood protection of the area as a whole. Similarly, in structural solutions, for example, the full-width glass wall of office space presents challenges for the implementation of technical solutions.

The presentation of the real estate feasibility of the plans and the boundary conditions for their implementation varied. From the point of view of real estate economic feasibility, the overall plan was mainly credible in the entries of Ahti, Boardwalk, For Generations, Makasiinipromenadi, Merimaili, and Punelma.

All competition entries also have plenty to clarify and specify when it comes to traffic. It is difficult to fully rank the entries in terms of their traffic arrangements. However, the entries South Park, Merimaili and For Generations feature the weakest traffic-related conditions. For all plans, attention must be paid to the distribution of implementation responsibilities for the areas' construction and maintenance.

## Observations considering the Port of Helsinki

The harbour area is presented well in all the entries; there is a slight variation, but the area is presented mainly to the extent specified in the competition programme. As for the port, the actual sufficient extent needs to be re-examined once the detailed planning starts.

The harbour's pedestrian and public transport connections are handled well in almost all entries, but the vehicle traffic solutions are covered superficially. Special attention should be paid to the latter: maintenance traffic, but also pick-up and drop-off traffic and bus traffic, are an essential part of harbour operations in terms of international cruise traffic.

The harbour area is mainly presented at its existing elevation. The connection to the environment varies in the entries: attention must be paid to how the harbour area is accessed by vehicles; how the levelling can be coordinated with the existing quay level. The harbour area must have a uniform security area access to the new passenger terminal, as specified by the supervising authority, which must be taken into consideration.

In several entries, the harbour area, which forms a security area required by the authorities (in accordance with the ISPS), is adjacent to structures, vegetation and features that are not suitable next to such a security area. The security area must not be accessible e.g. by climbing over a fence or a tree. Other features, such as a playing field, cannot be placed next to the security area, either.

The new passenger terminal is presented in almost all entries, mainly located in connection with the Olympia Terminal, which may be a possible location depending on the Olympia Terminal's future use. However, the high-speed vessel terminal must be located in the immediate vicinity of the security area, and/or the passageway must be connected to and be a part of an enclosed and uniform security area as specified by the supervising authority.

Several solutions are presented for flood protection (outside the harbour area). Flood protection can mostly be reconciled with the harbour operations, but this must be re-examined in further detail as the competition proceeds and/or during future planning stages.



## Climate-smart construction


The ambition level regarding climate change mitigation among the entries is at a high level and corresponds well to both the Paris climate accord (1.5-degree target), as well as to the city's own carbon neutrality target by 2030. It can also be said that climate targets are at a higher level than in any previous district scale competition in Helsinki. For example, the share of areal renewable energy among the proposals is typically over 90%, something that has not been implemented anywhere in Helsinki so far. Regarding transportation, several proposals boldly suggested zero new parking spaces, again a new concept, but, at the same time, action that is widely required in order to reach set climate targets.

LCA calculations were mostly done promptly and reported clearly as part of the proposals. Lifecycle based CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were ranging from 11kg CO<sub>2</sub>e/m<sup>2</sup>/a to 17kg CO<sub>2</sub>e/m<sup>2</sup>/a in some parts of proposals. Average life cycle emissions were clearly at a lower level than in assessments that are done about other (mainly residential housing) projects in Helsinki. An interesting finding is that the carbon handprint of the proposals varies a great deal, mostly depending on the proposed construction materials used. In the best entries, the carbon handprint was over 10kg CO<sub>2</sub>e/m<sup>2</sup>/a, almost equal the carbon footprint.

Although LCA calculations told that the proposals are mostly at a high level from the life cycle emissions point of view, there were clear differences in the credibility of proposals. This was especially evident in a description of the proposed energy system. The best proposals studied possible energy solutions a lot and were able to give a relatively comprehensive plan about the energy system and its performance. On the other hand, in some proposals the energy system was described at a much more general level, only by listing possible technologies. From the standardization point of view, all but one of the proposals were targeting the energy class A and most also promised the highest level of international sustainability standard, either Breeam Outstanding or LEED Platinum.


Traffic based emissions are not included in LCA evaluations and the climate performance of transportation was estimated by how much entries proposed new parking to the area. From this aspect, the best entries proposed zero new parking spaces, which underlines the concepts' commitment to climate targets and tells about their understanding of the central and highly accessible location.

The best proposals based on climate-smart contents were South Park, Saaret, Makasiinipromenadi and Merimaili. However, the feasibility of the presented solutions should be elaborated, and the consortiums should commit to the city's target and be willing to develop their solutions further, so that they are also up-to-date at the time of implementation.



The Port House (Satamatalo) and part of the deck structures.  
Image: Ville-Samuli Rantalainen







## 2.3. Ahti

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

The rhythm and scale of the architecture fit well in the existing city structure. The buildings align with the orthogonal street grid of the centre. This has the advantage of a jagged building line along the shoreline and the road at the back, which creates niches which lend themselves to placemaking, drop-off and loading zones, as well as triangular pavilions for gastronomy and other small scale uses. It has the disadvantage that it echoes the morphology directions of the inner city, which does not address the transitional public character of Makasiiniranta between the park hill and the water, nor give it a sufficient identity of its own. Furthermore, the buildings appear to be somewhat monotonous and dogmatic, as well as somewhat massive in the middle section.

On the other hand, the architecture language is restrained and sophisticated, which is adequate for the site. Its open character is carefully referenced with the genius loci, in scale, material, colour and texture, referring to C.L. Engel's pastel palette.

The Architecture and Design Museum is designed as part of the ensemble, which is not realistic, as the building will be subject to a competition and, hence, a different architectural articulation. This may impact the balance in the ensemble and require a review of the morphology. All the above arguments ask for a moderate review of the orthogonal orientation and the unifying typology of the buildings, without “throwing the baby out with the bathwater”, or without losing its positive qualities.

The roof-park landscape across the buildings is an attractive idea mediating between the Tähtitorninvuori park-hill and the waterfront promenade. The project clearly inspires the public to be conscious of climate issues in the Baltic, for instance, by marking flooding precautions and levels and, for instance, a self-operating water-purification basin for swimmers in the summer and winter.

### Cultural environment and landscape, the suitability for the national landscape of maritime Helsinki

From the above description, the project can be developed adequately into the concept of the national landscape of maritime Helsinki, provided that the orthogonal orientation is softened and the independence of the ensemble from the Architecture and Design Museum is safeguarded.

### Identity of the area

The softening of the orthogonal lay-out of the scheme and the independence of the future museum may also enable a more fluid relation to the Port House and Olympia



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



Terminal. In this way the linear sequence of the whole ensemble may be revised in order to create an identity of more varied articulations while maintaining a strong urban coherence, which would be in line with the identity of the site.

### **Views, openness, the silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori**

The conception for establishing the view by a delicate placement of built volume in different heights and positions is the right approach. Building masses follow the slopes of Tähtitorninvuori. The solution leaves views and the water mirror open from Tähtitorninvuori. Nevertheless, the view cones need to be checked and the volumetric disposition fine-tuned in a further elaboration. The view along Eteläinen Makasiinikatu needs to be taken especially into account. The views towards the sea from Laivasillankatu street also need improvement.

### **New construction, elevation**

As noted, the quality of the construction proposal is solid. The architectural articulation is restrained and sophisticated. The construction is based on sustainable and renewable elements and materials. The design of the facades, colours, textures and relief make the project blend with the environment.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

Greenery continues from Tähtitorninvuori park to the shoreline via rooftops and plazas. Roof gardens are a semi-public space with a variety of several functions and biodiversity supportive vegetation. Triangular squares with building ground floors opening outside create a good starting point for a comfortable atmosphere. The atmosphere and the dignity of the place has been understood well and the weather conditions have been considered successfully. Outdoor space has been solved mainly via pavilions with usable roofs. Pavilions create a comfortable outdoor space around them and give shelter in the wintertime, but, otherwise, the landscape architectural part is restrained and disconnected to the overall solution in the proposal.

The level difference between the shoreline and Laivasillankatu street has been solved via a separate ramp, which creates empty walls on a lower level. The area of the harbour safety zone has been reduced, which is not possible. With the correct size safety zone, the shore promenade is too narrow. With the safety zone fence and the ramp, the place is lacking the cosiness which has been accomplished in other parts of the area. It would help if the ramp would be a part of the overall solution. On the Laivasillankatu side, the triangular squares create varying street space. Some of the squares next to Laivasillankatu street are lower than the street level, which demands more careful planning with the elevation.

The water theme is visible in the landscape architecture. There are different storm water management structures and reminiscences of Finnish coastal nature. Next to a boating harbour, there is a pool with a manual operable seawater purification plant

for the swimming basin, which has an educational purpose. The ideas are good, although the main role should be left to the sea itself.

The vegetation mainly involves native species, varying from forest like arboretums to meadow rooftops and to bare shoreline vegetation. From a historical point of view, arboretums on the Laivasillankatu street side are a peculiar solution, because Tähtitorninvuori park is a piece of Finnish garden art history with its garden species.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

The waterfront promenade is designed adequately and, through the niches, is well suited for placemaking and activation, although the pavilions may sometimes occupy the space of the niches too much, and protruding fronts of the buildings make the passage sometimes quite narrow. One of the main ideas is to have the restaurants opening towards the shore promenade with terraces, so it is important to have enough space for them. The stepped terraces increase the narrowness of the main promenade level. Also, triangular terraces next to the sea require a fence around them, which creates a blocking element between the shore promenade and the sea.

### **Overall functional solution**

There is a conceptual connection to the Baltic Sea and the functions form a well-balanced mix, but the overall binding idea, concept, or brand, should be narrated more clearly.

The proposal includes several attractive sights and activities that would enliven the promenade and bring a significant amount of visitors to the area. The plan suggests a relatively varied mix of culture, retail, office, hotel, and spa operations. The functions and business ideas are described, but somewhat superficially, and operational models remain unclear.

The functional program includes an Atlantis Science and Culture Centre, a Baltic Sea Hotel with roof-spa/sauna and conference centre and an underground Cultural Cave with virtual reality experiences. The locations of different functions are presented at a detailed level. The concepts of the two hotels have not been described and it is unclear whether they would pursue different visitor groups. A clarification would be required so that the credibility and viability of the functions could be addressed. The concepts, financing and operating models of the Science and Culture Centre and the Expo require clarification and further detail.

It seems that the plan would increase the vitality of the city centre in various ways through the increasing amount of jobs and services, such as hotel, retail, office, and event functions. The functions and their volume correspond to demand. Although the size of Atlantis Centre is relatively large, the conversion flexibility increases the alternative use of facilities.



Seaside promenade is sufficiently wide and on one level, making it accessible to different user groups. Activities are mainly located in the south, near the Olympia Terminal (art, ping-pong, outdoor gym), and the northern part near the Market Square focuses on calmer seating areas and relaxation by the sea. The promenade is pedestrian-friendly and inviting with its activities, but it remains open whether or not suggested functions would enliven the entire stretch of the seaside. The southern part should perhaps be developed towards an attractive ending point to the promenade.

The children's workshop at the street level of the hotel is a welcome element, but the logic of it requires clarification. There is a gym located in the Port House, which is good service since there are few sports facilities in the vicinity. There is also an outdoor gym in the proposal that would be open to the public.

The ownership model for the area has a fresh and innovative idea and it may be developed although the implications, risks and long-term flexibility of the suggested ownership model should be studied further.

### **Old Market Hall and harbour buildings**

The Port house accommodates a hotel, co-working spaces and health activities and the Olympia Terminal contains Science and Art Expo. Both buildings are well renovated with respect towards the heritage quality of the buildings. The attractiveness and contribution to the promenade of these functions could be addressed. The concept regarding the financing and operating model of the Science and Culture Centre and the Expo requires clarification and further detail. The Old Market Hall is dedicated to culinary and food related activities. The integration of adequate technical installations and restrooms would need attention in the Old Market Hall.

A coach terminal for cruises is provided. The location of the new cruise terminal is between Olympia Terminal and Port House. Direct access from the terminal to the bus coach terminal and to the street level and square in front of the harbour buildings is guaranteed without blocking the peoples flow along the waterfront promenade. The coach terminal is a bit of a barrier between Port House and Olympia Terminal and the Cultural Cave along the railway tunnel.

### **Architecture and Design Museum**

The museum is presented in the northernmost part of the focus area for new construction, and it links to the surrounding areas, although the reserved site seems to be undersized. Also, the north side of the museum exceeds Makasiinikatu street and blocks its view. The museum's connection to the waterfront meets expectations.

The project proposes the same geometry for the Architecture and Design Museum as the other buildings, which will be a competition and, hence, obtain a different appearance. The design should, therefore, in the next phase be made independent of and complementary to the museum, instead of incorporating the building into the ensemble.

The museum can be implemented as a separate project and also as a separate investor-oriented project. The plan has many functions that support the museum, especially the proposed science and culture centre.

### **Feasibility and techno-economic quality**

The proposal presents several functions that would bring visitors to the area in different ways and the presentation and concept of the overall plan are clear and credible. In addition to the museum, the proposal presents an exhibition facility and a science and cultural centre, as well as hotel, office and retail functions. The placement of the different functions is presented in great detail, yet in a somewhat confusing manner across different buildings. On the other hand, the spa and hotel are connected well and create synergy. Overall, the retail spaces are well located, and the buildings create a steady continuum of operations for pedestrians walking along the shore.

The vitality-increasing effect of the proposal in terms of the numbers of visitors is significant and the plan will also increase the vitality of the city centre through the increasing number of jobs. The functions and their volume correspond to estimated demand and, although the size of Atlantis Centre is relatively large, the conversion flexibility increases alternative use of the facilities.

The presented ownership model can be considered to be innovative, where the fund ownership is continuous and owned by thousands of ordinary people in addition to traditional owners. Still, the unconventional model may also make the project less interesting for traditional investors and is open to question. The realism of the presented financing model as a requirement for the implementation of such an extensive whole must be surveyed in more depth.

### **Connections, traffic arrangements and parking**

The seaside trail follows the planning principles for the most part and cycling (slow) is also allowed on the seaside promenade. However, the trail seems to be too narrow in some places, if taking the harbour security area into account. In addition, improvements to the pedestrian connection towards the city centre are not presented and the quality of the pedestrian and bicycle connection on Laivasillankatu street is not very high.

The continuity of the pedestrian and bicycle connections along Laivasillankatu street is broken up by several driveways. The separation of pedestrians and cyclists on Laivasillankatu street is effective, but the main bicycle connection on Laivasillankatu street appears to be narrow.

In this entry, one lane is removed from Laivasillankatu street, and northbound motor traffic is replaced by rail transport. It is proposed that one lane by the Old Market Hall is removed so that there would be more room for pedestrians and cyclists. However, changes this substantial are not advisable for Laivasillankatu street.



There are 30–50 short-term parking spaces along Laivasillankatu street and it is proposed that long-term parking takes place in the Tähtitorninvuori carpark, which would be expanded as necessary. A maximum of 253 long-term parking spaces are needed. However, it is proposed in the entry that employees and visitors be encouraged to travel by public transport or bicycle and that only a minimum number of car parking spaces be implemented. Bicycle parking is proposed for both outdoors (600 spaces) and two indoor areas (160 + 150 spaces).

### Maintenance and municipal infrastructure

The maintenance facilities and dimensions are assessed to be some of the largest among the entries. The maintenance solution for the area with new buildings is proposed to run via the Tähtitorninvuori rock connection, and it would be dimensioned to serve lorry traffic northward up to the museum. The maintenance tunnel in the area with new buildings would be close to the middle of the structure; this and the coordinates of the new buildings result in triangle-shaped areas between Laivasillankatu street and the buildings. The level of these triangles between is below the levelling of Laivasillankatu street in places and might create a need for pumping the runoff waters. The entry does not specify the implementation method for the triangles.

There is also a row of trees proposed for the eastern side of Laivasillankatu, but it's located on a plumbing connection which is planned to be preserved. Some trees are also proposed on the rescue routes in the plan.

The maintenance of the southern area is proposed to take place below the deck, in order to serve both the protected buildings and other functions proposed below the deck. The maximum height permitted at the entrance is 3.5 m, which limits the vehicles that can be used. In Finland, the maximum height permitted for vehicles is 4.5 m. This connection is also presented for buses related to cruiser traffic and other types of tourist traffic, and an underground terminal is reserved to serve the needs of the area as a whole. This will probably require that the height of the accessway be increased. Also, the existing vehicle access to the south is below the flood level, which means that flood control needs to be resolved during further planning.

### General levelling and flood protection

The surroundings of the new buildings are proposed above the level +3.4 as specified in the planning guidelines, but the plan does not specify how the elevation differences at the museum and the quay would be handled in practice. Southward, it is proposed that the shore is decreased in steps, from +3.4 to +2.5. In the long term, the lowest level may be occasionally submerged, but structurally, it could be implemented.



Aerial view



View from the Market Square



### **Deck structure to the south**

The proposed main idea for the deck area is to turn the areas below the deck into indoor spaces. A direct connection is proposed from the cruiser bus terminal, proposed below the deck, to the Port House (Satamatalo) and the Olympia Terminal. There is an accessway below the deck from the deck level of Laivasillankatu street via the exhibition space.

Further planning and coordination are required to ensure the preconditions for the solution's implementation and compliance with various construction guidelines and requirements. Perspectives to be examined include, at least, structural engineering and physical requirements, solutions and requirements related to fire and rescue services, the planning of building services engineering and the specifications of the space reservations required. Turning various cold deck structures into heat-insulating ones is extremely challenging and may lead to very questionable and dysfunctional structural solutions without precise planning and implementation.

### **Special notes**

In the plan, the matters of waterproofed basement facilities and the maintenance tunnel connection are described well. These connections are, however, difficult to implement. Traffic on Laivasillankatu street cannot be interrupted. According to the assessment, the matters of noise and air quality planning are well recognised.

The separate pool and its cleaning system proposed for the Vironallas basin would be a peculiar solution that would require special design solutions and specialised competence. It will depend on the implementation solutions and the functional quality how significant measures the idea's implementation would require. The system would surely not be a solution to improve the Baltic Sea's condition, but through its existence, it could highlight the matter of protecting the Baltic Sea and activate the visitors relaxing in the area. However, according to the assessment, the project could not be the City's responsibility.

### **Climate-smart construction**

The Climate change mitigation substance is at a good level in this proposal. The LCA evaluation and calculations are made on an excellent level and the climate emissions are carefully studied by subtopics. The proposal meets the requirements for the highest grade of BREEAM certification.

Various strategies are employed to reduce the overall carbon footprint and the ambitious level of local renewable energy production is clearly an asset of the proposal. For example, the spa would utilise the hotel's excess heat. However, the technical feasibility is ambiguous for all parts and, especially, regarding usage of the sea warmth.

The spatial flexibility of the buildings is limited by wide space floors with a circle void in the middle. Only a limited amount of new parking is presented, which underlines the concept's commitment to climate targets and tells about their understanding of the central and highly accessible location.

### **Observations/ Other aspects**

The project proposes two unique "soft" principles for the site. First, the site should be dedicated in the programme and form to a sustainable Baltic Sea. This is an excellent comprehensive theme to tie all activities and programme together.

Second, there is a proposal to give the site in ownership to the Finnish people in the form of a foundation. This is a beautiful idea which may safeguard the future of such a precious site from speculation. It should, however, be checked as to its economic, administrative, juridical and political feasibility.

In the Voice your opinion –hearing, Ahti was one of the three most liked entries. The plan was considered to be elegant and serene and suitable to the surroundings. However, some thought that the building masses were a little too boxy, boring, and needed to be developed.



## 2.4. Boardwalk

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

The interesting approach to this project is that the built volume and spaces are generated by the silhouette, views and experiences from diverse perspectives, existing connections, urban landscapes, buildings and parks. The result is a sculptural sequence of volumes and spaces, which also respect the waterfront zone as a stage for elements with a special identity. The landscape architectural part is incomplete and must be taken into account during the next phase.

The project works as one undulating plastic volume, which goes up and down, forwards and backwards in reaction to the context. The roofscape of the buildings are accessible from the seaside promenade and lead up to the highest point of the hotel/spa in the form of a roof park.

Despite this unity, the project is divided into separate buildings with a certain flexibility and architectural freedom, connected by roof bridges, which at the same time cover the perpendicular openings between Laivasillankatu street and the seaside promenade. The architecture is conceived as a language of related articulations in local stone materials.


Next to the seaside promenade, the project has a second pedestrian circuit, which leads through the atria and the covered openings between the buildings, providing an attractive all-season environment for diverse programmes. However, the circuit sometimes leads through gastronomy and retail spaces, which should be revised.

