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District 33, better known to the public as “Firdusi”, (hereinafter referred to as “The District”) is one of the last surviving historical districts of Yerevan, which is located in the city center, next to the Republic Square. The square was formed as a paradigmatic symbol of Soviet urban development, and as a representative site for Soviet and post-Soviet power (formerly Lenin statue and currently Government buildings) and cultural heritage (History Museum and National Gallery). Standing in contrast to this environment, a district – i. e. Firdusi – was preserved next to it, which was formed in the late-18th century, and developed till the early 21st century.

Firdusi street and the District are unique traces of the city space from previous periods. This is one of the few streets in Yerevan that not only hasn’t changed its name over the centuries, or undergone radical transformations (both in urban development and sociocultural terms), but also remains a district, where people live their lives according to customs and traditions developed over many generations. The District contrasts with the city centre and becomes an alternative zone, where spontaneous architecture, one-or two-storey houses and orchards prevail.

PREFACE

Phot 33 կամ հայտնի է որպես զարգացած հյուսիսի Ֆիրդուսի փառքը (այստեղ ցույց է տրվում “Գրասան” կամ որպես զարգացած փառքի վերջին, որը սկսվում է քաղցրուկ ինչպես նայում է ներկայացուցչություն։ Ֆիրդուսի ամրոցը ձևավորվում է թեք գտի որպես հայտնի այս հյուսիսի փառքի վերջին, որը ձևավորվում է համարվում հայտնի համայնքների մեջ։ Ֆիրդուսի ամրոցն ու հայտնի փառքի հիմնական փուլների (առաջինը ծովի ծովին, այսպիսի կազմակերպվող փառքի պարկը), վիճակագրական նախապատկերների (Հայաստանի պատմաշրջանները) տեղակայությունների վրա։ Որոշ փայլությունների հետագա մասնակցությունը մասնակցությունն է մեկ դեպքով։ Ֆիրդուսի, որը ձևավորվում է 18-րդ դարի վերջին և կազմակերպվում վերջին 21-րդ դարի սկզբում։

Ֆիրդուսի ամրոցը նաև հայկապետ սալտանտական ծառայությունների կազմակերպության համար նախապատկերներն է են (որպես օրինակ կազմակերպված փառքներ), որոնք ենթադրում են բնակչության հմատակարգը պատմական սարքավորումների վրա (հունական պատմական գծերն, երկիր աշխարհական պատմություն)։ Այդպես կազմակերպվել են նաև ձևավորված կենսագրություններ, որոնցով բնակչության մասնակցությունները ենթադրում են իրենց ծրագրերի վրա。
All these elements oppose the formal, mainly Soviet architecture, which the District is surrounded by. Spontaneous construction and life prevail inside the District, while along the perimeter, it is surrounded by representative examples of architectural monuments dating from the 19th century to the early 1930s.

Since the 1990s, the whole street has changed into an “Oriental” market, which later covered almost the entire District and the collective moniker “Firdusi” was ascribed to the neighboring streets as well. The identity of the District and of its residents has undergone different transformations during the past two centuries, two of which were decisive: the multi-ethnic environment formed between 1915-1920s and the market being formed in the 1990s. The ‘Oriental’ market, the memory of the multicultural community, the street named after the Iranian medieval poet – all of this creates a unique aura of an eastern city, which was being erased from the other parts of Yerevan during the Soviet period, and also continues in the post-Soviet era.

In 2008 began the partitioning processes of the District’s territory, and some of the houses located in the north-western and eastern parts were demolished by developers. During the preceding period, just as in other historic districts of Yerevan (North and Main Avenues and other territories), residents lived in houses “under the plan”, which meant that such houses were slated for demolition, to be recompensed by new housing form the state on the same site or other territories. These expectations completely enveloped the pre-Soviet layers of Yerevan’s history with a veil of abandonment.
Existing urban texture of District 33 (Firdusi)
overlapped with draft proposal
Northern Avenue as built, 2019

Northern Avenue as built, 2019
It was proposed in 2015 to completely demolish the District’s historical buildings and build-up the area with an entirely different approach. It was only in 2020 that discussions around this reconstruction project intensified, especially after a late-19th, early-20th century historical building was demolished that same year in June. A group of citizens and specialists raised the issue of inadmissibility of this approach. Processes pertaining to this issue were instigated with the joint efforts of the remaining residents, which, despite having some impact on public opinion, have not had a significant effect on the processes of project’s reconsideration or the reevaluation of the historical district itself.

