

EUROPAN 11

Austria, Kosovo, Hungary (*)

Minutes of the second Jury Session
Oslo, 6.11.2011

Austria	Graz
	Linz
	Vienna
Kosovo	Pejë/Peć
Hungary	Szeged

(*) The minutes for Szeged are documented as an extra document.

Europan 11 Austria, Kosovo, Hungary
Sunday, November 6, 2011, AHO, Oslo
9:00 am – 21.00 pm

present in alphabetical order:

Liza Fior (architect, London)
Kaye Geipel (architectural critic, Berlin)
Patrick Gmür (architect, head of the City Planning Department, Zürich)
Lulzim Kabashi (architect, Zagreb)
Klaus Kada (architect, Graz/Aachen)
Tamás Lévai (architect, Budapest)
Mirza Mujezinovic (architect, European 8 winner in Vienna, Oslo)
Sabine Oppolzer (ORF Austria, national broadcast corporation, Wien)
Angelika Schnell (architectural theorist and critic, Wien/Berlin)
Wolfgang Schön (CEO WAG, housing developer, Linz)
Rolf Touzinsky (architect, Linz)

Alfredo Navarro, European Kosovo
Karoline Streeruwitz, European Austria
Arpad Szabo, European Hungary
Bernd Vlay, European Austria

The jury unanimously confirms Klaus Kada to be the chair of the jury.
The jury members have been made familiar with the projects the day before.
Representatives of the different organisations of European (Austria, Hungary, Kosovo), as well as the representatives of cities and clients have explained the development goals, the context of the site and the preselected projects.
Bernd Vlay introduces the procedure of the jury. In general, there is one winning project and one runner-up. There is the possibility to split the first prize in 2 runners-up. In addition, the jury can decide about the amount of awards according to the level of the projects. The winning projects should be chosen not for easy and fast implementation but as contributions to architectural and urbanist discourse which offer new strategies and ways in the implementation process. They should enable the cities and clients to understand the potential of the sites and to imagine new and unconventional ways to deal with them.
The jury decides to first discuss the projects, then to make a preliminary selection for the final decision at the end of the day.

Pejë/Pec, KOSOVO

GU 101 "New urban footprints / Green Campus Peja"

The project proposes a green corridor to connect the site with the city centre. Two different typologies of buildings frame this corridor on the site: in the western part hybrid objects made of horizontal slabs and vertical towers; to the east a linear structure that is cut diagonally.

It is stated as a crucial issue how to deal with the programmatic vagueness of the brief; the flexibility of the proposed structures therefore is an important criteria. The project suggests a vertical organisation of uses through the different forms of slabs and towers; otherwise no differentiation is made between buildings. The jury discusses if this fact is to be interpreted as programmatic openness or lack of specificity. For some members of the jury, it is not clear how students and tourist are housed in buildings of the same shape and size. There seems to be a jump in scale from concept to building. The diagram is judged as very strong, but the translation seems too literal. It is not comprehensible why the footprint of all buildings is exactly the same. The project apparently relies on concepts of modern urbanism that distribute points in empty space. It is discussed whether this is so or whether the space in between is actually a dense forest, with the buildings creating clearings in the forest. The images show a well-manicured park rather than wild nature. The very schematic translation of the concept into architecture does not suggest that the authors of the project will be able to react to the evolving program.

FR 123 "Fratres"

The project proposes megastructures instead of single objects. Two types of megastructures frame the site: to the west, snake-like buildings create a transitional edge and form courtyard situations, to the east an open structure of rectangular buildings with slim towers above marks the limit to the mountain. The most important drawing is the diagram that shows how the building creates an edge towards wild nature. This line also suggests the formation of a retaining wall to the soft and earthy structure of the hills. The space in between buildings seems to offer an idea of open nature instead of a park. The presence of the mountains in the images of the project suggests an interesting atmosphere, bringing together city and landscape. The skyline of the towers corresponds to the line of the mountains; the dispersed character of this new part of the city therefore unfolds a poetic quality. On the other hand, the clear separation from the landscape confers an urban quality to the central area.

It is discussed whether the large scale of the proposal is realistic and if it allows for a successive development. It also has to be taken into account that a certain critical mass is necessary to make the project attractive to the private sector that the city needs for implementation.

MH 124 “walking roofs on the roots”

The project proposes connections on two to three levels, allowing a direct access from the hillside onto the roofs. The approach to topography is different from the first to projects: it does not accentuate the topographic border but positions the linear buildings transversal to the topographic lines. The buildings therefore connect to the next plateau rather than separating from the hillside. It is questioned if the height differences in reality correspond to the ones shown in the project’s section. The disposition of the buildings seems arbitrary. Also, the appearance towards the street is very fragmented and difficult to imagine. The idea of walking on the roofs is weakened by the fact that no programs are placed there that would take people up from street level; the main access to the roofs is from the mountains which does not seem very realistic and reasonable.

WH 015 “teenage wasteland”

The project proposes an L-shaped structure of a large scale that separates the campus of the university from the city. The booklet shows that the project actually consists of three elements: student accommodation, university campus and residential buildings. This is not shown on the panel; the jury therefore discusses whether it has to be taken into account. The strength and clarity of the idea to frame the outdoor space as a university campus is appreciated by parts of the jury. On the other hand the approach reminds the jury of ideas from the 1970s that seek to combine urbanism with large-scale architecture. The question of materiality is raised; the jury is again studies the booklet, where a metal lattice structure is mentioned in the text. It is discussed whether this lack of materiality is a problem or not.

In difference to the other projects this proposal seeks to produce an image for the new university campus with one single gesture. The project does not directly offer a space for the city but creates a separate campus space framed by the building and the mountains. It offers a unique setting for the university which does not respond literally to the necessary connections to the urban fabric. Local benefits are promoted by creating a monastery-like, isolated space. While not taking into account the financial feasibility of such a mono-functional complex, the project is appreciated for asserting the importance of education as a public function.

DM 101 “un cadaver exquis”

The project proposes a megastructure that organizes the different programs on four levels: on ground level open public space, acting as a gateway to wood and mountains, on the first level the university, on the roof a landscape with sports infrastructures, and as a fourth level circular towers that contain housing for students, tourists and social housing. A phasing of construction is proposed. Acting as a threshold between city and nature the building relates to two quite different conditions. The programming of the urban side, the area towards the city, is problematic: instead of evolving a lively public space the only use for this area is car parking. It is not clear how the form develops and there seems to be little correspondence between the university program and the contour of the building. But since the shapes are basically rectangular slabs at an angle to each other, it would probably be possible to fit in the program. The phasing of the project seems arbitrary and the project is presented too much as one building so that the strategy of phasing loses credibility.

