

## European 10 Austria, first Jury

Friday, September 4, 2009, Aula of the Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna

6:30 pm – 9.00 pm

present in alphabetical order:

Maria Auxiliadora Gálvez

Sándor Gergély

Bettina Götz

Georg Kogler

Joachim Krausse

Michaela Mischek

Vasa Perovic

Lisa Schmidt-Colinet (substitute)

Socrates Stratis

Árpad Szabo (substitute)

Bernd Vlay, European Österreich, secretary, technical reports Vienna and Graz

Andrea Börner, European Österreich, technical report Eisenstadt

Christina Linortner, European Österreich, technical report Vienna

Excused:

Herbert Lachmayer (ill), Lesley Lokko (will arrive later due to an airplane-problem)

The jury anonymously nominates Bettina Götz for president and Vasa Perovic for vice-president.

In principle the jury will respect the specific format of European, acknowledging the importance of ideas which have to have the potential to be thrown to reality without losing their primary qualities. In addition to this overall criteria the jury will focus on the project's qualities concerning the specificity of site, programme and strategy/approach, and, especially, on the potential of how the projects could mobilize the respective actors.

The jury starts with a comparison of the sites Eisenstadt, Graz, Wien, and Ajka. In Wien the topic of housing has to face a paradox in the sense that a new urban neighbourhood shall be inserted on an abandoned „industrial“ site in the midst of suburban surroundings. Whereas in Eisenstadt the intervention deals with a comprehensive programme for the heart of the city which suffers from a lack of dynamics. Yet, a huge potential can be seen in the location providing a pleasant climate, high quality-landscape attractions in the surroundings (lake), and urban centrality within a historical context. Therefore, this site is highly different from Wien when it comes to scale, location, and complexity of programme, superimposed by the specificity of time: Esterházy thinks in rhythms following generations, having plenty of time in developing new projects. In this sense we could talk about a „superslow urbanism“ as a special case for Eisenstadt.

Nevertheless, both sites, Eisenstadt and Wien, need a vision in their respective contexts. A new vision is also an important driving force for the development of the study area in Graz, where the European project could act as a political tool for

impementing qualities in the southern suburban area which until now has been characterized by a diffused development, acting and reacting on the scale of the single parcel. European could provide possibilities for new development strategies focussing on landscape and infrastructural qualities which frame and conditon the architecture.

For Ajka the competition is highly important because it has to reactivate the urban centre creating new accessibilities, uses and public spaces.

The jury closes at 9.00 pm.

**Saturday, September 5, 2009, Aula of the Academy of Fine Arts**

**8:00 am – 8:30 pm**

VIENNA

European introduces the projects by presenting the technical report, addressing the strategies and concepts of every single project,

### **First round**

The jury decides to make a first round, eliminating all projects which have no voice in favour.

W01 > 0 Votes  
W04 > 0 Votes  
W05 > 0 Votes  
W07 > 0 Votes  
W14 > 0 Votes  
W19 > 0 Votes  
W22 > 0 Votes  
W28 > 0 Votes  
W31 > 0 Votes  
W32 > 0 Votes  
W33 > 0 Votes  
W34 > 0 Votes  
W41 > 0 Votes  
W45 > 0 Votes  
W47 > 0 Votes  
W49 > 0 Votes

### **Second round**

After a short discussion on every project the jury decides if the projects should stay or not:

W02 - OUT  
> precise microscale  
> not architectural  
> not linked

W03 - OUT

- > nice as carpet project
- > different typologies are interesting, including the parking tower as a landmark
- > juxtaposition of different logics leads to a „collection“
- > the spectrum of functions is arbitrary

W05 - OUT

- > interesting approach ends up very conventional

W06

- > the methodology to work with the programme of gardening is convincing
- > management of the void
- > yet it ends up in very conventional appartements

W08

- > ecological / bad on the level of building
- > creates spaces

W10 – OUT

- > the difference between urban courtyard and landscape injects an interesting contrast between a large „wild“ park and urban islands
- > the quality of this concept is clear but there are doubts about the appropriateness of the type of urbanity for this specific site
- > the quality and concept of the design is too too much familiar with mainstream Viennese developer-competition concepts lacking a new approach on the urban and grammatical level

