



# EUROPAN 13

## JURY REPORT: SECOND JURY SESSION

### Österreich / Kosovo

Minutes of the second jury session: Austrian Sites  
Wien, 08./09.11.2015

Bruck/Mur, Graz, Linz, St Pölten, Wien

Sunday & Monday, November 8<sup>th</sup> / 9<sup>th</sup> 2015, Depot, Wien  
2:00pm – 9:00pm and 09:00am – 13:00pm  
Present: Voting members of the jury

## **JURY EUROPAN 13 ÖSTERREICH/KOSOVO**

### **URBAN/ARCHITECTURAL ORDER**

**Tina Saaby** (DK), City Architect at Municipality, Copenhagen  
(Present for Sites : Bruck/Mur, Graz, Wien, Gjakova)

**Peter Ulm** (AT), Chief Executive Officer of 6B47 Real Estate Investors AG, Vienna

### **URBAN/ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN**

**Irène Djao-Rakitine** (FR), Landscape Architect and Director at DJAO-RAKITINE, London,  
Research Assistant at the ETH Zürich, Visiting Critic to the London Mayor's Project Review  
Panel

**Tina Gregoric** (SI), Architect and Partner at dekleva gregorič arhitekti, Ljubljana  
Professor and Head of the Department for Building Theory by Design, Institute of  
Architecture and Design TU Vienna

**Saskia Hebert** (DE), Architect and Partner at subsolar\* architektur und stadtforschung,  
Berlin Winner E9 Spremberg, University of the Arts, Berlin

**Max Rieder** (AT), Architect, Urbanist and Lecturer, Director at maxRIEDER, Vienna

### **PERSONALITY**

**Christian Kühn** (AT), Architect and Critic, Vienna, Dean of Studies of Architecture and  
Professor at the Institute of Architecture and Design TU Vienna, Board of the Austrian  
Architectural Foundation, Member of OECD-Working Group Evaluating Quality in  
Educational Facilities

### **SUBSTITUTE**

**Thomas Proksch** (AT), Landscape Architect and Lecturer, Partner at LAND IN SICHT -  
Büro für Landschaftsplanung, Vienna

(Present for sites : Linz, St Pölten / replacing Tina Saaby)

### **REPRESENTATIVE EUROPAN KOSOVO**

**Lulzim Kabashi** (HR), Architect and Partner at IVANIŠIN. KABASHI. ARHITEKTI , Zagreb  
Substitute: n.n.

### **Present: EUROPAN (non-voting):**

Bernd Vlay, General Secretary European Österreich

Pia Spiesberger, European Österreich

Peter Peternell, European Österreich

Rron Tresi, General Secretary European Kosovo

Hana Nixha, European Kosovo

In the morning the jury members were made familiar with the sites and pre-selected projects by the different organisations of Europan (Austria, Kosovo) and the representatives of the cities and clients.

Europan Österreich introduces the procedure of the jury. In general, there is one winning project and one runner-up prize on each site, but there is also the possibility to define no winner and nominate 3 runners-up. The winning projects should be chosen not for easy and fast implementation but as contributions to architectural and urbanist innovation which inspires and initiates a challenging and fruitful process of implementation. They should also enable the cities and clients to understand the potential of the sites and to imagine new and unconventional ways to deal with them. Moreover a Special Mention can be awarded to a project considered of being especially innovative yet without addressing sufficiently the brief and demands of the site. The authors of such proposals do not receive a financial reward, but will be published.

Winner: 12.000€ Runner up: 6.000€

#### Distribution of Winner and Runners up

In between the 5 Austrian sites the prizes (in total 5 winners and 5 runners up) could also move between the cities according to the level of the entries: the jury could decide to move a prize from one town to the other, nominating 2 winners on one site, if the level of the entries is exceptionally high and if it makes sense to award 2 winners on one site. Also, the jury is not obliged to award all prizes if the jury considers that the level of the projects does not correspond to the demands of the Europan competition.

#### Preliminary remarks

The jury agrees that there shall be a certain generosity in evaluating the projects, paying tribute to the specific framework of Europan.