### Cultural environment and landscape, the suitability for the national landscape of maritime Helsinki

The project produces a beautiful, sophisticated, and restrained massing, which respects and blends well into the context, yet it also exceeds the given maximum height.

### Identity of the area

Due to its plastic volumetric character, the project produces a unique identity for the local environment. Thematically categorized as pavilion-like, it matches well with the identity of the context.



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



### **Views, openness, the silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori**

Tähtitorninmäki and the views from the city guide the silhouette of the project and its views. The hotel section is slightly higher than allowed, but only locally. The building hides the façade of the city and the water mirror behind it from Tähtitorninvuori observation spot. There are questions regarding whether views from Laivasillankatu street would actually work. The views should be reviewed in a following phase.

### **New construction, elevation**

The buildings are meant to be constructed from local, natural and renewable materials. The articulation of the facades is thought of as a guideline-set which produces a certain variety within an overall material coherence.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

The meandering form produces a rich public space environment of different dimensions, which lends itself for all kinds of activation and events. However, along Laivasillankatu street the project forms quite a straight wall which makes it somehow untouchable and prohibits access bays and drop off zones. Also, the row of trees is not possible along Laivasillankatu street due to underground municipal systems, so squares or niches would help to have some vegetation along the street. The roofscape is smooth and accessible with partial gardens. The roof is intended to be free from extraction pipes and technical installations.

Furthermore, the landscape design is very rudimentary, and needs to be improved during a following stage. The swimming pool is considered to be in the wrong place and the street next to the museum in the axis of Eteläinen Makasiinikatu cuts the seaside promenade and square off from the Architecture and Design Museum. Also, the curved treeline running from the Market Square to the museum is unnatural. The square in front of the old terminal buildings has an important role in the city structure, but it has been left as a traffic area.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

As noted, the seaside promenade, basically, produces interesting spaces, however the pool and the transition to Kaivopuisto Park impose barriers to a smooth flow of pedestrians. For major pedestrian connections between different levels, accessible ramps should be introduced.

### **Overall functional solution**

The presentation of the functions is generally clear and credible. However, the overall concept, or idea of the commercial and non-commercial activities, should be established. The contents and functions are quite diverse and somewhat attractive, but the credibility, flexibility, sizing, and locations should be considered further.

It seems that the plan would increase the vitality of the city centre in various ways through an increasing amount of jobs and services, such as hotel, retail, office, sport, and event functions. The functions program is considered to be flexible. The amount of F&B functions may perhaps be oversized and should be reviewed or justified since it has an impact on the number of visitors in the area. The maintenance concept seems to be functional.

Retail operations are mainly located on the shoreside. Some retail spaces are difficult to access, specifically on the backside and inside alleys. The entire backside of the project should be reviewed.

The outside premises are interesting and lively on the shore side. Some of the building entrances, however, are unclear. Some entrances to buildings pass through retail space, creating additional operational problems for some retail operators. The entrance to the spa is between the museum and spa building, which may not be clear to pedestrians arriving via Laivasillankatu street. All ground floors are filled with exchangeable active public functions. Engaging volumes, grid of paths and courtyards, indoors and outdoors, form a canvas, places designed by stakeholders. In further design, the locations, sizing and openness and accessibility of street level spaces should be considered thoroughly.

The well-being and spa functions are separated from the hotel, while the office building is in the middle. This does not create synergy between the operators. However, the buildings are connected via an overpass to the upper floor. The initial gate in the north is visually distinctive and enables retail operations on both sides. Some



of the retail premises of the hotel building are behind a corner, and the visibility towards the city centre is inferior when compared to other presentations. The outdoor gym and playground are located close to each other, which encourages simultaneous activities for different user groups.

It is unclear whether the proposed functions would bring people flows onto the entire stretch of the promenade. The southern part of the area should be made an attractive ending point to the promenade.

### **Old Market Hall and harbour buildings**

The harbour buildings are well programmed, and the heritage aspect is respected. The parking next to the Port House inhibits the connectivity to exhibition spaces.

The Olympia Terminal contains Sport & Health activities; the Port House and Events and Convention Centre; the Railway Tunnel houses Art and Culture. Hotel conference centre and activity sports centre are credible concepts. However, two floors for the conference centre may be challenging. The attractiveness and the functions' contribution at the end of the promenade could be contemplated.

The Old Market Hall is dedicated to food and gastronomy related activities, like in most entries. The bike lane between the Old Market Hall and the sea would impose a barrier to extending e.g., restaurant terraces in the summer. Also here, the integration of adequate technical installations and restrooms needs attention. The connectivity of the plaza between the Old Market Hall and the museum could be studied in a further design.

The high-speed vessel terminal is projected in front of the Old Market Hall, accompanied by a ticket office pavilion. The Old Market Hall would benefit from passengers in its immediate vicinity.

### **Architecture and Design Museum**

The museum is presented in the northernmost part of the focus area for new construction. For the Architecture and Design Museum, the authors have conceived a building envelope in the spirit of their own design. As the museum will be subject to a competition, the project needs to show that it can successfully develop independently of its design.

The museum can be implemented as a separate project relatively well. Museum maintenance can be connected to the underground maintenance routes, but ground-level maintenance for temporary heavy-duty service is also presented. A general shape for the museum is proposed. The museum is close to other public spaces.

The plan has many functions that support the museum, although, depending on the concept, the proposed sea spa next door may lead to an unnecessary feeling of up-scale premises and conflict with the aim for diversity. The museum's connection to the waterfront meets the expectations and the ground-level public activities stand out. The museum is not dependent on those functions.

### **Feasibility and techno-economic quality**

The plan has a strong visual identity, and the overall presentation of the plan is clear and credible. The plan would increase the vitality of the city centre in various ways through the increasing amount of jobs and services. Retail operations are, mainly, well located on the shoreside and the premises are attractive and lively. Some of the building entrances, are however, unclear. It would be desirable if the street-level facilities would be open to all.

The presented functions and concepts suit the area. Operationally, based on the distribution of the presented ideas, the vitality-increasing effect of the proposal in terms of the numbers of visitors is more significant than that of many other proposals. However, the number of F&B functions may exceed the estimated demand.

The well-being and SPA are separated from the hotel, while the office building is in the middle, which does not create synergy between the operators as well as possible. The estimated total size of the hotel and SPA is considered to be above demand and would not necessarily be ideal for bringing visitors to the entire area.

The activity and sports cluster as the endpoint of the area is unlikely to bring in sufficiently vitalising numbers of visitors to the southern end of the area. The padel operations presented in Olympia Terminal typically require an 8-12 metre height.



## Connections, traffic arrangements and parking

The seaside trail follows the planning guidelines and the trail's continuity at the southern end of the area is presented in the plan. However, the pool proposed for the shore does not follow the planning principles and would reduce recreational space on the shore. The pedestrian connection towards the Market Square is also proposed for the western side of the Old Market Hall. The pedestrian connection to Armi Ratia's Park below the deck intersects with the maintenance connection, which can be problematic.

The main cycling traffic connection is proposed to take place along Laivasillankatu street, separated from the pavement. The main route is directed east of the Old Market Hall via Lyypekinlaituri, which is a weaker solution when compared to the existing one and is not a desirable option. Cycling (slow) is not proposed for the sea-side trail.

Bicycle parking spaces are not presented. It is mentioned in the text that the bicycle parking would take place under the deck, between buildings and partially in the buildings, but they are not presented in the plan material.

No changes are proposed regarding Laivasillankatu street (apart from the new pedestrian crossing). The motor traffic arrangements mainly remain as they currently are. It is proposed that the car parking spaces (approximately 200) be located below the Olympia Terminal's deck. The need for parking spaces is reduced thanks to the area's central location and good public transport services. Pick-up and drop-off places for bus traffic are not mentioned in the plan (museum and cruisers).

### Maintenance and municipal infrastructure

It is proposed that maintenance traffic runs as a tunnel connection from the south through the extension of the carpark. The maximum height permitted at the entrance is 3.5 m, which limits the vehicles that can be used. In Finland, the maximum height permitted for vehicles is 4.5 m.

The maintenance connections seem to be very sparse, and the maintenance facilities for the area with new buildings are not presented in the plan. The proposed level of the maintenance connection in the area with new buildings is at c. 2.5 – -5.0., which creates a need for watertight structures.

### General levelling and flood protection

The new buildings are proposed above level +3.4. In front of the southernmost new building, the seawall is lower than the overall elevation and the plan does not specify how this difference in elevation would be solved.

The entrance of the new terminal building is proposed to take place at the level +2.4,



Aerial view



which is not feasible in terms of flood preparation. Similarly, the plan does not specify how the flood protection of the Port House and Olympia Terminal buildings will be implemented. The potential flood wall structure would require an assessment.

### Special notes

The planned shape of the new buildings is complex and affects the costs. The slanted roof causes additional triangle-shaped areas on the roofs, which are difficult to utilise. When leaving the facility unheated, the solution proposed may lead to thermal bridges occurring in the upcoming building, which would pose a design challenge and a potential problem during use.

In the plan, balconies are proposed for the hotel. In principle, no obstacles to these are detected in the planning phase. However, structurally, the soundproofing against ship noise would require, at the very least, careful planning, and, possibly, special solutions in terms of balcony doors, for example.

The proposed location of the spa's outdoor pool, in connection to the seawall structure, is a complex and expensive structure, but also brings challenges and questions of distributing responsibilities related to the implementation and structure maintenance, and as such is a highly inadvisable solution near the shore.

A new deck structure is proposed between the Port House and the northern side of the area with new buildings, the functionality of which remains slightly unclear. What would be the cost-benefit ratio of this structure?

### Climate-smart construction


The LCA evaluation is done in the proposal, but the overall climate change mitigation related substance is at a very general level. Possible technological solutions are pointed out as a list, but it is not clearly defined what sort of technologies will be part of the proposal.

The buildings are not space-efficient, due to the sloping roof shapes. Spatial flexibility is not optimal, due to the complex floor layout.

### Other observations

The project is considered to be highly interesting, but a bit unsure and underdeveloped in many aspects.

In the Voice your opinion –hearing, the idea of the building masses was seen as massive, raw and joyless and the public spaces were seen to be lacking attractiveness. The modern vibe of the entry was, however, appreciated by a few respondents.



View from the Market Square



## 2.5. For Generations

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

The proposal recognises the history of the area and sits well within the cultural context. The new buildings follow the shoreline and set themselves both in scale viewed and alignment as a continuation to the Olympia Terminal and Port House. When viewed from the sea, the cluster of buildings, however, form a barrier like entity and, in such, differ from the South Harbour Bay's harbour buildings and warehouses. These are a set of low detached buildings along the shore with a higher and denser rising cityscape as a backdrop. Due to the barrier like design solution, the pedestrian views from Laivasillankatu street towards the sea are restricted and the permeability and breathability from the sea likewise. The heights of the proposed buildings do follow the guidelines set out in the brief and significant views from Tähtitorninvuori towards the South Harbour Bay remain.

The proposed buildings are set as on a chessboard along the waterfront, which creates a variation to layouts and courtyard like external spaces. The courtyards, however, may not be justified in proximity to the shoreline and their use would be restricted to the summer or warmer months. The external public spaces of the Makasiiniranta development should face and be orientated towards the sea and towards the South Harbour Bay landscape. The cluster of proposed buildings is in character dense and in such an estranged solution to the pedestrian city centre expansion towards the Makasiiniranta.

The proposed explicit, restrained and ordered facades give the scheme a rigid impression. The facades have been studied and developed in detail to create their own grid system that doesn't allow for chance. In contrast to the rigid architecture, the proposed treatment of external spaces is extensively diverse and filled with occurrences. The landscaping work is passionate and carefully considered. The quality of the external spaces is of a high standard, with stone paving and planting. The meandering network of paths and diverse material palette of the varied external spaces is, however, not appropriate for the Helsinki climate in terms of feasibility or maintenance. This would require a simplification. The design of the external space is further compromised by the large amount of deck-construction. Paths and landscaping constructed on top of the deck-structure requires renewing every 30 years in conjunction with the renewal of the waterproofing. The presentation does not reveal how the proposed scheme relates to the Olympia Pier area or what kind of a facade the terminal underneath the deck structure has towards the south.

The aim of the proposed scheme is to create the world's best seafront promenade. The proposed waterfront route remains, however, frustratingly narrow at the edge of the proposed buildings, not leaving enough space for dwelling. The promenade from the Market Square towards the south collides with the fencing of the harbour area and is, from there, redirected via an arcade up towards Laivasillankatu street, meandering over landscaped roof of the terminal building. The waterfront prome-



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



nade is also intended to host larger amounts of passers-by and their lingering movement though the site. By obstructing and redirecting the route, the purpose and significance of the seafront promenade that follows the Helsinki peninsula is compromised. Supporting functions for enhancing the attractiveness and liveliness of the pedestrian environment at squares and along the pedestrian walkways need to be developed further. Laivasillankatu street is lacking services, shop and restaurant functions that would open up towards and into the street and is, instead, proposed to house office functions that won't bring required life into the urban scape.

### Overall functional solution

The presentation of the plan includes retail offices, a hotel, and a spa, and it is clear, but the overall concept seems unfinished. The overall volume of different functions is moderate, and the estimated demand would allow a higher volume. The functions do not correspond to massing. Small buildings, courtyards and accessibility would make it difficult for the ground level to function commercially.

It appears that the plan would increase the vitality of the city centre in various ways through the increasing amount of jobs and services, such as a hotel, retail, and office. There are mostly commercial activities, although some low-threshold, non-commercial ideas would be welcome as well. It begs the question whether the accessibility and inclusion of different user groups have been integrated into the overall concept.

The operations are in quite credible locations in the real estate units. Hotel and SPA are connected, which brings synergy. Retail units are on the ground floor. The problem, compared to other plans, is the division of the pedestrian flow & retail units on the shore level and central building square. The slopes create an interesting park atmosphere, but also decrease the accessibility of retail units when compared to other plans. A separate gallery from the museum may prove to be operationally difficult in Armi Ratia's Park side.

There are multiple pedestrian routes (shore & building central park), which create interesting new routes, but also divides pedestrian flows and may lessen the attractiveness of retail units.

The goal is to enliven the entire stretch of the promenade, but it is unclear whether the proposed functions would attract enough people to the southern part of the area. The solution does not connect Helsinki's seaside trail adequately. The seaside promenade does not have enough space for pedestrian flows, functions, events, or maintenance.



Aerial view



## The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings

One of the few proposals that would redevelop the Old Market Hall and Market Square surroundings into “a culinary market”. A carefully thought-out connection that brings the Market Square and Market Hall together by a connecting (bridge), which is a functionally justified connection.

The plan presents a new bridge to the Market Square and to a pavilion, which could enliven the Old Market Hall area. The presented ideas, events and exhibits spaces, for the Olympia Terminal and the Port House buildings are credible, but perhaps not an especially attractive ending point to the promenade.

The functions presented in the plan fit well to the operational environment. Implementing the first floor of the old port buildings into commercial premises is a viable solution.

## Architecture and Design Museum

The museum is located in the northernmost part of the focus area for new construction. The museum is linked to the surrounding areas. The plan has many functions that support the museum, especially the proposed facelift of the Market Square area and Culinary Market stand out in the plan. However, the museum is not dependent on those functions and can be implemented as a separate project.

The museum is close to other public spaces. A new bridge from the Market Square is presented.

## Feasibility and techno-economic quality

The plan provides a believable concept that includes retail, offices, hotel and spa, and it is, overall, clear and credible. The overall volume of different functions is moderate, and the estimated demand would allow higher volumes.

The operations are located believably in the real estate units. Hotel and spa are connected, which brings synergy. The problem is that there are multiple pedestrian routes, which divide the pedestrian flows and may lessen the attractiveness of retail units. The slopes may also decrease accessibility of the retail units. Outdoor areas with small paths, stairs, and plantations require extra maintenance, and winter maintenance is difficult.



View from the Market Square



### **Connections, traffic arrangements and maintenance**

As stated above, one of the main goals of the competition is to create a continuous shore side trail. This target remains unfulfilled between the harbour buildings and Makasiinilaituri. The continuity and accessibility of the connections haven't been solved in the best possible way neither. The route is curvy, and with the height differences, the maintenance is difficult.

The rock tunnel connection via Tähtitorninvuori is presented as a very deep option. At the museum, the maintenance yard would be at level -30. The gradient proposed, 10% in places, is unsuitable for lorry traffic. In addition to this, the maintenance shafts placed into the building would be dozens of metres long and both increase the costs of constructing the maintenance functionalities and pose practical challenges due to their long lift connections. One maintenance yard below the new buildings, and from there a modestly dimensioned maintenance corridor to the new building to the north. The dimensions of the maintenance yard are assessed to be too small.

Parking places (258) are planned to be implemented as an extension of the existing Tähtitorninvuori parking garage.

### **General levelling and flood protection**

New buildings mainly take place above the level of +3.4. However, the flood protection of the square north of the museum building does not seem to be solved.

Recreational steps are proposed for the northern area close to the shore below this level. The ISPS area of the harbour is left as it is, and the levelling has been raised up to this edge. The new terminal building is assigned below the functional green deck functioning as an accessway. According to the proposal, the terminal's entrance is at level +2.5, approximately, which is not possible in terms of flood protection.

### **Deck structure to the south**

Vegetation is proposed on the deck: obstacles to this include the load capacity of the deck structure and the regular maintenance required by the deck, such as renewing the waterproofing. In addition, the vegetation has limited chances of thriving on the decks.

### **Climate-smart construction**

The climate change mitigation part of the proposal is carefully made. An LCA evaluation is done properly, although a carbon handprint is not reported. Additional information is given regarding building phase emissions of underground structures, which is a clear advantage of this proposal.

### **Other observations**

There are decks among the new buildings, below which there are functions and above which green construction is proposed. The quality and feasibility of the green structures should be verified during further planning.

In the Voice your opinion –hearing, the opinions for “For Generations” were divided. Many liked the subtle heights and the landscaping, but others thought that the buildings were too boxy and the overall plan confusing.



## 2.6. Helsinki Design Promenade

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

The basis of this scheme is sea and seafaring and the inspiration for the architecture has been drawn from the cruise ships at the Olympia Pier. The scheme proposes a deviation from the brief, in locating the Architecture and Design Museum with the existing Olympia Terminal and on top of and under the deck construction. This creates a strong point of attraction at the very other end of the waterfront promenade from the Old Market Hall at the Southern end.


The intended site for the Architecture and Design Museum is proposed as partially built up and partially as a park area. The conversion of the existing protected buildings into a museum, and the insightful re-use of these buildings could be viewed as a statement. The museum proposals are of a high quality and well presented, however they are not feasible. It is because it is the wish of the City of Helsinki and the Architecture and Design Museum to construct the museum as a new building located as presented within the competition brief. The Olympia Pier is still going to be operational and in use by the port operators at the time when the museum is planned to open its doors.

Three large, almost identical proposed buildings align the waterfront housing design-oriented functions and active urban facades, such as leisure, gastronomy and event spaces. The architecture of these buildings resonates the idea of cruise-ships or yachts and is large in scale. These dominating structures don't provide leeway for a diverse flexibly maintained programming and public space. The proposed buildings partly occupy the site earmarked for the Architecture and Design Museum and their bold statement dominates the waterfront. This concept would detract adversely from the new museum highlight.

This thematic proposal is compelling and challenging. In itself, the idea to place the Architecture and Design Museum in the existing structures in the South is compelling. However, the scale, form and articulation of the proposed architecture is not sufficiently adapted to the context. The proposal fails to catch the spirit of the place; the stylized buildings would be ill-fitted to the historical and urban surroundings.

### Identity of the area

The proposed scheme relies heavily on the architecture of the buildings, their sculptural form and polished quality, as opposed to the idea of the urban fabric. The success would require much of realization process, especially in respect to the sculptural terraces.



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



### **Views, openness, the silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori**

All proposed buildings exceed the area guidelines outlined in the Planning Principles and this scheme is the largest out of all the competition entries. The buildings would block views to Tähtitorninvuori, albeit street level views have been thoroughly investigated and significant views between Laivasillankatu street and the sea remain between the buildings.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

The landscaping part of the scheme remains unresolved, and the waterfront area lacks substantial ideas. One of the challenges, regarding the level difference between Laivasillankatu street and the shoreline, has not been tackled. The continuous and fluid connection from the Port House to the seaside Promenade is also missing.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

The new terminal building would block the connection to the sea and, as such, would bring unnecessary maintenance traffic to the pedestrian environment. Furthermore, the proposed vehicular connection to the underground maintenance tunnel crosses the seafront Promenade, which is contrary to the aspirations for the pedestrian areas.