By initiating this competition, the Committee for the Protection of Yerevan’s Heritage, aims to find the best alternative solution for the revitalization of the urban environment of the District.

This initiative especially aims to affect the final decision of the city authorities, since the project submitted has not yet received final approval. Therefore, the purpose of the conceptual proposals regarding the revitalization of the urban environment is: to point out economically, socially and environmentally feasible, and sustainable solutions through open and competitive processes at the urban development level, which will be based on the principle of conservation and re-evaluation of the historically-formed urban environment.
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Sergo Tonoyan
Architect, Historian

In the chronicle of its historical development, each city inevitably encounters fatal dates and the interpretations of the events on either side of the latter, assume entirely different formulations and meanings.

Of course, we are not talking about dates of the foundations of cities, but rather about the endpoints that shift the continuum of existing historical developments into a completely new era. In this respect we can recall, for instance, the Great Fire of London in 1666, which compelled the fundamental reconstruction and industrialization of the British capital, or the example of Paris, with its similar transformation that is linked to the appointment Baron Georges-Eugène Haussmann as the Seine department prefect in 1853.

For the purpose of certifying - from the perspective of modern Yerevan - the currently visible segment of a past, which goes back into millennial history, we encounter two such fatal dates: the first is the 1679 Great Earthquake and the second relates to the approval date of the general plan of Yerevan’s reconstruction developed by architect Alexander Tamanyan in 1924, soon after Armenia’s Sovietization.
Historic building being demolished for construction of Northern Avenue, 2004, photo by Hayk Bianjyan
Similar to the aforementioned examples of London and Paris, these two key events in Yerevan’s history, also pertain to a natural disaster in one instance – which simply wiped–out the existing city that was formed since the early Middle Ages – and, relate to the city’s reconstructive and modernization processes against the background of wider socio-political and historical changes.

Any junction or district of Yerevan’s current urban environment has undergone its known odyssey of historical transformation within the turmoil of the almost two and a half centuries that lie between these two dates, and has reached us by surviving, of course, the urban planning developments of the last century.

The stretch between these important dates clearly expresses, in its turn, the various cycles of Yerevan’s historical-political life, which move from successive periods of Persian and Tsarist Russian occupation to the Sovietization of Armenia in the 1920s, and till our days. It is also here that the notions of ‘old’ and ‘new’ Yerevan intersect, which invoke the peculiarities of an urban environment developed through the amalgamation of the urban planning paradigms and stylistic characteristics of each period.
Firdusi at the Crossroads of Yerevan’s Historical Development Stages

Being directly adjacent to the Republic Square, the District is hidden in a unique crossroads of historical and cultural layers. Enclosed by the late-19th and 20th century buildings constructed along the streets surrounding the District, it has embalmed the colorful environment formed by the urban textures peculiar to the earlier settlement periods in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Even now, this district-forming modality of snaking street-networks and the garden-bound building blocks formed around it, are easily identified in Firdusi. Firdusi is the only one of the districts in Yerevan’s central, low-land part with such urban textures preserved in its entirety. In contrast to other such districts - Kond, Old Nork, Kanaker, Sari Tagh - which encircle Yerevan with big and small hills from west to north and to east, Firdusi, much like its ‘predecessor’ – the old district on the site of the Northern avenue – seems left alone and helpless in an open field, in a battle against the policy of ‘Priority interest’ that is consuming the city.

Just as in the Northern Avenue ¹ – where the current Hin Yerenatsi (former Lalayants) Street had paved its way through the old district during almost three centuries,

¹For more details about Northern Avenue, please see: Contrivances on Araratian Street: An Ideology or An Urban Public Space, by S. Petrosyan, N. Topalian, www.academia.edu/19954659/Contrivances_on_Araratian_Street_An_Ideology_or_An_Urban_Public_Space
had paved its way through the old district during almost three centuries, and which was entirely destroyed due to the new development, leaving only its currently meaningless name – today the main street forming the nexus of the district is threatened in Firdusi. The latter’s presence with its vein-like street branches is the best evidence of the city’s 18th-19th century heritage.