At the same time the jury has to consider that Europan is a competition for young architects who are fully educated, judging the competition projects as a work of architects and not of students. The aim of Europan should be to give a clear sign to the city about the potential and the quality of the projects with the aim to figure out innovative projects which also can be implemented.

For this reason the jury will write recommendations which describe the qualities of the winning projects, including advises for the cities and clients about future implementation-steps.


The jury decides unanimously to nominate:

Max Rieder as president of the jury.

Saskia Hebert as vice president of the jury.

The jury consists of 8 votes for all 6 sites.

The jury decides to first discuss the projects, then to make a further preselection and leave the final decision for the second jury day.



Max Rieder, president of the jury.

# GRAZ

- >G02 BI657 LINK
- >G03 BJ198 GRAZ UNITED
- >G06 GD022 DURCH'LÄSSIG
- >G13 LN889 WALZER
- >G25 SL978 COLLAGING CONTINUITY
- >G27 WA662 GRAZ IN TRANSITION
- >G31 YP626 (SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM

## First evaluation session:

Discussion of all 7 projects.

G02 BI657 LINK

G13 LN889 WALZER

G31 YP626 (SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM

There is unanimity of the jury to keep these three proposals in mind.

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect any of the four remaining projects.

## Second evaluation session:

G13 LN889 WALZER

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

Comparing discussion of the following proposals:

G02 BI657 LINK

There is unanimity of the jury not to award this proposal.

G31 YP626 (SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

## Third evaluation session:

G13 LN889 WALZER

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal.

G31 YP626 (SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM

There is unanimity of the jury not to award this proposal.

## Evaluation:

G13 LN889 WALZER

There is unanimity of the jury to award this project as Winner.

## FINAL RESULTS

### °WINNER: LN889 WALZER

Authors

**BUSE MIHAI** (RO), architect

**MARTON TÖVISSI** (RO), architect

Collaborators

**TAMÁS FISCHER** (HU), architect

FRANCE, France

## WINNER

### >G13 LN889 WALZER

*Local Commission: "An exciting interplay of positive and negative spaces is triggered by complete development of the site using a 5-storey slab out of which patios are stamped and onto which additional pane-like volumes are added. These spaces can be read as resulting from a series of open and closed public spaces between the eastern railway station forecourt and the western park adjacent to the depot. By its different scales (large: towers, medium: slab, small: arcaded courtyards), the proposal succeeds in creating connections to the city as well as to the immediate environment and to the future users of the building. Integration of the neighbouring site is particularly convincing. This neighbouring site features existing buildings which, as backdrops, form one of the facades of the central inner courtyard, or could also be gradually replaced by new buildings. The economic dealing with public space results in the emergence of compact and clearly programmable outdoor spaces, as well as of a permeable ground floor. The jury also suggests a more intensive use of the roofs as open areas. It is noted that the proposal does not contain any relevant figures relating to the programme - no Table of Program was submitted. Distribution of functions and gross floor areas can be grossly determined on the basis of the information on the posters. The proposal as a whole convinces the jury because of its simplicity, typological variety, robustness of urban design and formal smartness. The given task is solved not in a spectacular, but conclusive way, so that the proposal is highly resilient for an adaptation process in the upcoming steps of implementation."*

The jury appreciates the - in fact - not spectacular but very clear strategy: The implementation of positive and negative volumes (high points and noise-protected courtyards), the differentiation of the building heights, the idea of a generous open space as a central plaza-like courtyard and the adaptable integration of the existing neighboring buildings are convincing design elements. The spatial quality of the main plaza courtyard and the different arcaded courtyards are conceivable, the courtyards' atmospheres still have to be evaluated, considering the urban quality on the site. The relation to the northern square with its water tower demonstrates the tension of providing an edge to the square that is porous at the same time. The jury agrees that the project gives too much weight to the closure of the square, a fact that could be easily improved due to the robustness of the structure.