### **Overall functional solution**

The plan provides a high amount of retail premises and offices named hybrid buildings. In addition, the museum is located on Armi Ratia's Park side, which connects to the hotel planned in the Port House (Satamatalo). The plan has a high emphasis on retail, compared to other plans. The museum located in the Olympia Terminal and the Port House would create an attractive ending point for the promenade, albeit against the competition program. The proposal would enliven the entire seaside stretch, bringing people flows onto the entire area.

This plan proposes all the architecture & design museum proportions to the Olympia Terminal and the Port House and Armi Ratia's Park side. The hotel is located in the Port House. Retail is located mainly on the ground level, but on the first floor in Armi building as well, which may be difficult to lease. The amount of retail premises

is similar to a small grocery-oriented shopping centre. Such a high amount of retail, given the location, may be difficult to lease.

The walkability of the seaside promenade is good. The streetscape of Laivasillankatu creates an urban milieu. The functions at street level activate the pedestrian realm and the compelling public walkway through the atrium courtyards increases the all-year-round use.

The proposed plan creates its own strong identity in the city centre of Helsinki. The plan works as a destination in terms of operations included in the buildings and the overall visual appeal. Lively outdoor premises that are supplemented by the retail units. The buildings are also open for pedestrians to walk through. The retail units open to the shore side, between the buildings and Laivasillankatu street. The plan creates a distinctive walking path which is supplemented by retail premises both on the shore side and between the premises.

The buildings are distinctive, and the pedestrian routes are clear. The continuum of interesting premises encourages pedestrians to walk from the city centre to the Olympia Terminal and the Port House buildings.

### **Old Market Hall and harbour buildings**

The Old Market Hall will remain, and the proposed bridge may liven up the area. The old Port House building is implemented for a hotel and museum. Renovation of the multi-storey Port House hotel may be costly, but it is a well-suited concept next to the museum. Helsinki Design Promenade suggest a tall extension building with 5 stories (+20,20) in front of the building near Ehrenströmintie, which would cover the protected Olympia terminal.

The Olympia Terminal, the Port House and ancillary spaces under the deck construction have been allocated for the Architecture and Design Museum, including associated gastronomy, atelier and retail spaces and hotel development. Old buildings have successfully been transformed for this proposed use. A new sculptural entrance has been added between the buildings and large glazed showcase elements pierce the deck structure to bring exhibits and artefacts into the public realm for the passer-by to admire.

The railway shaft acts as a continuation of the active public urban space. The Armi Ratia Park platformed stage with a grassed and terraced viewing area provides an apt opportunity for events and, as such, enriches the potential cultural offering.



## Architecture and Design Museum

The museum is presented in the Olympia Terminal, which deviates from the planning principles. The concept doesn't support the museum project's prerequisites, in terms of the schedule and connection to surrounding areas. For example, the museum's goal is to open the museum while the port of Helsinki is still operating. Also, if implemented first, the museum would be left alone and separated from other city operations for a long time. Therefore, the museum is seen as extremely dependent of the implementation of the entire area.

However, the jury found the presented premises to be excellent and of high quality. The plan has many functions that support the museum and placing the museum in the south would enliven the whole Makasiiniranta area.

The presented museum's location fits the old harbour buildings and, otherwise, implements difficult premises well. The volume of the museum exceeds the volume in the competition programme. The problem is that the museum would be left alone in the south if it is built first. The risk of project delays could leave the museum separate from other city operations for a long time. The museum can't be implemented as a separate project independent of the development of the area. Relatively detailed plans for the museum are presented.


The plan has many functions that support the Architecture and Design Museum, especially the proposed retail spaces and the hotel. The museum is extremely dependent on the implementation of the entire plan.

## Feasibility and techno-economic quality

The proposed plan creates its own strong identity in Helsinki city centre. The plan works as a destination in terms of operations included in the buildings and the overall visual appeal. The buildings are distinctive, and the pedestrian routes are clear. The continuum of interesting premises encourages pedestrians to walk from the city centre to the Olympia Terminal and the Port House. Placing the museum in the Olympia Terminal would facilitate the creation of an attraction that would guarantee considerable visitor flows in the entire area.

The plan provides a high number of offices and retail premises, which may be difficult to lease given the location. However, the retail is located mainly well on the ground level and the buildings are open for pedestrians to walk through.

Proposing three new buildings as hybrid buildings is well-founded, considering the long implementation schedule for the area, as the solution makes it possible to implement the buildings in accordance with the currently prevalent demand as an office, a hotel or other business premises. However, in future work, attention should be paid to ways to ensure the presented idea of street-level facilities open to all. It is somewhat questionable if the buildings can be implemented as presented and a matter of concern is whether they would end up looking very different after more detailed structural planning.



Aerial view



View from the Market Square



### **Connections, traffic arrangements and parking**

The seaside pedestrian trail connects Katajanokka to Kaivopuisto. It seems to be accessible and easy to maintain, even in the winter. However, the pedestrian route intersects with service traffic and a bus turning point. The pavement along Laivasillankatu street is also separated from cycling traffic, but pick-up and drop-off traffic crosses the pavement and the main cycling path. Spaces are reserved at quay level along the maintenance route for buses serving the cruiser traffic. An option for an underground parking extension is presented. The maintenance traffic route is functional in itself and makes it easier for buses serving cruisers to access the area.

It is somewhat difficult to discern the traffic arrangements for Laivasillankatu street in the plan. Apparently, the parking on the western side is removed. Otherwise, the street's arrangements remain as they are.

### **Maintenance**

The architecture is large-scale and complex. The exterior walls are mainly glass, and some are two storeys high. Some of the facade glass is curved, which is an expensive solution. The difficult shape and broad terrace areas are also unconventional for the Finnish weather and may require high maintenance in the winter. The tilted structures of the overhangs are visually impressive but challenging in terms of the snow load and the snow falling down.

The maintenance operations for new buildings are proposed to take place at the basement level, with a rather long maintenance corridor. Vehicle access to the maintenance area is at quay level, running from the eastern side of the Olympia Terminal. The service route in front of the Olympic Terminal is a cost-effective solution, but, otherwise, the feasibility of the route must be considered.

### **Special notes**

Facilities of the art museum are proposed below the deck, which would lead to difficult heat insulation and structural solutions.

The glass cubes stretching from inside the building to the outside are challenging to be implemented in terms of construction physics (lead-throughs from the ceiling and vapour condensing on the cold glass). If the cube was located on the street, the snow around it would need to be removed manually.

In Helsinki Design Promenade, the museum is located in the Olympia Terminal, and while the location goes against the competition programme, it is an interesting solution from the port's perspective. However, the reconciliation of the centralisation scenario for the harbour, the development programme and the museum's schedules pose a problem: the harbour will be operating in the South Harbour under the existing concept until 2030, and the museum should be finished by 2026. However, the solutions for the West Harbour with its harbour tunnels, as required by the centralisation, may not be finished by 2026.

### **Climate-smart construction**

The Climate change mitigation part of the proposal is well made and presented with a principle drawing. The main source of heat is left partly open (for example semi-deep ground source heat pump) and a description of climate actions are made at a fairly general level. The LCA calculations made well, but the results are not among the best ones and the carbon handprint remains very small.

The functional flexibility of the buildings is at an average level, floors can be divided, but they are not space-efficient due to the curved exterior walls.

### **Other observations**

In the Voice your opinion –hearing, this entry received the most comments of all the entries. The comments were equally divided between positive and negative ones. The appearance of the buildings was controversial, but the new museum presented in the harbour buildings was appreciated.



## 2.7. Makasiinipromenadi

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

This is a strong, solid proposal with a clear city structure that forms a good base for Tähtitorninvuori park. Horizontality corresponds to the Market Square's empire façade. The proposal has potential, and it can be developed further. The architectural concept is harmonious and coherent, but there could be more variance in the facades. Public spaces are well designed and leave enough space by the quay. An interesting seaside area that provides possibilities for many types of activities. There are lots of opportunities to develop the landscape architecture. The proposal connects the seaside trail well.

In this entry, the blocks extend the harbour buildings parallel to Laivasillankatu street. The row of buildings consists of three half-open blocks that open to face the shore. The volumes are equally high and form a peaceful and horizontal facade that connects naturally to the empire-style city centre.

The buildings, in a row, border Laivasillankatu street in an upright manner and make the street space look urban. One building stands out from the row: it is recessed from the street line, and its gable end faces Laivasillankatu. This deviation creates a small square in front of the building on the Laivasillankatu side, which breaks up the monotonous street facade.

In the yard in front of the main buildings, there are smaller pavilions and pergolas of various sizes with terraces. The seaside promenade is a clear entity that forms a pleasant area for recreation and events, together with the deck.

The architecture is subdued and stylish, but also a little rugged. In the cityscape, the overall impression is horizontal, but the facade motifs of individual buildings are vertical. The solution presented allows for different variations of the facades. The walls and roofs are made of the same material, the purpose of which is to give a uniform, single-piece-like impression. The roofs are bevelled, and the upper storeys have terraces on them. The shape of the roofs is an essential element of the main buildings' and pavilions' architecture and gives them a unique character. The building materials are brick and CLT. It is proposed that the slopes of the roofs be realised with handmade roof tiles. The largest building is the hotel next to the A&D Museum, and its shape deviates from the other buildings.

The yards are an essential part of the idea presented in the entry. On the long sides of the buildings, the yards are lined by arcades, as well as pavilions on the waterfront. The pavilions and pergolas separate the yard lightly from the seaside promenade. The connection running along the shore and through the block reduces the impact of the seaside promenade.



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



The buildings, functions and routes have been studied carefully, and they form a firm entity. On the Laivasillankatu side, the row of buildings is enclosed, but the lines of sight in between the buildings are fine, and the pedestrian connections between Laivasillankatu street and the shore are functional. The lower floors of the buildings open up in different directions, including Laivasillankatu (e.g., the entrances of the hotel and gallery).

The linking to the existing city structure is successful both to the north and the south. The horizontality of the building masses hints at an empire facade, while the shape of the roofs hints at the city centre. To the south, the buildings are linked to the harbour buildings to be protected through the rugged materials.

### **Cultural environment and landscape, the suitability for the national landscape of maritime Helsinki**

The proposal adapts to the cultural environment and does not compete with it. The architecture is modern, but also respects the old cultural environment. The buildings are placed so that the key views are preserved. The plan is balanced, and the historical maritime scenery is preserved despite the new layer of buildings. The roofs reflect the silhouette of the city centre.

### **Identity of the area**

The local identity is born out of the architecture in the entry and the relationships between the buildings, the yard area and the pavilions, as well as the choice of material. The yards open up to become a part of the seaside promenade that forms a maritime urban space.

### **Views, openness, the silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori**

Views are working excellently from Tähtitorninvuori and from street level towards the sea. From Tähtitorninvuori, the city façade and the water mirror are visible. From the street level, the sea glimmers between the buildings and as an end point of the streets. The only view along the Bernhardinkatu meets the wall of the building.



Aerial view



### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

An alley flows through and under the buildings and shoreline pavilions, which is the main concept of the entry. Shoreline pavilions create terraces with a view to the sea, but unfortunately the terrace zone is very narrow. The tunnels under the buildings might also be unpleasant.

The level difference between the shoreline and Laivasillankatu street has been solved via bridges on a seaside of the old terminal buildings. The solution is peculiar to the place and space under the bridge might be difficult to solve successfully. Also, the sport equipment of “Street Culture Plaza” are peculiar. The sport function doesn’t respect the importance of the place as a node point of the views and the dignity of the place as an entrance to the Kaivopuisto area.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

On a shoreline, the area next to the sea, Makasiini dock, has brought down close to the sea level. The solution is nice, and the level differences has been examined carefully, but the area is quite big when the promenade itself is narrow. The shapes of planting areas and the vegetation species come from the islands nearby. Flood problems and the elevation of the promenade have been examined carefully.

### **Overall functional solution**

The commercial concept is not particularly interesting or attractive but may be developed further. A clarification of the overall concept and value proposition of different functions would benefit the proposal.

It appears that the plan would increase the vitality of the city centre in various ways through the increasing number of jobs and services, such as a hotel, retail, office, and event functions. The plan is well presented and has a balanced division of type of use. The plan also includes a skate park in the Armi Ratia’s Park side.

The operations are clear, credible, and located well in relation to each other. The retail units are located in both sides of a pedestrian area on the shore side with separate pavilion buildings. The retail units are located mainly on the ground floor, despite a rooftop restaurant & culture cafe. The black box theatre (1,300 sqm) could be challenging to lease in Armi Ratia’s Park side.

Routes are clear both in the east-west connection and north-south connection. There are three separate routes, shore, middle through buildings, and Laivasillankatu street. The first two routes remain mainly visible to each other and do not create a heavy distinction of retail premises to separate routes.

Even though there are separate pavilions, kitchens are integrated into the pavilions, which improves rentability.

An interesting seaside area provides possibilities for many types of activities. The activities presented in the proposal for the area are diverse and will form an interesting series of spaces from the Old Market Hall to the Olympic Terminal and Armi Ratia Park. The pavilions provide the area with a pleasant and varied environment suitable for pedestrians. Activities are targeted towards different groups of people, which makes the range of functions diverse. Accessibility should be a focus, so that functions are easily accessed and attractive to different people.

The proposal examines the impact of different activities through different user groups and the time distribution of the activities. This provides good conditions for further development of the proposal, although not all of the activities presented may be feasible (i.e., profitable) in the locations presented. The vitality of the proposal, in terms of visitor numbers, is significant.

The proposal will create spaces in the area that will allow for various activities, which can also be imagined to be usable outside the summer months. The prerequisites of winter maintenance and accessibility are key in further design.

### **The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings**

The Old Market Hall and square form a “Finnish Food District” area that promotes Finnish food culture. There is a restaurant and food events square proposed in front of the Market, by the sea. The solution may be well-grounded, but the operating environment of the Old Market Hall should be taken into consideration.

Functions in the south and in the Port House and Olympia Terminal are versatile. Olympia Terminal and Port House will be turned into the “Centre for Visual and Maritime Culture”, which is a “setting for art, creativity and innovation”. The concept is, potentially, convincing, but requires clarification and more information about its contribution to the area. Offices and exhibit spaces are a credible use, but perhaps not an attractive destination at the end of Makasiiniranta promenade.



Public spaces and outdoor activities by the Olympia Terminal have been designed nicely. The Ratakuilu railway shaft area would become an attractive space with galleries, a sauna, a skate park and workshops. Artist residences are not a possible solution, but other ideas are worth exploring. Investment and operations logic require further detail.

The location of the high-speed vessel terminal is indistinct in the proposal. The location and space should be reserved in further design.

## Architecture and Design Museum

The museum site is in the northernmost part of the Makasiiniranta area. The reserved area seems to be adequate and links to the waterfront well. The subtle architectural concept of other buildings works as a discreet background for the museum and permits many design solutions for the museum. The museum is close to other public spaces. A new bridge from Market Square is presented.

The plan has many functions that support the Architecture and Design Museum, and especially the proposed hotel next door and the proposed Finnish Food District stand out. The museum is not dependent on those functions.

The surrounding area of the museum has been designed successfully. There is a museum square in the area with space for various events. The square opens attractively towards the pier and the sea. Adjacent to the south is a hotel with cafés and restaurants on the ground floor. They also open towards the museum and the beach. Other new buildings are mainly office buildings, but, on the ground floors, various services and business premises have been presented: restaurants, design shops, pop-up dining, events. Conference facilities are shown below ground level.

## Feasibility and techno-economic quality

The plan is well presented and has a balanced division of type of use and the overall gross area is in balance. The plan is economically well balanced with an emphasis on office use. In terms of the numbers of visitors, the vitality-increasing effect of the proposal is significant.

The proposal is based on a meritorious survey on the vitalising effect of different functions on the area by utilising different user groups and through the temporal distribution of the functions.

The operations are believable and located well to each other. The retail units are located in both sides of a pedestrian area and the pedestrian environment remains interesting from Old Market Hall to Olympia Terminal and Port House. The retail units are located mainly on the ground floor, except the rooftop restaurant & culture cafe. The architecture of the new buildings is clear, and the floor scale of the subfloors is good.

This provides a good foundation for developing the proposal further, even though not all the presented functions are necessarily feasible (i.e., profitable) in the proposed locations. For example, a Black Box theatre can be challenging to implement and involves a cost risk.

There are three separate pedestrian routes, shore, middle through buildings, and Laivasillankatu street. The first two routes remain mainly visible to each other and do not create a heavy distinction of pedestrian flows. However, a clearer main pedestrian connection is encouraged.

## Connections, traffic arrangements and parking

There are clear pedestrian paths and even the east-west connections are good. The pavement on the eastern side of Laivasillankatu is effectively separated from the cycling path. In Eteläranta on the northern side of the Old Market Hall, pedestrian space is increased by narrowing down the road, which is not desirable.

Due to flood protection, the pedestrian area on the shore involves some height differences, but the overall accessibility is good. The entry includes an idea for a scenic bridge for public pedestrian traffic in front of the Port House and the Olympia Terminal. The bridge would also be connected to Laivasillankatu street via the deck level. However, the connection between the shoreside trail and Laivasillankatu is hoped to be solved in a more natural way. Also, the bridge might conflict with the regulations concerning the ISPS area and should, therefore, be revised.

The traffic arrangements on Laivasillankatu street remain as they are in terms of motor traffic. The main cycling path also remains along Laivasillankatu. There are only two intersections with the pick-up and drop-off areas which support the continuity of the cycling route.

No new parking spaces are presented to the area and new land use will use the existing spaces in the Tähtitorninmäki carpark.

## Maintenance and municipal infrastructure

The southern area's maintenance connection from Ehrenströmintie street below the deck. The current maximum height permitted at the entrance is 3.5 m, which limits the vehicles that can be used. The maintenance connection of the new buildings is presented via a tunnel from Tähtitorninvuori, but it remains a little unclear, how they are planned to be implemented and their feasibility needs revision. It seems that the museum would be fully responsible for implementing the maintenance street and for its expenses.

There are many ideas for controlling stormwater floods and a biofiltering structure, as well as directing the waters to the vegetation to be planted on the shore is presented. The feasibility of these ideas needs to be examined further and their implementation responsibilities needs to be clarified.



### General levelling and flood protection

A flood wall is proposed between the Port House and the Olympia Terminal, and the shore. At the same time, the structure would also function as an element bordering the ISPS area of the harbour.

### Deck structure to the south

It is proposed in the plan that the facility below the deck be mostly turned into an indoor space. Further planning and coordination is required to ensure the preconditions for the solution's implementation and compliance with various construction guidelines and requirements.

### Climate-smart construction

An ambitious attitude towards sustainability issues in terms of strategic sustainability goals, and towards climate change mitigation goals. Also, a promise to develop solutions further, if needed, is present in this proposal.

The LCA evaluation and carbon balance study is made at an excellent level. The usage of electricity is seen as a major contributor to life cycle emissions and optional calculation is made using zero-carbon electricity. The carbon handprint is not at the best possible level.

The spatial flexibility of the buildings is good, and the floor setting is clear and space-saving. No new parking is presented, which underlines the concept's commitment into climate targets and tells about understanding of the central and highly accessible location. The proposal sets out the main features of LEED Platinum.

### Other observations

This proposal was one of the top three most popular entries in the Voice Your opinion-hearing. The overall solution was considered to be calm, classy and fit to the surroundings. Makasiinipromenadi received only a few negative comments.



View from the Market Square



## 2.8. Merimaili

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

This ambitious proposal has been prepared with an idealistic stance, in line with Helsinki's HNH 2035 (carbon neutral Helsinki) aims and establishes, with green solutions, a new area identity for Makasiiniranta. In this Merimaili scheme, three surrounding elements, the city, the shoreline and the park have been combined to form a new kind of green urban realm. The terraced buildings join the grid of the Market Square and its surroundings and from the street level views open up towards the sea and towards the Market Square. Compositions created by the arrangement and shaping of the buildings are interesting.

The street level is very much park-like, and the level differences are mitigated with banks. The buildings continue the same theme, terraced and opening up enticingly towards the sea. The scheme has a strong emphasis on activities and nature, throughout the seasons and throughout the day and evening.

The facades of the buildings give an impression of residential dwellings, and the architecture becomes hidden by vegetation. Plentiful vegetation has been proposed on the roof terrace and the deck construction. A clearly defined streetscape emerges on the Laivasillankatu street side with a square to announce the entrance. Projections on the upper floors, on the Laivasillankatu street side, cast an unnecessary shadow over the pavement and do not, as such, contribute to a pleasant pedestrian realm.

### Cultural environment and landscape, the suitability for the national landscape of maritime Helsinki

This proposal disregards the cultural heritage of the area and location. Makasiiniranta should be an extension of the historical city centre, not a forest. The area has not been green in the past.

