

SECOND JURY MEETING EUROSPAN 10 AUSTRIA/HUNGARY

November 8, 2009, Stadthalle Graz, 9:00 o'clock,

present in alphabetical order:

Martin Frühwirth (substitute)
Maria Auxiliadora Gálvez
Bettina Götz
Georg Kogler
Vasa Perovic
Socrates Stratis
Árpad Szabo (substitute)
Lisa Schmidt-Colinet (substitute)

excused:

Wolfgang Krausse, Herbert Lachmayer, Lesley Naa Norle Lokko, Michaela Mischek

Arriving later:

Sándor Gergely, Sándor Finta

Until the arrival of Sándor Gergely and Sándor Finta the jury has 8 votes.

The jury starts with a resumee of the Forum of Towns and Juries during which were discussed the projects in an international framework, using the two formats of working group (small workshop type) and debates (large plenary type). Considering the reflections of this Forum the jury agrees that a main decision criteria will be the question of „innovation“, understood as a comittment which introduces new potentials for the respective sites. Seen in this light the question of implementation is interpreted as a procedure that has to be inventive as well, demanding the creative involvement of actors as a complementary force. The quality and effects of the winning projects, therefore, have to be seen on different levels, integrating debates about unexpected issues, providing material for different development tools, offering ways for new planning initiatives. Only by adresssing all these credits, the potential of the combination of Europan as an ideas competition with follow-up implementation could be exploited. It is the task of Europan to convince its partners about these values offering them rather an opportunity for development than a finished project which could be implemented with the existing planning instruments on the next day.

According to the rules the jury has the possibility to award 2 prizes (winner and runner-up) per site plus honorable mentions. The jury is free to give as many honorable mentions as it thinks to be appropriate. The jury can also decide to split a first prize in 2 runner ups. Moreover the jury can decide to hold back prizes if the jury thinks that the level of the projects is not sufficient.

SITE VIENNA

present from part of the site representatives:

Erich Rieck, BIG E&V

Angela Lämmerhirt, BIG E&V

Birgit Hundstorfer, department of city planning and zoning of Vienna

The jury starts with the option to bring back projects which were abandoned in the first round, asking the site representatives about their suggestions. The site representatives propose two projects – W25 and W29 – to be discussed for a „come back“:

W25 – GREEN ROOMS

The project shows different options for living by offering basically two types. It illustrates the idea of open space as an integral part of the development, reminding of projects from the 1960s, which we can find in various towns of Europe, such as in Oslo for example. But the „green room“ does not answer to the challenge of the in-between: what to put there exactly? Unfortunately, the green spaces are not neither designed nor conceived in their potential, although this would be the central task of the design. Being „green“ is therefore not innovative enough to offer to the site developers a promising project. In the end, the proposal is too simplistic in its message, avoiding to address the potential richness of an open space design.

*Voting for bringing the project back to the second round:
0 votes in favour. The project remains out.*

Sándor Gergely and Sándor Finta arrive, the jury now has 10 votes.

W29 – THE FRAMED PICTURE PROJECT

On the one hand the project offers a wide range of housing types for different clients addressing a variety of social ideas. On the other hand the obvious approach of a „tabula-rasa“-insertion which applies a catalogue of building types for „any developer“ is not the right strategy, neither for the site in its specificity, nor for the contemporary housing-question in general. Moreover, the urban approach seems to be problematic if we have a closer look at its implications: the protective attitude leads to a mega-form which only responds to one question, leaving a lot of issues unaddressed. Especially the issue of the site's bigness would demand for a specific identification process which is not faced at all by the design.

*Voting for bringing the project back to the second round:
0 votes in favour. The project remains out.*

The procedure of bringing back projects for the site of Vienna is closed, the jury starts with the discussion of the second round projects.

W16 – H URBS

The project has been provoking an intense discussion about its readability, credibility and specific qualities. The *representation* of complexity is striking, but its *actual* complexity has still to be explored. Reminding of Buckminster Fuller's „think global, act local“ the project integrates local and translocal scales in its development strategy ranging from manifesto-like urban visions to details on the intimate scale of the apartments' rooms. A set of tools according to different parameters triggers a perpetual accumulation of things (infrastructure, buildings, program) which is in itself transforming due to feedback processes between existing and new elements. The design can be seen as the promotion of combinatory excellence, demonstrating powerfully how we could control an urban process on the site, integrating strongly socio-ecological issues. Yet, the parametric patterns lack a certain specificity which would have to go beyond a generic debate about complex urban design strategies. Unfortunately, a machine beyond subjective intervention seems to be put forward hiding the lack of real intention behind rather general tools. Having a closer look at these tools, they seem to be inadequate: for example, they do not deal with the parameters of the in-between as a decisive realm of linking things. Also, a couple of strange elements (e.g. palm trees) add a considerable amount of incoherence and doubt about the project's substance. This, again, leads to the primary question of complexity: is this a really complex project in the sense that it allows to manage a comprehensive brief in the most efficient way so that the balance between the best possible quality and the most economic efforts is optimized?

It rather seems that the project addresses complexity through its very mode of representation, enjoying the illustration of complexity in itself. By doing so it misses to address complexity as an exciting and promising operation between different agencies. In the end, we can see a bold narration on complexity as a self fulfilling prophecy, preferring the mapping of generic tools to the creation of specific qualities.