DR 138 “Diana’s ring”

The project proposes one large square block and a green central space. The sides of this block are specified with 200 meters length. The building is explained as an abstraction of the territory of Kosovo, with small towers (“minarets”) as representation of the different localities and their ethnic identities.

What is appreciated is the clarity and strength with which the project positions the university at the heart of the site and claims for it to be an independent entity. It also questions the tendency to create a hybrid between nature and architecture, creating a clear sense of inside and outside. It is not clear whether the space inside is meant to be accessible for all citizens or if it is to be understood as a campus or even as a monastery. The central space remains quite bleak and its potential as a public heart is not explicitly explored, its orthogonal form creates a strong contrast to the topography or city contours.

The plan promotes a strict zoning which addresses highly ideological issues such as the separation into female and male areas. This separation provokes a strong rejection in the jury. If it is taken literal it is unacceptable. The jury tries to figure out the intention behind this zoning. It is not clear whether it is an interpretation of

muslim tradition, or if it is a metaphoric way to describe atmosphere. Both explanations are seen as problematic. Applying the most “optimistic” reading, one could say that the provision of a female area suggests that women are an integral part of the educational programme: in order to include them they have to be given a space for themselves.

“Diana’s ring” can be interpreted as a provocative statement, rather than as a proposal for the concrete construction of a new neighbourhood for the city. In this sense the project critically reconfigures the demands given in the brief. Since the shape and configuration of the building is simultaneously form, ideology and symbol the phasing of construction is no issue, Parts of the jury do not appreciate this lack of process in the project’s conceptual consideration.

The project’s simple geometry could be seen as an ordering device which aims at transforming the world into a tidy place. It is mentioned that for the city representatives of Pejë the proposed form brought up the connotation of military barracks and their watchtowers.

Generally, the jury can appreciate that the issue of education is taken very serious. On the other hand the project can be criticized for imagining the space of education as elitist or detached from city life. Parts of the jury see exactly this isolation not as elitist but as a necessary condition to promote education as a main development program of the country of Kosovo.

Concerning the idea of spatializing the primary importance of education the concept is very similar to project WH105. One can ask: what does it mean for Kosovo today if an approach makes reference to 1970s utopian projects from Italy such as “Superstudio”. The jury discusses whether the building typology can be judged as outdated and even conventional, or if it is an interesting contribution to the discourse about the contemporary city.

Nevertheless, one has to appreciate the conceptual approach which opens up the discussion about the role and responsibility of architecture in the ongoing and future development of Kosovo. The project rightfully extends this question to a cultural issue, reminding of the necessity that the building industry has to face and reflect the existing cultural situation in order to provide substantial urban developments.

In this sense the proposal raises a number of important questions that have to be taken seriously:

what is the meaning of education for the city and the country, how can a strong identity of a place be established, what is the relation between the new construction and the city around it?

If the project gets a prize it would be important for Europana to take further this kind of debate and convey the issues raised to the city representatives.

The plea is made to select three projects through single majority and leave the final voting for the end.

Voting:

GU 101 6:5 votes – IN

DR 138 5:6 votes – OUT

WH 115 8:3 votes – IN

MH 124 0:11 votes - OUT

FR 123 10:1 votes - IN

DM 101 0:11 votes – OUT

The jury discusses the outcome of this first voting, The jury decides to eliminate only the projects with 0 votes.

Therefore DR 138 is brought back.

For the final decision remain:

GU101, DR 138, WH115, FR123.

GRAZ, AUSTRIA

The plea is made to look again at two projects for the site in Graz and discuss whether to bring them back, since there are only three preselected projects for Graz. In the first jury there was a discussion about these two projects, as the minutes show, but in the end they were not included in the preselection. European Austria presents the two projects: ZK548 ("Urban Fringe Mechanics") and DG262 ("Missing Link").

Voting for ZK548:

1 vote in favour of bringing the project back, 10 votes against;

Voting for project DG262:

0 votes in favour of bringing the project back, 11 votes against;

Both projects stay eliminated from the second round.

The discussion about the three preselected projects starts:

AF878 – BUILDING WITHOUT BUILDINGS

The inner urban density as a "replica" of the inner city structure is an interesting approach that has to be explored in its "relevance" for this specific location. The proposed density within an up scaled block structure raises two important questions: In what sense can the massive volumes become an appropriate means for intensifying urban programs? The massive volumes seem to be exactly the problem of the project, being unable to generate a "city" in this area.

If the title suggests "building without buildings" one has to ask, 'where are the programs which are suggested by the title?' Contrary to the title one can see a huge amount of buildings as a primary condition for the project's development.

The issue of times and rhythms is another topic to be raised, especially when one looks at the urban structure of the project. The proposal inadequately responds to its role as an "entrance-project" at the stadium. It does not reflect convincingly the hard rhythms of weekdays and weekend, which strongly will inform the ambience and operation of the area.

SG005 – MAGNETIC URBAN FIELD

The projects suggests an interesting field of coexistence between mobility and public spaces, suggesting a folded surface development which tries to merge the different organizational levels. The skyscraper seems to be added as an appendix to the horizontal structure reinforcing a certain disruption in the northern area. The

connecting bridge above the street would cause troubles concerning the flow of people: the heavy visitor streams before and after a match or event would not be able to pass because the bridge is, on the one hand, too narrow and, on the other hand it is blocked by facilities and an array of furniture. Moreover, the dimension of the bridge is already too wide if one considers the space underneath: for the street space the bridge would create a tunnel-effect. This might cause a conflict between functionality of people flow and quality of street space.

Nevertheless, the project demonstrates a strong and unique approach which addresses the intermingling of programs as a scenario of dramatic and attractive coexistence.

CZ136 – Yes We Bridge

The chair explains that, in the course of the discussions and reflections during the first jury round, this project has triggered highly important insights for the future urban development of the whole area. Its radical typological and spatial response can be seen as a response which extends the frame of the European intervention area. Large scale issues such as the lack of continuity of the North-South connection and the lack of integrative East-West links appear all of a sudden before the eyes. In this sense the project brilliantly demonstrates that a comprehensive traffic solution is a primary condition for a far sighted urban strategy.