The next two main changes in the development of the urban environment during the tsarist period, namely the implementation of the regular street network, as well as the construction of modern types of residential public buildings along the streets, enclosed the District from two sides in an unique way, but did not in any way distort it.

In the row of residential buildings constructed from the side of the Tigran Mets Avenue, the entrance to Firdusi Street is clearly discernible – although not with appropriate pomp. From the other side, the District borders on the current Hanrapetutyan (former Alovyan) Street, which – acquiring key significance in Yerevan’s newly–reorganized street network in the late 19th and early 20th centuries – not incidentally bears the name Nahangayin (Provincial). The Governor’s office (currently Hanrapetutyan 32) and no. 28, 30 buildings were built here, constructed according to the designs of two of the best architects working in the said period in Yerevan’s history – Vasili Mirzoyev and Mikhail Von Der Nonne. Another architectural-artistic gem, the profitable house of P. Esapyan (Hanrapetutyan 46 building) is located up the street.
Made of black tufa, with rich exterior and interior decoration peculiar to the given period, these buildings – developing the street’s external aesthetic image – immediately affected the transformation of the District’s internal space. As a continuation of the style developed along Hanrapetutyan Street, the houses no.6 and no.11 were built on the eponymous old curvilinear backstreet, leading from Hanrapetutyan Street towards Firdusi, while in the evolving architecture of the houses in the District’s interior, wooden balconies begin to appear, in tandem with the characteristic customs of Yerevan’s architecture of the time.

It should be noted that during both the Persian and Tsarist period, the limits of the District – especially its north-eastern and south-eastern borders – were much larger reaching, for instance, the Getar rivulet on the eastern side. The District gradually started retreating only during the Soviet period, to become encased in the current borders, demarcated on one side with buildings along the city’s Central Avenue and by the construction projects of the newly-opened Khanjyan Street, on the other side.

During the Soviet years Fidusi district underwent some external and internal interventions, but was not demolished, lending its place to other parts of the urban environment under the doctrine of planned economic development.
Nonetheless, the seven decades of Soviet power did have their role to play in the process of invoking and instilling the idea of the district’s total demolition and regeneration with entirely new buildings. In some way, it is the result of such thinking that the possible development of the vernacular district was impeded during the Soviet period and in the years that followed.

According to the logic of the cataclysmic dates mentioned at the beginning of this brief historical excursion, both the Firdusi district and the whole of Yerevan in general, entered the 21st century by confronting the radically different urban planning philosophy and principles of this new historical stage.

The processes that were ignited since the 2000s, especially with the construction of the Northern Avenue, heralded the era of the destructive policy towards the distinct parts of the city formed out of the most diverse textures that had survived for over two centuries. Completely ignoring all the possibilities in securing the historical-cultural heredity in relation to newly-realized projects, the strategy orientated towards the service of exclusively private business interests was adopted instead. Any kind of historical environment was considered solely as a plot of land, destined for realizing short-term, profit-led construction projects.
Nonetheless, after these new and, certainly, equally fatal two decades, Yerevan preserves, despite countless losses, the potential of implementing and realizing new approaches in urban planning.

In the central section of the city, when the numerous domes of the churches and mosques are already destroyed, and the multi-storey buildings scattered around the urban fabric prevail in the city, the District – with its unique outlook and rich environment – holds its breath in anticipation, ready to face new challenges, but also living its life according to its natural course.
The Firdusi district was formed in the late 19th century when the population of Yerevan was prevalently multiethnic. Buildings were made of soil, straw and stone, the majority of houses had basement floors, which previously served as residential areas. Manual labor, small entrepreneurship and farming were the prevailing forms of employment. Agriculture and trade were the main types of employment, and this feature had its impact on the style of the streets during the last two centuries. In 1915-1930s active repopulation of the district starts by Armenians immigrated from the Ottoman Empire. They further the architectural style of the district housing with their indigenous ideas, traditional forms and construction technologies brought from different Anatolian regions and also from Greece, Lebanon, Iran, etc. In this period already 1,5-2-storey houses are built, and the old ones are reconstructed. The main materials used were stone and brick.