W17 – VOLKSPARTERRE

Contrary to the approach of „H URBS“ (W16) the strategy of Volksparterre could really work as a step by step procedure, identifying progressively a new future for the site. The project creates excellent relations to the neighbourhoods on different scales with a variety of content and action: private/collective gardening, educational gardening (integrating the close gardening school). The choice to start with a reflection on the culture, the role and the potential of landscape within the city is promising and site specific, relating to the dominance of green-popular-culture, as it is expressed by the neighbouring Schreber-Gardens. The project ironically appropriates the anachronistic aspect of the high-culture-green of Schoenbrunn-Castle that has today become a popular object for all kind of tourists. It introduces a subversive reading: what if the emperors' ‚Par-Terre‘ becomes a Volks-Parterre?

Volks-Parterre proposes a new idea of green environment for a residential project, offering various options of use to its dwellers as well as providing a structure for identification and built development. Parts of the jury dislike the ironical attitude of the strategy: using vegetation to create urban space is a highly contemporary tool, but the intellectual approach limits the inventive potential of the landscape: vegetation could be used in a much more interesting way provoking higher intensities in use and quality. Does the vegetation create a quality? Why not densifying the Schoenbrunn gardens in themselves? Nevertheless, the way how to use the tools is innovative as it integrates the transformation of cultural landscape-issues in the development of the new residential area.

W18 – GARTEN>HOF

The project offers a comprehensive strategy of densification as an intense procedure of options and negotiations extending the programme of living to a programme which relates the quality of *life* to the „quality of *development* with its different procedures. The project offers a powerful tool that activates the residential programm in such a way that it becomes the promotor of an urban space. Combining a grid structure, plot patterns and social equipment with the productive specificity of housing agencies, private developers and communal initiatives the project delivers a convincing strategy that operates as a set of actions on various levels. The taking of final decisions is the outcome of a well structured process which does not reduce the project to mere questions of type, use, building and physical context. In addition, the social work is an integral part of the construction work, offering platforms for exchange and development, ranging from private micro-initiatives to larger collective enterprises such as ambitious concepts of social housing. By integrating the small scale as a vivid element in the overall concept the project creates a productive relation to the neighbouring housing structure, not repeating it but transforming it in its very condition.

Parts of the jury think that the proposal is too „semantic“ without relating too much to the spatial qualities. Indeed, the project obviously has troubles with the scale: one can say that it provides the right solution in the wrong scale. As a consequence of the downscaling of collective housing the issue of privacy has to be scrutinized: if the management and coding of the outdoor spaces is not developed and maintained properly, a privatization of the open spaces could counter the intentions of the whole strategy.

Although the proposed architecture and structure is not experimental in itself, a big potential of innovation is introduced by the strategy and its re-programming of familiar elements: the blow-up of a garden plot meets the downscaling of a collective courtyard structure – this new interface of scales not only provokes a shift in the organisational development-model, it also integrates a different notion of open spaces which transgresses the system of the grid by offering attractive pathways and routes across the coordinates of the plan. Not new objects but new relationships between things demonstrate a strategy of how to avoid modernist open space. Each proposed square has its own built ratio, acting as an inversed city garden who allows

synergies between different projects by special tools such as as the deal with air-rights for example.

Clients – e.g. housing developers – can especially take advantage from the structure because it allows them to develop a series of interesting architectural projects within the overall scheme of the urban system. The wide range of use models also reflects the habits of a society of communication where actions like living and working are interlinked in a new way.

W26 – REFINDE VESTA REFOUND

In its socio-urban vision the project is highly provocative leading to an intense discussion among different positions in the jury. Especially the radical approach of creating a „complete“ utopia where social living in a peaceful setting meets heroic open spaces, agricultural landscape and collective facilities is seen not without doubts about the concept's political approach. The harmonic community life is mirrored by the composition of the design, integrating a certain economy of doing things (appropriation and/or conversion of existing structures) and an urban strategy (how to link things). Though, for parts of the jury, the cultural ambitions and the totality of the design's setting create the impression of a somehow violent approach, saturated with the mission of social engineering. Seen in this light, the relation to social utopia, memory, and cultural contextualization should be reflected critically. The religious mission – creating powerful impact by powerful forms – corresponds to the lack of „real tools“: the project relies on a poetical and strong text which finds its respective illustration in the black and white drawings. Concepts like interdisciplinary are put forward, yet parts of the jury see in these integral aspects the consequence of an approach that is devoted to a totality of control.

W30 – STOP ISOLATION – PLEASE PLUG IN!

Vis-à-vis the famous Viennese housing complex „Alt-Erlaa“ the proposal seems to be anachronistic as it repeats a certain syntax of Alt-Erlaa without reflecting new conditions and different contexts. With its panopticon-like setting the typology reminds parts of the jury of prisons. On the other hand, the urban setting can be seen as an interesting approach, offering a characteristic topology with collective facilities that is embedded „inside“. Urban infills in the outdoor space supplement the differentiation which is already achieved by the topology itself. Yet, at a closer look, the plug-in idea seems to create more problems than it solves: the lighting conditions of a considerable part of the apartments are bad although the volumes are exposed to the outside by their fragmentation.

W37 – Ctrl+I – TOWN INVERTED

The pattern of the project suggests social intensification but what you can see finally is an accumulation of types as a mathematical exercise in „mixture“ and social diversity. The focus on the infrastructural issue ends up with options for accessibility which do not improve or take influence on the potential of the outcome.

*Voting if the project should stay in the second round:
0 votes in favour. The project is out.*

W39 – EVERYDAY MOSAICS

The project undoubtedly has its advantages in the 3-dimensional qualities of the architectural structure, offering a wide range of different situations in the transition between intimate and exposed living-spaces.

But it is not understandable why the design repeats the same structure four times on the plot. „While the building is good, the urbanism is bad“.