The jury discusses the ambiguity between representation and operation: the bridge-idea creates a suspended program which is rather detached from the ground floor. Although this program refers to the necessary overbridging of the railway tracks the relation between ground floor programs and suspended programs seems to be out of balance: the suspended monumental bar („bridge“) with its offer of mall-programs reminds of a weekend-destination-structure: being detached from, and floating above the ground the spatial organization might suppress important local demands.

On the one hand the distance from the stadium creates a remarkable gesture and statement on the necessity of marking a connective public field of large dimensions. On the other hand the place where the bridge crosses makes it arrive amidst of allotment gardens on the other side of the railtracks.

Nevertheless, the dimension of the public park is intriguing in its relation to the stadium translating the necessity to respond to the peak-hours of public events in a translocal public square which hosts mostly visitors coming from outside. But at the same time the park's quality very much depends from the relation between traffic and architecture. Whereas the project „Magnetic Field“ takes the power of traffic to be translated directly in urban qualities, „Yes we bridge“ makes the motorized

individual traffic disappear underground. The jury partly questions this total covering and discusses the possibility of driving on zero level. However, this would strongly transform the spatial and organizational quality of the square in a way which is obviously not intended by the project's authors.

„Magnetic Field“ and „Yes We Bridge“ show two quite opposite planning approaches: „Yes We Bridge“ suggests a layout which creates order by disentanglement. „Magnetic Field“ proposes to intensify the spot by intermingling the various flows of movement in a space of critical proximity and exciting compression.

The jury resumes that none of the two projects is able to give a satisfying response, but both take valuable positions for reflecting the potential of the area's future development.

A plea is made to keep both projects and to award them with a runner-up prize: 9:2 votes in favour.

CZ136 and SG005 are selected as runner-up projects for the site of Graz. The selection will have to be confirmed in the final round.

LINZ, AUSTRIA

The jury starts with the discussion of the projects.

XX888 – TABAKFABRIK

The ideal to revitalize the existing building complex by an overall concept of furniture-like mobile devices suggests an interesting approach. The jury discusses the parameters on which these elements are based. Although the authors provide a comprehensive chart, the translation between parameters and objects lacks somehow a convincing link.

For the important development of new buildings the project unfortunately gives no answer, not responding to the issues of noise and traffic accordingly.

AM573 – ASSISTED MONUMENT

A discussion about the structure of the new development starts: why does the project propose cubes, and not triangles or blobs? Parts of jury argue that this question appears because of a lack of reference between the proposed structure to the existing complex: the drawing of the structure does not tell us why it is drawn like this. It follows a discussion about frame and programme: parts of the jury see the grid as too formal, leading to a rather determined narrative of how it could be used. The discrepancy between structure and architectural representation is again discussed. On the other hand parts of the jury think that the grid structure has a certain potential which is partly developed in an interesting way: the project creates a strong connection with the Danube, providing an open and attractive ground level which invites people to enter and visit the site. This openness is supported by the proposed grid structure

XT974 – CO-OP

The jury appreciates the basic idea of the project: a socio-economic concept which refers to the factory's history of being a place of social production. It is exactly because of this very claim that the removal of the non-protected buildings is a mistake. They could have been included in the socio-economic archaeology of the project's development. It follows that the architectural solution itself does not productively support a solution which spatially and programmatically could manage the deal between production and social surplus. The most interesting development can be observed in the ground floor: compared to other projects the authors reprogram the whole ground floor turning it into a promising field full of collective manoeuvres.

HR120 – LINZERTUS

The project takes high risks concerning the issue of building-preservation: the authors open the protected facades in the ground floor in order to create strong connections with the surrounding areas. Moreover, they ignore the fact that the ground floor level of the tobacco factory building is not on zero-level.

On the other hand the projects suggests a convincing strategy of a series of precise interventions in different areas, which could give to the city a valuable catalogue of transformation. The jury discusses the ambiguity between openness and closeness: the project seems to be inclusive and exclusive at the same time, the ground floor transversally cuts through the new urban structure whose development in parallel layers creates an interesting interiority. This huge effort of opening up the ground floor makes the interesting approach a bit normative. At the same time the play with the angles in the ground floor area suggests attractive and surprising links between the site and its surroundings. The proposed housing development is not feasible as it does not respect the building performance of the listed tobacco-building.

AK311- TO WAKE A LANDMARK

Three skyscrapers and a little bit of green are not enough. The strong idea is unfortunately not convincingly developed. The project lacks an overall programmatic vision: if the CO-OP project had dared to create an architecture which seduces an investor, the idea of skyscrapers could have been productive, paying off for another system of investment.

AP421 – URBAN MONOLITH

The project illustrates how to make the site a powerful address. It creates a strong accent at the corner giving a convincing balance between existing and new buildings, opening up to the Danube, providing a good quality of the inner spaces.

The jury discusses intensively the value of the water surface: the drawings are highly seductive, suggesting a “Zen-garden” atmosphere, calm and remote from the noisy urban life. This act of “dimming down” could be criticized as a concept, which ignores the life of the surroundings. On the other hand it creates a strong and convincing statement by “calming down the site” in a fruitful and productive way, making it resistant to forced communication. The project brings up an internationally important discussion about “elephants in the city”. Like “Berlin Tempelhof” the site is an elephant, it is too big to be filled at once with uses. How do planners and architects address this exaggerated size? The authors of “Urban Monolith” are very good designers. They respond to this question with a seductive dream. The dream needs a rich protagonist, such as an American art collector who wants to implement his own dream-project. Parts of the jury exactly see the motif of the dream as a

pragmatic response to deal with the myth of Behrens: the project provides an attractive distance between city and factory, representing strongly the tension between historical time and contemporary demands. The response to the monument is just to elevate it even more in order to enter a state of intense dialogue. Still, the idyllic aspect of the project does not convince fully all jury members – references to the depicted animals are made, saying that the representation of the project is a quite illusionary and artificial composition.

PB143 – EIN ENSEMBLE IM PORTAIT

The project cleverly propagates the potential of the whole area by introducing a narrative of its single buildings making them a “group” that reflects on their overall becoming. The project carefully looks at different scales of context, combining existing potentials with prospective scenarios. To give ‘names’ to every building reinforces the importance of an interactive process, which has to be directed by the city, not only carefully but also creatively. Parts of the jury criticize that the “plan” makes completely disappear the space. On the other hand the project reintroduces the space in the form of the diagram, which underlines the necessity of extending the discussion about the future spatial development, relating it to political, programmatic and socio-economic issues. Although the “thinking” is not elaborated enough in the diagrams the project offers to the city a manual for the elaboration of a strategy: the necessity of defining where they want to be in 20 years.