### >G31 YP626 (SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM

*Local Commission: "By organically combining a 2-storey base zone with tower typologies, a differentiated transition from public (ground floor) to semi-public (base zone) and private open spaces (towers) is enabled. In this context, the base zone bears the potential for being transformed into an attractive link, if providing an adequate range of offers. The spatial situation around the square at the water tower is particularly convincing. Public use of the upper levels of the highest tower and the installation of social and cultural activities is also appreciated. However, the excessive mass of the proposal (approx. 58,000 m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area, density = approx. 4.0) is criticised. There are also major reserves regarding the height of the towers (up to 66 meters)."*

The representation of the urban facade of the base-zone with different lively activities along the rail tracks is appreciated and at the same time doubted by the jury. The urban configuration is perceived as too massive and too dense: The amount of four high rise towers seems to be too much and in fact gives the impression of providing luxury high-rise apartments which is not the goal of the task. A phasing concept is missing. The conceptual approach is acknowledged, however the vision of a green eco-city (trees on the platforms) is doubted.

### **>G02 BI657 LINK**

*Local Commission: "Zoning of the site into seven lots is considered as extremely positive with regard to their visual penetrability in east-west direction. An exciting skyline is created, which can be implemented in stages - even by different architects. The layering of the individual buildings according to a polygonal basis - inspired by historical views of streets of the historic centre of Graz - and rectangular towers create exciting semi-public spaces on the upper floors that are accessible via a three-dimensional road network. According to this logic, semi-public functions are also offered on the upper floors, thus creating an interesting typological mix. The distribution of the shopping centre onto several buildings - key word Open Air Mall - is appraised as positive. Sound insulation against the railroad is mainly ensured by a glazed acoustic wall along the rails, by the layout of the towers and the orientation of the housing units. The jury criticises the insufficient circulation in the north-south direction, as well as the lack of address generation for individual buildings that can only be accessed via other buildings."*

There is unanimity that the important north-south-permeability is insufficient and the numerous large north facades of the towers are questionable. The spatial appearance of the entrance of the southern tunnel seems to be neglected. The jury doubts the quality of the light circumstances in the plinth and the quality of the floor plans.

### **>G03 BJ198 GRAZ UNITED**

*Local Commission: "The idea of continuing urban road networks and the subsequent division of the site into four separate lots that can be developed individually, creates a robust urban development concept with lively and square-like expanding road spaces. Smooth transitions to adjacent public spaces and underpasses with attractive free space quality are generated. The jury also highlights the clear zoning of free areas into public streets and semi-private green spaces on the roof of single-storey base buildings. Development of the base, however is criticised regarding their formal randomness. An informal, almost village-like atmosphere is created, which, however, is considered as too suburban given the location in the city. Integration of existing buildings is appreciated as an idea which, however, appears realistic only if completely rebuilt owing to the constructive overlap with the base buildings."*

The jury recognizes the readable definition of public and semi-public spaces and highlights the connections and openings to Eggenberger Straße. However the proposal is considered as too un-urban and the ignorance of an integration of the existing neighboring buildings is not convincing.

### **>G06 GD022 DURCH'LÄSSIG**

*Local Commission: "Through a linear development in the north-south direction, the site is clearly zoned into a western urban part and a landscape part with open space in the east. The structure reflects a series of different detailed building typologies, which may vary in height and configuration according to the desired functional mix and predetermined building density. The robustness of this layout is as convincing as is its high degree of flexibility. By its very nature, however, this flexibility is limited to the design stage. The functional mix and the open spaces between the functional units of the upper floors are appreciated just as is the representation of the temporal development of the implementation. However, the strict linearity of the concept prevents an optimum use of the site. The landscape space facing the railway appears too large and not sufficiently divided in order to be actually used."*

The jury appreciates the ambition of creating various crossings in principle. In contradiction to the project's name "Durchlässig" (Permeable), the proposed project is not considered to be permeable: it blocks the city's view and denies different conditions to each side of the site.