*Voting if the project should stay in the second round:
0 votes in favour. The project is out.*

W48 – 29 MORGEN

The project offers an interesting identification strategy allowing the landscape to become a main criteria for the site's qualities. The scale of the crane defines the layout of the urban plan with courtyard types. Parts of the jury question if the grid of the cranes can be taken as a useful criteria at all, including even the question of practicability. The architectural result even more confirms that the outcome of the cranes's system is a rather poor courtyard setting, especially when it is compared to the potential of the identification strategy (creating a sense of belonging): the transitional concept of „pre-occupation“ and shift of roles (from gardeners who dwell to dwellers who „garden“) could be an excellent configuration to build upon. In combination with the cranes, however, the setting gets trapped by its own premises. Finally the promising process ends up with a quite conventional city block.

*Voting if the project should stay in the second round:
0 votes in favour. The project is out.*

SECOND ROUND

remaining: W16, W17, W18, W26, W30

W16

The gap between representation of complexity and contextualization and the effectiveness of the design is striking. The choice of tools misses a lot of decisive issue such as a concept on the quality of the in-between spaces.

W17

The jury argues if the project offers a cheap strategy or provides a new strategic approach based on an urban notion of landscape that is transformed according to the potentials of the site and the contemporary housing-demands. The hedges as a

tool seem to be ambiguous: doesn't the project rather create a problem in order to solve it? The hedges themselves seem to demonstrate a lack of intelligence in the design – a one liner, addressing limits but not treating them. Yet, the hedge could also be seen as an unfinished structure in spite of its seeming banality. In this sense the project should be seen rather as an approach that addresses the occupation and coding of the unbuilt ground – it is not a result. Most interesting is the inversion of coding – a public reference (the Schoenbrunn-garden) is made private! This appropriation is in itself ironic and puts the value of open space in the city under discussion. The result itself is nevertheless not convincing, cutting the whole site in pieces.

Voting if the project should be nominated for one of the prize categories (winner or runner-up):

0 votes in favour. The project is out.

W18

When looked at it critically, the project might cause a lot of conflicts in land use. Moreover, it lacks a vision on the architectural level, it is rather a vision on a spatial urbanism using familiar elements to intensify the residential programme as an urban realm. It offers a high potential for developers, asking for a mixture of public/private models in specific scales and interfaces.

Voting if the project should be nominated for one of the prize categories (winner or runner-up):

0 votes against. The project is kept.

W26

As already discussed, the project's concept is seen ambiguous, introducing aspects of designing societies, making use of a hierarchical structure which reminds parts of the jury of camps.

Voting if the project should be nominated for one of the prize categories (winner or runner-up):

0 votes in favour. The project is out.

W30

The project's quality can be found in how it addresses the territory, providing a visual model for a „strange landscaping“.

Voting if the project should be nominated for one of the prize categories (winner or runner-up):

0 votes in favour. The project is out.

FINAL VOTING

W18

*Voting if the project should be nominated for the winner (first prize):
9 votes in favour. 1 vote against. The project is the winner.*

Voting for honorable mentions, integrating all preselected projects:

W30 3 votes in favour

W26 4 votes in favour

W17 5 votes in favour

W16 4 votes in favour

W48 2 votes in favour

W39 0 votes in favour

W37 0 votes in favour

After a short discussion the jury unanimously decides to give an honorable mention to the following projects:

W30, W26, W17, W16

AJKA

HS138 HUMAN SCALE

- important is the juxtaposition of elements
- one simple, but elegant architectural gesture unifies the whole centre with a well balanced series of public spaces
- the project looks for a clue for the whole area including the in-between
- the project provides a strategy to find a strong urban form with minimum definitions, yet creating an urban focus
- in its way how to look at programmes, the project is very formal
- the programmatic solutions of the project do not provide functionally properly operating buildings, the functionality of the floor plans is underdeveloped

CC 183 AGORAPHILIA

- the project is a generic response to the specificities of the brief
- one new building erected in the place of the demolitions; it does not interfere with the existing buildings, but reacts on their position, all new functions are collected into one complex multifunctional building
- the grandiosity of the project probably goes beyond the needs and possibilities of the city
- clear, but not really refined public space system created

- the project provides a well “advertisable” image through the definition of a strong, large scaled building; but its problems are also rooted in this strongly formed “image” which actually works against the scale problems of the centre, and does not address this question at all
- its design is rather conventional not going beyond familiar layouts of urban renewal

*Voting if the project should stay in the second round:
0 votes in favour. The project is out.*

AJ111 PUBLIC URBANITY

- the location of a few buildings with a simple setting define the logic of the new public space system
- Gradient of public spaces created: big, main square; small square (public courtyard) and linear space system along the commercial boulevard
- the project focuses on the memory of the basic systems of a city and the organization of spaces
- creates functional complexity through the vertical distribution of functional spaces
- A rather conventional project, with usual building forms, a “fashionable” character and well known typologies

RI749 DENSE/ LITE

- the project shows a striking balance between built and unbuilt spaces as a strategy for intensifying the centre
- it provides a structure that invites for being appropriated by different uses and architectural qualities integrating the importance of public spaces
- densification: creating a network of small streets with various urban situations and experiences
- town houses with active ground floor, in functional layout also recalls the mixity of a traditional centre
- instead the mainstream global tendencies of city-renewal which use a great deal of engineering tools in order to create a „new identity“, the project goes for a structural intelligence which should substantially enable a successful occupation
- the project creates a spatial frame that actually addresses one of the main questions of the site: proper and balanced scale of buildings and public spaces communicating with the surrounding