W11 - OUT

- > good relation to heights and scales
- > density = interesting
- > there are better carpet projects
- > conventional approach

W12 - OUT

- > could be compared to W20
- > interesting formal approach disappears too soon in the diffused differentiation
- > the dissolution of the structure destroys the project's own idea

W13 - OUT

- > the project deals with the desires of the people playing with the issue of the single family home
- > interesting for the discussion background
- > contradiction between repetition and subversion
- > the project addresses a familiar topic that has become a mainstrea theme with better examples elsewhere
  
- > shall we accept the repetition of the syntax of a house in a fenced garden?  
How to negotiate the border between gardening, privacy and living?
- > the low density of the project is a wrong signal – we cannot afford it

W15 - OUT

- > if the concept is to create an interesting inside-outside condition with one structure – why, then, 2 elements?
- > the city block does not give any answer on the housing question

W16

- > the presentation is highly difficult to be read but promises an interesting process
- > the diagrams in themselves introduce important topics on an interactive process which the jury wants to discuss in a later round

W17

- > ambiguous relationship between symbols of power and democratization
- > imperialistic connotations with subversive meaning
- > paradoxical contextualization – appropriating the „Parterre“ of Schoenbrunn

W18

- > growing structures based on a comprehensive study on the process of housing development
- > project with clear strategy of diversification, extending a mere typological approach
- > useful tool for addressing the task of the brief (housing as an urban development in itself)

W20

- > intending structure as a communal unit by downscaling a hexagonal block structure

W21 - OUT

- > hierarchical structuring has contradictory implications, such as the ring road creating conflicts with the neighbourhood

W23 - OUT

- > a strategy of the ground is worth to be discussed for zoning in the city, but is misplaced in this context
- > filling of the ground floor (underground) will be problematic

W24

- > linked to the idea of the garden city
- > who will pay for the emptiness?

W25

- > scaling of green voids is convincing

W26

- > productive criticism of the framework including the cemetery

W27 - OUT

- > one of the few vertical projects
- > the layout itself is not convincing in the distribution of the masses and their contextualization

W29 - OUT

- > different typologies fill the field creating a potential diversity
- > isn't it cynical to take a people's wall as noise buffer for a privileged development behind it?
- > the main concept of urban planning is wrong in its polarization

W35 - OUT

- > wrong place and context for the site
- > inside/outside bridges do not create any quality

W36 - OUT

- > interesting island structure
- > one cannot understand the relations of the project

**W37** > dominated by traffic (17,4 kilometers), structure is not interesting – always the same linear code; at the same time the structure has a potential for diversification and interesting encounters between different living types

- > contemporary garden houses
- > good project – good diagram
- > the random and generic mechanism of the project has to be further discussed

**W38** > strategy of open space

- > seems to be more interesting than W37
- > should be kept in the discussion as a contribution to the carpet-concepts

**W39** > labyrinthian space addressing the relationship of public and private spaces

- > the concept is to create an island in itself - but why 4 islands?

W40 - OUT

- > although the project offers an interesting and ambitious programme, the spatial setting and the configuration of the buildings cannot convince: the cut east-west bar setting does not create enough quality to „give respective room“ to the ambitious programme

W42 - OUT

- > the block structure as a megastructural network introduces a wrong concept for this site (urban stereotype)

W43 - OUT

- > a Rob Krier-resolution of Yona Friedman
- > green effect is superficial
- > method is weak
- > drawings are an illusion

**W44** > interesting approach develops into a megastructure

**W46** > kept for comparative discussion on the important questions of occupying and densifying the site (field condition)

W50 - OUT

- > not enough structural coherence to become a megastructure
- > „academic joke“ - the critique is not convincing

W51 - OUT

- > reflects the relation between train and site

## Feedback round

Remaining projects:

W06, W08, W09, W16, W17, W18, W20, W24, W25, W26, W37, W38, W39, W44, W46

W06 > economic concept – wrong – weak strategy

W08 > economically not possible

W09 > density is too low: 0.6 – 0.7 – only 0.3  
> million dollar units

W17 > the cultural substance of the garden as a material to be recoded is interesting

W18 > gives a comprehensive development strategy especially valuable for the housing discussion in Vienna  
> danger of repeating always the same  
> a clear idea of coexistence of sizes

W24 > too large green space  
> monostructure is bad – as well superstructure  
> no vision

W25 > reflection of the green as a room opens up new potentials for the relationship between built and unbuilt spaces

W26 > highly controversial and ideological, but comprehensive strategy of re-evaluation

W37 > too long pathways  
> could provoke conflict between uses

W30 > one of the few vertical approaches, important contribution  
the quality of the public space between the buildings has to be discussed  
> plug-in does not work  
> the question will be if the setting is appropriate for this site

W33 > provokes a discussion about the meaning and interpretation of diversity

W48 > interesting identification strategy ends up with conventional block buildings

## Graz

present as site representative: Rainer Plösch, GBG

The jury discusses primary issues of the brief: it is about a large scale urban strategy. One jury member raises the question about the criteria of judging the projects. Can

they be judged appropriately? Other parts of the jury say that the context is clear, that it will be a difficult task to tease out qualities but that the judgability is given. The brief also launches important questions about the role of the architecture: how to bring/attract the buildings (and necessary clients) to the site?

European introduces the projects by presenting the technical report, addressing the strategies and concepts of every single project, integrating feedback discussions with the jury members.

In addition European reads loudly the written statement of the department of city-planning, concerning its opinion about the quality of the projects.

After this introductory phase the selection procedure starts:

### **First round**

G01 > 0 Votes  
G02 > 0 Votes  
G03 > 0 Votes  
G05 > 0 Votes  
G08 > 0 Votes  
G10 > 0 Votes  
G11 > 0 Votes  
G12 > 0 Votes  
G13 > 0 Votes  
G15 > 0 Votes  
G17 > 0 Votes  
G19 > 0 Votes  
G20 > 0 Votes

### **Second round**

G04 > OUT  
> it is not a vision that might create a new attractiveness on the site  
> very precise analyses

G06– 5 VOTES  
> process is valuable  
> the section of the architecture is more interesting than the plan

G07 – 0 VOTES  
> Nützing = new typology introducing a realistic idea  
> why does the Nützlicg have this formal expression?  
> it is an interesting building but in the end not a convoncing strategy

G09 – STAYS IN  
> motor in speculative reading  
> atmosphere as a perceptive structure  
> megastructure boosters introduce valuable attracting elements  
> industrial temples are contradictory but unique

#### G14 - OUT

- > scale is good
- > artificial qualities
- > problem is the architectural dominance: a building is proposed to look like this...
- > too much of architecture

#### G15 – STAYS IN

- > interesting reading of the site
- > green space and landscape activated as marketing tool

#### G18 – OUT

- > strategy too much attached to 3D formalization

#### G21 – STAYS IN

- > the network with other cities could increase the local potential
- > the relevance of the local impact has still to be studied

The following projects are in:

G06, G09, G15, G21

## Eisenstadt

02:30 pm

Lesley Lokko has arrived, taking the voice of Arpad Szábo who continues to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

#### present as site representatives:

Wolfgang Leinner

director of city planning

Carla Schmir, Thomas Brauneder

Esterházy real estate development

European introduces the projects by presenting the technical report, addressing the strategies and concepts of every single project.