The jury suggests voting to eliminate the projects AK311, AM573, XX888, XT974:

AK311- TO WAKE A LANDMARK

Yes: 11. No: 1

The project is eliminated.

AM573 – ASSISTED MONUMENT

Yes: 8. No: 3

The project is eliminated.

XX888 – TABAKFABRIK

Yes: 10. No: 1

The project is eliminated.

XT974 – CO-OP

Yes: 9. No: 2

The project is eliminated.

The projects PB143, AP 421 and HR120 stay in for the final discussion.

VIENNA, AUSTRIA

FIRST TOUR VIENNA

The projects are introduced, followed by questions and a short discussion.

HT 175 “Idensity”

A central square connects all surrounding levels, passing through under the barrier of the rail tracks. Three parallel bars of housing and two objects contain social and cultural facilities within artificial landscapes. They form an active open frame around the central square.

The huge underpass is judged as unrealistic due to the high cost of the bridge construction for the train. If such a strong crossing is suggested, it would have to result in a highly attractive setting. Yet, the underpass leads to a rather modest urban facility and continues along a narrow pathway between closed walls, without any uses. The jury strongly doubts this dead zone. Therefore, the costs of the intervention do not seem justifiable for this kind of space. The housing program is elaborated very well; unfortunately the plans are too conventional and predictable. On the whole, the proposal lacks innovation and a strong idea, which is indispensable for a European contribution.

DP 306 “Dreiecksplatz”

The project proposes an impressively simple but highly convincing solution: a triangular square smoothes all the topographic differences and connects the street with the upper level of the rail tracks. The form of the square is dedicated to the concept of an easy connectivity, as well as suggesting three different project areas around it. On the square itself small boxes (kiosks) are distributed in a loose and open structure. The square is seen as a platform where the rural and urban system interacts. Relocating the site in the centre between inner town and countryside. The noise problem is explicitly resolved but the project’s structure has the potential to adapt to the noise conditions: the multi-oriented housing units enable an intelligent activation of the openings. The level crossing of the rail-tracks is a convincing and easy-to-do-solution, avoiding the high financial investments of an underpass without direct economic benefit. The exact way to cross would have to be negotiated with the public railway company, respecting especially issues of safety.

The three sub-areas promote a close interaction between buildings and landscape. The quality and process of interaction is quite different in each of the 3 areas, which

the jury appreciates as an important way for evaluating the different housing programs.

Although certain adaptations will be necessary the project to offers an intelligent conceptual toolbox with which to work productively during a possible implementation process.

XY 123 "Ungravity Circle"

The project proposes an urban landscape, which develops in floating stripes along the railway tracks - the concept introduces an organic flexible structure as an alternative to rigid urban patterns. A mosaic of landscape, uses and spaces provides "urban gravity" for the site. A unifying circular surface marks a new centrality, containing the "Pavilion of Generations".

The superimposition of the housing structure with the urban field does not lead to convincing qualities for the housing programme. The jury misses an alternative to the absolute separation of Speisinger Strasse and Lainzer Strasse: the proposed stripe-structure does not convincingly integrate the area in its surroundings.

MD 415 "heart of matter"

A central square frames a public living room with the clear geometry of a rectangle of buildings that are interrupted in order to provide multiple accesses to the square. A colonnade with roof underlines the importance of this interior "hall" which is complemented with three "annexes to the west, east and south. The height differences on the site are neglected.

DB 196 "Viennese curls"

One snake-like building contains a variety of spaces and programs. The meandering structure creates different relationships with its surroundings, resulting in a specific programming of the outdoor spaces.

Parts of the jury say that the building seems to be too small and too low to develop a convincing spatiality.

CX 393 "Varieties"

A dense structure of patio housing offers a variety of labyrinthine spaces. Towards the train tracks the terrain is dug out, creating a green strip as linear playground. The proposal is seen as an interesting contribution in so far as it covers the whole site with one continuous texture of patio type houses, but on an architectural level

the housing types do not reach the quality of existing patio type projects. Nevertheless parts of the jury appreciate to the “charm” of the spatial labyrinth.

MW 954 “Space-ing Platz”

The square is a sunken public area connecting across the railway tracks, framed by public and commercial facilities. The facilities mediate between the level of the sunken square and the level of the city. Nine buildings on top of this urban topography contain housing program.

SF 237 “Street in the Forest”

The combination of the 2 city models results in a vertically layered configuration: on the ground level the idea of the urban street is implemented, creating a deviated connection between Lainzer and Speisinger Street, framed by urban programs. On top a green carpet with point-cluster of housing shall reflect the “garden city”.

SECOND TOUR VIENNA

Following the introduction, the chair of the jury suggests that the members of the jury vote for those projects that should be discussed further on. In order to stay in, the project needs at least a single majority.

HT 175:

No further discussion.

The jury votes unanimously against the project (0 votes) – OUT.

DP 306:

The jury again underlines the quality of the simple resolution of the traffic problem. The proposal seems both obvious and convincing, creating through the simple gesture of the triangular central square different sub-areas. It then develops these sub-areas with very different housing qualities, which are more convincing in the northern part than in the southern. The proposal of the continuous open square would also lend itself as a test case for resolving the problems of shared space. The solution seems easy and effortless. The size and shape of the volumes seems adequate to the site. Although the pictures are perhaps too optimistic they are promising for the realization.

The project is voted for unanimously (11 votes) – IN.

XY 123:

At a closer look the superimposition of two structures (linear strips and meandering building above) is not convincing. The circle is questioned as too much of a gesture. The jury votes unanimously against the project (0 votes) – OUT.

MD 415:

The project offers an unexpected solution for the site. The “surreal” of the space seems attractive, but it is not clear whether this is the intention of the proposal. Furthermore, the project seems to turn its back on the rest of the city. The jury votes against the project (2:9) – OUT.