---


3 In the 1930s, most of the population of Firdus was Muslims, which was mainly because of near located Mosque (currently near Vernissage), in the territory of small Tatar cemetery and in the residence of the Persian Consul, which was connected to the District from the side of Hanrapetutyan street.
Since 1950s another construction wave starts in Firdusi (e.g. Firdusi street No. 80 building), simultaneously the previous series of houses are strengthened. Construction from the side of Khanjian-Tchaikovsky streets also begins. A nursery-kindergarten was operating in the center of Firdusi district; it ceased working in 1989, and the building currently is gradually dilapidating, being abandoned by the city government. Already in 1984 it was registered that the vernacular houses of the district were at risk. A new design for the district reconstruction appears at that time, according to which the main paths and streets should have been preserved, two eight-story houses should have been constructed in the northern part of the district, followed by a seven-story building instead of Firdusi street No. 70 building. But this plan remained unaccomplished because of the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In 1990s, when the newly independent Armenia was under heavy strain because of economic hardship and a war over Nagorny Karabakh, an informal market appeared in the district and grew fast, extending all over the Firdusi street and also including a number of houses of the Tigran Mets street and the small side street heading to the Pedagogical University quarter. The formation of the market leads to a proliferation of extensions and attachments to the existing houses; sales outlets, garages, and warehouses appear, built from metal or stone. The main paths and the height (amount of stories of the buildings) of the street are preserved. All the houses of the street acquire dual identity: “external”, adapting to the market, and “internal”, that is continuing to be also residential.

Since 2008, when the district area is declared as an area under the prerogative of the “prevailing state need” (eminent domain),
which means that the residents have to abandon their houses selling them with the land to the buyer assigned by the state, the residents start gradually leaving their houses. Developers undermine the 19th century buildings and destroy houses which are perceived as non-valuable. The houses of the north-eastern part are fully destroyed, and in the western part, in the back of the Firdusi street No. 80 house the construction of a foundation for a new building has already started. In 2020 developers demolished the Hanrapetutyan side street No. 11 house, made of engraved black tufa and rich with decorative elements; and partly demolished the Hanrapetutyan side street No. 6 building, made of brick.

The Allocation of Space in the Area: the “Internal” and the “External” Areas

The majority of houses inside the district have quite simple structure, but some vernacular buildings are made of tufa and brick, and represent the samples of the 19th century masters’ work. Most of these buildings are in the Northern part of the district, close to the Hanrapetutyan side street. The No. 17 three-story house in Firdusi street was constructed in 1930s, it has architectural design; the No. 30 and No. 18-26 (b) houses were constructed in the first half of the 20th century by the design of the architect Hayk Kirakosyan. But the boundaries between vernacular versus non-vernacular styles are melted, because even those buildings that have had design and architects were constructed with the active participation of the residents.
The state identifies as immovable monuments of history and culture only a few facade buildings on the Tigran Mets avenue and the Hanrapetutyan street. Meanwhile, the buildings on the Khaniyan and Buzand streets represent the Soviet modernist and constructivist styles and therefore have to be preserved, given their historical and cultural significance and representative architecture. The existence next to each other of buildings recognized as cultural heritage, on one hand, and those representing the vernacular style, on the other, may be contributing to an island-like isolation of the two types of inhabitants from each other and mutually juxtaposing their identities. At the same time, the 19th century monuments physically materialize the idea of the past history of the city, history which is actualized and modernized in the immediate neighborhood, inside the district.

An Intercultural Area

The memory of the community and the fragments of the architecture preserve the history of peaceful coexistence of the Armenian and Muslim populations; it lasted about a century and ended in 1988, with the start of the Karabakh conflict, when Muslim population left. In 1990s, with the formation of the market, the interethnic lifestyle and peaceful coexistence had a comeback. Armenians and Iranians interacted here for about 20 years. ⁴

---

⁴ In 1988, as a result of Karabagh conflict, Azerbaijani population of Firdusi abandons the District. But the Armenian population preserves the memory of peaceful co-existence with the Muslims, thanks to which in 1990s merchants from Iran were able to easily integrate with the community. Till 1990s the market continues its active and continuous operation in this area and the Iranian merchants rent not only adjacent shops, but also residential areas. Moreover, till the year of 2019, there were Iranian cafes, tour agencies in Tigran Mets street.
until the closure of the market. During the Soviet years Firdusi was also an area where the students of the Pedagogical University, located in the same district, coming from different regions of Armenia, often rented rooms and houses there; the location was convenient and affordable, and the residents were hospitable.