### **First round**

E01 > 0 votes

E02 > 0 votes

E03 > generosity of space  
> handles the fragments of the Jewish City  
> connecting in a precise and generous way to the surroundings  
> works with existing buildings

E04 > failure in treatment of preservation

- E05 > 0 votes
- E06 > traffic solution has to be reconfigured
  - > good starting-method
  - > valuable strategy from the preservation point of view
- E07 > 0 votes
- E08 > works with the overall context
  - > small scale is interesting but densification on project site is not solved
  - > housing could be a hotel
- E09 > interesting strategy operating on a local scale
- E10 > 0 votes
- E11 > 0 votes
  - > wrong answer
- E12 > strong and interesting concept
- E13 > 0 votes
- E14 > 0 votes
- E16 > 0 votes
- E17 > 0 votes
- E18 > 0 votes
- E19 > 0 votes
- E20 > interesting urban strategy of transforming existing structures

The following projects are in:  
E03, E06, E08, E09, E12, E20

## Ajka

04:30 pm

European Hungary presents the analyses of the technical report and the recommendations of the Hungarian technical committee (see appendix) to the jury

### First round

The jury makes a first round, eliminating all projects with 0 votes:

0 votes for:

DZ169, JB007, UF020, JK571, HS835, AP756, BL175, AJ495, MY248, UE347, PB777, MW266, ED111, AS119, IG003, KT124, AJ257, AK279, WF009, AJ111 (transforum), AE345, HP034

### Second round

Discussion of projects concerning their value for the specific context of Ajka. After the discussion the jury decides to eliminate projects which do not reach a single majority:

HS138 > 6 votes  
BB512 > 3 votes > OUT

AY322 > 0 votes > OUT  
CC183 > 7 votes  
EC610 > 0 votes > OUT  
SP333 > 3 votes > OUT  
AJ111 > 5 votes public urbanity  
MT001 > 4 votes > OUT  
RI749 > 9 votes

The following projects are in:  
HS 138, CC183, AJ111(public urbanity), RI749

## Vienna

Arpad Szábo takes the voice instead of Lesley Lokko

### **Fourth round**

The jury decides to eliminate projects which do not reach a single majority:

W06 > 0 votes > OUT

W08 > 0 votes > OUT

W09 > 7 votes  
> 2 different cultivations of landscape

W16 > 9 votes

W17 > 3 votes > OUT

W18 > 10 votes

W20 > 0 votes > OUT

W24 > 1 vote > OUT

W25 > 0 votes > OUT

W26 > 5 votes

W30 > 6 votes

W37 > 4 votes > OUT  
> relation of all possible qualities in suburbia  
> 7,4 km walkway through an organized condition of suburbia

W38 > 4 votes > OUT  
> catalogue of typologies

W39 > 2 votes > OUT  
> question of how to debate

W44 > 6 votes  
> discussion about the criteria  
> vision – what is the vision of living?  
> it is also about models

W46 > 7 votes

W48 > 7 votes

The following projects are in:

W09, W16, W18, W26, W30, W44, W46, W48

## Graz

The jury decides that the actual selection is ok for this day and that the final selection will be confirmed in the end of the first jury.

## Eisenstadt

The jury decides to make another round of discussion in order to consolidate the choice and continue the selection procedure.

E06 > high potential on a local level, dealing with the in-between

E08 > how to extend the city into the park  
> not only to be discussed on the level of building

E09 > valuable urban strategy

E12 > precise placement of a large scaled object  
> produces a big museum  
> form would have to find content

E20 > good structure-study of Eisenstadt  
> bad architectural level

All projects stay in for now.

## **SUNDAY, September 6, 2009**

9:15 am

All 10 jury members plus Lisa Schmidt-Colinet and Arpad Szábo as substitutes are present. except fr Herbert Lacmayer is excused for being ill.

The jury starts with a fundamental review of all the competition sites. The jury agrees that the selection will serve as important material for the debates and discussions at the Forum of Towns and Juries in November in Graz.

## Graz

Two jury members say that it is a problematic decision to bring a site like this to European. The majority of the jury disagrees, saying that it is a difficult but manageable brief, resulting in four interesting projects.

The jury votes on the question if the site of Graz allows the jury to define appropriate criteria for a selection procedure: 8 votes in favour / 2 votes retreat from voting.

## Eisenstadt

There are five remaining projects which open a highly interesting debate about the relationship between local and translocal issues, as well as between urban planning and architecture.