### Identity of the area

The proposal alters the character of the historical built environment from a harbour city waterfront to a forest. The main idea of the overflowing afforestation seems to be unrealistic. The identity and the architecture of the proposed scheme do not conform to the genius loci.

### Views, openness, the silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori

Views from Tähtitorninvuori are retained, but not at street level. The façade towards the sea is disorganised and vague.



Siteplan 1:1000 scaled to 1:4000



### **New construction, elevation**

The buildings follow, predominantly, the height guidance set out in the competition brief. The roof gardens do, however, require a more substantial construction build-up than what is presented within the proposals. Base layers required for the planting and trees would raise the height and massing across the site.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

The foundation for this proposal revolves around landscape architecture, which has been carefully constructed. However, serious questions of feasibility and maintenance arise. There has been much effort placed on landscape architecture, but the spirit of the place has been overlooked. The planting of trees at this harbour and waterfront location to the extent as the proposal presents is not technically feasible due to the existing harbour wall. Furthermore, the trees would hinder the shoreside and commercial functions and don't resonate the area's history. Proposed green structures would not be able to grow or thrive on the quay or deck construction. Green public spaces in the city must be maintained and appropriate to the surroundings.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

The proposed promenade is forest-like, with twisting, narrow paths. The concept of a waterfront, seaside promenade space is missing. The path leads along the green shoreline from the Old Market Hall, past the Port House to Armi Ratia Park. The length of the journey is a 'merimaili' ('seaside mile'). There are connections proposed from the waterfront to Laivasillankatu street, including a bridge connection all the way to Tähtitorninvuori. But this cuts off a part of the park. The height difference from street level to the bridge is built up with banks, whereby the level accessibility is compromised by a zigzagging path-like ramp.

### **Overall functional solution**

The presentation of the plan is, overall, clear. The commercial concept seems to be reliable and functioning, although customer flows may not work on pedestrian routes. The plan would increase the vitality of the city centre through a variety of jobs and services, such as a hotel, retail, offices and a variety of event activities such

as band facilities and a youth centre. The public garden located on the roof requires careful planning and agreement regarding responsibilities and maintenance costs.

A hotel and office spaces have been proposed within the new buildings. The street level spaces would house restaurants and other retail premises, which open up and activate in such the outdoor areas. In the vicinity of the hotel, there is an area for city edible gardens, including a greenhouse.

The plan has an emphasis on offices. Retail is located on the ground floor, which is believable. However, there is some separable retail path, such as the Finnish design fashion shop district. While the concentrated fashion operators are believable, the separation from shore path may be difficult to lease. Separate business units on side streets, such as art&design streets, may also be problematic with streets with less traffic. The number of new restaurants may be too excessive. The hotel concept fits to the overall plan and is connected to the museum via an overpass bridge. The band premises in Armi Ratia's Park work well in an otherwise separate location.

The pedestrian connection to the east-west side is created well, despite having some elevation and stairs. The shoreside is attractive and lively and continues naturally from the museum and Old Market Hall with an art play park. Many outside activities are presented in front of old harbour buildings and other open areas, such as Art Play Plaza. The presentation of functions is very detailed, which makes the overall concept difficult to grasp. The proposed functions seem to be quite weather-dependent.

### **The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings**

Activities have been presented between the Old Market Hall and the museum, which is justified in order to connect the Old Market Hall and the promenade closely. The Old Market Hall remains with the suggested Biennale pavilion increasing the attractiveness of the area.

The Port House is implemented as sports & hobby activities and restaurants, sauna, and hostel, while the Olympia Terminal works as an event space and transit hall for travellers. Alongside this, the building is proposed to house youth activity areas and events spaces. A hostel, bar and public sauna have been proposed within the existing Port House.



Music rehearsal spaces have been allocated adjacent to the Railway Shaft, and the shaft provides a pedestrian connection to Kaivopuisto Park. The spaces under the deck construction by the Olympia Pier are shown as parking and the side of the Railway Shaft allows an area for climbing and bouldering. Proposed functions in and around the Port House and Olympia Terminal would hopefully attract people flows to the southern part of the area.

In the Merimaili entry, the Makasiini Quay is presented as a shortened version, which makes the area too short and small in terms of harbour operations. The overwhelming vegetation alters the identity of Lyypekinlaituri Pier and may impair the seafaring functions, and the usability of the area for varying functions and maintenance.

### **Architecture and Design Museum**

The museum is presented in the northernmost part of the focus area for new construction. The museum is linked to the surrounding areas, and the building is connected to other buildings via an overpass bridge. The museum can be implemented as a separate project. Relatively detailed plans for the museum are presented.

The plan has many functions that support the Architecture and Design Museum, especially the proposed hotel next door, restaurants in the new buildings, and event venues in the south stand out. The museum is not dependent on those functions.

The proposed form and composition of the Architecture and Design Museum feels out of place, but the proposal does, however, demonstrate that the museum and hotel entity would enable an active seafront urban fabric. A public walkway route has been allocated over the roof of the museum to lead over connecting roofs all the way to Tähtitorninvuori. Retaining the proposal would limit and restrict the design of the museum as a project.

### **Feasibility and techno-economic quality**

The presentation of the plan is overall clear and credible with a believable emphasis on offices and retail located on the ground floor. However, the offices presented in the proposal resemble residential buildings, and this impression is reinforced with ample green construction. Operationally, the plan is believable, but there are some separate retail units on the sloping side streets, which may be difficult to lease. The unconventional shape of buildings is exciting and recognizable but may also make

the space division in the future more difficult. The large-scale and complex architecture is also a cost growth factor.

Pedestrian paths connect to existing paths, and the shoreline is operationally continuous. The pedestrian connection to the east-west side is created well despite having some elevation and stairs. The public garden located on the roof requires careful planning and agreement regarding responsibilities and maintenance costs. Many outside activities are presented and various functions are also proposed for the existing harbour buildings, which would bring flows of visitors to the southern end of the area as well. Different functions are presented in great detail, but the vitality-increasing effect of the functions is marred by their seasonal dependence.

Public spaces on the roof gardens and city farm need extra maintenance. Outdoor areas with small paths and plantations require extra maintenance, and the winter maintenance of pedestrian routes is difficult. Especially large trees and plantations on the roof can be difficult to maintain in the long run. The deck structures set significant limits for the vegetation proposed for them.

### **Connections, traffic arrangements and parking**

The plan includes the seaside trail for pedestrians. However, the abundant vegetation makes the route narrow and winding, in addition to which cycling is also allowed. If the harbour security area is taken into account as instructed, the seaside trail appears to be almost non-existent at some points. The meandering slopes between the buildings do not enable a pedestrian flow. The pedestrian and cycling routes along Laivasillankatu street seem to be functioning, but the vegetation might reduce visibility.

The levelling of Laivasillankatu street is changed, at least in terms of the pavement and the cycling path because of the levelling of the maintenance tunnel. The plan does not detail how the changes to the levelling affect the longitudinal gradient, so the feasibility of the solution remains unclear. Otherwise, the motor traffic arrangements for Laivasillankatu street remain as they are currently. No new parking is presented.

Maintenance traffic is based on a maintenance tunnel at the basement level which is accessed below the deck of the Olympia Terminal. It is possible to extend the maintenance tunnel, even towards the Old Market Hall. Vehicle access to the harbour's safety zone is not presented.



## Maintenance

The maintenance connection serving the area as a whole is proposed to be implemented from the southern vehicle access, below the southern deck, and to the northern area with new buildings. In the area with new buildings, the gradients of the maintenance connections are high in places, up to 8%. At the museum, the maintenance yard would be at level -5. The underground maintenance yard would serve the three office buildings relatively well, but the distances and transport drives of the hotel's maintenance facilities are very long.

## General levelling and flood protection

According to the plan, the surroundings of the new buildings are at +3.4. Parts of the buildings and facilities below the new decks are partially proposed to take place below this level. It is possible to implement this, but it would require that the structures be waterproofed against hydrostatic pressure.

In the southern area, both the quay level and the sides of the protected buildings are proposed for the same level, +2. The flood protection method is not specified or presented in the plan.


## Deck structure to the south

Some of the existing spaces below the deck are left open as outdoor spaces. This is a good option in terms of implementation.

Plenty of vegetation is proposed on top of the deck in front of the Port House, the implementation of which, when using the current deck structure, is questionable.

## Special notes

The plan does not specify how the embankments proposed for different parts of the area would be implemented: as a deck structure or embankment. Both options have their own challenges: for the deck structure, the use of the space below and the vegetation's ability to thrive below the deck. The embankments may pose additional challenges to the area's stability; ensuring the feasibility would require further planning. In addition to this, the technical implementation and integration of the building's stories and the embankment would need to be considered.



Aerial view



Several roof terraces are proposed for the area. In terms of structural engineering, implementing e.g., the heat insulation requirements of the space below the terrace may involve facility requirements or result in steps from inside the building to the terrace. Removing snow from a terrace with steps is also challenging.

### **Climate-smart construction**

The vision and design strategy of the Merimaili proposal supports the city of Helsinki in reaching the Carbon-neutral Helsinki –program. The group has had an ambitious attitude towards sustainability issues, especially towards biodiversity solutions, which link to strategic sustainability goals, and towards climate change mitigation goals, that link to specific carbon neutral actions.

The LCA evaluation and carbon balance study is made at an excellent level. The study of the energy system is thoughtfully made, and different options for implementation are considered, but, at the same time, also more detailed information is given, for example, about the location and amount of ground source heat pump boreholes. The LCA evaluation is made at a good level, relatively low life cycle emissions are achieved together with a good carbon handprint. However, achieving these goals is dependent on implementing the vegetation as proposed. The feasibility of the abundant vegetation is, somewhat, questionable.

The floor plan of the buildings is quite clear despite the irregular layout. Spatial flexibility is good, which enables a longer life span.

### **Other observations**

In the Voice your opinion –hearing, this was one of the top three most popular entries. This entry received a lot of positive feedback on the greenery and pleasant outdoor spaces.



View from the Market Square



## 2.9. Punelma

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

The old railway route is the basis of the plan. The railroad has disappeared in many places and this solution is not a very successful way of reinventing it. The construction is parallel to the beach and Laivasillankatu street and is divided into five blocks, the alleys between which offer views of the sea. The number of storeys of the buildings rises from the south towards the empire centre and the open views between Tähtitorninvuori and Suomenlinna remain. The buildings rise a lot towards the Market Square. The museum is located in the northernmost site. The design could be more subtle and elegant. The alignment results in a tight size and shape of the museum site.

The architecture and facades of the office buildings create a business park-like appearance in the area. The façade on the Laivasillankatu side is completely closed and the street-level facilities do not open out to their surroundings, the entrances to the buildings are in the alleys and on the beach side. A public transit route has been run through the atrium-themed buildings, starting at the museum and ending at the bike hub. For some reason, the interior design of the seaside buildings has not taken advantage of the sea views, the atrium courtyards open onto the route connecting the buildings and not towards the sea view. The office floors offer sea views. On the shore side, business premises activating the pedestrian environment have been assigned to the ground level.

In overall terms, the proposal is not suitable for this location or cityscape. Overall programming is not convincing.

### Cultural environment and landscape, the suitability for the national landscape of maritime Helsinki

The proposal is weightier, yet there is a certain strive for harmony. The downside is the sloping pedestrian route from the Olympia Terminal to the quay, adding a large and rather dull element to the façade towards the sea. The volume of the new construction closest to the Market Square is also a little too high.

### Identity of the area

The proposal builds the identity of the business park on the site. The proposed functional concept is unnecessarily one-sided as an extension of the walkable city centre.



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



### **Views, openness, the silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori**

Buildings are blocking the view from Tähtitorninvuori to the Market Square and eastern facade. Street level views are working well.

### **New construction, elevation**

The new blocks rise from south to north as a terrace-like urban structure. The solution is based on connecting the heights of the buildings to their surroundings. The building height exceeds the design maximum. The maximum height is exceeded in the north and the structure will become unnecessarily dominant towards the marketplace and ADM's future construction site.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

The overall concept with an indoor alley is problematic. Also ramp systems between new buildings and old terminals is an unrealistic and costly solution, which makes the outdoor space unpleasant. There are strong themes and carefully examined ideas of landscape architecture, but the solutions are unimaginative and don't respect the dignity of the place.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

The old railway has taken the theme of the promenade. The promenade works well but is lacking the strong landscape architectural idea. Pergola partly blocks views towards the sea. The connection between the shoreline and Laivasillankatu street is a long ramp which continues on a ramp to the bridge to Tähtitorninvuori. There is a suggestion of the bridge to Tähtitorninvuori, but it would cut out part of the park. The solution to the height difference to the bridge is complex.

The seaside promenade areas have not been utilized successfully. The entrance is unwelcoming when approaching from the south. Height differences have been solved with pedestrian ramps that create an unappealing urban environment.

Construction focuses more on Laivasillankatu street than on the seaside, leaving a great deal of space in the promenade area. However, the extensive outdoor space of the promenade remains unused and does not become particularly lively. There are terraces in front of the buildings and the light traffic connection is shown along the old harbour line. There is a lot of spacious and empty windy space. A long pergola-type structure is a problem. It is modest and does not belong to the port. It can also obstruct sea views. The high concrete retaining wall is solid and too rigid and does not create a comfortable pedestrian environment.



Aerial view



## Overall functional solution

This is, functionally, a relatively balanced plan, with an emphasis on offices. The mix of commercial functions is simple and the proposed locations for restaurants and retail are clear. Commercially atrium courtyards would be a risky solution since it is difficult to attract customers into them. The idea of the indoor alley remains unclear and a bicycle hub as its ending point is unappealing. Outdoor sports and gym equipment form an attractive and active route for passers-by.

The Port House building is redeveloped into a hotel. The total volume of the plan is the largest among competition entries. The plan could increase the vitality of the city centre in a variety of ways through jobs and services such as hotels, retail, offices, event functions, and a skate park.

The retail premises are on the ground floor, opening towards the shore side, which is a functional solution for the presented plan. The pedestrian path remains interesting, even though some of the retail units have walls instead of glass in the street corners in the visual illustrations. The proposed covered seating in the shoreline before entering the port's land activates the shore side, but also increases the required maintenance. The underground path to Armi Ratia's Park includes workshop premises and sports activities. A canopy is presented in front of Olympia Terminal and Port House buildings.

## The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings

The Old Market Hall is developed for food & beverages services, similar to the current concept. The Port House is implemented as a hotel and the Olympia Terminal as a food market, events and sports spaces. The high-speed vessel terminal is located in the Olympia Terminal, as well. The idea of a food market may create a separate temporary offering to the south, competing against the Old Market Hall.

There is a large, empty-seeming area between the Port House and new construction of Makasiiniranta, that makes the southern part distant and perhaps challenging to attracting people.

## Architecture and design museum

The museum is presented in the northernmost part of the focus area for new construction. The museum is linked to the surrounding areas and can be implemented as a separate project. Relatively detailed plans for the museum are presented. The proposed structure with an atrium fits the overall plan but may divide the museum functions into two separate areas inside the building.

The museum is presented in the northernmost part of the focus area for new construction. As the project's buildings exceed the highest permitted elevation, they also form a massive background to the museum. This might leave the museum in a subordinate position.

The plan has functions that support the Architecture and Design Museum, and the retail proposed spaces stand out. The museum is not dependent on those functions.

The plan has functions that support the museum, for example, the hotel and retail, but the public outdoor spaces lack attractive functions. The museum's maintenance is separated from other buildings, which leads to a back alley feeling next to Laivasillankatu street. However, this solution enables the museum to be implemented as a totally independent project.

## Feasibility and techno-economic quality

The total volume of the plan is the largest among the competition works and it is relatively balanced with an emphasis on offices. The proposed plan fits well to the operational environment and creates a continuous path with retail operations. The Port House building is implemented as a hotel. In terms of the numbers of visitors, the vitality-increasing effect of the proposal is significant.

The structure of the plan is believable. The retail premises are on the ground floor, opening towards the shore side. The pedestrian path on the shoreline remains interesting throughout the route. However, a somewhat empty area is left between Makasiiniranta and the Port House, creating a hindering effect at the level of emotional distance. Nonetheless, the outside premises are attractive, and the operations around pedestrian streets remain continuous, but their feasibility next to the harbour security fence needs deliberation.

## Connections, traffic arrangements and parking

The pedestrian connections are clear and functional and even the east-west connection enables easy access to the shore. However, the presented ramps may not create the most pleasant pedestrian environment and the seaside trail is rather narrow in front of the Port House and the Olympia Terminal, especially for cycling.

The main cycling connection is marked along Laivasillankatu street and it is separated from the pavement with a three-level solution, which is partially under the arcade. New pedestrian crossing connections are proposed for Laivasillankatu street: on the northern side of the tram stop by the roundabout and in the middle of the new land use area. These are not compliant with the city's guidelines for pedestrian crossings.

Car parking (260 places) is presented well, and the number of places complies with the calculation instructions. However, bus parking spaces for cruiser traffic are not presented in the plan.

## Maintenance

The maintenance for the Olympia Terminal and the Port House is proposed to take place below the deck. The maintenance of new buildings is marked for the basement



level, in connection with the carpark (3 loading bays), The entrance for maintenance and parking is presented as a new driveway from Laivasillankatu, but the dimensions of the maintenance connection need to be verified. The maintenance for the Old Market Hall is not presented and the vehicle access to the harbour's safety zone is presented unclearly.

### **General levelling and flood protection**

A flood wall is proposed in front of the museum, but the presentation does not show what the marked elevation levels signify; does this refer to the elevation on both sides of the flood wall? The end of the flood wall structure towards the Old Market Hall also remains unclear.

The level of the new buildings' environment is +3.35 or above. The seawall is drawn diagonally with the shore side being at a lower level.

### **Special notes**

The implementation method of the embankments proposed between the new buildings remains unresolved, based on the materials. If it was implemented through an embankment, there would be challenges to the area's stability, which would need to be considered in further planning.

As for noise and air pollutants, it seems that it has not been understood that the solutions should be structural or related to structural engineering. The control measures proposed in the entry include speed limits or restrictions on the event area's operating hours.

### **Climate-smart construction**

This group has presented some rough ideas for energy and eco-efficiency, but the suggested measures are not examined any further. The proposal is lacking the LCA evaluation regarding the annual overall carbon footprint, as well as the carbon handprint. Actions towards climate targets are described at a relatively general and principal level, which causes a certain lack of credibility. The principal visualization is partly unclear and not very credible.

The functional flexibility and spatial flexibility of the buildings is, on most parts, quite good, thanks to the simple floor plan.

### **Other observations**

In the Voice your opinion –hearing, this entry was seen to be lacking attractive outdoor spaces and some thought that the buildings were too massive. However, Punelma also had some supporters.



View from the Market Square



## 2.10. Saaret

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape


Saaret is a group of four buildings that forms a clear and compact block entity to the city structure. The starting points for the layout are the coordinate system of the city centre and the eye view perspective to key landmarks, such as Helsinki Cathedral and Uspenski Cathedral. There is a controlled rhythm and naturality to the building placement. The layouts form plastic 'islands' opening up in all directions. The building heights do not exceed the maximum height specified.

The buildings are carefully shaped pieces of the same height, with flat roofs. The uppermost storey is recessed. The city silhouette is peaceful and horizontal. The buildings connect to their environment naturally, and the terracing can be seen as an abstract extension of Tähtitorninvuori and Armi Ratia Park.

The buildings border Laivasillankatu street windingly, while opening up the views. The connections from Tähtitorninvuori to Laivasillankatu street and further into the area are planned so that pleasant, wooded squares are formed along Laivasillankatu street. The entry's strength is its overall solution, where the architecture and landscape architecture interconnect successfully. Pleasant urban spaces are created on both Laivasillankatu and the waterfront. The waterfront is accessed from Laivasillankatu street via alleys between the buildings. The waterfront is made into a maritime zone with various spaces, functions and green areas.

Two hotels and two office buildings are proposed to be situated in the buildings, with public spaces, restaurants, cafés, commercial premises and coworking spaces on the ground floors. The ground floors are transparent and have a light appearance. Courtyards are formed in the middle of the buildings. The buildings' frames have timber-concrete hybrid structures, while the facades are timber and glass. The roofs are green roofs. However, the facade architecture is slightly monotonous and commonplace. All of the buildings look the same and merge into one large shape. Nevertheless, the structural solution is flexible, which makes the buildings adaptable to various purposes: the spaces can be divided into different sizes, and the facades can also be modified, which allows for various implementations.

In the entry, two alternate locations are proposed for the Architecture and Design Museum. The more detailed alternative is the one in which the museum is situated in the protected harbour buildings and a round exhibition pavilion is proposed for the museum's location specified in the competition programme. North of the pavilion is a museum square for various events, and to the south a wooded square for storm-water retention, for example. The pavilion with the water motifs and woods is skilfully designed, and it suits the environment of the Old Market Hall. The Cholera basin and Vironallas basin are lined with wooden recreational decks, and wooden benches of various sizes are grouped on the waterfront. Pleasant places for recreation and meeting are created for the area.