AJ111 AJKA TRANSFORUM

- considering the overall context the project offers a valuable strategy, addressing the economy of means as well as a strong social commitment
- the project, in addition, addresses the question of how to begin a process of transformation on a short term, offering tools for an early start
- involves short term animation of the public spaces into the transformation process of the whole
- the jury appreciates this commitment as an important message to be discussed within the European-debate on restructuring cores of cities which are characterized by a heavy transformation of their economic, social and structural system

*Voting if the project RI749 should be nominated for the winner (first prize):
10 votes in favour. The project is the winner.*

*Voting if the project AJ111 AJKA TRANSFORUM should be nominated for the runner up:
10 votes in favour. The project is the runner up.*

EISENSTADT

Wolfgang Leinner, director of urban planning of the city of Eisenstadt is present. He agrees with the selection of the jury in the first round. He underlines that, above all, the European competition is especially important because the city would get an overall urban concept for the next years. In addition he reminds of the question of densification on the project site: for the site owner Esterházy it is important that the site creates a certain profit in the sense of a higher densification.

FIRST ROUND

E03 EVENT.DROM

The project conceives the site as an attractor on a regional scale, creating a framed square which opens up to the Castle Park. The scale of the public space as well as relies on a considerable density of events which would be the main ingredient of the project's success. Yet, the project's devotion to the regional scale – underlined by the well elaborated access-situation, integrating the busses – neglects the issue of urban density on a local level, making the project strongly dependent on the success of the regional programme. Parts in the jury therefore think that the project causes a certain risk which would have to be balanced by an equally convincing concept for the local scale being unfortunately not addressed in an appropriate way.

E06 HEAL THE VOID

The project demonstrates a comprehensive strategy of re-use dealing with (infra-)structure, scale and programme. Instead of adding building mass to the site it reactivates it as a new central amenity for Oberberg/Unterberg offering living, working, gardening and visiting. Above all, a strategy of activating the in-between creates a promising starting point for the revitalization of the whole area. By splitting programmes, such as the hotel, into small dispersed units the project replaces the big building by a number of small destinations so that the streets and squares participate actively in the use-logics of large programs. In addition to this strategy of splitting the specific profile of the new European Museum of Horticulture provides another fertile ground for the local intensification and revitalization: the museum's topic of garden history is used as a productive force that can activate and design the in-between spaces of the area by its very substance – vegetation. The

superimposition of „exhibiting“, „filling“, and designing public spaces introduces an innovative notion of landscape which could endow the whole area with a new identity. At the same time the project demonstrates an economy of means by appropriating the museum's mission in an intelligent way – the maintenance of the public space becomes part of the exhibition itself. The project thus extends and transforms the issue of densification and its well-known investor-calculations, integrating the process of „healing“ as an intensification of local qualities and activities. Thus, the idea of growth is seen in a different light beyond the narrow profit-calculations which are driven by a mere concept of „adding“/high density.

E08 PHILEMON UND BAUCIS

The project addresses the whole Oberberg/Unterberg area as a zone of enhanced hospitality, being revitalized by specific infrastructural elements, public facilities, „rurban“ clusters and special „didactic“ programmes. The intervention on the Meierhof site relates to the scale of the existing housing in Oberberg/Unterberg, yet it does not take in consideration the existing differentiation and coexistence between more urban types of housing and the suburban house. By splitting the development in 2 areas with the public poles in the southern part at the Castle Park the project reduces the housing development strongly to the suburban setting. This is seen problematic due to the attractive location of the site which has an important interface along its western border where Unterberg with its cultural institutions stretches out. On the other hand the project provides a valuable tool for the city of Eisenstadt by a convincing set of interventions for the improvement of the whole study site, including inventive elements (such as the horse ride-tram) and integrating strongly the Castle Park as a central public landscape which should be intensified by special programs (temporary pavilion, re-use of stadium for children's race course, ...)

On an urban scale the extended program of living is well integrated in the set of interventions in the study-site-area participating actively in the restructuring of the local fabric. This rich proposal on urban interventions, actions and renewal-strategies would allow the city of Eisenstadt different entering points in its urban revitalization-programme.

E09 STITCHING & WEAVING

The project aims at an upleveling of public space working rather with surface and landscape than with buildings. It strongly votes for the delimitation between Meierhof and the park suggesting to turn Esterhazy street in a connective surface becoming part of the landscape of the park. The introduction of a district management and a „try and error strategy of temporary uses“ could add value to the process of re-occupation of existing structures. Unfortunately the project fails to resolve a decisive issues of its concept: the difference between the folded surfaces as connective elements and the existing buildings of the city is not exploited on the spatial and programmatical level. The jury cannot see how the encounter of the new structure with the existing might create an enriching dialogue which exploits the

potential of the „already there“. Rather the project introduces a certain contradiction between preserving and transforming without showing moments of synergy between the new and historical developments.

E12 ÜBERSETZUNGEN

The urban strategy of defining identity-generating clusters to be developed in a step-by-step strategy culminates in the development of the Meierhof site where „Bigness“ is introduced as a way to create a new urban condition including symbolic value as well as programmatic performance: the „repetition“ of the scale and ground-type of the Esterhay Castle at the Meierhof site inserts a powerful building making the not only site visible but questioning also the dominance of the Castle as a singular monument. In this sense the Meierhof site adds a „perfect form“ whose content is the symbolic shift of urban space: instead of the park with the castle as its centre the project introduces a relationship between an existing and a new symbol shifting the geography of meaning of the city's urban centre. This is the power of the urban operation.