The Collective Local Identity and the Impact of Architecture

The district branches out from the main Firdusi street and creates, through side streets, small passages towards the Khanjyan street and the Hanrapetutyan side street. It is often possible to move from one street to another via passing through the adjacent yards. Several houses may have joint yards and entrances. This generates a form of networked communication, which has its effect on the identity of the population. The community and family memories are formed in this networked way, which links the everyday life of the community and the family stories. Thanks to the low-story system of the houses and the interconnected yard system social relations in the district do not follow the rules of strict hierarchy. The functional places usable for daily life needs and water springs based in yards are still functioning today, serving the community of the district and the city in general; they are common for several families simultaneously and are open and accessible to other residents and guests.
The sales stories and garages which appeared during the last 30 years make the residents used to the lifestyle related to trade. The daily life and income here are directly linked to the district and to the facade part of the houses; this, in its turn, further roots the community in its inalienable environment.
MAIN PROVISIONS FOR THE PROPOSAL
MAIN PROVISIONS FOR THE PROPOSAL

The proposals should suggest solutions to the four issues stated below:

- Formation of an urban environment with high standards of living;
- protection of historic layers in relation to the harmonious development of the spontaneously-formed environments;
- responsible environmental approach;
- economic feasibility and sustainability.

Taking into account the aggressive real-estate development projects (North and Main Avenues, Old Yerevan project, etc.) of the last few decades, as well as the anticipated future projects (Kond, Noragyugh and etc.), the proposals should formulate a new standard for urban environment planning, facilitate the integration of different social groups and the transformation of their perceptions of the District.
FORMATION OF A HIGH QUALITY URBAN ENVIRONMENT

Participants should pay special attention to the development of the urban environment, offering in particular:

- Internal pedestrian, cycle and vehicle movement, complementing and not interfere each other, especially underlining pedestrian movement and public spaces;

- existing urban flow system with the aim of connecting the District to greater junctions, such as Republic Square, Main Avenue adjunct area with the Vernissage (Flea market) and Ayrarat (Rossia) cinema;

- development of diverse public spaces, as well as solutions boosting interconnectivity of spaces;

- developing and spurring solutions for the neighbouring public institutions;

- taking into account the adjunct large transport junctions, as well as the metro (subway), it is necessary to provide the required minimum number of parking lots and offer car-free pedestrian zones.
PROTECTION OF HISTORIC LAYERS AND HARMONIOUS EXISTENCE OF SPONTANEOUS ENVIRONMENTS

The historically formed urban environment, having its unique, market formation pattern, needs to be rediscovered and reevaluated. By harmonious existence we mean a new environmental approach for Yerevan with a proper respectful approach to spontaneous developments, arising during the past two centuries, as well as creating prerequisites for future similar developments.

Particularly expected:

- preserve urban fabric and historical directions;
- reintegration of buildings and fragments, which can showcase the District’s past and can also define the future of the District;
- without disrupting the visual integrity of the Republic Square, also taking into account the monuments neighboring Hanrapetutyun Street and Tigran Mets Avenue;
- to a highest extent possible preserve the current construction typologies of the District;
- pay particular attention to the re-use of existing gardens and include them into the suggested proposals.

particularly expected:

- preserve urban fabric and historical directions;
- reintegration of buildings and fragments, which can showcase the District’s past and can also define the future of the District;
- without disrupting the visual integrity of the Republic Square, also taking into account the monuments neighboring Hanrapetutyun Street and Tigran Mets Avenue;
- to a highest extent possible preserve the current construction typologies of the District;
- pay particular attention to the re-use of existing gardens and include them into the suggested proposals.
RESPONSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL APPROACH

Being aware of the global and local environmental challenges, in their proposals the participants should develop systemic solutions aimed at reducing extra loading on engineering networks because of the new development of the District. At the same time, having a positive effect on the microclimate of the surrounding, minimizing the formation of urban heat islands in the District.