DB 196:

The project is interesting as it proposes a structure that is completely different to its surrounding urban fabric. The superstructure therefore seems to be out of place if one looks at the urban structure from above. The project has the capacity to create one single image to sell itself as a new place, but this image can only be perceived from a bird’s eye perspective. At the same time, as parts of the jury see it, the structure should be bigger to be convincing. The continuous line is taken too literal on the architectural level. Parts of the jury criticize that the line cannot be experienced as such on eye level because of its little height. Other jury members argue that it is exactly the project’s conceptual quality: at eye level the megastructure disappears, and its spaces become surprisingly interesting. Low height and little depth refer to the local scale, but the implied richness and variety of the housing scheme are missing. The lack of architectural quality becomes evident when one looks at the way the building is cut on both: the cut reflects an enforced end suggesting that a head and a tail, which are missing. The jury votes in favour of keeping the project for further discussion with a single majority (6:5) – IN.

CX 393:

The jury appreciates a certain elegance of the plans and images. It seems relatively nuanced how the field of housing responds to the surroundings. The creation of courtyards addresses the noise problem effectively. Small places of respite are offered within a loose structure. The discrepancy between the drawings and images suggests different densities: however, it is not clear how the spatial syntax can accommodate a variety of programs beyond the scale of housing. Although the project offers an interesting answer to the issue of housing, the other needs on the site are not convincingly addressed.

The jury votes in favour of keeping the project for further discussion with a single majority (8:3) – IN.

MW 954:

The housing typology with a double shell as free space and meeting place is interesting. The project's images raise the issue of scale, concerning both, size and activity: the vertical layering disconnects the public levels, suggesting an urban core (sunken plaza) which is much stronger linked to the translocal mobility (train) than to the flows of the locals.

The jury votes against the project (2:9) – OUT.

SF 237:

The project proposes an interesting interpretation of the type of single family housing, characteristic for the area: small towers with one flat per floor and a shared staircase offer qualities of single family living in a different configuration. Yet it seems difficult to imagine how the small-scaled circular plan enables attractive plans for the living units, especially when it comes to the integration of private gardens or generous terraces. The concept of creating a forest suggests a new quality for the suburban landscape. Nevertheless, this quality is not clearly visible: in the images the green space on top of the urban base does not look like a forest but just like a green roof. The basic idea of combining suburban and urban space is interesting but not sufficiently developed. In the end, the way in which the project proposes the urban detour rather causes more problems than offers solutions.

The jury votes against the project (1:10) – OUT.

**For the final decision remain:
DP306, DB196, CX393.**

FINAL DISCUSSION

Pejë/Peć, KOSOVO

The jury discusses whether to identify one winning project or two or more runners-up. It is stated that, on the one hand, the jury decision needs not fulfil the expectation of the city. Instead, the jury has the obligation to decide for the most productive contribution, be it in terms of possible implementation or of contributing to the discussion about the meaning of this new part of the city. On the other hand the jury decision is of high significance because Europana 11 is the first international architecture competition to be ever held in Pejë/Peć, and the first European competition in Kosovo. It therefore is extremely important to convey the competition result as a productive contribution to the local discussions.

DR 138: further discussion

Again the separation of male and female areas is discussed. Some members strongly question this separation as discriminatory. Is it legitimate to contextualize this separation, speculating about it as a metaphoric separation that designates different atmospheres? One could also speculate that the proposal is a provocative way to see women as an integral part of the educational system: designating a space for women within the university campus might also be understood as a demand to balance the rate between male and female students offering half of the campus space to women. This then might be understood as an anti-discriminatory measure. But none of these speculations is supported by the author's text. It therefore has to be kept in mind that these assumptions have only a speculative base. This uncomfortable ambiguity makes it difficult to rely on the project's strategical strength, especially when it comes to establish a productive dialogue with the city.

The jury raises the question in what way the idea of social life in an enclosed sphere, as suggested by the project, might respond to the realities of contemporary society. Parts of the jury observe that the notion of an open grid seems contradictory to the kind of separation from the outside and the determination of the inside. The dimensions of the project introduce another interesting ambiguity: on the one hand being too huge for one single building, on the other not even filling up the project site. Development in steps does not seem realistic or even intended. Against these doubts the point is made that scale and time are less relevant than the concept itself: a strong architecture based on a paradigmatic typology might be able to create a new identity for the region, the city and the site.

WH 015: voting for discussion – 6 votes for discussion

This project proposes a similar atmosphere to DR 138: an enclosed campus as a separated from city life. The suggestion of the social life within the enclave is not elaborated. The drawings show a very simple idea that has not been developed, although the jury appreciates the potential.

The plea is made to vote between GU 101 and FR 123. The jury decides against this plea.

The plea is made to vote for each project once more. The voting takes place.

GU101: 3:8 – OUT

FR123: 9:2 – IN

DR138: 7:4 – IN

WH015: 5:6 – OUT

Two projects remain in the competition for further voting. In the next voting each jury member has only one vote to give for a winning project.

DR138 for winner: 5 votes

FR123 for winner: 4 votes

Vote abstention: 2 votes

The jury members who abstained from voting explain why they did so: they are against giving a first prize. Nevertheless they are clearly in favour of one of the two projects.

A discussion about the prizes starts. Kosovo takes part for the first time. Europana is an important sign for internationally opening up the country. Seen in this light the task of Europana must be to give a clear result to the country and the city of Pejë. Not to give a first prize would be the wrong signal.

The plea is made to decide for one winner and one runner-up. The plea is accepted unanimously.

Final voting takes place.

DR138: 5 votes in favour for first prize

FR123: 6 votes in favour for first prize

FR123 is the winning project (first prize), DR138 the runner-up.

GRAZ, Austria

The jury has done already a preliminary voting suggesting two projects for the runner-up award: SG005 and CZ136.

The jury confirms this voting unanimously.

SG005: runner-up

CZ136: runner-up

LINZ, Austria

Further discussion:

HR120:

The project shows convincing urbanistic qualities. The interventions are strongly structural and programmatic. The jury discusses if the treatment of the existing buildings is a relevant criteria, since the city does not know what kind of uses will be assigned to the buildings.

PB143:

The project does not propose any concrete architectural intervention, but rather diagrams and narratives for the shaping of a process. The question is raised if the city is in need of such a project. In this context the project can be seen as a valuable extension of the already existing debates, creating a link between “spatialization” and conceptualization of possible scenarios.

AP421:

The jury again discusses the issue of the “elephant in the city” and the rather fixed intervention. The setting is highly seductive, nevertheless, if one compares it to project HR120, that one is much more flexible in its “developability”. AP421 cannot be realized without the functionally pretty determined western gallery building.

The jury discusses if there should be one first prize: parts of the jury say that Linz should be given a strong and convincing project which pushes the local forces to go ahead. On the other hand the jury cannot see one single project that unifies architectural, strategic and programmatic qualities in a way that would justify to give it to the city as the one winning project.