Yet, parts of the jury criticize that the approach limits itself by being too conceptual and formal in its ambition. The typological operation does not meet a programmatic proposal that could be equally convincing. The focus on national institutions seems to be too generic in comparison with the formal concept lacking an adequate strategy. In the end the idea of the cluster is overruled by the dominance of a big building, announcing a doubtful message: that a mega-building could address the challenge of the quarter's comprehensive revitalization.

E20 THE CITY ON TOP OF EISENSTADT

The ambition of creating a three-dimensional local network with programmatic densification is appreciated as an urban strategy for the area. Yet the jury unanimously agrees that the project shows a considerable lack on the level of architectural concretization. Therefore the urban concept does not meet an adequate architectural response that would allow to evaluate the its ideas.

*Voting if the project should stay for the next discussion-round:
0 votes in favour. The project is out.*

SECOND ROUND

The aim of the second round is to clarify the potentials of the remaining projects in order to find the winning teams.

E03

-the constraint to make the project dependent from programmatic intensity on a translocal level is a risky and therefore problematic approach

E06

- the project starts the process from within using the city's potentials in a concrete and creative way;
- the concept of „healing“ should be seen more in a spatial and programmatic sense; the importance of the „healing-prosthesis“ attached to the buildings should be revised;
- the concept of densification is a process relating to a dialogue between open and built up spaces; the suggested density should be seen as a one scenario among possible alternatives;
- the project demonstrates a thoughtful investment in new programs;
- the process introduced by the urban strategy allows and even triggers a promising discussion with the site owner;

E08

- the project develops convincingly new structures out of the old
- a series of activating micro-elements intelligently intensify the urban space
- compared to the excellence of the urban proposal the setting for the project site is not designed very well;

E09

- the project's big connective gesture contradicts the title of „stitching and weaving“, as it does not provide small tools that really perform as connecting devices;
- the architectural project is too formal and not convincing in its dialogue with the existing buildings;
- the idea of folding cannot transgress a certain formalism which limits its potential as an urban operation;

E12

- the ambitious concept unfortunately is dominated by an object that introduces ambiguous qualities such as isolation and not manageable bigness for Eisenstadt's situation;
- the idea of putting another castle to the existing is conceptually interesting but at the same time misleading in various aspects (symbolically, programmatically)

E06

- compared to E12 the project shows a less preconceived top-down intention;
- by starting from within it develops new ideas which make the existing things more powerful;
- for the city the project therefore provides a powerful strategy, increasing the value of the place;

*Voting if project E06 should be nominated as winner:
8 votes in favour. The project is the winning project.*

E08

- the architecture of the project site is not convincing
- the urban strategy of introducing connective programmes in order to link the site with the city is seen very positively
- the quality strongly depends from the successful insertion of programs, making this project more powerful than E09

E09

- the urban intentions and the project are not coherent enough showing contradictions concerning scale, integration of the existing and the programmatical performance of the new structures

*Voting if project E08 should be nominated as runner-up:
8 votes in favour. The project is the runner-up.*

*Voting if the jury should nominate projects for honorable mentions:
0 votes in favour. No honorable mentions for Eisenstadt.*

GRAZ

FIRST ROUND

G09 EU-AE-PARK-GRAZ

The project introduces a clear and strong strategy of evaluating the area as a promising future, a new model for peripheral areas which suffer from an overall lack of structural qualities, are characterized by a diffused landscape and an absolute absence of identity. The idea is to develop a characteristic new spatial setting which we could see as a „productive landscape“ entering a specific dialogue with buildings: being a significant, large-scaled object each building provides a specific programme which is strongly linked to the productive landscape, using and shaping its qualities. At the same time these specific buildings share the same skin, thus introducing a serial mode of sequential appearances along the longitudinal development of the landscape: the heterogeneity of the area meets the homeogeneity of the skin, provoking an attractive tension between similarity and difference. The Mur river as the one identifying element thus finds its correspondence in the overall study area which – territorially – develops to a new species, an interesting pilot-model for suburban areas where landscape closely intertwines with large scale production, integrating agricultural, industrial, an recreational uses. Although the large scale of the project does not seem to respect the context of the fragmented ownership structures, the strategy clearly addresses the pattern of the parcels creating different „fields“ of intervention in which the specific programmatic scenarios can take place.

The suggested programs range from agricultural animal farms to recreational drive-in buildings. The jury discusses the appropriateness of size and programme in relation to the demands of an intelligent urban strategy. Parts of the jury do not see any viable strategy behind the seductive images which tell about the poetic relationship between landscape and object. Another part of the jury exactly sees in the configuration of large scale developments in synergy with an open landscape a very high strategic potential: by providing a concept for a very strong identity, issues such as traffic infrastructure, interdisciplinary synergies, programmatical appropriateness and landscape development are secondary structures whose further development can be easily negotiated and adapted in the future process without losing the quality of the concept.

G06 TO BE CONTINUED...

The project suggests a careful strategy for a step-by-step development which respects the synergy of existing enterprises and new players. A curatorium with different representatives (policy, administration, experts, neighbours) organizes and reinforces new dynamics in the area. The project also introduces the idea of open spaces which are the result of a productive synergy between the suggested linear densification, natural elements (rain) and a low-budget-concept of free space. The Schlepfbahn is seen as a media of transport, also including the transport of

information and cultural events which present themselves to a broader public. Although the jury appreciates the commitment of a process-orientated approach which integrates strongly the relation between production and open landscape, the plan of the suggested built development, stretching out linearly along infrastructural lines, is not convincing. Its conventional organization does not offer the qualities which are potentially introduced in the sections.