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



The second alternative for the Architecture and Design Museum's location is the plot to the north in accordance with the competition programme. The new buildings are designed so that there is plenty of room for the museum, but the solution is not planned or presented in more detail. In this alternative, a new purpose needs to be found for the harbour buildings.

### **Cultural environment and landscape, the suitability for the national landscape of maritime Helsinki**

The entry aims for harmony with the cultural environment. The buildings are placed carefully so that the key views are preserved. The plan is balanced, and the historical maritime scenery is preserved despite the new layer of buildings. Using timber as a facade material is a reference to the old wooden harbour buildings.

### **Identity of the area**

A modern entity of sustainable wooden construction is created for Makasiiniranta with much potential for further planning. The solution is unique, but also a subtle one that blends to its environment.

### **Views, openness, the silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori**

The views have been one strong starting point of the proposal. The views are planned carefully, and they open up towards key landmarks. The structure is fascinating since the lines of sight do not run perpendicularly in relation to the street. The silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori is preserved in the cityscape, and the construction is subordinate to it.

From Tähtitorninvuori the city façade and water mirror are visible, and sea is visible along Eteläinen Makasiinikatu, Bernhardinkatu and Laivasillankatu streets towards north. There are no straight views from Laivasillankatu street towards the sea, but between buildings are diagonals, which are leading for example towards the churches of the city.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

Excellent, the landscape architecture is an integrated part of the overall solution, not just a secondary theme after architectural design.



Aerial view



The building masses create multiple square-like spaces and niches around them. They make the outdoor space interesting. At both ends of the new building area are the node points, which lead people to the site. The green surroundings of the museum pavilion in the north especially create a natural continuation to Tähtitorninvuori and help to orientate and identify the green network of Helsinki.

The cracking bedrock of the shoreline has been the inspiration of the entry, which is where the shape of the plant areas, “urban cracks”, come. Abundant, park-like vegetation flows down from Tähtitorninvuori and changes to maritime vegetation on the shoreline. The vegetation species support the biodiversity.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

The high-quality public outdoor spaces, functional connections and diverse functions in the shore zone make Makasiiniranta an extension of the pedestrian city centre. A pleasant and walkable maritime city space, where it is easy to pop into the cafés and restaurants, successfully connects the Market Square and Kaivopuisto to each other.

The seaside promenade is wide enough, and the challenging level differences are a part of the overall city planning solution. The dignity of the promenade has been understood right and the landscaping solutions are carefully examined. There are containers for a pop-up store on a shoreline, which is a strange solution for a dignified place.

### **Overall functional solution**

Saaret is a compact and harmonious entity, where the architecture, landscape architecture, traffic connections and functions have been carefully studied in various areas. The area forms an inspiring series of public spaces from the Market Square to Armi Ratia Park that could be used throughout the year by different user groups. The pedestrian scale is taken into consideration. The waterfront, with its squares and green zones, is urban and appealing.

In terms of contents, functions and activities the overall idea, concept, or brand, should be narrated more clearly. The plan is relatively balanced, based on hotel, culture, and retail volumes. The proposed commercial content is not particularly unique. Retail activities are promptly located and continue along the shoreline. A

deep building mass results in a short commercial façade which may pose a potential risk to the viability of retail and restaurant functions. When implemented, the plan would increase the vitality of the city centre through jobs and services, such as a hotel, retail, and offices. The retail concept is less vague, compared to other presentations, and the flexible layout enables many types of activities.

The plan proposes two separate large-scale hotels in the northern new building and in the southern new building, which could possibly be problematic for phasing and viability, depending on the hotel concepts and market saturation.

The mixed-use office/commercial operations proposed on the shore side on the ground floor is credible, and they open up to the pedestrian level relatively well. The retail unit sizes are straightforward and dividable, suitable for a number of different types of services. There are no large retail units that could be more challenging to lease. It would be beneficial for the proposal to outline an overall commercial concept first or together with determining functions and sizes.

Museum operations are placed in two separate locations, a new pavilion building in the north and the old Olympia Terminal and Port House buildings in the south, which divides the operations (however, the plan enables one museum in the north, when port buildings require other use). Even though the museum will be located in a single location closer to the Market Square, as per the competition program, the idea of an attractive destination in the south is one to develop further.

### **The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings**

The Old Market Hall area remains active in the plan, similar to current operations. The surroundings of the Old Market Hall is an open public space, and the plan is subtle and respectful of the cultural environment. The wooden decks around the Cholera basin and Vironallas basin are new.

The suggested museum operations & exhibitions fit to the buildings, but, since all the museum operations will be located in the north, another concept or use should be presented for the old port buildings (presentation example, “E-Sports”).

A new high-speed vessel terminal building has been presented between the port buildings and the new buildings. On the ground floor there is an entrance to the terminal and an extension to the railway shaft and Armi Ratia Park via the business premises.



## Architecture and Design Museum

This project has two options for the museum, one in the Olympia Terminal and Port House and a secondary one in the south. Even if the museum would have a pavilion in the north in option one as well, placing the museum in the harbour buildings is not a feasible solution as stated above.

The project should be based on locating the museum in the north. Because it was the plan's secondary option, it remains somewhat unclear how the museum would connect to the surroundings and other functions in the area. Still, the plan has functions that support the museum, in particular, the proposed commercial spaces stand out.

Some space for the Architecture and Design Museum is reserved in the northernmost part of the focus area for new construction, but, mainly, the museum is planned to the Olympia Terminal and the Port House and their surroundings which aren't as easily accessible from the city centre. The risk with dividing the museum operations may create difficulties to the overall plan, while other plans propose a single museum in either the north or south. The museum cannot be implemented as a separate project and is dependent on the overall development of the area.

## Feasibility and techno-economic quality

The feasibility of the proposal is evaluated from the basis of the museum being located in the north as a whole. Therefore, new usage is required for the harbour buildings, preferably creating an attraction or destination that would guarantee considerable visitor flows in the entire area. Otherwise, the plan is relatively balanced, based on hotel, culture, and retail volumes, and the retail activities are well located and continue along the shoreline. The concept of retail is vague, compared to other presentations, but the flexible plan enables many operations.

The pedestrian paths are natural and functional and continuous operations encourage walking on the shoreside. The east-west side connections are believable for pedestrian traffic. Placing hotel functions in two different buildings and converting Vironallas basin into an outdoor swimming pool are aspects that should be examined critically when developing the plan further. However, the mixed-use idea is believable in the middle buildings and in terms of the numbers of visitors, the vitality-increasing effect of the proposal is highly significant.



View from the Market Square



### **Connections, traffic arrangements and parking**

The traffic plan is presented at a quite general level and must be examined during further work. In particular, the museum's connections need to be presented in more detail.

The traffic arrangements on Laivasillankatu street remain mainly as they are and seem to be working. The pedestrian connections seem to be working on the shore trail, as well as between the shore and Laivasillankatu street. Accessibility has been taken into consideration and the solutions seem to be natural. Cycling traffic is permitted also on the seaside trail and it needs to be considered whether the trail is of adequate width. No new parking is presented.

### **Maintenance**

The presentation of maintenance connections is a little unclear and some of the connections from maintenance yard to different functions seem to be quite long. Maintenance at street level deviates from the planning principles and the mentioned tunnel option should be examined further. The maintenance of the southern area is proposed to take place below the existing deck: accessed via the existing vehicle access on Ehrenströmintie. The maximum height permitted at the accessway is currently 3.5 m, which should be taken into consideration.

### **Municipal infrastructure**

It is proposed in the entry that stormwaters be channelled via biofiltering from Laivasillankatu towards the sea. The biofiltering structure would be placed close to the shore, underground. Implementing the solution requires consideration and additional examination during further planning.

Surface waters can mostly be channelled away gravitationally. However, the elevation levels in places in front of the Port House are such that surface waters would need to be pumped.

### **General levelling and flood protection**

The surroundings of the new buildings are above level +3.4. As for the entrances of the new terminal building proposed north of the Port House, it is slightly unclear on which elevation level the entrances are located, especially the one on the shore side. A flood wall solution is proposed between the Port House and the Olympia Terminal and the shore. Access to the new museum's entrance building would be sheltered by the flood wall.

### **Deck structure to the south**

It is proposed that the entire space below the deck structure is turned into an indoor space. Further planning and coordination is required to ensure the preconditions for the solution's implementation.

### **Climate-smart construction**

In this proposal, the attitude towards sustainability issues and climate targets is ambitious. The LCA evaluation is well made and presented clearly. The carbon footprint is among the smallest ones, in addition to which this proposal also has a very significant carbon handprint.

Climate change mitigation has been considered by making most of the existing buildings from intelligent adaptive reuse and recycling material, as well as reducing CO2 emissions during the entire lifecycle with local renewable energy solutions and energy efficiency.

The divisibility of the premises is slightly limited, which is not optimal for further usage.

### **Other observations**

In the Voice your opinion –hearing, this proposal received quite neutral comments. The overall solution was considered to be successful, however some thought that the buildings lacked character.



## 2.11. South Park

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape and landscape

This is an ambitious and idealistic scheme that proposes, as the name suggests, a park along the waterfront instead of buildings. The sculptured buildings have been arranged within the waterfront park and a walkway path leads between the buildings towards the view of the Market Square and Helsinki Cathedral. The proposed built environment expands the Kaivopuisto Park towards the city as opposed to expanding the city and urban fabric. The scale of the building over ground level is small, giving a village-like impression, whilst the construction expands underneath the deck construction and further into the underground basements. The proposal is original, and its poetic grasp awakens interest. The scale of the actual buildings, however, remains small and the scheme falls, as such, short of the objectives of the competition, which is to expand the enticing and walkable city-centre and increase services. Hence, this proposal is not suitable for the urban context.

One aim of the proposal is to offer operational flexibility. The chosen built fabric, division and scattering of spaces and elements doesn't, however, support this idea as the spaces are not easily combinable. The desire for the small-scale massing above ground has led to large scale underground spaces, some even at a level of -4. This would require costly and large-scale construction methodologies, including water pressure retaining walls, which, at this point in time, cannot be considered to be environmentally effective. Furthermore, locating the spaces at this prime location underground also prohibits all fantastic views out towards the sea. The internal spaces have, however, been presented as very high-quality spaces and with interesting spatiality.

### Cultural environment and landscape, the suitability for the national landscape of maritime Helsinki

The sculptural "South Park" has a closer affinity to the Kaivopuisto villas than the Market Square city blocks that make up the urban fabric.

### Identity of the area

The proposed park area, with the small-scale villa-like buildings, gives an impression of a private housing area, as opposed to a continuation, or extension, of the city and a public urban realm.

### Views, openness, the silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori

The airy urban fabric of the proposals retains all significant views, apart from the vista from Laivasillankatu street to the Uspenski Cathedral on the other side of the



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



bay, blocked by the new hotel building. Also, the landscaped mound (the Museum Garden), housing the museum building, would block pedestrian views from the Laivasillankatu street towards the sea.

### **New construction, elevation**

The proposed buildings are sculptural and the massing in terms of heights follow the planning principles set out in the competition brief.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

The landscaping elements of the scheme are carefully examined and ambitious, however the large-scale deck constructions weaken the proposals. The park elements over the deck construction are not realistic. Vegetation would have to be replaced and renewed every 30 years in association with the renewal of the waterproofing and the mature trees could not be implemented as displayed in the presentation material.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

The promenade is a park-like space, which not only borders buildings but also “parks”. The idea is interesting. The seaside walkway and wider pedestrian network becomes fragmented into narrow paths, which doesn’t offer sufficient space for dwelling alongside it. Their use is also compromised by their placement predominantly above the deck construction.

### **Overall functional solution**

The plan proposes a smaller-scale construction compared to other plans. When implemented, the plan would increase the vitality of the city centre through jobs and services, such as an office, retail, culture, events, day care, and spa. The plan has a relatively limited amount of offices.

The scheme proposes a variety of services to the area, restaurants, grocery store, offices, museums, events spaces, a spa and a kindergarten. The variety in services is very much welcomed, however, for the feasibility of the functions, especially for the

events centre, for the spa and the museum, there should already be a named operator.

The design proposal includes the unique and creative development of existing and new underground spaces. Excavating under the Olympia Pier, between the pillars, and locating a grocery store at level -4 in the basement below the Old Market Hall would be complex and costly to achieve and the viability would perhaps be uncertain. The underground spa would be a highly ambitious and one-of-a-kind project with impressive interiors. On the other hand, large under-deck areas would also be a challenge for the implementation, phasing and long-term flexibility.

The operations are mainly located well and in natural locations. The hotel has a connection to the spa, which creates synergy. Retail is mainly at ground level, which is functional. Some restaurant premises are presented on second and third levels, which are accessible from the upper outside street, with a separate retail-oriented floor in the north. The flow of retail is not as continuous on the shoreside as in other proposed plans, as there are only a few windowed retail units towards the seashore. The plan proposes a multitude of main paths: shoreside, retail building floor, and building the central park, which is interesting scenery, but fragments retail operations and people flow. Small retail spaces and large underground areas would be difficult to make commercially viable or attractive. Attracting the public or different user groups on a larger scale could be challenging.

While the central building creates a shopping centre-like ground floor in the food market with the possibility to open up premises from both sides of the commercial pedestrian walkway, the continuation on the shore side is not optimal, and premises do not open up or create a continuous path in the shore side. The connection of the south side of the shore and Laivasillankatu street is relatively steep due to the high elevation.

The proposed bridge from the Market Square to the Old Market Hall improves the connectivity of the area from the Market Square from the city centre. The greenery remains coherent and continuous in the plan throughout the area. The shoreside retail is not continuous due to the wall of the buildings when compared to other plans. The connection between Armi Ratia’s Park and the south side of the shore is difficult due to the maintenance road dividing the underground area between east and west. Some of the proposed event plazas may not be functional due to their locations and sizes. Children have been taken into account well in the overall proposal, however accessibility would require revision.



## The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings

The pedestrian connection from in front of the Old Market Hall to the Market Square has been improved by converting the old harbour track bridge into pedestrian use. The area of the Market Square has been expanded by infilling the Cholera basin, which, however, may not be a feasible solution.

A new grocery store is located below the new buildings, which may have the intention of creating synergy with the market activities. However, the feasibility and viability of an underground grocery store are greatly uncertain in the location in particular.

The scheme proposes a restaurant, events spaces and a hotel to be located within the Port House. For the Olympia Terminal, a spa and a kindergarten have been proposed. The Terminal building will remain at street level. The Olympia Terminal is not suitable to house a kindergarten due to the location, the lack of outdoor space for the children and due to the noise pollution caused by the cruise ships.

An events centre and an experiential spa are proposed for the spaces located underneath the deck construction and the railway shaft. The roof of the events centre rises above the existing park level as a green roof. By altering this waterfront track connection, the historical layering of the area is lost and the pedestrian connection between the sea and Kaivopuisto Park have not been considered.

The hotel has a connection to the spa, which creates synergy. The implementation of Olympia Terminal as a spa may prove to be challenging. A spa and underground movie theatre would be difficult to implement, and the hotel may also be an expensive renovation project, but, otherwise, the operations fit well to the old port buildings.

## Architecture and Design Museum

The museum has been proposed as per the location outlined in the competition brief. Parts of the museum spaces have been allocated in the basement, under the Museum Park, which enables a smaller scale to the building mass above ground. The strategy however restricts the future development of the museum design. There will be a separate competition for the design of the museum building and there needs to remain enough flexibility for this key stage.



Aerial view



The museum is presented in the northernmost part of the focus area for new construction and the site seems to be of sufficient size. Relatively detailed plans for the museum are presented, and it appears that the museum is a significant element in the whole entry. Most of the park in South Park seems to be a deck over museum facilities. As the museum project cannot commit to these kinds of fundamental solutions, it seems that the idea of the entire plan is threatened. It remains unclear whether the plan would work and retain its character if the museum's design solution would change.

The museum is close to other public spaces. New bridges from Market Square and Lyypekinlaituri are presented. The plan has many functions that support the Architecture and Design Museum, in particular, the proposed restaurants next door stand out. The museum is not dependent on those functions.

### **Feasibility and techno-economic quality**

The plan proposes smaller-scale construction compared to other plans and the plan has a relatively limited amount of offices, which is challenging from the financial feasibility point of view. The presented plan fits to the environment, but also creates its own identity with the greenery. Because of the small scale of the project, the vitality-increasing effect of the proposal is limited.

The new buildings are relatively small scale and complex in shape. In addition to the technical facilities, there is a grocery store underground, which is a cost risk. The flow of retail is not continuous on the shoreside, as the premises do not open out towards the seaside. The plan proposes several pedestrian paths: shoreside, retail building floor, and building the central park, which is interesting scenery but divides the pedestrian flows.

Proposed underground levels in the retail building & museum may be expensive, compared to potential rent levels. It also remains unclear, how the overall plan would work if the museum would not be implemented as presented.

The main pedestrian route is clear and easy to maintain even in the wintertime, but the connection between the shoreside trail and Laivasillankatu street is relatively steep due to the high elevation. The connection between Armi Ratia's Park and the shore side is missing.

### **Connections, traffic arrangements and parking**

The seaside trail is presented in the plan. In front of the new buildings, the seaside trail is narrowed down by the plants, and the route is winding. The trees take up space from the seaside trail also by the Olympia Terminal and the Port House.

A pavement and a cycling path are separated along Laivasillankatu street. Three new pedestrian crossings are added across Laivasillankatu street, but they do not comply with the city's guidelines for pedestrian crossings. There are multiple pedestrian connections from the shore to Laivasillankatu street, but these are likely to require steps.

The motor traffic arrangements for Laivasillankatu street are the same as the existing ones. It is calculated that 210 car parking spaces are needed; the intention is to place them in the Tähtitorninvuori carpark to be expanded, but no plans for this are presented. No spaces for buses serving cruisers are presented but using the pick-up and drop-off space in front of the Olympia Terminal is also permitted for buses.

The maintenance traffic is based on the maintenance tunnel proposed for the basement level. The maintenance yard is rather small, as are the areas for turning vehicles.

The maintenance for the area of the Olympia Terminal and the Port House is marked to take place below the deck, but it is likely that maintenance vehicles will not be able to turn there. The vehicle access from Ehrenströmintie is also presented unclearly. Access to the harbour's safety zone is not presented clearly. The maintenance for the Old Market Hall is not presented.

### **Maintenance**

Maintenance of the proposed middle park with underground retail may be difficult and expensive maintenance wise.

The large and slanted windows of the facade are challenging in terms of water channelling – all water from the large window surface would run towards the lower corner and require a large-scale channelling solution.

The shaft-like spaces proposed inside the buildings do not seemingly have roofs, according to the plan.

Channelling stormwaters from the shaft-like spaces proposed inside the buildings would be challenging, as the facilities seem to be located above the deck structure in places. In addition, snow removal from inside the building would be challenging.

### **General levelling and flood protection**

The height of the filling hill in the museum park south of the museum is possibly +5, judging from the plan. If this was implemented through filling, it would affect the stability of the area, which would need to be taken into consideration.



The shore structures are proposed below level +1.5 in places. During further planning, it would need to be determined what would be best for the structures' implementation and potential occasional floods, which may be increasingly common in the future. In the plan, elevation is proposed for the shore at such levels that, at the mean water level of the 22nd century (2100), these areas would be underwater, which is not advisable with regard to the area's service life.

### **Deck structure to the south**

A spa is proposed to take place below the deck in front of the Port House (Satamatalo) and the Olympia Terminal. Below the deck, there are several pillars that support the street deck. Spa facilities are often wide open and placing the facilities on the existing pillar grid would require major changes to the structural engineering throughout the deck structure, which would be structurally and technically challenging.

A theatre and cinema facility below the deck is also proposed; however, the existing height of the facilities will likely not be sufficient for such features, which would lead to excavation needs if the deck could not be elevated. The solution would also require extensive changes to the structural engineering, which could partially lead to challenging structural solutions and the implementation of which would substantially increase building and renovation costs.

### **Climate-smart construction**

This group has had an ambitious attitude towards sustainability issues and climate targets and towards climate change mitigation goals. All relevant environmental sustainability criteria have been taken into account and the LCA evaluation and carbon balance study is made at an excellent level. Extensive usage of timber and circular materials. Very good level of life cycle emissions, as well as carbon handprint.

The comprehensive plan of the local renewable energy system includes a careful study of ground source heat pump utilization (amount and location of boreholes shown). Small overall climate impacts supported by the smallest proposed amount of floor space. However, due to the small scale and complex shaped floor plans, flexibility and convertibility are moderate.