After discussing the other sites the jury will, in the end, raise the question if the selection should be reduced to 4 projects

## Ajka

Important site Criteria are:

- > to face reality and the economic situation
- > most of the contributions do not deal with the „real“ situation – no one seems to be prepared to Eastern Europe – people are not prepared to deal with poor conditions
- > the jury looks for the capacity to acknowledge reality without losing the projective potential
- > there is not only one way to intervene in such a situation
- > projects create a debate: DIY as a response is put on the table for discussion

## Graz

- > interesting comparison concerning the different notion of poorness
- > there are poor conditions in the south of Graz (off centre)
- > how to deal with poorness?
- > disappointing pragmatics are not a sufficient response

## Vienna

As representative of the clients, one jury member makes a comprehensive statement on the housing situation in Vienna: the structure of development, the involvement of players and the recent innovations

Players:

- > BIG – highly committed real estate partner, being a state agency
- > City of Vienna – as a potentially inventive zoning authority
- > Wohnfonds Wien (Housing Foundation of Vienna) as a powerful institution which controls the development procedure of housing in the overall area of the city

European can be an important „tool“ to take advantage of the commitment of these players, as well it could give valuable innovative impulse to the existing development situation,

- > the city extension by housing has become crazy
- > looking for different models – composition of examples as a strategy
- > which density is good for the site?

- > discussion – not on a functional level – densifying should be rather used as a tool to achieve something different
- > regenerating / recycling – the process and the actors play an especially important role
- > European introduces new issues that can be useful afterwards
- > what strategies do the projects use?

## Vienna

10:00 am

The jury continues with the selection procedure, keeping in projects which reach at least a single majority:

- W16 > 10 VOTES in favour
- W18 > 10 VOTES in favour
- W09 > 0 VOTES in favour > OUT

- W26 > 9 VOTES in favour
  - > gives on all scales a comment on the strategy and structure
  - > a thoughtful study on the morphology of the site
  - > vision of a new society / position
  - > communication tactics – competition
  - > City of the Captive Flow / Raimund Abraham
  - > not just a statement, asking what is sustainable - it is *doing*, not (un)doing it

W44 > 0 votes > OUT

- W30 > 7 VOTES in favour
  - > interesting set of a landscape
  - > new landscape format – topography <-> architecture
  - > should be seen as a design
  - > how does the landscape concept relate to the design?
  - > relational approach, dealing with mutual dialogue
  - > ground incorporates infrastructure
  - > project addresses the issue of density

- W48 > 6 VOTES in favour
  - > it is a „Bauklasse I“ project
  - > certain formalization of social organization
  - > strange method of colonizing the land - the result is not relevant
  - > do we want this model to be discussed?
  - > occupying land in a softer way, introducing a story of occupying land
  - > no relation between concept and result
  - > a construction site with gardens, asking:
    - > How can you make a community? How to do a community forming process?
    - > social concept is questionable relating to „social sustainability“
    - > scale of community = questionable conflict!! – construction site
    - > strong illustration of a behavioral model results in an urban design
    - > completely arbitrary

- W46 1 VOTE in favour > OUT
- > project about densification
  - > mechanical parameters
  - > regulatory mechanism ->
  - > how much control do you have?
  - > concept is not convincing – does not create space!
  - > what is the final method?
  - > urban planning based on relations but not on frozen blocks
  - > reductive process – a lot is not offered by the game
  - > it is not transformed into something that becomes a spatial reality
  - > it provides a tool whose application is not being explained
  - > you can at least see how the system works - regulations
- W37 > 7 VOTES in favour
- > subject to a debate on suburban developments
  - > accumulation of suburban objects could create another quality of the city
- W38 > 0 VOTES > OUT
- > working with pattern/texture results in spatial qualities (W37, W18)
  - > questions raised by the others are solved here, but unfortunately ending with a quite conventional concept of suburban housing
- W39 > 6 VOTES
- > privacy relationship is explicitly addressed
  - > research of a spatial perception in architecture
  - > value in itself as an input for urban planning
  - > every architectural approach has an urban strategy
- W17 > 7 VOTES
- > green megastructure operating on a „cultural scale“
  - > good strategy for densifying, addressing the garden as a contextual element