In particular we expect:

- Consider an opportunity for rainwater re-use approaches, as well as natural absorbing landscaping solutions in order to reduce the burden on stormwater systems;

- propose design solutions which will reflect on specific climate conditions: shelter from the summer heat and from the winter cold;

- develop energy efficient solutions and buildings;

- stress the use of materials with low carbon impact on the environment.
ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY

Being located in the very center of Yerevan, the District has a unique historical environment, as well as a valuable location from an economic perspective. Therefore participants are required to substantiate the economic expediency of their proposals, trying to find a balanced and sustainable synergy between preservation of historical layers, improvement of environmental and living conditions and new real estate developments.

It is recommended to conduct mixed-use construction to ensure the following rough but not obligatory ratio of sustainable surfaces of various significance:

- Primary use: residential, offices, services, workshops - app. 60%
- Secondary/supplementary use: commerce, HORECA, educational: app. 40%
- The participants are expected to present an enhanced review of projected return on the investment.
Area construction density may fluctuate between 40-80%.⁵

There are no restrictions on the number of floors, the height and ratio. Proposals may vary depending on the existing monuments, protected areas and construction, and if in compliance with the main provisions mentioned in this guide book.

As a result, approximately 150 thousand square meters (app. 1.6 million square foot) of useful area can be foreseen.

Taking into consideration the conceptual essence of the competition, as well as the timeline and other limitations, the participants of the competition have a tangible freedom to come up with innovative and alternative proposals within the spirit of the aforementioned points.

Though competition organizers believe the competition will pave the way to explore better solutions to present to the city authorities, in the meantime they agree that conceptual proposals may not meet all the requirements and answer to formulated questions, and as a result winning projects may undergo significant changes.

---

⁵ Yerevan does not have any detailed zoning regulation for this area that might be eligible for consideration.
1. Topographic Survey of Yerevan Center
   in the Autodesk AutoCAD format:
   Alt33_Yerevan_Topo.DWG

2. Topographic Survey of current situation
   in the Autodesk AutoCAD format:
   Alt33_Yerevan_Topo.DWG

3. The images and location of the buildings
   of the District:
   Alt33_Images.ZIP

The competition package is ready for you to download from this link:
https://www.dropbox.com/s/1e46ytat9wkspwh/Alt33_Files.zip?dl=0
Metro (Subway) outline
APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The proposal needs to be presented in a PDF format on minimum 2 maximum 3 sheets in 700x1000mm dimension, in 300 dpi resolution and horizontal (landscape) orientation.

Each sheet needs to have an eight-digit number on the top right corner as an identification code for each application. Identification code should be in Tahoma Bold or in any other standard font with 18 pt.

Digital materials, with the identification code, should be named as aforementioned: ID_DESIGN.PDF
01234567_DESIGN.PDF

Each applicant needs to make another A4 Info Sheet with a file name of the same eight-digit identification code. The body of Info Sheet needs to have the same eight-digits, full name(s) of the author(s) of the proposal and also the creative input percentage of each author, contact information that must include postal address, phone number and email address.

The name of the additional files should be created in the same logic.

All final files for application should be in Adobe Acrobat format (PDF) and should not exceed 100 Mb altogether.
WeTransfer, Dropbox, OneCloud, iCloud: The final files need to be sent via one of these file sharing websites: WeTransfer, Dropbox, OneCloud and iCloud. Files from other sources will be considered as incomplete applications. The application packages need to be accessible for 3 days at the very least.

An email with a direct download link needs to be sent to alt33@urbanlab.am email address with the eight digits in the subject line. The Info Sheet needs to be attached to the email with direct link from one of the above mentioned file sharing websites in the email body.

In the event of technical issues, the organizers will contact the sender through the same email address within 3 days after the deadline of the competition. We kindly ask you to check your mailbox during that period.

A confirmation email will be sent to each application upon successful receipt of the proposal.
Submitted proposal needs to consist the below mentioned drawings, which can be exceeded based on the nature of the proposal:

- Master Plan Of the District in minimum 1:1000 scale
- Flow chart diagram
- District Sections and Elevations
- Bird eye view
- Urban Design Renderings
- Short description of the proposal, maximum 500 words

All textual information needs to be in English. Armenian versions or translations are welcome but not an essential requirement.

No sign of a legal and/or informal entity, name(s) of the author(s) should be put on any proposal submitted. This info can appear on the Info Sheet only.
Competition is open for all interested individuals and teams from around the world without any restriction.