### **Other observations**

In the Voice your opinion –hearing, the moderate building volume and green areas were appreciated, but some negative comments focused on the appearance of the buildings.



View from the Market Square



# 3. Selection for the Second Phase

All proposals had been carefully prepared and all of them had merits, as well as weaknesses. The maximum of four entries have been selected to the second phase based on which proposals meet the evaluation criteria most successfully and provide a good foundation for further development

The level of ambition must continue in the next phase. The jury is prepared to look into the different options and potentials that these entries will provide for the area. The city of Helsinki is looking for a solution that exudes the style and spirit of Helsinki and provides added value, taking the special characteristics of Helsinki into account.

The best proposals emphasise taking the goals of the competition into consideration in terms of urban planning and architecture, vitalising the area and other functions, as well as the new Architecture and Design Museum, and being a pioneer in climate and sustainability solutions.

The four entries selected to the second phase are **Ahti, Boardwalk, Makasiinipromenadi and Saaret.**

The project Ahti is comprehensive and inclusive, in terms of the integration of urban design, architecture, public space, program and sustainability. The functional program is interesting and diverse.

The proposal Boardwalk has strong architectural concept and identity. Architecture is sculptural and unique.

Makasiinipromenadi is a coherent proposal with a clear city structure, seaside promenade and public outdoor spaces that are well designed and the new buildings have a balanced co-existence with the cultural landscape

Saaret meets with the competition programme well and is a strong and confident proposal that has understood the identity and location. The overall solution is balanced and holistic and the quality of outdoor spaces is high.



# 4. Evaluation of 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

## 4.1. Evaluation process

The Jury met three times, 8 September, 29 September and 27 October 2022.

The preparation group had several meetings divided into smaller groups by various topics: - Urban planning, architecture, landscape architecture, cultural heritage - functions and economic development - civil and structural engineering, traffic planning, port functions and climate smart construction. The preparation group as well as the Jury were provided with a Review of Real Estate feasibility of the entries by Newsec and a summary of the Voice Your Opinion public hearing.

The whole material of each proposal is found on website:

<https://kerrokantasi.hel.fi/makasiiniranta-kilpailuehdotukset-2022>

## 4.2. General observations

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape, architecture and landscape

#### architecture

The competition assignment was demanding with respect to the dignity and cultural historical context of the site. A new layer of landscape architecture was expected, but the solution still needed to respect the uniqueness of the site. In the competition proposals, the role of the landscape architecture varied a lot; in some proposals, the role of the landscape architecture was even minimal. In the winning entry, the general and landscape architecture interconnected successfully. For example, managing the level difference between the shoreline and Laivasillankatu street was a difficult task, which required resolution as part of the city structure.

With respect to the urban design concept and the architectural articulation, all four projects presented a different approach.

The Ahti project had synchronised its urban design morphology with Ehrenström's and C.L. Engel's street grid direction of Helsinki's Empire centre, resulting in a kind of saw-tooth profile along the seaside promenade and Laivasillankatu street, resulting in niches for different urban activities. In terms of architectural articulation, Ahti provides a most sophisticated palette of compositional principles, materials, textures and colours, related to the principles of Engel's palette and proportions.

In contrast, the Makasiinipromenadi project organises its buildings parallel to the seaside as a reference to the historical configuration of warehouses along the quay, which creates a rather hermetic facade along Laivasillankatu street and more openness towards the harbour basin. Makasiinipromenadi proposes quite a unifying architectural language in brick and natural wood, reinforced by the characteristics of the inclined roof-shapes. An esplanade-like public space composition with majestic tree-rows accentuates the ensemble. Although the buildings may slightly vary in tone, the project breathes a rather comprehensive inner-city atmosphere.

Both of the projects mediate a modest and traditional approach, which is understandable for this sensible context.

The project Boardwalk creates a fascinating three-dimensional sculptural tectonic landscape, which has less off a historical reference, but provides a very original and convincing interpretation of the topography and edge condition of the site, in which the roof-landscape really becomes an integrated element between the park hill and the water.

The architectural articulation of Boardwalk is kept pure, uniform and relatively abstract, which is logical in the sense of supporting the power of the overall tectonic landscape.

Finally, the project Saaret exploits the various view-directions in a very intelligent way to create a porous and light urban morphology with multiple axes and views, within which polygonal buildings provide opportunities for placemaking. Saaret's vision for the architectural articulation of the buildings is comparable, but less sophisticated in comparison to Ahti's principles.

In this respect, the creation of clear urban design guidelines and an architectural code, within which buildings may have a balance between urban coherence and architectural variation, would be welcome.

In all projects, the solutions for the Port House, Olympia Terminal and railway shaft are well elaborated, whereby the jury recommends keeping the ferry terminal in the Olympic Terminal and use the railway shaft as an important pedestrian connecting space between the seaside promenade and the back. Also, the treatment of the environment of the Market Hall was convincing in all projects and, last but not least, so were the site conditions for the future Museum of Architecture and Design. The main views across the park hill and the harbour basin were respected in all of the proposals. Also, views from Laivasillankatu street towards the sea had been examined in all proposals, but the winner had the most successful concept.



All competition entries allow for versatility and for the areas included in the plans to be partially in public use. The location of the site allows all competition entries to be accessible by public transport, bicycle and walking, and all entries allow for promoting urban and outdoor activities as well as the activation of everyday mobility. Even the practical solutions should promote everyday mobility and guarantee smooth and safe walking/cycling conditions.

### Overall functional solution and feasibility

The commercial challenge for the planning area, despite its good location, was the somewhat isolated micro-location of the area in the urban fabric: the surrounding sea, the park, and the distance to significant visitor flows and public mass transport. At present, another drawback is the lack of a main attraction in the south, with the exception of the ferry terminal.

Creating a new attractive, pleasant area at the same time is another challenge. Monotony and a desolate public space represent threats in a location that is difficult in terms of directions and conditions. Due to the strict planning programme limitations, the entries received are quite similar from a commercial and operational point of view. The technical implementation of all the buildings is likely to be relatively easy. However, the phrase “the devil is in the details” also applies here.

The location has a particular impact on commerce and some impact on restaurant operations – especially as there is no significant lunch demand expected – as well as special facilities and event offerings. As an office and hotel location, the area is good and natural if parking is arranged as needed. The solutions of the art museum project will affect the area’s natural connection to the active urban structure, Market Square and Esplanade Park.

The factors relevant to the future commercial success and economic implementation of the competition area include at least the following:

- location and connection to the urban structure, entry into the area
- visitor flows within the competition area, interaction between the buildings and pedestrian and bicycle traffic
- role of customers with cars in the plans as a complement to pedestrian and bicycle traffic, parking
- attractiveness of outdoor areas, activities, comfort, green solutions, challenges posed by the situation on the eastern shore

In the competition proposals, clear differences can be seen in the level of effort, as well as in the solutions created by experience/inexperience. The more diverse the content, the higher the requirements for project implementation and future administration as a whole, so that good ideas are not watered down, and the activities actually take place. Public spaces play a major role in the success of the project, which poses its own challenges to future investment and facility management. As an underground solution, the possible maintenance solution for the area is expensive in relation to the volume of the project, and the financial contribution of the Architecture and Design Museum project to its implementation costs will determine how realistic it is.

The requirements and final implementation of the new construction and the renovated sections differ considerably from each other in the entries. Few groups of implementers have expertise in both, not to mention a desire to invest in high-risk properties being renovated for low-income functions. Most of the completely new content for revitalising the city centre are presented in the renovated sections. Investing in and succeeding in the quay area will create the possibility of a new active, special recreational area in the city centre, at least during the summer season.

The implementation of the project requires the working group to have versatile property development expertise and experience, significant risk financing resources, communication skills for reaching the public community and for municipal decision-making, the ability to organise future activities, and years of perseverance in order to achieve the intended result to serve the development of the city centre of Helsinki.



### 4.3. Ahti

#### Overall solution in terms of cityscape, landscape and cultural environment

Ahti is a well elaborated and balanced project. The main urban/architectural concept is unchanged with a respect to the first phase of the competition. The morphology of the new building volumes is oriented parallel to Ehrenström's and C.L. Engel's grid-plan for the inner city of Helsinki, where buildings are traditionally along the street or quay side. The advantage of the configuration is that triangular niches appear both along Laivasillankatu street and the waterfront promenade, which can be used for public space activities, pavilions, and drop-off zones. However, the zig-zag façade along Laivasillankatu street creates a somewhat diffuse street space which is unfamiliar to historical Helsinki.

In contrast, the architectural elaboration and detailing of the proposal are highly adequate and sophisticated. A sensible colour palette, materials, and textures, in combination with the fine articulation of the façade compositions, fits very well within the context and with the envisaged identity of the site on the edge of the city and the water.

In the second phase of the proposal, the buildings are more detached and the height difference less strong in favour of better views. The masses of the larger rectangular shaped buildings are bold in part. Alleys between the buildings are oriented in an east-west direction, providing views towards to the sea. Views towards other directions are not present in the proposal. The roof park landscape across the buildings is an attractive idea, mediating between the Tähtitorninvuori park hill and waterfront promenade. Every building has a roof garden and solar panel surface.

The overall size and sequence of the new seaside promenade is well-dimensioned and allow multiple activities as well as good pedestrian flow. A new seaside promenade is wider than in the first phase of the competition, even though the preserved footprint for the museum makes the quay a bit narrow.

#### Identity of the area

Although the ensemble of the configuration creates certain advantages for place-making, it does not fully comply with the character of the site. The literal translation of the direction of Ehrenström's and C. L. Engel's grid plan, which is meant to integrate the proposal to the context, creates an atypical situation and contradiction to the historical grid plan.



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



### **Views, openness, silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori**

As in the first phase of the competition, building masses are following the slopes of Tähtitorninvuori. In the second phase of the competition, volumes are extended more south, and the presented urban structure covers the views towards the sea more than before. However, the water mirror and the façade of the city centre are still visible from Tähtitorninvuori.

The view from Eteläinen Makasiinikatu street has improved, and view sectors from Laivasillankatu street towards the sea are wider than in the first phase of the competition. However, the views are still somewhat narrow and mainly head towards Katajanokka.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

In the second phase of the competition, pavilions in the squares are smaller and more elegant, leaving more open outdoor space around them and providing shelter in the wintertime. The level difference between Laivasillankatu street and the seaside promenade is a successful part of the new urban structure. The dialogue between the buildings and the outdoor space is active, and supports the public and urban character of the competition area.

However, the proposal does not take advantage of the historical site and its character. The landscape architecture is overly rich and disoriented. The proposal has multiple ideas, such as the use of domestic vegetation in arboretums and the inspiration of the Baltic Sea as well as Armi Ratia's design in the outdoor areas. The proposal suggests plenty of outdoor functions, but some of them – e.g. the beach – is a peculiar solution for the site. Although the proposal has plenty of ideas, the specificity of the site with its cultural and garden historical aspects has not been crystallised in the entry.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

The wider seaside promenade provides enough space for pedestrian flows and terraces. Smaller pavilions create a cosy and inviting atmosphere. A triangular-shaped terrace creates a barrier with its fences, even though the overall number of previously criticised terraces is now reduced in the proposal. Bringing cycling to the recreation areas is demanding in terms of comfort.



Aerial view



## Overall functional solution

The project has a shifted thematic focus. In the first phase, there was a thematic connection with the Baltic Sea and the functions formed a well-balanced mix. The focus was fixed on an interesting public ownership concept and innovative programme, e.g. science and culture. In the second phase, the Baltic Sea theme is somewhat diluted, and the focus has shifted towards a more commercial programme with 40% offices, 20% hotel, 15% spa/wellness, 5% culture (the museum not included), and 15% retail/gastro. The proposal may become more realistic, but on the other hand, its initial programme – which emphasised the character of the site – has been abandoned.

Centrepiece of the proposal is the Atlantis Centre, a working hub, bringing together various actors which are connected to the theme of the Baltic Sea. The south part of the new blocks houses the Baltic Sea Hotel and Spa. All buildings have open ground floors with public functions. Although the size of Atlantis Centre is relatively large, the conversion flexibility increases alternative uses and facilities.

Some interior concepts of the first phase are abandoned in favour of a more rational organisation, and all buildings are now highly flexible – perhaps even too flexible; as strong architecture, which forces the programme to adapt to its structure, is often more successful than dull flexibility.

From a commercial point of view, the insular layout of the buildings, arcades and commercial spaces as well as deep frames on the second floor are not very credible and functional solutions. However, the façades of the buildings are in the visual sense interestingly oriented perpendicularly to the Market Square, which is the main observation direction, and to Laivasillankatu street.

## The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings

The design of the surroundings of the Market Hall are adequately and well elaborated. Effort has been made to come up with ideas, and there are many that, if successful, would bring new activity to the city centre and support the vitality of the competition area.

The Old Market Hall is dedicated to culinary and food-related activities. The integration of adequate technical installations and restrooms would need attention in the further elaboration.

Round the Old Market Hall, the authors have perhaps rationalised the design excessively with respect to the first phase. Things like the pool and a strong architectural code for the pavilions were small but important elements of an overall attraction sequence and coherence.

The underground world between the harbour buildings and the “Cave” have been filled largely with parking for cars and buses and the logistics tunnel. As a result, there is no pedestrian connection through the railway shaft towards the Cave area, which is a pity. However, parking represents a realistic and feasible use for the spaces under the deck.

The Port House and Olympia Terminal are well-renovated with respect to the heritage quality of the buildings. The new ferry terminal is inserted in a sensible way between the two buildings. A significant part of the building’s surface has been reserved for the office, which improves the otherwise difficult economic feasibility of the site.

## Architecture and Design Museum

The site for the Architecture and Design Museum has been kept free and can be well integrated. Ahti works well, even as independent of the presence of the Architecture and Design Museum. The all-sided orientation of the Architecture and Design Museum suggests, however, a kind of hinge effect, which is interesting.

The reserved site for the museum is still somewhat undersized and the presented building mass partly blocks the existing street views. The space between the footprint of the Architecture and Design Museum and the quay may be a bit narrow, but this depends on the outcome of the Museum competition. A ceremonial square is located at the northern side of the museum and a smaller square is placed on the southern side.

The Museum’s maintenance tunnel is facilitated through the existing connections from the harbour area in the south, but the feasibility of the connection is questionable. The Museum’s drop-off for taxis and buses is not properly studied in the proposal. However, the Museum can be implemented as a separate project and also as a separate investment project. The plan has many functions that support the museum, especially the proposed science and culture centre, as well as hotel, office and retail functions.

The functions next to the Museum are neutral and do not limit the museum’s functions. Proposed functions, architecture and urban planning provide a calm background for the museum.



## Feasibility and techno-economic quality

The feedback and instructions given in the first phase have been taken into consideration, and the proposal is clear and well-elaborated.

The proposal presents several functions that would bring visitors to the area in various ways, and both the presentation and concept of the overall plan are clear and credible. The placement of the varying functions is presented in great detail, yet in a somewhat confusing manner across different buildings. On the other hand, the spa and hotel are connected well and create synergy. Overall, the retail spaces are well located, and the buildings create a steady continuum of opportunities for pedestrians walking along the shore.

The vitality-increasing effect of the proposal in terms of numbers of visitors is significant, and the plan should also increase the vitality of the city centre through the increasing number of jobs. The functions and their volume correspond to estimated demand and, though the size of the Atlantis Centre is relatively large, the conversion flexibility increases alternative use of the facilities.

The plan includes plenty of triangular squares with strong green elements and pavilions. If successful, the squares will serve as peaceful stopping points and attract visitors to the area. However, their commercial importance as such is limited, with the exception of the terrace area. Triangular squares may not be the optimal solution in terms of direction and sunshine potential either.

The rental flow possibility from the functions of the new part is credible for the most part, but it has not been presented how the wide range of activities can be achieved and how its diverse and challenging operations can be managed. The content of the new building's business premises is restaurant-oriented, the size of the hotel is small, and the profitability of the separate spa poses a challenge. The handling of the underground premises is, however, realistic. The working group and implementing partner are credible in themselves, but they are inexperienced in this type of project.

## Connections, traffic arrangements and parking

The buildings in the proposal have been co-ordinated with the grid plan of the city centre, yet with a weak connection to the existing street network, making the functional significance of the solution non-existent. The connection to Laivasillankatu

street is not very intense in terms of transport connections or buildings. The buildings are insular with façades away from the street line and the main pedestrian and bicycle route. However, the solution creates a chain of small squares in the area.

The insular solution of buildings with walkways and business premises positioned round the building breaks down customer flows and creates challenging spaces in terms of operations, as the main routes are separate from the buildings. With plenty of squares and small parks the visitor flows and recreation are spread widely in the planning area: consequently, there is a risk of competition between the premises as well as an absence of precision, commercially speaking, due to lack of prioritisation.

Considerable emphasis has been put into traffic planning, and the result is sufficient in terms of the general planning level. The pedestrian connection in the direction of the city centre has been improved next to the Market Hall by removing one car traffic lane and widening the pavement and cycleway. The pedestrian connection to Laivasillankatu street is broken only by the hotel's pick-up and drop-off traffic connections. Armi Ratia Park does not have an underground connection from the shore, however, and the connections from Laivasillankatu street are via the park paths.

Both short-term (street parking) and longer-term parking are considered. This increases the commercial credibility for the success of the functions, as does the bus parking area under the deck, which particularly supports the operations of the premises to be renovated.

## Maintenance

An underground tunnel is proposed for maintenance traffic. There are two tunnel entrance options, either from the southern end of the area under the Olympia Terminal deck or via the access road to the Tähtitorninvuori parking facility. The museum has a separate maintenance yard, but there is only one maintenance yard for the rest of the new buildings, and the maintenance is based on long service corridors, which is functionally questionable. The maintenance of the Market Hall is proposed as a surface solution at the northern end of the building. The seaside promenade has no need for maintenance traffic, as there is a maintenance connection to the surface from the underground tunnel. No maintenance connection is proposed to the harbour security area. The plan also includes proposed emergency access routes; however, they come into conflict with the streetside parking.



## General levelling and flood protection

On the whole, the plan seems feasible, but a flood wall next to the ISPS area has not been presented.

## Deck structure to the south

The commercial functions presented under the existing uninsulated deck structure are particularly challenging in terms of structural solutions. Also, the existing pillars seem to cross with the driving lines of the bus terminal as presented.

## Climate-smart construction

In the second phase of the competition, the proposal has improved and developed the climate impact assessment. The proposal has emphasised cycling by allocating bicycle parking both indoors and outdoors. Climate-smart solutions are holistic, and the proposal has introduced innovative solutions such as capturing CO2 from indoor air.

The proposal provides options for solar panels and Breeam Outstanding and Breeam Communities as a target. The energy system is based on regional geothermal heating with charging solar thermal collectors. Heating and cooling energy is local and renewable.

To reduce the carbon footprint of construction, the group has proposed to use low-carbon alternatives or recycled materials. The aim for the project is to minimise the use of new materials and pay attention to the ease of demolition and reusability of materials.

## Other observations

The entry has been carefully drafted and conceived, sparing no effort. Even the noise and air-quality impacts have been considered thoroughly, with the growth layers of the plantings given attention in relation to the structures.

The overall impression is commercially neutral: it is not uninviting, but it does not include any specific regional attraction.

Ahti was ranked in third place with 19% of the votes in the public Voice Your Opinion hearing.



View from the shoreline



View from the shoreline



## 4.4. Boardwalk


### Overall solution in terms of cityscape, landscape and cultural environment

The concept of the proposal is very interesting from the urban design and architectural point of view. The entry creates an iconic and internationally remarkable project for the site. The project produces a beautiful, sophisticated and restrained massing, which respect and blends well into the context. However, its offer and technical elaborations are sketchy and incomplete.

The configuration of the new buildings is articulated as a continuous tectonic landscape, constructed from four rectangular buildings plus a smaller pavilion. The buildings have inclined roofs, which are connected by bridges and staircases to the quay level, generating a continuous accessible roof landscape. The bridges function as canopies for the passages between Laivasillankatu street and the waterfront, framing the views towards the water in an attractive manner. The resulting tectonic sculpture adapts itself quite well to the site, and also creates a strong relationship as an intermediate realm between Tähtitorninvuori Park and the harbour basin. The promenade between the buildings and the water, as well as the intermediate spaces and façade along Laivasillankatu street, become an integrated public space system with fascinating, sometimes labyrinthic qualities. The architectural articulation is sober and in line with the overall concept, however: still relatively abstract, and immaterial.

In the second phase of the competition, Boardwalk has reduced the massive and long facade character of the building masses in favour of a more varied and complex configuration. Also, the large hotel building is reduced in height, in order to better embed the project to the scale of the park and quay. The access stairs to the roofscape are more clearly integrated in the sloped forms of the buildings.

