Looking at the
GOVERNMENT DISTRICT
exploring possibilities in “Regjeringskvartalet”
This booklet is trying to illuminate the attempt of finding an appropriate design for the government district (Regjeringskvartalet). After our site analysis we felt it was appropriate to build both close to Utøya and in the government districts due to the importance of the place where it happened. It is very difficult to predict the development. Some say the “Høyblokka” will be demolished, some say it’s grown in to too much of a symbol to be torn down. The Y-building is described as challenging circulation wise and also in a risky situation in terms of security due to the fact it is situated on top of a tunnel. The R-buildings are probably also being replaced. The only thing that is certain is that the old government building from 1901 is staying. With those conditions we were trying to think rather conceptual rather than specifically about the design.

The attacks were very different in nature because the bomb was destructive in terms of the architecture in Oslo, and the killer was not directly involved with the lives that were taken. At Utøya the killing was more personal in terms of how the killings occurred and 69 lives were ripped away. We thought it was important with a strong link between the design in Regjeringskvartalet and at Utøya, therefore we wanted to find out what the happenings had in common. After a lot of consideration we found that the strongest connection was that they are both like island because they are both destinations. The government district is a place one does not so often pass through but is more of a place on goes to for errands or events, so is Utøya. However on July 22nd Grubbegata should have been closed, and Utøya wanted a stronger connection to land. If grubbegata was filled with water and the land from grubbegata was in-between Utøya and the shore. By highlighting this one could make people think about the happenings and the despair. The strategy was to surround Regjeringskvartalet with water and make a bridge to Utøya. However we would then change both the identity of both sites.

Another strategy was to introduce the void in the government building design. Again we thought the logistics of the design were too compromising. There were thoughts on extracting the crater or digging out Grubbegata, but the last thing we wish to do is being naive about the design and make artificial criterias.

In the end we felt like the design in Regjeringskvartalet was based on compromises and assumptions. Therefore in the end we decided to present the ideas from Regjeringskvartalet and pursue the design by Utøya to the fullest.
Emphasising the heavy lid but symbolising the life that can grown through it. Also keeping in mind structures that can work well in a social context, for meetings and having lunch.

The space is a small lounge within a busy area and to interrupt it is difficult. Also the idea of adding something heavy and something growing to tell as story was slightly banal.
After coming back from our study trip we wanted to test the elements on our sites. Here is a test of putting a similar pool as in Oklahoma to inspire further ideas.

Of course we would never do a rip off, but copy-pasting can inspire other ideas.
Embracing the void created by the bomb and inhabit it with something ever changing and growing, 8 trees representing each of the victims.

Logistics gets in the way of completing such an idea as it would be an obstacle by the entrance of “Høyblokka”.
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VOID

Highlighting the place where it all started, embracing the crater that was created by the bomb. One could inhabit the void with eight trees symbolising the 8 whom lost their lives, and also the everchanging process and grief.

There are many logistics involved when designing in the government district, this was probably a favourite but would need rearranging of the entrance to the main building.
TOWER

Extracting something from the void that all the people in Oslo could see. The idea of having something in common, even if one is alone one shares something.

There are many logistics involved when designing in the government district, this was probably a favourite but would need rearranging of the entrance to the main building.
A connection between two possible memorials is important in order to see the connection of day and happenings. When looking at making a gesture with a bridge, one could reply to it by building one in “Regjeringskvartalet”.

As mentioned in the “Idea” booklet we abandoned the idea about bridges because of how it changed a place and we were seeking a more sophisticated way of making an approach.
Where did it happen? What is in people's memory from what happened? We want to frame or embrace “Høyblokka” with a physical structure, either by connecting or making obstacles.

Our personal opinion is to keep Høyblokka as it has turned into a Norwegian symbol of resistance. Whether one should frame it or not is less relevant than keeping it.
An island is a destination, in that sense we saw the similarities between Utøya and “Regjeringskvartalet”, by making a moat around “Høyblokka” one could highlight that, and perhaps a bridge to Utøya.

There is an irony in the fact that “Regjeringskvartalet” needed shielding from surroundings when Utøya needed a connection, but by pursuing this idea it would be on the expense of the pure phenomenological expression. One would introduce a massive artificial structure on the island and in Oslo.
Testing out definition of the location of where the victims had their final resting place in “Regjeringskvartalet” by making bridges across the water-frame in an angle that would discretely end up at the exact location.

It is difficult to predict the development in the area, but we think that there would however be an obvious link between the Sørbråten memorial and the one in Oslo. The cut is a symbol of many things we think should be embraced no matter the outcome of the architecture in the Government District.
Experimenting with the bridges across the moat, by mixing different materials we thought one could communicate the values that were attack on July 22nd.

In the end we felt the idea was too literal and a bit “Disney” to mix materials on a bridge to show resistance to anti-multicultural ideas.
PAVILION

A pavilion supported by 8 pillars surrounding the building, it could be used as shelter or one could perhaps enter it. The idea is to create an oasis in an otherwise busy area.

We would like to pursue the idea of making an oasis, however we concluded that this idea is not strong enough, it is rather naive to believe one feels like one is in an entirely different space just because one is 3 meters over the ground.
The wish for creating a different world within the hectic city life, inspired by “The High Line” - a park on rails in New York City, one could pull the audience away from the district by pulling them up. The 8 pillars could represent the victims.

One thing is practicality, the other is if it would actually function as a place to commemorate. Also the eight pillars turned out to be too literal if we would follow our policy of putting the happening in the spotlight.
If one would make the platform in to a slow descending ramp one is able to experience a priming to an elevated space. Again it is supported by 8 pillars symbolising the victims whom lost their lives in Oslo on July 22nd.

We did not feel that the space was dominating enough to give an experience, but unfortunately an obstacle in the practical lives of the workers in the area.
The idea we find most appealing would be to translate the cut in to “Regjeringskvartalet” and the most natural location we think could be Grubbegata. It is already an open wound, and there is something about it that should not be forgotten.

It is difficult to predict the development in the area, but we think that there would however be an obvious link between the Sørbråten memorial and the one in Oslo. The cut is a symbol of many things we think should be embraced no matter the outcome of the architecture in the Government District.