Awarding more than one project would give a strong signal to the city, reflecting the broad bandwidth of questions that have to be managed. The selection would express to the city that there are in fact different issues that have to be addressed, and that

there are different ways that have to be followed at the same time in order to detect the promising future of the factory.

The jury discusses whether to give two or three runner up awards.

With the final three projects the city could get a strong input addressing three essential topics: process, architecture and programme.

The jury makes the plea to give all three remaining projects a runner-up prize:
Yes: 10 votes. No: 1 vote (in favour of 2 runners-up)

The jury awards the projects AP421, PB143, and HR120 with a runner-up prize.

WIEN, Austria

The jury agrees that the project DP306 is the only project, which addresses the potentials of the site in a promising way, integrating strategy, quality and malleability as main components for the future implementation process.

The chair therefore makes the plea to award only one first prize and no runner-up.
The jury unanimously agrees and votes in favour of project DP 306 (11 votes).

DP 306 “Dreiecksplatz” is the winning project (first prize).

The jury decides that the members will elaborate the recommendations carefully and approve them by Email communication (see following pages).

The jury session closes at 10.00 pm, after having opened the envelopes (preselected teams, winners, and runners up see final pages).

EUROPAN A

www.europan.at office@europan.at ZVR690746338

RECOMMENDATIONS EUROPAN 11
Vienna, Graz, Linz, Peje

RECOMMENDATIONS

VIENNA

DP 306 – “DREIECKSPLATZ”

The project gives to the city and the site owner a promising spatial concept which is “robust” enough to be adapted in phases and its respective parts by multiple authors.

The quality of the project is the striking simplicity of the idea of the triangular space which is both public space and organizing principle ; it succeeds in linking both sides of the railway without elaborate engineering.

The idea to group three different “landscapes” of housing around this square must be followed because it is their very differences, that ensures a “malleable richness” for the future development.

The borders between square and built development are not yet clearly developed, but drawn rather graphically. Therefore, the jury recommends the winning team should be given the opportunity to study the quality and potential of the three borders of the square in order to enhance the quality of the “frame”.

The jury recommends the winning team should be invited immediately to a workshop in order to “fix the idea” and refine it.. This is best done by testing the ideas with those from the city who understand the constraints and opportunities of the site , both physical and political without attempting to erase the potential of the juxtapositions.

Examples of constraints and opportunities

It is important to keep the idea of the level crossing as an essential element of the urban design. Above all, the proposed level crossing shall trigger new ways of integrating infrastructure in the local tissue. Conflict points between different mobility systems are crucial nowadays. The quality of the winning project is exactly to make a proposition of how to „de-instrumentalize“ the usual spatial regulations. Regarding the benefits of a successful integration the city planning department should explore this innovative concept, finding ways to negotiate its implementation, especially with the federal railway company (ÖBB). In this way the project would become a pilot, contributing to necessary transformations of existing planning regulations,.

Concerning the proposed types of housing the jury appreciates their variety, but at the same time recommends to look for a more balanced relationship between

density and open space. The architects should test the critical point of densification without losing the textual and atmospheric quality of the proposal.

The apartment types can be developed further, the issue of noise protection has to be studied more closely.

The concept of the botanical boxes makes one curious about their potential, nevertheless it has to be tested in what way these boxes can be useful as a substantial urban equipment for the public space of the district. In general, the idea of intertwining landscape and built development in a productive and innovative way has to be explored in the further development.

Conclusion

The fact that the architectural development is open to adaptation when it comes to density, the question of limits, and typological elaboration demonstrates its quality. Therefore the team should be responsible for the urban plan and the design of the public space and also directly be involved in the architectural implementation.

GRAZ

SG005 – MAGNETIC URBAN FIELD

CZ136 – YES WE BRIDGE

The two projects bring up important questions for the future development of the site, addressing the relation between infrastructure and city.

Although one can observe a general weakness in terms of program in both projects, they give a valuable complementary response to a city-area which has to be seen as a neuralgic point for the future growth of Graz.

The value of the 2 contributions therefore has to be seen in its “combinatory reading”, allowing the city to recognize the site’s comprehensive potential. Such a combinatory reading provides a promising frame with which the city finally will be capable to start a strategic urban plan for the whole area.

“YES WE BRIDGE” makes visible the lack of an overall spatial concept which has to solve the local situation by introducing a much more comprehensive view on the necessary urbanistic agenda:

How should we link which things? How can one spatially solve the local knot in order to provide a framing condition for a sustainable, mid- and long-term development of the whole area, addressing as well north south and east west connections? The project’s large scale clearly reflects the conflict between big events and urban everyday, both in a spatial and programmatic sense. At the same time this carpet-like transformation of the linear public space can be seen as a centre of a development whose potential existence can be introduced through the very fact of its large scale.

The concept of a transversal figure which stretches across the railtracks provides an open threshold between the new public space and its surroundings if one follows the movement from north to south and vice versa. Although one can appreciate the strategic effects of the urban operation on the larger scale, one has to look nevertheless at the local implications: the placement of the east-west-link should be reconsidered, it now would land in midst of allotment gardens. The detached position of the building creates a certain threshold suggesting an interior world for a weekend destination. The future development on this side should not only support such “weekend city life”. Therefore, the architectural and organizational quality of the building would have to be improved concerning the distribution of programs, the dialogue between the levels, and the quality of its “ends” which seem to be cut-offs without concept.

The complete disappearance of the individual drive-through traffic hints to another “difficulty” – the whole strategy is based on a very “heavy” intervention which cannot

be started “lightly”, nor changed easily, especially if one looks at the reorganization of the ground-level: the disappearance of the cars seems to be an absolute condition for the spatial concept.

MAGNETIC URBAN FIELD picks up the topic of traffic flow quite differently, suggesting an amalgam of movements with a maximum of compression and proximity. It addresses the “dilemma” of ordering and intensifying in an intriguing way: a clockwise spiral move counteracts the familiar solution of a separation of levels, creating a unifying field for cars, public transport, bicycles and pedestrians. A variety of inclinations and the “sprawl” of furniture specify the qualities of the surface and organize the flow of the different actors. Holes provide shortcuts and oblique perspectives. The clear idea to create a “theatre” of traffic can be seen as the primary condition for an attractive urbanity. This is a most valuable “message” for the urban planning strategy, offering an alternative response which includes the potential of the existing and extrapolates its qualities in a poetic way. If “Yes we bridge” works with the idea of absence, “Magnetic Field” addresses the surplus of presence.