#### **>G25 SL978 COLLAGING CONTINUITY**

*Local Commission: "The meandering perimeter block development enables optimal use of the site, creating an exciting inner courtyard and free space that are clearly delimited against the outside. The overall ensemble thus features an inviting gesture. Inner and outer space interpenetrate and are provided with several footpaths enabled by the development partially on stilts. The utility of open areas facing the railway is discussed in a controversial manner. The neighbouring site is integrated in the overall layout in a natural way. The existing development can be substituted through completion of the perimeter block development at a later moment.*

*Due to the meandering development, the outer surfaces and the noise load in the direction of the railway are maximised - a problem, which can be solved by taking appropriate measures such as double facades or sound-insulated loggias.*

*The represented functional mix with public facilities up to the upper floors convinces as much as the neutral utilisation structure, which promises a good divisibility into individual construction stages. Nevertheless, there is a doubt whether the intended unifying structure and facade design are able to respond ideally to the different challenges of all uses."*

The meandering form does not convince the jury, instead it gives the impression of not reacting to the site and its conditions, unfortunately it's a strong autonomous signature in itself.

#### **>G27 WA662 GRAZ IN TRANSITION**

*Local Commission: "Due to a procedural approach, a new image of the city is formulated that is completely independent of any master plan, but rather based on open-end initiatives and design and realisation processes of different parties. A productive and informally designed urban space evolves that is able to react to all possible opportunities in a flexible manner. Building structures already existing on site and railway tracks are consequently reused, in order to establish initial activities (Fab Lab, Food Coop, etc.). Buildings existing on the neighbouring site also blend naturally into that ensemble.*

*New buildings along the railway tracks intended for a later stage of the design process renew the subject of self-finishing noble building shells. The development along Waagner-Biró-Strasse enables an extension of the square at the water tower as well as a spacious access to pedestrian passageway in the south. The use of roofs for sports and urban gardening is considered as positive. The architectural quality of the new buildings, however, is criticised: The design is not consistent with the innovative power of the conceptual approach. This overall conceptual approach to the specific plot with its clear ownership is questioned and discussed. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to establish a classical zoning plan on the basis of the proposed procedural development. In this case, a zoning plan would have to specify spatial and temporal framework conditions for a free development of the proposal."*

The conceptual approach to the specific site with its clear ownership and given program does not convince the jury. The informal approach ended to early.

# WIEN

>W01 AQ531 LIMINAL CITY

>W05 JP322 PUBLICQUARTER

>W09 SI060 INTEGRATING CLUSTERS / INCREASING DIVERSITY

## First evaluation session:

Discussion of all 3 projects.

## Second evaluation session:

W05 JP322 PUBLICQUARTER

There is immediate unanimity of the jury to preselect this proposal.

W01 AQ531 LIMINAL CITY

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

## Evaluation:

W05 JP322 PUBLICQUARTER

There is unanimity of the jury to award this project as Winner.

## FINAL RESULTS

### °WINNER: JP322 PUBLICQUARTIER

Authors

**BLAŽ BABNIK ROMANIUK** (SI), architect

**ANNA KRAVCOVA** (SI), architect

**DUŠAN STUPAR** (SI), landscape architect

Collaborators

**DRAGAN POPOVI** (RS), 3D designer

LJUBLJANA, Slovenia

## WINNER

### >W05 JP322 PUBLICQUARTER

*Local Commission: "By radically re-designing the place, it was aimed to create a new centre for Kagran: Publicquartier. The area around the underground station is redesigned step by step, thus creating a generous urban space with public facilities on a hot spot next to the underground station. The Donauzentrum is shifted in the direction of Schrödinger Platz, in order to avoid it being intersected by Wagramer Strasse. The proposed high rises in Donauzentrum are well accessible from the existing infrastructure and give evidence of an efficient dealing with the ground as a valuable resource in a growing city. A new urban space is created by shifting the Donauzentrum and redefining the horizontal and introverted structure as a new permeable development. This new space will not only become a contemporary urban centre in Kagran, and as such an attractive front court of the underground, but also act as an attractive link to Forum Donaustadt. The clear and bold development strategy is praised by all jury members as a very interesting and challenging approach."*

The jury appreciates unanimously the courageous and innovative strategy to shift the shopping mall Donauzentrum from the underground station to the direction of Schrödinger



Platz in order to establish an open “publicquarter” for Kagran around the underground station. This radical proposal can initiated and establish a dialogue between the city of Vienna and the shopping mall Donauzentrum. By removing the existing bridges of the shopping mall, the project brings the value of public streets into the urban discourse, suggesting to reflect the dialogue between commercial programs and public spaces that are liberated from the corporate shopping-mall-design: could the area around the U1 subway stop become a public space with a much larger bandwidth of publicness? This question is especially relevant if one considers the development of Forum Donaustadt with its civic programs as an important symbolic and programmatic counterpart of the European project area.