G16 LANDSCHAFTSBAND

The project obviously addresses the wide range of issues which were listed in the brief: infrastructural development, interdisciplinary work, integration of landscape in the built developments. Nevertheless the approach ends up with a proper proposal for a masterplan without adding a strategic surplus value to the future developments. All too quickly the plausibility of the masterplan could end up as a good intention whose qualities will be consumed by the pragmatism of the single developments. Finally, no one would recognize the characteristic qualities that have been introduced originally due to the lack of a strong and resistant overall concept which would allow to create a new chapter of city planning in peripheral areas of European towns. As the jury sees European as a real opportunity to grasp this possibility, the technocratic appropriateness of this project lacks a convincing driving force, being strong enough to survive all the modifications that have to be expected in long term urban planning procedure.

G21 DANGEROUS

The project promotes a manifesto for a new practice of urban planning based strongly on global concerns, acting within a network of interchange between different cities and planning agencies. The jury appreciates the ambition to create a new dialogue between local and translocal parameters. But, unfortunately, it is exactly the quality of this dialogue which is not installed successfully because of a series of pre-conceptions which do not allow the team to arrive at the local level of the site. On the one hand, the pre-conception of the mechanical notion of infrastructure leads to nostalgic models of modular densification with an atmospheric focus on the industrial-inhabited landscape. On the other hand, the manifesto itself does not introduce innovative topics, repeating quite superficially slogans from the discourse of critical theory on urban planning („toward an architecture...that learns“/ „toward an evolutionary development of the projects“/ „toward a laboratory urbanism“). As well the team offers a generic catalogue of elements which should be used as tools for different interventions. But it is exactly the lack of specificity of these interventions which disempowers the tools and makes them lose their credibility as useful urbanistic instruments.

SECOND ROUND

Eva-Maria Benedikt, representative of the department of city planning/city-development of the city of Graz and Günter Hirner, director of the GBG, the city's site-development agency, have arrived.

Eva Benedikt presents the point of view of the planning department:

Referring to the comprehensive task which was addressed in the competition brief

Misses Benedikt repeats the main criteria for the city:

- to look for teams which work on an interdisciplinary level, being able to face the complex relationship between an intelligent traffic solution, new developments and the integration of landscape as an important element for the future quality, especially when it comes to the use of public space offering attractive common facilities (leisure&recreation).

Concerning the projects Misses Benedikt starts with a comparison of project G09 and G16, saying that both projects, in their respective way, are „good“: whereas project G09 demonstrates a strong idea, project G16 introduces a comprehensive response to the different tasks of the brief.

From part of the GBG Mr. Hirner adds that he could be happy with both projects (G09/G16), nevertheless he would like to put the question if the landscape proposal of G09 could be implemented. For the GBG it is important to find new ideas concerning future evaluations of the site, as they are interested to develop projects there. With the IPG-Park and the Wirtschaftsbetriebe/AEVG sites the GBG is indirectly involved in the area, but has not found a concrete project site for the European competition. Therefore European could give important impulses on future developments, helping the GBG to define their concrete goals and opportunities in this area.

Misses Benedikt continues to comment the projects:

G16

- the teamwork is appreciated
- a fine solution for the traffic is proposed, shifting the terminal toward north close to Puntigamer Strasse
- a realistic scenario of densification is suggested, keeping existing fields open, thus integrating the green as a public value in the future developments

G06

- the development process is appreciated
- the marketing work, being controlled by an agency, is a very positive aspect of the project

The jury asks Misses Benedikt to introduce projects which the city would like to be discussed in the second round bringing back of eliminated projects).

The city would like to discuss project G03:

- the project addresses all three decisive issues – free space, traffic, urban planning in a complex way

The jury responses:

- the project is realistic in a too easy way – it could be implemented the next day without developing a work on the potentials of the site
- how to persuade a developer to come to this site-area on the basis of a project like this?
- The location of the site is excellent as for its potential. European is an opportunity to create a new input in urban development. The city deserves a vision which should move forward the urban development activities.

Voting for bringing the project back to the second round:

0 votes in favour. The project remains out.

G09

Jury, city and GBG have an intense discussion about the quality of the project. The critique against the project focusses on its obsession with the appearance, being too formal and not providing any valuable strategy - „a zero-condition for starting ending up in a strange park“.

Against this critique parts of the jury list the aspects concerning the potential of the project:

- the idea of the productive landscape creates a potentially new space, not only in its formal, but in its programmatical and operative approach
- the project provides a fertile ground for strong architecture
- the way in which and where the project places the objects contains strong logics of availability and accessibility of land
- the project has to be seen as a seed of potential development on the level of territory; this allows for a programmatical freedom in the concrete choice of uses, the installment of infrastructures, and the treatment of the landscape
- productivity of the landscape also includes aesthetic values inasmuch the pleasures of the views and panoramas develop and structure the territory, demonstrating a convincing work on atmospherical values
- the idea of creating buildings beyond buildings can be seen as urban operation in itself, challenging the usual syntax of the masterplan
- the future power plant serves as a good example for the potential of the productive landscape – the power plant as an extra-large building creating a specific landscape as its effect could be translated to an urban strategy of large objects (land-marks) with high impact on the performance and appearance of the landscape

*Voting if project G09 should be nominated as winner:
8 votes in favour. The project is the winning project.*

*Voting if project G06 should be nominated as runner-up:
10 votes in favour. The project is the runner-up.*

OPENING OF ENVELOPES

EISENSTADT

Winner

ER008 – HEAL THE VOID

Esther Escribano (ES), born 1978-06-16, Miguel Ángel Rosique (ES), born 1978-04-18, architects

Runner-up

BA238 – PHILEMON & BAUCIS

Adrian Untaru (RO), born 1977-01-07, Andrei Serbescu (RO), born 1977-12-13, Bogdan Bradateanu (RO), born 1980-06-23, Irina Bancescu (RO), born 1978-05-28, Sebastian Serban (RO), born 1982-03-19, architects

GRAZ

Winner

JB007 – EUROPEAN AGRICULTURE & ENERGY PARK GRAZ

Andreas Lechner (AT), born 1974-05-03, Emilio Hauer, born 1971-01-17, (AT), Robert Zawodnik (AT), born 1979-03-27, architects

Contributors : Christoph Simschitz (AT), born 1976-04-28

Runner-up

XT974 – TO BE CONTINUED...