The rather irregular and arbitrary building footprints and intermediate spaces from Phase 1 have been clarified in Phase 2, where the building footprints are essentially rectangular and placed in various angles, with some annexes as exceptions. The floorplans of the buildings are consequently more functional, more realistic, and clearer in orientation.



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



## Identity of the area

Due to its plastic volumetric character, the project produces a unique identity for the local environment. Thematically categorised as pavilion-like, it matches well with the identity of the context.

The buildings are meant to be constructed from local, natural, and renewable materials. The facades are conceived as using local stone. The articulation of the facades is envisioned as a set of guidelines which produce a certain variety within an overall material coherence.

## Views, openness, silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori

In the first phase of the competition, Boardwalk was criticised for hiding the façade of the city centre and the water mirror behind the building masses from the Tähtitorninvuori observation spot. In the second phase of the competition, improvement has been introduced, and the façade of the city centre as well as the water mirror are now excellently visible.

More consideration has also been given to the directions of the views from Laivasillankatu street. There is a ceremonial, wide and framed view towards Uspenski Cathedral from the top of the wide outdoor stairs. Also, other views from Laivasillankatu street head towards Katajanokka and Uspenski Cathedral. Besides the ceremonial view, the view sectors are quite narrow, so, the sea is linked with Laivasillankatu street only at highly specific spots. In front of the harbour buildings, the new buildings block most of the view towards the city centre.

## Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces

In the second phase of the competition, the proposal has elaborated a dialogue between the buildings and the outdoor spaces. The meandering form produces a rich public space environment of different dimensions, lending itself to all kinds of activation and events. The roofscape is smooth and accessible, with partial gardens. The roof is intended to be vacant of exhaust emissions and technical installations.

Privatising elements such as an outdoor pool and canopies are abandoned, which allows more public and open spaces to the shore. The Laivasillankatu street side has improved, with a more meandering and rich character. An accessible ramp between Laivasillankatu street and the seaside promenade has been added to the plan, but its narrow and tunnel-like feature is not convincing.

Although there has been improvement in overall design, the landscape architectural part is still quite rudimentary, incomplete, and vague.

## Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment

In the second phase of the competition, the seaside promenade has more public character, and the buildings along it create interesting public spaces. The connection between the shoreline and Laivasillankatu street is weak, and the solution is inadequate for the estimated pedestrian flows.

Not many activities or event squares for the outdoor areas have been presented, and the green plan is limited, which may create challenges in terms of the attractiveness of the area. The active use of outdoor areas is not presented, and space is limited due to the relatively large building footprints.

## Overall functional solution

From the point of functionality and concept, Boardwalk is not as complete as the other proposals. It remains somewhat unclear if the functions will activate and vitalise the whole area. The entry does not particularly open to the North, which is the main entry direction to the area. The connections from the seaside promenade to Laivasillankatu street are not very natural either, but the openness and route solution in the direction of Kaivopuisto Park is interesting, as is the connection for a roof terrace landscape.

The relationship between the buildings and the seaside promenade is intense and potentially functional for the restaurants and business premises. A massive restaurant offering opens to the routes. The small amount of other business spaces presented are in difficult locations in terms of customer flows. The idea of a roof terrace is charming, especially as the conditions elsewhere are demanding for terraces. However, the economic functionality of the roof terrace might be challenging due to its operations and accessibility. The diagrams also show a large amount of internal “public” space, the functional model of which remained unclear.

The strong profile and visibility of the buildings do not automatically increase the commercial attractiveness of the area, though it may affect the appearance of the area and even challenge the future Architecture and Design Museum. But is the implementation enough to be an attractive “sight to see”, even if successful? The impact on the commercial functionality of the area is, in any case, limited and will depend on the “close experience” of the visitor and the pleasant atmosphere of the area. Are the interiors as extensively public and attractive all year round as presented? The presented solutions are flexible, but some of the floorplans are quite deep.

While the retail premises are relatively well-located in the area, the hotel and spa are located on opposite sides inside the competition area, with the spa entrance opening towards the Museum on the Laivasillankatu street side. This reduces the synergy between the functions, even though there are overpass bridges connecting the buildings. On the other hand, the hotel is relatively well-connected to the terminal, which brings synergy.



The buildings create corners that reduce the visibility of retail premises from the seaside promenade. The overall visibility of retail spaces towards the city centre remains slightly inferior compared to other presentations. However, the public indoor spaces remain continuous.

### **The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings**

The Old Market Hall is dedicated to food and gastronomy related activities. The bike line between the market hall and the sea imposes a barrier for extension, e.g. restaurant terraces in the summer. Also in this respect, the integration of adequate technical installations and restrooms needs attention. The connectivity of the plaza between the market hall and museum could be studied in further design.

The Archipelago cruise terminal is projected in front of the Market Hall, accompanied by a ticket office pavilion. The market hall will benefit from passengers in its immediate vicinity.

The Architecture and Design Museum may be well integrable and, also the surroundings of the Market Hall are plausible. The southern section of the site around the Port House and the Olympia Terminal is very well elaborated. The Olympia Pavilion keeps its function as a cruise terminal and the railway shaft has become an attractive pedestrian connection, aligned with creative activities towards the patio area behind. The preservation of the cruise terminal bridges along the quay is questionable, however, due to the poor state of maintenance and the challenges to adequately renovate it.

The harbour buildings are well-programmed, and the heritage aspect is respected. The parking next to the Port House inhibits connectivity to the exhibition spaces. The underworld between the seaside promenade and the Cultural Cave has very well developed into a fascinating, functional and beautiful spatial sequence, well connected to the pedestrian circuit. The space is not interrupted by the service tunnel. The ship terminal is based in the Olympic Terminal.

The Olympia Pavilion contains Sport & Health activities, the Port House an Events and Convention Centre; whilst the railway shaft houses Art and Culture. The hotel conference and activity sports centres are credible concepts. However, two floors for the conference centre may be challenging. The attractiveness and the functions' contribution at the end of the promenade could be given consideration.

### **Architecture and Design Museum**

The new museum is situated in the northern section of the main construction area. For the Architecture and Design Museum, the authors have conceived a building envelope which can accommodate various types of architectural articulation, without creating disharmony with the urban design concept.



Aerial view



The reserved site for the museum is slightly undersized. A ceremonial square is located at the northern side of the museum, and a smaller square is placed on the southern side.

In the second phase of the competition, the museum and its volume are presented as an independent element in the area. The presented building mass is not connected with the existing city structure, but rather the building mass is located freely in the museum site.

The Museum can be implemented as a separate project relatively well. The Museum maintenance facility can be connected to the underground maintenance route, but ground-level maintenance for temporary heavy-duty service is also provided. A general shape for the Museum is proposed. The Museum is close to other public spaces.

The Museum's maintenance traffic is provided through the existing Tähtitorninvuori parking facility. The Museum's drop-off for taxis and busses is not studied in the proposal.

As in the first phase of the competition, the plan has many functions that support the museum; though the proposed sea spa next door may lead to an unnecessary feeling of upscale premises and conflict with the aim for diversity. The museum's connection with the waterfront meets expectations, and the ground-level public activities stand out. The Museum is not dependent on those functions.

### **Feasibility and techno-economic quality**

The proposal is still a somewhat sketchy declaration, and the focus on content is unimpressive. The commercial attractiveness is questionable, and the finances are challenging, at least as a private implementation. The proposed project consortium is probably merited in its own sectors but has not demonstrated implementation of a project of this type and level.

The idea places great emphasis on the importance of spaces open to everyone and flexibility. It remains a bit unclear how it is intended to implement and manage the idea and bring some possible new activity to the city centre. The need for public funding is likely to be overall high.

The functions are presented as very gastronomy-oriented, and the volume of offices is low considering the competition area's central location. The limited amount of office space poses significant challenges for the implementation of the whole because the underground maintenance solutions are quite expensive and the share of premises with lower rental income is high. Also, the planned shapes of the buildings are complex and thereby affect the cost. A separate spa does not seem financially credible, because the construction costs of spa premises are typically high. Four elevators inside an office building may improve the conversion flexibility of the premises but is expensive in terms of building costs compared to single or dual stairwell solutions.

The Armi Ratia Park exhibition spaces are quite large (14,500 m<sup>2</sup>) and may be financially challenging from a real estate perspective. The functions presented under the deck structure are particularly challenging in terms of structural solutions. The structure of the concert hall in the middle may be difficult and inefficient to implement in the building structure.

### **Connections, traffic arrangements and parking**

The updated plan maintains a strong visible identity that operationally fits the area. The seaside promenade remains active throughout, linking the existing Old Market Hall and the harbour buildings well.

On the seaside, the proposal creates a steady continuum of functions, even though some functions are not as visible throughout the promenade compared to other competition plans (the hotel building in particular is located behind a corner when arriving from the city centre). The buildings themselves are connected via overpass bridges. Some of the entrances are located in relatively difficult areas, especially for the spa with the entrance in Laivasillankatu street in the passage next to the Museum.

The western hotel entrance has a hard elevation and stairs that may be unpleasant when arriving from Laivasillankatu street in the west (especially for tourists with luggage). Due to the large hotel complex, the plan has fewer east-west outdoor connections, the buildings being accessible through indoor public connections. There are several optional routes between Laivasillankatu street and the shore, and while this may divide the traffic flows, it also offers an indoor connection especially for winter seasons. The sharp turn between the hotel and old harbour buildings reduces the visibility to the promenade.

According to the City's aim to reduce traffic in the city centre, parking is projected to be centred mainly in Tähtitorninmäki's existing parking facility. One-third of the parking is allocated to the development area, but the amount does not exert a significant impact on the commercial activity. Nevertheless, it may improve the operating conditions of the hotel, for example.

### **Maintenance**

Maintenance traffic is proposed underground with vehicle access from the Tähtitorninvuori parking facility's connection. Each building has a separate maintenance yard. The maintenance of the southern section is provided in facilities under the Olympia Terminal deck. Furthermore, maintenance-vehicle access is proposed to the harbour security area. The maintenance of the Market Hall is proposed by underground maintenance containers on the south side of the hall. The location presented is poor in terms of its exposed relation to the museum.

The clear walking paths and outdoor areas are, however, easy to maintain, even in winter.



### General levelling and flood protection

The general levelling is poorly presented, and the solutions are therefore hard to assess. The terraced quay level may be structurally difficult and expensive.

### Deck structure to the south

The commercial functions presented under the existing uninsulated deck structure are particularly challenging in terms of structural solutions.

### Climate-smart construction

The proposal has introduced some improvements from the first phase of the competition, but overall solutions are still vague. The proposal does not have any special emphasis on cycling infrastructure with regard to the routes.

The regional energy system is based on geothermal holes, but feasibility has not been considered. The means of reducing climate emissions are partly vaguely described. The proposal solar panels are in the competition area but outside the actual property.

The complex layout and planned floorplan depth of the buildings together create a quite demanding and inflexible solution. The stairs and lifts in the office building are not located in the same area, which will affect the divisibility of the layers. The solution does not provide easy functional changes.

### Other observations

The plan material is limited, and many aspects are not dealt with at all (e.g., noise and air-quality). The rudimentary landscape architectural part is an absolute weakness of the proposal and even complicates the judgement of the proposal.

The complex shape of the buildings may create structural challenges that risk the financial feasibility or may lead to compromises in terms of architecture.

Boardwalk was the least favourite entry in the Voice Your Opinion voting, garnering only 9% of the votes.



View from Laivasillankatu



Aerial view from South



## 4.5. Makasiinipromenadi

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape, landscape and cultural environment

The project is a well-elaborated and complete project. The morphology of the proposed new building volumes is oriented parallel to the quay line and thus to the Olympia Terminal and Port House. This refers to the historical configuration of warehouses along the water from the past.

The buildings form one aligned, continuous, rather solid façade along Laivasillankatu street, due to the narrow gaps between the buildings. In doing so, Laivasillankatu street becomes an urban route with little relation to the waterfront. At the waterfront, the buildings open to the promenade in a disciplined configuration of larger building facades and smaller pavilions, providing some pockets and niches for diverse activities.

Although this configuration may function relatively well, the project mediates a certain rigidity and a rather static impression. This impression is reinforced by the proposed unity and coherence of the architecture. The buildings all show a uniform language in material and colour and are crowned with pitched roofs. The larger buildings all have the same height, and so do the pavilions. All in all, the project gives a quite dense and hermetic impression, though the programme does not substantially deviate from that of the other entries.

The landscape design is not of a waterfront character. The result is that also the waterfront side works more like an inner urban space, which is accentuated by a strong row of trees which conceptually seem to belong more to an esplanade than an urban waterfront promenade.

The promenade itself is well-dimensioned and offers ample opportunity for activation. The site of the Architecture and Design Museum fits well in the urban design with multiple opportunities for an independent architectural articulation. Likewise, the area round the Market Hall is well designed.

The cultural ensemble formed by the Olympia Terminal, Port House and railway shaft has been developed in a promising manner, though the authors have removed the programme for the cruise terminal from the project.

### Identity of the area

Makasiinipromenadi is a solid project which is well-elaborated and studied in many aspects. The placement and design of the buildings is clear and simple and creates a recognisable identity for the area: the new construction is aligned with the quay and



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



existing port buildings. The buildings are equally high and form a horizontal facade that connects naturally to the empire-style city centre.

The new buildings have a strong character. They are shaped plainly, and the identity of the area comes from the proposed materials and from the strong roof shape. The facade material of the buildings is brick, which is also used in the roof layer. The tone of the bricks used varies subtly from one building to another, giving each of them their own identity and materiality while also creating a harmonious and continuous whole, which is a successful solution.

The pavilions create a humane scale and playfulness in contrast to the masses on Laivasillankatu street side. In a wide and park-like shore area, the buildings and pavilions create a cosy atmosphere amidst them. On the top floor, there is a green roof and terraces. Inside the buildings there is a flexible wooden structure. "The Orangerie", which opens towards the shore, is a bright and attractive space with its green plants. From the inside, wooden lattice structures can be seen outside, offering a pleasant and attractive view.

On the Makasiinipromenadi, the roofs create a recognisable and strong city scape, but the urban design and architectural proposal are dogmatic and rigid: the building masses are quite monotonous, and the facades are similar to each other. The plan seems to be universal rather than specifically designed for the location. The proposal offers a nice narrative about the history of the area, but the interpretation is not convincing. Compared to C.L. Engel's warehouses, the rhythm of the structure is completely different. The presented roof shape is quite dominant and an integral part of the idea of the proposal, which leaves little room for architectural development; which can be challenging in, for example, phased implementation.

### **Views, openness, silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori**

The views from Tähtitorninvuori Park to the harbour basin and to the back are free, as the height of the buildings does not exceed the height of the hill; however, there is no particular relationship between the park and the project.

The Empire façade with the City Hall and water mirror are visible from the vantage point of the Tähtitorninvuori. Also views from Laivasillankatu street towards the sea are the same as in the first phase of the competition. Views are quite narrow, and they are heading towards Katajanokka, not to the city.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

Although the proposed urban structure and outdoor spaces around the buildings have not been changed in the second phase of the competition, the landscape architectural part has been studied further. The bridge from the first phase of the competition has been abandoned and the level difference between the sea promenade and Laivasillankatu street has been solved via wide, accessible ramp, which is part

of the urban structure, as requested. The seaside promenade is now wider, providing a better flow of people and places for terraces.

The landscape architectural part of the proposal is carefully examined. There are good ideas about biodiversity and recycling outdoor materials. The main idea of the proposal originates from the history of the venue. As well as the forms of the buildings, forms of the quay and embankment walls are derived from the history of the quay. Inspiration for materials comes from the sea and the industrial history. In the previous phase, the shapes of the meadow vegetation areas echoed the shapes of islands in front of Helsinki. Now the shapes are different but still formed freely, and its inspiration comes from the archipelago. Also, red granite paving follows these shapes. However, the shapes are familiar to the nature, but alien to the historical city centre. The meadows and granite paving create strong elements towards the shoreline.

Accompanying these meadow areas are rows of big trees on the shore area near the buildings. Rows of trees create another very strong element towards the shoreline – an even stronger façade in the seaside direction of the buildings. The atmosphere is reminiscent of Helsinki's esplanades. Historically, the esplanades of Helsinki are projected inside the city structure and bordered by the buildings, and not along a shoreline or harbour basin. The result is a kind of contradiction between inner city esplanade tree rows and archipelago-suggestive meadow areas. Both elements have a narrative with respect to history, but the interpretation is not convincing.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

As its name suggests, the proposal emphasises the seaside promenade. The promenade is now wider to provide more room for pedestrian flows and terraces. The terrace zone, paved promenade, wooden promenade with furniture and Makasiini Dock area with meadows and street furniture are distinct from each other, serving their own purpose. However, some of the level differences may affect the maintenance of the route.

The new buildings create an urban street space along Laivasillankatu street. The level difference between the seafront and Laivasillankatu street has been resolved as part of the urban structure. Between the buildings, there are direct view lines from Laivasillankatu street to the seaside promenade. The new connection from the seaside promenade to the railway shaft is successful.

The outdoor spaces of the competition area and their functions and activities are well structured. Sufficient space has been reserved for recreation and entertainment, distributed across the various directions. Greenery has been utilised to in-



crease a pleasant ambience in the area. The retail spaces offer relatively good and natural visibility, and the pedestrian environment is generally interesting from the old Market Hall to the old harbour buildings.

### Overall functional solution

The floorplans of the buildings are clear and modifiable, and they open up in many different directions. The dark arcades have been removed and public interior space has been added. The northernmost building is a hotel, which is a rather heavy and large building.

Buildings are quite massive in size and differ from each other only with small variations. The lower pavilions are located on the seashore side

The buildings, functions and routes have been studied carefully, and they form a firm entity. On the Laivasillankatu street side, the project creates a closed façade of buildings with relatively narrow gaps towards the water, whilst the pedestrian connections are functional.

The link to the existing city structure is successful both to the north and south, even if the proposal does not particularly open up to the north, which is the main point of entry. The updated plan includes an additional indoor route between office buildings. The indoor route location does not inhibit east-west accessibility and, overall, the visibility and routes towards the shore side remain open.

The direct link between the seaside promenade and the railway-tunnel area provides an attractive sequence of public spaces and integrates the remote parts of the site.

The updated plan fits well into the operational environment and creates a continuation of functions (the old Market Hall, Museum, hotel, retail, the harbour buildings). The plan offers a balanced mix of office, commercial, hotel, and cultural spaces. The amount of retail space is the highest (approx. 9,200 sqm), yet the suggested functions with retail, grocery, and design remain credible. The proposed amount of office space with the old Port House also including offices (total approx. 19,000 sqm) is slightly higher than in the other competition plans, but remains on a credible level. Overall, the plan seems viable economically and functionally, but the large retail unit (over 500 sqm) in Armi Ratia Park may be difficult to lease in the proposed location.

Concept-wise, there are many strengths in this proposal and the plan is estimated to increase the vitality of the city centre in various ways through the increasing number of jobs and services. Time distributions of visitor flows have been considered and have developed well from the first phase.



Aerial view



## Old Market Hall and harbour buildings

Efforts have clearly been made to define the content of the renovation section. The functions of the harbour buildings (the Helsinki Learn & Play Centre, Baltic Sea House, and Visual Culture Club and Sauna Spa) as well as the connection from the seaside promenade to the railway shaft create a distinctive and interesting urban culture as well as a strong identity with regard to the southern part of the area. The pillars of the railway shaft as well as the pillars underground in front of the Olympia terminal and their utilisation show an excellent spatial understanding and planning that take into account the basis of the area.

The Olympia pier area including the old railway shaft, Port House, and Olympia Terminal are holistically solved well, and the concept is of a high standard. The content of the sections is quite thought-out and well-themed. If funding is successful, it will bring new elements to the offering of the city centre.

## Architecture and Design Museum

As in the first phase of the competition, the plan has many functions that support the museum. The most northern building located next to the Architecture and Design Museum, is the Design Hotel. On the ground floor, there is a lobby, design shops and restaurants that open towards Laivasillankatu street, museum and the seaside promenade. The functions support the ideology of the Architecture and Design Museum and the proposed Finnish Food District in particular stands out.

The site reserved for the museum seems to be adequate and links to the waterfront well. The subtle architectural concept of other buildings works as a discreet background for the museum and permits many design solutions for the museum.

The surrounding area of the museum has been designed successfully. There is a museum square in the area with space for various events. The square opens attractively towards the sea.