Seen in this light the proposal establishes a far reaching urban planning strategy which involves a political and cultural statement about the value and possibilities of public space, increasing the commitment of the competition brief. It gives a long term vision to a clearly new character of the site beyond its present connotation with the shopping-mall-center. Therefore the concept provides an essential tool for the city of Vienna to start a process-oriented dialogue with a grand perspective on the future public space of Kagran-center. Moreover it represents an innovative contribution to the urban discourse in European cities, reflecting the future meaning of public spaces and the public space-relation of indoor:outdoor spaces.

#### **>W01 AQ531 LIMINAL CITY**

*Local Commission: “The proposal suggests a coordinated strategy on a social, economic and spatial level. According to the system “trial and error”, a series of temporary events are projected which serve as a planning tool that integrates various actors and enable restructuring in several stages. From a spatial point of view, the proposal focuses on Schrödinger Platz, which is surrounded by a large 2-storey basement into which the urban space continues. A cluster of high-rising structures is arranged above. The complex strategic approach, the creation of an equivalent to Forum Donaustadt, and of a new centre with high density within the high-rise cluster, is highlighted as positive. Considering an extension of DZ is interesting; however, the suggestion does not go far enough. The large basement developing towards the interior is questioned because of its impact on public space. The floor area of the high rises is considered as too low and thus as inefficient.”*

In general the jury is questioning the added value of the five proposed high rises and of the created public space which seems to be closed and separated instead of connected and opened: The linking system in public space is missing.

#### **>W09 SI060 INTEGRATING CLUSTERS / INCREASING DIVERSITY**

*Local Commission: “The project suggests filling the gap in the urban fabric and delimiting new spaces by means of new buildings: through the extension of the Bernoullistrasse planned for pedestrians and cyclists only, an attractive forecourt for Donauzentrum is created. Attractive spatial sequences are created by the adjacent triangular square which is surrounded by public buildings such as a cultural centre or a museum. The conceptive incorporation of Bernoullistrasse is mentioned and interpreted as an interesting and logical approach. The suggested functional crust along the Donauzentrum facade and the “movement space island” on the street crossing are discussed as positive.”*

The project does not convince the jury, a response to the brief and an improvement of the traffic are missing.

# BRUCK/MUR

- >B05 QF877 BEYOND BOUNDARIES
- >B07 UF537 FRAME
- >B12 VQ812 TOGETHER
- >B15 XC007 SWITCHYARD
- >B17 YF334 BLACK SWAN

## First evaluation session:

Discussion of all 5 projects.

## Second evaluation session:

B05 QF877 BEYOND BOUNDARIES

B12 VQ812 TOGETHER

B15 XC007 SWITCHYARD

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect these proposals.

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect any of the two remaining proposals.

B05 QF877 BEYOND BOUNDARIES

There is unanimity of the jury not to award this proposal.

Comparing discussion of the following proposals:

B12 VQ812 TOGETHER

B15 XC007 SWITCHYARD

There is unanimity of the jury not to award the proposal B15 XC007 SWITCHYARD.

## Evaluation:

B12 VQ812 TOGETHER

There is disagreement of the jury to award this project either as Winner or as Runner up.

There is unanimity of the jury to decide this in the final decision on the second day.

The projects reflect the „unsharpness“ of the competition task which addresses at the same time 2 different development perspectives: a concrete project on the site on the one hand, and a long term vision for a future restructuring of Bruck-Süd on the other hand. Due to the lack of a respective consensus none of the projects could match a clear agenda, rather all submitted projects themselves have become a catalyst to make visible the still unclear agenda, as well as to give new ideas to the province and the city, concerning the future steps to take. Among the submitted projects the runner up project addresses the most promising approach, intertwining macro- and micro-levels in its scenarios. Deepening the submitted ideas would open up new opportunities for future development.