Christian Haid (AT), born 1978-11-08, Lukas Staudinger (AT), born 1982-03-18, architects

Contributor : Doris Schweighofer (AT), born 1976-04-03, economist

WIEN

Winner

PC202 – GARDEN>COURTYARD

Luis Basabe Montalvo (ES), born 1975-05-05, Enrique Arenas Laorga (ES), born 1974-10-11, architects, Luis Palacios Labrador (ES), born 1983-03-08, architect

Contributors : Eva Miguel Gómez (ES), born 1983-06-10, Helena Sebastián Ochotorena (ES), born 1986-01-14, students in architecture

Honorable mention

HW210 – HURBS -HYBRID HUMAN-URBAN RE-ADAPTIVE BIDIRECTIONAL SYSTEM

Eduardo Gonzalez Corrales (ES), born 1978-01-01, Daniel Del Rey Hernandez (ES), born 1979-06-19, Rubén Miguel Águeda (ES), born 1979-09-05, architects;

Sergio Del Castillo Tello (ES), born 1978-01-01, Maria Hernández Enriquez (ES), born 1987-05-15, graphic designers;

Contributors : Alfonso De Sala Ribé (ES), born 1979-05-28, student in architecture, Emilio López Ruiz De Salazar (ES), born 1979-01-09, architect, Eva Teresa Juarranz Serrano (ES), 1983-12-15, Angela Carmen

Juarranz Serrano (ES), born 1987-12-16, Laura Currals Perez (eS), born 1982-03-10, Beatriz Azpilicueta Pérez (ES), born 1987-12-28, students in architecture, Alicia Bautista Martin (ES), born 1976-01-01, architect

Honorable mention

VP030 – VOLKSPARTERRE

Manuel Collado (ES), born 1972-07-01, Ignacio Martìn (ES), born 1973-01-28, Diego García Setién (ES), born 1974-07-08, architects

Contributors : Alfonso Aracil (ES), born 1987-05-12, Efrain Redondo (ES), born 1986-01-02, students in architecture, Gonzalo Used (ES), born 1979-06-23, architect

Honorable mention

LX 004 – VESTA

Sante Simone (IT), born 1980-09-27, Pietro Cagnazzi (IT), born 1981-10-07, Nunziastella Dileo (IT), born 1980-06-27, Alessandro Zappaterreni (IT), born 1977-06-28, architects

Honorable mention

WN 816 – STOP ISOLATION, PLEASE PLUG IN!

Santiago Bouzada Biurrun (ES), born 1975-12-19, Angel David Berruezo Ortuño (ES), born 1975-10-20, Elena Cuerda Barcaiztegui (ES), born 1980-02-27, Antón Maria Puente (ES), born 1978-07-24, Irene

Alvarez De Miranda Silgo (ES), born 1981-02-19, architects

Contributor : Marta Guedàn Vidal (ES), born 1980-12-10, student in architecture

AJKA

Winner

RI749 - DENSE/LITE

Martin Jancok (SK), Irakli Eristavi (GE), Pavol Silla (SK), Silvia Miklusova (SK), Milan Vlcek (SK), architects

Cs. Armady 29

080 01 Presov, Slovak Republika

T +421 517710741

studio@zerozero.sk

Runner-up

AJ111(25) - AJKA TRANSFORUM

Christina Lenart (AT), Ernst Gruber (AT), architects, Michael Klein (AT) architect-urbanist

Dontgasse 11

1130 Wien, Österreich

mec4ajka@googlemail.com

RECOMMENDATIONS

VIENNA GARTEN>HOF

Despite of its innovative approach concerning the creation of development models which foster diversity and new coexistence between different models of housing and urban facilities, the architectural quality of the project has still to be developed in a much more explicit way. This is necessary because of the danger that the project might easily shift to a rather conventional block system if certain modifications are applied to the urban concept whose qualities consist of the combination of infrastructural, structural and organizational ideas. The implementation process has to consider the whole range of these ideas: it is neither possible to take the infrastructural grid, modify it and free it from the inherent organizational concept (management of different development concepts), nor is it possible to introduce the organizational concept without relating it to the structural ideas of diversity being strongly related to a rescaled grid-system, including the insertion of microfacilities as well as the idea of collective left-outs which create specificity and public value within the suggested structures.

Especially three topics should be focussed:

I. development agency

It is absolutely necessary that the concept of the project is developed further on with the support of a special development agency. The agency has to be established as a first step in the implementation and shall be composed out of representatives from developers, BIG, Wohnfonds, city-planning department and the European 10 jury. The mission of this agency is clear, demanding a highest possible commitment when it comes to develop innovative housing models. The agency acts not so much as an instrument for quality control but would have to „invent“ new *possibilities* for qualities inspired by the competition concept of the project. The agency thus creates new conditions for different follow-up-procedures, such as „Baugruppen“, group housing initiatives and, finally – most important – the „Bauträgerwettbewerb“ which should definitely take advantage of a *different* brief beyond the familiar constraints of a plot-by-plot development.