The urban surface has the power to connect the nearby neighborhood in different interesting ways. Nevertheless, the project would have to address the question of people flow in times of events in a more convincing way without losing the idea of compression which somehow contradicts the possibility of a smooth flow. Also, the design of the competition clearly privileges the space between stadium and project site, neglecting a convincing solution to the study area north of it. It follows that the skyscraper at its northern fringe does not act as an integral part of the urban development but seems to be an add-on of the project: the development towards north would have to be improved, as well as attention would have to be given to the integration of the skyscraper.

The jury recommends to invite the two teams to a workshop on the above mentioned issues in order to render more precisely the starting point for a future transformation of the area. The workshop should provide the basis for an urban development concept involving the teams as partners in the respective steps of the process, ranging from urban study to architectural project.

LINZ

PB143 – EIN ENSEMBLE IM PORTAIT

AP421 – URBAN MONOLITH

HR120 – LINZERTUS

The decision of the jury to select three projects has to be seen as a deliberate response when it comes to the task of the competition: the city shall take the results of European as a fundamental resource for the future process. The city shall use the capacity of all three winning teams and invite them for a cooperation. In the course of this cooperation each of the teams can contribute very specifically to the three most important challenges of the future development:

Significance (Urban Monolith)

Urban and architectural structure (Linzertus)

Process (Ein Ensemble im Portrait)

The result of the European competition clearly demonstrates that the question of uses cannot be answered directly. Instead, European reminds the city of the extraordinary requirements which one has to face in order to develop this area honestly.

The European projects make clear that routinist masterplanning and professional process-management are in themselves useless if one takes them as discrete disciplines. Instead, the city has to find a way to establish an „infrastructure“ which intertwines space and process in a new way, leaving outdated polarizations between formal and informal attitudes, between object and process behind.

Different potentialities have to be addressed:

-> the potential of the site as an urban area

-> the potential of the architecture as a somehow paradoxical ‚cultural structure‘,

-> the potential of local and translocal agencies (public and private sectors).

All these potentialities have to be orchestrated in order to exploit the potential of the factory in its full extent, demanding from the city an extra-high commitment for making outstanding quality „real“ (different from other projects)..

Seen in this light, the European projects can be elaborated as tools for assigning the right tasks when it comes to the different scales and levels of the follow up processes. Issues such as preservation, spatial programming and progressive transformation can be explored in a fruitful and surprising way.

The jury therefore recommends to involve all the three teams in the future steps of the process.

An initiating workshop should elaborate the topics of the competition, engaging in a quite offensive way the international background of European and discuss exactly the multilevel attitude of the three winning projects in their combination with the help of people engaged in similar projects. European should directly discuss, support and observe these fundamental resources for the future process.

The city of Linz itself has to take this chance of activating urban planning/management in a different manner, demonstrating its commitment for a new planning agency that aims at an extraordinary result.

The initiating workshop also should define the involvement of the teams and the various steps that would lead finally to architectural implementation.

Pejë-Pec

FR 123 – FRATRES

DR 138 – DIANA'S RING

The detailed discussion about the content of the winning- and the runner up-project has already been recorded in the minutes.

The jury had a lot of controversial discussions, in particular about the runner up project which parts of the jury consider to be a highly problematic project, whereas other jury members appreciated its conceptual sharpness.

One also has to consider the enormous size of the site which asks for a rather urbanistic solution which still has to be developed further to a socially, politically, economically *and* architecturally plausible plan.

The further development should be conditioned by mutable web of relations that constitute the global/local, cultural/ technological etc. The process shall include, as the selected projects imply, the physical and especially the cultural reality.

The jury recommends to invite both teams for the further implementation procedure in order to address a broader field of development which explicitly involves cultural issues.

The winning project, 'Fratres', is a reasonable blueprint for the future urban project. Taking into consideration the aforementioned relations and realities during the design process, it is a great option to create a contemporary landscape in the city of Peja. Emphasis should be on the cultural realities / education, without neglecting the fact that the project must be attractive to the private sector in order to make implementation possible.

The jury appreciates the clear concept of the proposed structures that frame the site, to the west and to the east. The buildings in the west intelligently integrate nature on every level - on the ground level as well as on the higher levels. Their proportions make the buildings appear as actors in front of a nature, "stage setting" the quality of the landscape.

The space in between seems to offer an idea of open nature, a huge area linked to the huge existing park. The architects should precisely define the content of this huge area.

The strength of 'Fratres' is especially to provide an open frame, nevertheless with clear premises: the relation to the landscape on a larger scale, the formation of

borders as limits and inhabitable spaces, the accessibility of common spaces, the possibility of flexible programming and adaptable volumes.

All these qualities not only have to be respected and carefully explored in order to become usable assets for the urban development. Above all they would need an monitoring commission who makes their values manifest introducing them to different institutions, groups and people of Kosovo.

Diana's Ring, the runner up project, in this sense, can be seen as a programmatic statement „ideologizing“ the future of Peje. It is clear that the drawings and the text have to be critically discussed. By using theory as a design-method it addresses the context between geography (political site), landscape (cultural / wild nature), and history (past / future).

Decisive issues are put on the table of the discussion:

- > education as a main programme for the development of the city and the country
- > cultural identity as a parameter which one must not exclude in the concept of future urban developments
- > typological performance as a disciplinary tool which has to „decipher“ the codes of architectural language in the specific context of Kosovo: by means of which gesture do we, in fact, achieve open space?

The implementation process has to be seen as an insistent series of carefully taken steps. These steps establish preparatory measurements creating an agenda for the future implementation. Essential parts of this agenda are:

Exhibition of all projects as a medium for launching a public discussion, organized by European Kosovo with involvement of the city of Peje. The exhibition should also launch the topics of European Europe on urban development in order to initiate a sensitivity for these issues.

Presentation of the winning projects to the city officials and local representatives, The winning teams, European, and at least one jury member introduce the concepts of the winning projects.

A workshop should follow this presentation with the participation of the winning teams, one jury member, European Kosovo, European Austria (optional), city representatives and locally involved actors. The goal of the workshop should be to clarify the potential of the selected projects concerning the future development process. As well the workshop should outline the way how to involve the teams in the future process.

A local task force shall accompany and monitor the process providing continuous „maintenance“ for the gradual evolution of the project. Part of this group should be the town of Peje, European, and further actors with contact to government or development organizations.