**The following projects are confirmed for the second jury in Graz:  
W16, W17, W18, W26, W30, W37, W39, W48**

## Ajka

AJ111 Transforum:

- > unanimously brought back because of social relevance
- > touches the ground and addresses the reality of poor condition
- > introduces a finer scale

CC183 - 2 VOTES in favour

- > a lot of design covers the structural weakness of the project

AJ111 - 5 VOTES in favour

- > issue of colonization
- > image of people of Ajka

- > how to regenerate the place?
  1. architecturally
  2. large setting
  3. bottom up
  4. programme and organizational space

Although not all 5 remaining projects got a simple majority in the anonymous voting the jury decides unanimously to bring all 5 remaining projects to the second round in Graz because of their different approach and attitude.

**The following projects are confirmed for the second jury in Graz:  
HS 138, CC183, AJ111(public urbanity), RI749, AJ111 (transforum)**

## Eisenstadt

**The following projects are confirmed for the second jury in Graz:  
E06, E08, E09, E12, E20**

## Graz

**The following projects are confirmed for the second jury in Graz:  
G06, G09, G15, G21**

The jury session closes at 1.00 pm.

## APPENDIX

### **EUROPAN 10 COMPETITION, SITE: AJKA - HUNGARY**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HUNGARIAN TECHNICAL COMMITTEE:**

FINTA Sándor, HORNYÁK Attila, LOCSMÁNDI Gábor, GUNTHER Zsolt, SÁNDOR Gergely, ERŐ Zoltán, MOHÁCSI Sándor

#### Architectural means - Approach

In the examined projects there are two basic aspects of approach:

1. One of them tackles the whole problem from the point of view of public space, creates one or more public squares, and arranges buildings according to the needs and aspects of this newly formed public domain
2. The other approach deals much more with the problem of urban fabric and city structure. Rather than creating separate elements, creates a fabric or a big megastructure

According to the approach and aspects of the Technical Committee the main question of the competition is the proportion? To what degree is the first approach valid and to what degree is the second? Is there a middle-of-the-road type of solution? Can those approaches mixed? And if they can be mixed which of the approaches is valid in Ajka?

In looking for the proper solution a fragile equilibrium of those approaches has to be found which mixes both aspects and also solves the functional needs explained in the brief.

### Magnet

The brief did not clarify exactly what has to be meant in this situation exactly on “Magnetic pole”

1. One of the interpretations uses the public space or space system as a the real magnet, with usable and well functioning programmatic elements in the public realm (performance stands, flexibly usable areas, green surfaces, ice skating ring)
2. The other approach uses the function as the “magnet”, which in most cases works well with a very intense and active communication with the adjoining public spaces.

### The following aspects have to be taken into consideration:

- The new appearance of the centre towards the Csingeri road is going to be the new face of the centre for the passerby drivers, its importance has to be handled according to that
- Many elements of the structure are remaining so the “proper and balanced continuation of the structure” is an important factor
- Neither the size of the city neither the available resources make it possible to create a “big new centre” with a completely big construction, cost efficiency has to be an important measure – over dimensioned gestures are not acceptable (this also threatens with repeating the mistakes of the 70s)
- Elements of the centre have to be readable separately (question of scale), but still splitting the functions into too small elements is again not the solution (question of relating to the existing elements and fabric)
- One typical repeating element of the competition entries is the vertical division of functions. The main goal of bringing residential functions into the area is to provide the complexity and rich urban life a traditional centre can provide. From that aspect it would seem logical that the vertical layering of the functions is a logical configuration. Nevertheless many of the competition entries create a strict separation in between the two functional zones, which not only misses complexity, but also lacks the connections of the two functional zones.
- Relation of the green areas of the creek with the new centre has to be defined, but its green character has to be kept. (No intense building seems to be acceptable at this location.)