The agency and its right composition are therefore an indispensable condition for a successful continuation of the whole project.

II. scale

The project's scale with its parcels of 21 by 21 meters and its units of 1ha has to be checked closely concerning its capacity to integrate a variety of different scales and types without provoking a high potential of conflict and constraints at the same time. This concerns the potential variation of highly different types (as proposed), concepts of adaptation and step-by-step transformation, as well as contrasting ways of living whose coexistence until now operates on a collage-like model.

Also, concerning the high amount of access space, the scale of the grid is irritating, as the high rate of access space faces a rather small plot size. The existing ratio has to be explored concerning

_the range of use (shared space, space providing light and possibilities for higher buildings)

_the physical condition (quality of surface/street vs. landscape, borders)

_the overall organization of the motorized traffic

_the possible limits of densification

III. intimate/exposed/transitional

The way how the space itself will be working as a continuous passage between accessible and „blocked“ areas has to be especially elaborated. The competition project introduces a highly interesting urban ambience in which private housing and open space coexist in a seductive proximity. Nevertheless the dialogue between retreat and exposure (not to mention public and private space) is still to be shown as a space-time relationship. The competition project has inserted a whole array of buildings, facilities, people, cars, plants and devices onto a white projection board. It will be the task to scrutinize the relationships between these elements in order to find an appropriate syntax for an exciting and „intact“ dialogue between different spatial spheres.

Only by respecting all the mentioned points, the project could reach the unique and innovative potential which it has introduced on the urban level.

Only by being open to a new procedure with new models of development, the danger to fall back to a conventional architecture leading to an even more conventional residential neighbourhood can be avoided.

Only by continuing the commitment and the efforts which are introduced in the concept of the *process*, the site could become a promising test ground for a pilot project whose quality is the output of a synergy between architectural, social, economic and organizational forces.

GRAZ EU-AE-PARK-GRAZ/ TO BE CONTINUED...

The jury recommends to work with both, the winner and the runner-up project. This allows the city to combine the process-orientated approach of G06 with the convincing identification-strategy of G09 providing the attractive horizon for the appearance of a new urban landscape, seen in a mid- to long term planning. It further implies that the Board of Curators has to be implemented as one of the first steps in the ongoing development process. It finally implies that the activation of attention by specific interventions (temporary occupation, facilities, exchange-deals between existing enterprises and new pioneers) becomes an integral part of an extended concept of urban development which operates strongly beyond the confines of masterplanning.

Being part of an evolving procedure the programme and position of the big buildings have to be taken in consideration, being developed according to the respective opportunities which will be at hand as a result of the forthcoming, initiating projects. To a considerable part these opportunities are „situated“ linked to the future initiatives. It follows that the programmes are subject to processual revision, which would not at all limit the quality and substance of the winning project.

In addition to the programmes, the development of the adequate infrastructures has also to be adapted in cooperation with the respective experts. It is clear that the high amount of open spaces and the „point-logics“ of the built development create a sufficiently elastic condition for the layout of the necessary traffic-infrastructures, integrating the idea of the shared space concept of project G09.

The project can only be successful if the ambitious ideas which complement themselves in both projects will be taken serious, and if the necessary structures will be established. It has to be clear that the city will be the main „patron“ of the work, being responsible also for the far-sighted integration of economic and creative actors in order to build a bridge between public and private forces, as well as to link the urban plan to the architectural project.

EISENSTADT HEALING THE VOID/ PHILEMON & BAUCIS

It is important to acknowledge that the choice of the winner and the runner up endows the city with a multitude of tools which are strategic in the sense that they allow the city to develop an attractive framework for action, renewal and new construction. For the first time, the city of Eisenstadt could take advantage of an „urban planning kit“ which is highly contemporary on a European level, introducing new possibilities by starting with a careful analyses and revelation of the local potential. Both teams address these issues on a similar conceptual level but provide different contents for the concrete intervention.

Concerning the larger urban scale both projects could contribute to the future urban development in order to establish a new framework for various kinds of activities and developments, ranging from temporary urban interventions to larger construction projects. The site owners of Oberberg/Unterberg could especially profit from this new framework, so that a productive cooperation between city and private initiatives can be launched.

The jury recommends to install a local „planning-cooperative-group“ consisting of both European-teams (winner and runner-up) representatives from the city (directing), the province, local players (especially Esterházy), and an expert for the supervision of the intended qualities and specific intervention-strategies, such as the thoughtful splitting of programmes. The group would have to set up a development strategy which maps the future process of implementation, including the phases of

work, the plan of involved actors and resources, the structure of clients, the communication with the public.

Concerning the Meierhof-site the result of the European competition provides an excellent material for a project-brief, as the Meierhof-site is seen in the frame of an ambition which operates on a larger scale. Questions like how to integrate the site, how to connect it to its surroundings, how to densify and how to use it (which programmes) can be efficiently developed out of the larger planning- and design-premises of the urban project. Above all, the development of this brief has to be definitely integrated in the task of this group if Esterházy seriously wants to profit from the unique synergy between urban planning, site-evaluation and architectural design. But also for all other sites in the overall area these advantages could be exploited. Therefore the group will also have to face the management of the interface between construction and urban design.

The mission of the group would have to include the commission of the European-teams in order to develop the urban project further, responding to the group's brief which would be actualized according to the process of interaction.

European should stay actively involved at least for the launching phase of the working group. After this phase European could operate as a strategic actor if an „impulse from outside“ is needed in order to find ways out of conflicts or stuck situations.