## FINAL RESULTS

### °RUNNER UP: VQ812 TOGETHER

Authors

**LOPEZ UJAQUE JOSE MANUEL** (ES), architect

**GARCÍA TRIVIÑO FRANCISCO** (ES), architect

**PSEGIANNAKI KATERINA** (GR), architect

ELCHE , Spain

## **RUNNER UP**

### **>B12 VQ812 TOGETHER**

*Local Commission: "The proposal includes extensive urban development solutions and is able to dissolve the large linear infrastructural structures of the federal roads Leobner and Grazer Strasse and particularly the northern part of the Wiener Strasse into space-like structures. This leads to a significant improvement towards a high-quality public space beyond just mere beautification which, however, needs to be scrutinised with regard to the increased traffic volume.*

*The proposal to introduce a processual and participatory development based on modular space structures on the site is seen by the jury as principally positive. This could however, also be realised at a different already existing site (vacancy). The experimental fundamental idea that new spaces can lead to new social forms is undermined by the rather conventional positioning of the hall structure which is described by the jury as unscandalous."*

The jury appreciates the main intention of the project and criticizes unanimously the architectural formulation of the hall-structure with the roof. "Together" is considered to be the only submitted project that provides the requested time-puffer for the city to start a process on the site. Moreover "Together" could even work on a small scale and low-budget level as the first starting point in order to occupy the site and establish the first step of a strategy. Providing car parking as first step of the strategy and as entrance to the city of Bruck/Mur is discussed and could run into danger to become a permanent usage of the site. The proposed program of micro production, co-working and start-ups seems interesting and can be improved and enriched.

### **>B05 QF877 BEYOND BOUNDARIES**

*Local commission: "The jury emphasises the high quality of the public spaces and how the teams handles the different height levels. The rapid train railway station is integrated very well due to the generous railway station forecourt. The clear grid structure forms a barrier to the north, which on the one hand protects from noise and on the other, attenuates the connection with the neighbouring districts. The seemingly high rate of elaboration of the proposal appears as very realistic and quickly realisable. However, it bears the risk of ending up as a mere investor project without potential for development."*

The project gives the impression of a generic second city centre which is not intended in Bruck/Mur. The jury criticises the main cultivation of the connection to the train station; whereas the essential reaction to the streets and to the nature are strongly missing.

### **>B07 UF537 FRAME**

*Local Commission: "This proposal is recognised as based on a key idea and is discussed as a structurally interesting contribution. Above all, its significance as a landmark contributes to giving the project site a recognisable address. The stepwise design and building stages are in principal considered as positive, however, the architectural and programmatic detailed design and "making" have been criticised as not radical enough. Whereas the first stage of temporary use of the ground floor finds approval, the transverse bars provided for subsequent uses are considered as unsatisfying. The jury underlines the lack of reaction to the urban environs outside the proposed parking ground/green space exchange. "*

There is unanimity in the jury to appreciate the concept as interesting, but nevertheless there are serious doubts in the creation of a spatial added value for the city of Bruck/Mur. It seems that the proposed volume is reducing the usable city.

### **>B15 XC007 SWITCHYARD**

*Local Commission: “The proposed second road, parallel to the Wiener Strasse, is seen by the jury as positive. The urban consolidation at this axis seems appealing and will be continued systematically at the project site in a clear manner. Additionally, the generally high flexibility of use and the open architecture of the proposed buildings are widely approved. Temporary utilization as a landscape park based on private transport with drive-in possibilities can very quickly be transformed into a permanent traffic-free zone. Also, it bears a high identification potential. The typology and the design as a campus should be seen as flexible, since it seems rather unlikely that this location will be solely used for educational purposes. “*

The aesthetic design of the project and its criticism on cars are appraised, nevertheless the jury is questioning if the project is radical and strong enough to establish the needed new input for Bruck/Mur. Moreover the jury discusses if it the right way to criticize individual car traffic by offering car infrastructure and considering a parking structure as a landscape park.