There is no application fee for participation.
Participants will be required to maintain confidentiality throughout the competition and not identify themselves or release any design proposal images etc. To any third parties or media outlets until an official announcement has been made.
RULES AND REGULATIONS

By requesting the Competition Package and submitting the Proposal all participants are accepting the rules and regulations of the competition.

It was developed based on “Standard regulations for international competitions in architecture and town planning” approved by UNESCO 20th General Conference in Paris, 1978.

The author of any design will retain the copyright of their work, no alterations may be made without applicant’s formal written consent.

The Jury has the right to disqualify any design which does not conform to the mandatory requirements, instructions or regulations for the competition presented in this package.

All submitted projects, including those disqualified by the Jury will be showcased on the competition website. A copy of the signed report of the Jury also needs to be part of it.

The Jury, as well as the organizers have the right to not award the first prize by allocating the entire award fund between winners.
The Competition Jury consists of seven professionals, the majority being architects from Armenia and abroad. Jury will select a coordinator for their work.

The jury members are (in an alphabetical order):

1. Dr. George Arbid, Architect, Director of Arab Center for Architecture (Lebanon)

2. Areg Asatryan, Architect, New York City Building Department Lead Plan Examiner (USA)

3. Movses Der Kevorkian, Architect (Belgium)

4. Narineh Mirzaeian, Architect, Founder & Principal of MNOOffice and Faculty at UCLA, School of Architecture and Urban Design (USA)

5. Sevada Petrossian, Architect (Armenia)

6. Dr. Irina Subotić, Art historian, (Serbia)

7. Dr. Taline Ter Minassian, Historian, Professor at the National Institute of Oriental Languages and Civilizations (France)
Taking into account the non-profit nature of the competition, as well as tight deadlines, the organizers, considering the available financial resources, have delegated the following awards:

1st place: 1’250’000 AMD (app. 2’500 EUR)

2nd place: 750’000 AMD (app. 1’500 EUR)

3rd place: 250’000 AMD (app. 500 EUR)

The competition organizers will try to involve additional financial resources to ensure a proper award budget.

Names of the winners and their projects will be published and disseminated in local and international professional media and websites. Only winners will receive certificates.

The competition organizers will promote the winning project for which an agreement should be signed after additional discussions between both sides.
DATES

Announcement Date and Registration:
10 July 2020

Making the competition package available for the registered participants:
15 July 2020

Submission Deadline:
10 September 2020

Selection Deadline: 20 September 2020

Winning project announcement: 21 September 2020

Online exhibition of the submitted projects: 25 September 2020 (at least 6 months)
CONTACT

For all inquiries please contact competition coordinator both in Armenian and in English by: alt33@urbanlab.am

An open online discussion platform will be available by the following address: chat.alt33.info
Committee for the Protection of Yerevan’s Heritage

Firdus: The Memory of a Place - Official Facebook Page
https://www.facebook.com/firdusmemory/

We call for immediate halt to construction in Firdusi District:

Statement by NGO’s on the need for radical reforms in areas of regional development and urban planning:

Firdus: The Memory of a Place — collective monograph ed. by T. Amiryan, S. Kalantaryan
http://firdusmemory.com/

Firdus Memory - Project report & Key ideas. Ed. by T. Amiryan, S. Kalantaryan
https://goo.gl.su/6szcb

The Transformation of Yerevan’s Urban Landscape After Independence, by S. Petrosyan
https://www.academia.edu/29171148/The_Transformation_of_Yerevan_s_Urban_Landscape_After_Independence]

Contrivances on Araratian Street: An Ideology or An Urban Public Space, by S. Petrosyan, N. Topalian
[https://www.academia.edu/19954659/Contrivances_on_Araratian_Street_An_Ideology_or_An_Urban_Public_Space]
Amiryan T. Firdus: The memory of the place and the locals (English subtitles) - boon.am 23.07.2019: http://book.csnlab.net/

Other Yerevan / Ուհեր Երևան ՝ www.othyeryerevan.am

Human rights activist on Firdusi District construction plan:
‘This is a very sad precedent after the revolution’
– Panorama, by Armenian Reporter,
https://www.reporter.am/human-rights-activist-on-firdusi-district-construction-plan-this-is-a-very-sad-precedent-rafter-the-revolution-panorama
alt33.info