Finally, the jury would like to remind all involved actors that it is absolutely important to be aware that we face an implementation process which is radically new. Therefore the urban and architectural project need a strong support on the political, administrative, and cultural levels. The process will be exciting if its „durability“ is acknowledged. Its success absolutely relies on the commitment of all parties and people involved: that they provide and create the necessary framing conditions with all available means.

EUROPAN A

WIEN

Project Nr. Title	Team Leader	Associates	Collaborators
DP306 Dreiecksplatz WINNER	BOREJSZO Artur (POL) _ architect Rotterdam		1. CHO Leena (US) landscape architect 2. HILGEFORT Jason (US) architect urbanist 3. KARAVANAS Andreas (GR) architect urbanist
XY123 The Un-Gravity Circle	BELLINI Cristina (I) _ architect Alfonsine	1. MICUCCI Valentina (I)_architect 2. PATRIZI Laura (I)_architect 3. CONTATI Anna (I)_architect 4. MICUCCI Caterina (I)_architect	
DB196 Viennese Curls	BORG Delphine (F) _ architect Marseille	GUIDONI Billy (F) _ architect	
CX393 Varieties	WOLF Anna Maria (A) _ architect Wien	MURAUER Michael (A) _ architect	BÜCHEL Heinrich (A) student in architecture
HT175 I Density	HORVATH Tamas (H) _ architect Wien		AICHINGER Matthias (A) computer expert
MD415 Heart of the Matter	FLORIS Job (NL)_architect Rotterdam	1. NAUS Sandor (NL)_architect 2. MATERIA Barbara (I)_architect	MURPHY Matthew (IRL) student in architecture
SF237 The Street in the Forest	NUNEZ Carrasco Rodrigo (E) _architect Madrid	JIMENEZ Garcia Alberto (E)_architect	
MW954 Space-ing Platz	BOLANOS Oncino Jordi (E)_architect Sevilla	1. BARRENO Gutierrez Angel (E)_architect 2. BANOS Ramos Borja (E)_architect 3. RUFFATO Serena (I)_architect	BAUZA Cortes Carlos (E)_artist

EUROPAN A

GRAZ

Project Nr. Title	Team Leader	Associates	Collaborators
SG005 Magnetic Urban Field RUNNER-UP	GRUBER Stefan (D)_architect Wien		1. SOEPARNO Philipp (A) _student in architecture 2. BERTHOLD Gilbert (A) _architect
CZ136 Yes We Bridge RUNNER-UP	DONAIRE Barbero Juan Pedro (E)_architect Sevilla		1. NUNEZ Bootello Ignacio (E) _architect 2. GARCIA Gomez Pablo Baruc (E) _architect 3. NUNEZ Bootello Jesus Maria (E) _architect 4. PACHECO Donaire Delia Isabel (E) _architect
AF878 Building without Building	FRADEGRADA Andrea (I)_architect Sesto san Giovanni	1. NATOLI Simone (I)_architect 2. MUNAFO Giovanni (I)_architect	1. RIVA Riccardo (I) computer graphic designer 2. ROSSI Marianna Francesca (I) student in architecture 3. LAMORTE Stefano (I) student in architecture

EUROPAN A

LINZ

Project Nr. Title	Team Leader	Associates	Collaborators
AP421 Urban Monolith RUNNER-UP	ZOLI Gian Luca (I)_architect Faenza	1. RAMPAZZO Alessandro (I)_architect 2. GALIOTTO Marcello (I)_architect 3. MONTINI Nicola (I)_architect 4. MONTAGNINI Marco (I)_architect 5. FUSARO Francesco (I)_architect	1. SCALVINI Paolo (I)_student in architecture 2. BARBIERO Alessia (I)_ student in architecture 3. NASCIMBEN Enrico (I)_student in architecture 4. PEVERE Ludovico (I)_student in architecture 5. DELLAMOTTA Francesco (I)_ student in architecture
HR120 Linzertus RUNNER-UP	DE LA FUENTE Julio (E)_architect Madrid	GUTIERREZ Natalia (E)_architect	DENZ Paul-Rouven (D) _ student in architecture
PB143 Ein Ensemble im Porträt RUNNER-UP	POTOCNIK Lorenz (A)_architect Linz	1. GNIGLER Sandra (A)_architect 2. GUNAR Wilhelm (A)_architect	
XX888 - Tabakfabrik	ACEDO Andres Javier (E)_architect Madrid	ANASAGASTI Gutierrez Paula (E)_ architect Martin Lopez Lucia (E)_architect	
XT974 - CO-OP	STAUDINGER Lukas (A)_ urban planner Wien	HAID Christian (A)_architect urbanist	SCHWEIGHOFER Doris (A)_ economist
AM573 - Assisted Monument	LEB-IDRIS Jasmin (A)_architect Graz	WALLENBÖCK Gudrun (A)_architect	RAMSCHAK Martina (A)_ architect
AK311 To Wake A Landmark	BLAZEK Thomas (A) _ architect Linz	WAKOLBINGER Simon (A)_architect	

EUROPAN A

PEJA

Project Nr. Title	Team Leader	Associates	Collaborators
FR 123 Fratres WINNER	Roberto GARCIA (E) Mataelpino	Hector ARDERIUS	
DR138 Diana's Ring RUNNER-UP	Sante SIMONE (I) Rome	Alessandro ZAPATERRENI (I)_architect Giovanni ROMAGNOLI (I)_architect Laura FABRIANI (I)_architect	
DM101 Un Cadavre Exquis	Luis BASABE MONTALVO (E) Madrid	Enrique ARENAS (E)_architect Luis PALACIOS (E)_architect	Almudena CANO (E) Helena DE SEBATSÍAN (E) students in architecture
GU101 New urban footprints - green campus peja	Fatum RADONIQUI Graz	Georg AUINGER (A) architect	Arben Verzivolli (Macedonia) Ganbat Choidogjamts (Mongolia) students in architecture
MH124 Walking on the roofs/roots	Stefano FOSCARIN (I) Torino	Francesco DE GIORGIO (I)_architect Luciano LAFFRANCHINI (I)_architect Diego DECORTES (I)_architect Paolo PORPORATO (I)_building engineer	
WH015 Teenage Wasteland	Filippo DE DOMINICIS (I) Rome	Lini MARIA CARLA (I)_architect Luca PORQUEDDU (I)_architect	