### **>B17 YF334 BLACK SWAN**

*Local Commission: “The proposal is discussed by the jury as a pictorial didactic model on several levels: It focuses on the megastructure highway/railway as a local peculiarity. It not only highlights them but, as a kind of revenge, it superimposes the city to these megastructures. The megastructure itself has a bellevue character. By being a system in itself, it opens up space for small-scale structures, which however, remain isolated from the city. Additionally, the proposal points out the importance of infrastructural consideration for future developments. The jury notes that the proposal, in its current state, would not be able to be realised; the critical mass of users is missing and the possibility of dilapidation cannot be precluded from the beginning. The proposal has to be seen as a starting point for the clarification of fundamental issues. There is unanimity with regard to a recommendation for an Honourable Mention.”*

There is unanimity in the jury not to consider the project worth a special mention.

## **LINZ**

- >L03 AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES
- >L04 CW890 A 21st CENTURY HOUSING ZOO
- >L10 TM151 INVISIBLE OED
- >L13 XS115 RIGHT TO CREATE
- >L15 ZD169 LINKING LINZ

### **First evaluation session:**

Discussion of all 5 projects.

### **Second evaluation session:**

L03 AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES

There is immediate unanimity of the jury to preselect this proposal.

Comparing discussion of the following proposals:

L04 CW890 A 21st CENTURY HOUSING ZOO

L10 TM151 INVISIBLE OED

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect any of these two proposals.

L15 ZD169 LINKING LINZ

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind as a Special Mention

### **Evaluation:**

L03 AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES

There is unanimity of the jury to award this project as Winner.

L15 ZD169 LINKING LINZ

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal as Special Mention.

## **FINAL RESULTS**

### **°WINNER: AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES**

Authors

**BENNI EDER** (AT), architect

**THERESA KRENN** (AT), architect

VIENNA , Austria

### **°SPECIAL MENTION: ZD169 LINKINGLINZ**

Authors

**MARÍA VASALLO** (ES), architect

**SOFÍA SOLANS** (ES), architect

**ISABEL SANCHEZ** (ES), architect

MADRID , Spain

## **WINNER**

### **>L03 AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES**

*Local Commission: "The overall concept, the overall representation and the high degree of elaboration are unanimously considered as very convincing and of high quality. Both the urbanistic integration (layout of individual buildings and height development) and the architectonic formulations (arrangement of functions, innovative adaptable housing floor plans and addressing of underrepresented user groups) are appraised as clear high-quality answers to the task. The fact that a central place is created is highly lauded, as are the connections to Albert Schöpf Siedlung development, the porosity of the dam and the parking space with an integrated skatepark playground: all of them are convincingly positive approaches."*

The project convinces unanimously because of its simple concept and detailed answers of all tasks in the competition brief. The urban concept of Three Houses with public basements at the Union Square on project site 1 integrates parts of Europastraße to Albert Schöpf Siedlung and offers an innovative adaptable housing concept of large cluster apartments with open floor plans addressing underrepresented user groups. The jury appreciates the idea of the Union Square as an Urban Anchor for the neighborhood; nevertheless some recommendations are discussed to improve the spatial relation between the Union Square and the Three Houses and the design of the public space. On project site 2 the Starter Tower acts as a shining sign and entrance to the neighborhood and offers small medium-term starter apartments for young adults. Along Europastraße (project site 4) dam sheds are implemented as parking stacks offering a combination of parking lots and rentable spaces for workshops, storage, collectivity and outdoor terraces.

Proposed punctual interventions in Albert Schöpf Siedlung consist of the implementation of velo bicycle parking, extended lobbies to improve the entrance situations at the parking level, an additional parking stack with an integrated skatepark to allow future transformations and a workshop-based moderated process to start an urban activation of courtyards through a participative process together with the inhabitants of Linz Oed.