## Feasibility and techno-economic quality

Economically, the plan is well-balanced with an emphasis on office use. The overall gross area is on the same scale as the other plans, but the office-oriented nature of the entry gives credibility to the implementation and economic attractiveness. The architecture is clear, and the floor scale of the subfloors is good. The content and amount of new construction is relatively credible. However, the architecture itself is not particularly commercially attractive; it is somehow heavy, but the impression has been lightened with pavilion solutions and the rhythm of the façades.

The offices are efficient and credible, even though the conversion adaptability with single stairwell solutions may prove slightly difficult. The urban sauna is an attractive concept, but it may be difficult to implement operationally and economically in

the South in Armi Ratia Park side. The exhibition/multipurpose spaces in the railway shaft and on the lowest floor of Olympia Terminal and Port House can be an economically challenging part of the overall real estate concept. However, the proposed office levels may level up the economic functionality.

Pedestrian routes are clear in both North-South directions and in the West-East direction. The path offers a continuum of retail functions, and the retail units have good visibility. The contact to Laivasillankatu street is clear and credible, but the contacts to customer flows in the seaside promenade are somewhat withdrawn.

## Connections, traffic arrangements and parking

The buildings connect well to each other and create a steady, natural, and interesting continuum of commercial premises. Even though the seaside promenade and the indoor route through the office blocks create two routes, they remain in close connection to each other, and the switch between the seaside and indoor route is relatively natural. The indoor spaces provide a good option, especially during the winter seasons.

The connections from the seaside promenade to Laivasillankatu street are not very natural, but the openness and route solution to the Kaivopuisto direction are interesting, as is the connection to a roof terrace. Some minor inconveniences may occur for the hotel lobby being in the public area in immediate connection to Laivasillankatu street indoor path and the crossroads of the first indoor path between the Museum and the office unit.

The proposal has not presented additional new car parking or considered the additional needs of car traffic at all.

## Maintenance

The logistics and service tunnel of the new buildings is proposed in the basement with vehicle access via the Tähtitorninvuori parking facility. The maintenance yards are under the southernmost building and under the museum. Other buildings are maintained through long service corridors. The maintenance tunnel is single-lane and must have alternating traffic (traffic lights). The maintenance of the Olympia Terminal and the Port House area is proposed under the existing deck. The maintenance of the Old Market Hall is proposed on the square at the south end of the hall (underground waste bins). There is no maintenance connection proposed to the harbour security area.

There are drop-off points next to the Museum, hotel, and office building. Parking and the museum's maintenance traffic are integrated into Tähtitorninvuori. The clear walking paths and outdoor areas are for the most part easy to maintain, even in winter.



## General levelling and flood protection

Raising the levels on the quay is done creatively and +3.4 is reached farther from the shoreline. The solution works in terms of flood protection, but structurally the implementation may be challenging, e.g. the staircase at the water's edge at level +1.0 is unfeasible.

The planting area presented on the quay would require special solutions for the pier structure, so that there is a sufficient growth layer. Vegetation on the pile slab can be problematic.

## Deck structure to the south

The commercial functions presented under the existing uninsulated deck structure are particularly challenging in terms of structural solutions, e.g., insulation and features that enable daylight.

## Climate-smart construction

In general, the entry has a well elaborated climate impact assessment. The proposal has well-conceived and structured cycling and pedestrian connections, and it proposes a flexible bicycle parking concept.

The proposal is ambitious with respect to climate-smart solutions. The proposal binds the project to different-level sustainability strategies and promises carbon negativity during its lifecycle. The project has innovative circular economy ideas and experimentality by using ecological construction methods and a series of environmental strategies. The main building construction material is wood, and renewable energy is produced by using geothermal heating systems and solar energy.

The lifecycle flexibility of the solution and the functional flexibility of buildings is good, as the building layout, shape, and technical solutions are flexible and enable multiple solutions.

## Other observations

The entry has been carefully drafted sparing no effort and the jury appreciates its contribution, especially in some of its commercial details and calculations, as well as the climate smart construction.

The relationships between the functions in the overall offering are well thought out and credible. The working group is credible for the implementation of a challenging project of this size.

Makasiinipromenadi was the audience favourite in the Voice Your Opinion voting, garnering 43% of the votes.



View from the sea



View from the shoreline



## 4.6. Saaret

### Overall solution in terms of cityscape, landscape and cultural environment

This project intelligently proposes a morphology for the new buildings based on four directions: the quay, the two directions of historical grid plan, and a diagonal view line from Tähtitorninvuori Park towards Uspenski Cathedral. These co-ordination lines form the framework for the shape of four triangular buildings with cut-off corners. The result is a transparent and light configuration, where the facades of the buildings align with the waterfront, while at the same time providing dynamic alternating public spaces and views from the city to the water and vice versa. In doing so, the composition simultaneously integrates with the direct context of its surroundings as well as with the larger context of the city on the harbour. The city structure is fresh and new but at the same time it is referring to the historical quarters of Helsinki. The urban design concept is open, airy, and flexible, with an agreeable human scale.

The in-between spaces between the buildings form short “vista alleys”, increasing the length of open street front activities, coupling Laivasillankatu street with the seaside promenade with multiple perspectives.

The strength of the entry rests in its overall solution, in which the architecture and landscape architecture interconnect successfully. The buildings border Laivasillankatu street in an intertwining way, while opening the views. The connections from Tähtitorninvuori to Laivasillankatu street and further into the area are planned carefully. Investment has been made in the design of public outdoor spaces and the quality of landscape architecture is high. The public spaces form a very well-considered entity. The seaside area is connected naturally to the north and south by the squares and the green areas, creating an interesting series of spaces. The concept for the views is excellent. From Laivasillankatu street, vistas open towards the sea and the city as well as to Uspenski Cathedral. The view also opens towards the city in front of the old terminal buildings.

The programmatic concept of the harbour buildings and railway shaft are quite convincing. The maintenance of the Olympia Terminal as cruise terminal and the adaptation of the Port House into the Baltic Sea Centre are logical. However, the closing of the railway tunnel for pedestrians is a pity: this is due to the intersection of the logistics and service tunnel through this area.

The buildings are generally four stories high, with a flexible ground floor as open street front and an airy, set-backed top floor with roof terrace, which provides the buildings with elegant proportions. The vertical cores to the buildings are placed near Laivasillankatu street in order to provide as much flexible ground floor space along the seaside promenade. The city silhouette is peaceful and horizontal. The



Siteplan 1:2000 scaled to 1:4000



buildings connect to their environment naturally, and the terracing can be seen as an abstract extension of Tähtitorninvuori and Armi Ratia Park. The proposed regulations for the façade detailing are a little bit banal and superficial, not of the same high quality of façade treatment as in Ahti. Also, the roofscape of the buildings may be articulated in a more dynamic way in order to diversify the buildings.

Overall, the entry is comprehensive, and the various parts of the program have been resolved in a balanced manner.

### **Identity of the area**

The concept of the proposal activates the use of the area from north to south. The museums are located at the far ends of the competition area to provide interesting attractions at both ends. Commercial activities such as hotels, restaurants, cafés and offices are in the middle of the competition area. The interesting spatial solutions for free art and urban culture are located in the south. Sustainable construction solutions combined with architecture and functions create a vital maritime feeling in the area. The goal of the proposal is to compose a lively and pleasant entity for city dwellers and tourists.

### **Views, openness, silhouette of Tähtitorninvuori**

The concept of the views is excellent, and they have not been changed since the first phase of the competition. The sea is visible from the observation spot in Tähtitorninmäki Park. Between the buildings, diagonals lead the views towards the landmarks of the city.

### **Landscape architectural solution, quality of public spaces**

Since the first phase of the competition, there have not been many changes in the landscape architecture. It is still part of the overall solution as it was in the first phase. The green nodal points at both ends of the area are visible, even though the museum has been moved to the north. The Armi Ratia Park design was missing in the first phase but has now been satisfyingly designed.

The landscape architecture of the proposal is elegant and suitable for the site. Although there are biodiversity meadows along the seaside promenade, the historical aspect of Tähtitorninvuori with its abundant vegetation has been recognised and the side of Laivasillankatu street is linked to it. Fountains are concentrated around the museum building. Rooftops form an important part of the design with beehives, vegetable and herb gardens. Plain, simple ideas of outdoor design emphasise the uniqueness of the site and create a modern layer of landscape architecture in a sophisticated manner.

### **Seaside Promenade and pedestrian environment**

The outdoor premises and pedestrian routes remain attractive and lively in the updated plan. The visibility of functions remains good throughout the seaside promenade. The plan proposes interesting functions, such as a wooden deck for seating and beach volleyball, thereby introducing lively activities to both sides of the pedestrian walkway.

Attention has been paid to green solutions, especially on the Laivasillankatu street side of the planning area and between the buildings. The area has plenty of squares and small parks marked with lots of activities. Winter activities have also been considered. Extended deck solutions have been used to enlarge the sunny areas.

The emphasis of the Seaside promenade as a part of the Helsinki seaside trail round the southern shores of Helsinki is not clear in the plan. On the other hand, elevation differences are solved well as a part of the city structure, but some of the elevation differences on the quayside may exert a negative impact on accessibility and the maintenance route. Also, the continuity of the shore route to the railway shaft is unclear.

### **Overall functional solution**

Two hotels and two office buildings are proposed for inclusion in the new buildings, featuring public spaces, restaurants, cafés, commercial premises and co-working spaces on the ground floors. The ground floors are transparent and show a light appearance. Buildings have a hybrid wooden construction, which brings flexibility and modifiability to the layout and enables various uses. The roof floor is set back, and the roof yards have various activities, cultivation, gardens and lounges. From the second floor upwards, there is an open courtyard in the middle of the buildings, which brings more natural light to the otherwise deep floors. The proposition presents ambitious targets with regard to the themes of sustainable development.

The large office floors with courtyards in the middle may be difficult in terms of conversion, division for smaller office units, and flexibility, especially in the building 1 with a single elevator stairwell. The architecture is large scale, and the triangular floors limit the division of office space into two.

The technical solutions allow some flexibility, and the building in the central area can be used for office or hospitality. Each building's footprint is relatively large, and the shape of the buildings may not be the most modified layout.

Saaret is connected to the centre of Helsinki, and the series of spaces from the Market Square all the way to Kaivopuisto Park is attractive, with its squares, parks and versatile activities along both the Laivasillankatu street side and on the shore. The passage through the buildings and visiting restaurants and cafés or the roof garden is made inviting and easy. However, one of the weaknesses is the pedestrian connection from the railway shaft. Otherwise, the plan fits well with the environment



and creates natural visibility and accessibility both in the north-south and east-west directions. At the seaside, the proposal offers a continuum of commercial space that remains interesting and visible throughout the competition area.

The insular solution of buildings with walkways and business premises positioned round the ground floors break down “customer flows” and creates some challenging spaces in terms of operations and rental. The premises on the Laivasillankatu street side appear to be natural but are not likely to be near the desired main visitor flow. The buildings open well to the street space and walking areas.

### **The Old Market Hall and harbour buildings**

The old harbour buildings and the new buildings are connected with a low restaurant building, which repeats the shape of the larger new buildings. The row of new and old buildings creates a stylish entity.

The contents of the section to be renovated and the underground spaces are presented quite briefly. The main floor of the Olympia Terminal remains committed to its original use. The Baltic Sea Museum has been represented in the Port House, which is a successful solution, but the feasibility of the concept is vague.

A new all-glass main entrance building is built between the existing harbour buildings. It offers a passage to the ground floor and the railway shaft. Art galleries as well as designers’ and artists’ workshop spaces are located on the ground floor of the Olympia Terminal and to the railway shaft which houses a wintergarden as well. The places assigned to culture on the ground floor are not structured in the best possible way. The underground section of the railway shaft is not connected to the seaside promenade, because the service tunnel intersects with the pedestrian flow.

The area round the Market Hall is well-designed.

### **Architecture and Design Museum**

The Architecture and Design Museum has been presented in accordance with the competition program on the north side of the new buildings. The restaurants and cafés on the ground floor of the northernmost building open attractively in all directions, including towards the Architecture and Design Museum, and thus can also support its functions. The architecture and overall composition will provide enough



Aerial view



space in the future for the planning of Architecture and Design Museum. A ceremonial square is located at the northern side of the museum, and a smaller square is placed at the southside.

### **Feasibility and techno-economic quality**

The updated plan is a balanced mix of commercial, office, hotel, and cultural spaces. Retail activities are well located and continue along the shoreline. The updated plan remains well-balanced and would increase the vitality of the city centre through jobs and services.

The significant share of the hotel and the number of offices bring credibility to the economic feasibility of the new buildings, but in the Port House and Armi Ratia Park the relatively large amount of workshop premises may be an economically challenging component in the overall real estate concept.

The updated plan relocates the hotel premises next to each other in the south with a closer connection to the Olympia Terminal, which makes the plan more credible as the hotel and terminal create mutual synergy. The plan fits well with the environment and creates natural visibility and accessibility in both the north-south and east-west directions.

The outdoor premises and pedestrian routes remain attractive and lively in the updated plan. The seaside promenade offers a continuum of commercial spaces that remain interesting and visible throughout the competition area. Retail units on the seaside also suggest that they can be walked through, which may be a good option during the winter season. However, this also reduces the ability to separate units by walls, which may be important for some retail and restaurant operators, thereby limiting potential tenants.

### **Connections, traffic arrangements and parking**

No particular attention has been paid to the northern or southern entrance to the area from the traffic planning point of view. Nevertheless, the pathways are clear and natural from the pedestrian perspective, with an interesting continuum of functions. The locations of building entrances are credible and visible. Some façades of Laivasillankatu street are connected directly to the street, creating opportunities for commercial premises and lobbies, but the insular solution disrupts customer flows within the area.

Overall, the traffic arrangements are presented roughly, making their assessment difficult. The proposal requires a significant amount of traffic planning before the preparation of a detailed plan, and this poses a risk to the realisation of land use as proposed.

The traffic arrangements along Laivasillankatu street are difficult to assess, due to the roughness of the plan. It remains unclear how many lanes will be reserved and whether there is car traffic on the rails. The adequacy of the space allocation also remains unclear because the plan does not include any dimensions.

The continuity of the seaside trail at the south end is unclear.

Car parking is arranged in the existing Tähtitorninvuori parking facilities with 147 parking spaces. The proposal has not taken the additional needs of vehicular traffic into account.

### **Maintenance**

Two alternatives are proposed for logistics and service traffic. One is a maintenance tunnel via the access road under the deck in the south, and the other is via the access road to the Tähtitorninvuori parking facility. The service yards under the Olympia Terminal deck are proposed in the plan, but may be difficult because of the existing pillars. Maintenance yards for the rest of the new area are not proposed in more detail. The plan does not propose a logistics solution for the Market Hall, and no maintenance connection is presented to the harbour security area.

Elevation differences at the quay exert a negative impact on accessibility and maintenance.

### **General levelling and flood protection**

The levelling and equipment of the seaside promenade must be planned as an entity to ensure that structural solutions, flood protection and equipment can be coordinated between different projects. The wooden deck might not be feasible due to on-going ferry traffic.



### Deck structure to the south

When designing the functions presented under the existing deck structure in front of the Port House and Olympia Terminal, particular attention should be given to the possibilities of insulating the currently uninsulated structure as well as to the general feasibility of the structural solutions.

### Climate-smart construction

The proposal had well-studied climate impact assessments in the first phase of the competition, but in the second phase of the competition the group has not elaborated those aspects any further.

The proposal suggests regional renewable energy system by using solar panels and specially located geothermal heating holes. The project is connected to district heating for peak power management with an option to feed into the district heating network.

The facades of the buildings have been transformed into ceramic and glass bricks after the first phase. This solution substantially improves the weather resistance of buildings in a maritime climate. More individuality has been applied to monotonous facades by adding horizontal and vertical themes. Green elements have also been ambitiously presented on the facades, though their feasibility can be challenging under Finnish climate conditions.

The structural solution is flexible, which makes the buildings adaptable to various purposes: the spaces can be divided into different sizes and the facades can also be developed and modified, which allows for various implementations.

### Other observations

The insular buildings are difficult to implement with flexible content. Quite moderate effort has been put to the content of the entry. The developing consortium is credible and enables the implementation of the project.

Saaret was the second favourite of the audience in the Voice Your Opinion voting, garnering 29% of the votes.



View from Laivasillankatu



View from the shoreline



# 5. Selection of the Winner

The jury unanimously decided to distribute the prizes and purchases as follows:

## 1<sup>st</sup> place: Saaret 100.00 euros

Saaret is a proposal that is, in terms of its cityscape, architecture and landscape, the most suitable as a focal point of maritime Helsinki. It respects the historical values and cultural environment of the area, but also creates a new unique and natural part of valuable downtown area. Its cityscape is well balanced, and it integrates into the urban structure of Kaartinkaupunki, Ullanlinna and Kaivopuisto Park, preserving the important views.

In addition, the functional concept is well-balanced and economically viable, together creating the most comprehensive solution specified for this unique site.

## 2<sup>nd</sup> place: Boardwalk & Makasiinipromenadi 70.000 euros each

Boardwalk has developed well into a beautiful three-dimensional urban and architectural landscape or relief. The programme and functionality have improved greatly. The architectural elaboration promises a real new popular attraction on the waterfront, as well as a project with international radiance.

Next to these qualities, the proposal round the Olympic buildings and the Cultural Cave shows the great potential of these structures. Even so, the project is insufficiently elaborated on the level of technical elaboration, feasibility and sustainability, which is a pity. Finally, the landscape design is also not sufficiently elaborated and remains quite sketchy.

Makasiinipromenadi is well elaborated and studied in many aspects and forms a solid project. In terms of concept, the proposal is of exceptionally high quality especially in the harbour buildings. In terms of a climate-smart solution, Makasiinipromenadi was of the highest quality.

However, the urban design and architectural proposal of Makasiinipromenadi are dogmatic and rigid: building masses are quite monotonous, and the facades uniform. The plan seems to be universal rather than specifically designed for the venue. The proposed architectural articulation appears to be somewhat anachronistic and is reminiscent of the architecture of the 1970s and 1980s.

## 3<sup>rd</sup> place: Ahti 40.000 euros

Ahti is a solid project. It has been very well elaborated, addressing all required topics, such as urban design, architecture, programming, functionality, construction, sustainability, emissions and feasibility. The project forms a complete offer.

Nevertheless, it must be said that the project in the urbanistic and typological sense is rather banal and does not provide a cutting-edge exemplary project for an important part of the Helsinki waterfront. Specifically, the rigid orientation parallel to Helsinki's inner-city street pattern is ostensibly not the right solution for an urban ensemble along this particular waterfront. The landscape proposal is too rich and disoriented to provide a robust base for this development.

Moreover, in Phase 2, certain interesting conceptual elements have been abandoned in favour of a more pragmatic and consequently dull character.

## Conclusion

To conclude, these are only a few important highlights of many evaluation aspects that were discussed in the jury sessions and expert meetings. On the basis of these, the jury concluded that the synchronisation of the buildings in Ahti does not fully address the character of the site in a convincing manner. Makasiinipromenadi's urban and architectural vision also does not provide the most convincing urban concept for the site, though this project was most popular in the public consultation. Boardwalk provides a very promising situationist concept and a highly sophisticated design with a potentially international impact, which nevertheless underperformed with regard to its technical execution, sustainability and feasibility.

Saaret was chosen for its ingenious urban morphology of axes and view lines. Since, like all projects, Saaret has some very positive features and some less developed ones, the project is naturally not yet completed and will be further developed along a set of instructions and recommendations which have been formulated by the jury.

The jury is confident that the Makasiiniranta competition has been concluded successfully with a solid base for its future transformation.



# 6. Approval of the Jury Report

HELSINKI 24.11.2022



**Juhana Vartiainen**  
Mayor of Helsinki



**Anni Sinnemäki**  
Deputy Mayor for Urban Environment




**Marja-Leena Rinkineva**  
Director of Economic Development



**Outi Säntti**  
Urban Development Manager



**Ville Lehmuskoski**  
Head of the Urban Environment Division



**Marja Piimies**  
Head of Detailed Planning




**Kees Christiaanse**  
Professor Emeritus, Architect, KCAP,  
impartial expert




**Leila Strömberg**  
City Architect, Head of Town Planning for City  
of Jyväskylä, impartial expert




**Salla Hoppu**  
Chief Architect



**Jussi Luomanen**  
Head of Urban Space and Landscape Planning



**Aino Aspiala**  
Representative of the Finnish  
Association of Landscape Architects,  
Aino Landscaping Oy, impartial expert



**Markku Hietala**  
Senior Advisor, Realidea Oy,  
impartial expert



**Sami Haapanen**  
Head of Land Property Development  
and Plots



**Sari Saresto**  
Head of Cultural Environment

## ANNEX

Instructions and guidelines for the second phase

Instructions and guidelines for further planning





Helsinki