## **SPECIAL MENTION**

### **>L15 ZD169 LINKING LINZ**

*Local Commission: "The logic of the conceptive approach is well worth mentioning. The overall representation and its aesthetic softness are convincing. The paradox character of the overall concept triggers fundamental discussions and speculations regarding new value systems in our society, expressing the response of a new generation with new value systems and means of communication. The proposal includes an open-use platform for a trading market, instead of a Spar market, coupled with a technological centre and collaborative and participative housing. Although realisation seems impossible, the convincing logic of the conceptive approach is worth a Special Mention."*

The jury considers the project as a very sensitive and essential contribution to the European discourse per se, nevertheless the proposed project is not realizable on the site in Linz Oed. Deliberately ignoring the given program of a supermarket and proposing a trading market is considered to be an important worthwhile contribution to an European competition.

### **>L04 CW890 A 21st CENTURY HOUSING ZOO**

*Local Commission: "The sober orthogonality and the spatial interlinking with the neighbourhood (continuation of Albert Schöpf Siedlung axes) are considered as characteristics of an interesting urbanistic concept, which suggests an exciting interplay of spatial sequences and simple architectural rhetoric. Moreover, it promises sufficient*

*typological flexibility in urban construction. This positive processual nature of the proposal is outweighed by a few weak points: the elaboration of typology and its, most probably, difficult implementation. The seemingly random distribution of volumes and the realisability are challenged - partially due to the depths of individual building units. This proposal is discussed in detail and compared with proposal L13 XS115 RIGHT TO CREATE during the last evaluation session. Both proposals are pre-selected because of the jury's disagreement."*

The jury discusses the proposed public space as a grid of trees as new urban centre for the neighborhood. The general concept of using landscape per se as an linking element in public space is very interesting, but in this proposal not convincing: There is no concept and identity of landscape evident and moreover the existing trees are not respected as part of the concept. The representation of the proposed architecture and its urban fitting is appraised.

### **>L10 TM151 INVISIBLE OED**

*Local Commission: "The conceptual analogy with other urban squares in Linz seems interesting, albeit not entirely comprehensible. Although the creation of the represented urban square situations in project site 1 seems essential and is discussed as positive, the fact that such a situation could be considered as too intimate is considered as a weakness. The arrangement of functions, the sufficiently represented architectural language of the facade division and the possibility of views are mentioned as strong points. The fact that the element of the designed square interlaces with Albert Schöpf Siedlung is discussed as worthwhile. Transformation of Europastrasse in a shared space is seen with a critical eye though, because it is considered as not realisable according to requirements of the competition task. The 52-m height development is partially considered as an exaggerated urbanistic gesture, which can, however, be easily mitigated by removing a few storeys."*

The high amount of public space is considered to be an too urban approach and is missing an added value in its spatial organisation. Although the proposed connecting ramps to Europastrasse are appraised, there are neither specific qualities nor a relation to existing criteria in the public space evident. The superimposition of the three grids is understood to be only graphic design but not a spatial design for public space creating added value for a new center of the neighborhood. The proposed typology with a small atrium does not seem to be appropriate for the site.

### **>L13 XS115 RIGHT TO CREATE**

*Local Commission: "Although the continuation of the axis of the existing Dorfstraße into the Albert Schöpf Siedlung development and its integration in project site 1 is appreciated as the major urbanistic component of the project by the jury, the end of the axis close to the health centre is criticised. The proposal of two housing block typologies raises the question as to whether this gesture is strong enough to create a new centre. The represented flat typologies and the quality of the flat floor plans have weaknesses and are criticised in the context of this special task. This proposal is discussed in detail and compared with proposal L04 CW890 A 21st CENTURY HOUSING ZOO during the last evaluation session. Both proposals are pre-selected because of the jury's disagreement."*

The proposed continuation of the axis is solely represented as a green strip without showing spatial qualities, program and design of public space. The quality of the floor plans is not convincing.

# ST PÖLTEN

- >P04 EM645 REMEMBRANCE & FREEDOM
- >P12 ME856 A(U)STRIUM
- >P15 NS530 OSMOSE
- >P18 OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY
- >P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG

## First evaluation session:

Discussion of all 5 projects.

## Second evaluation session:

P12 ME856 A(U)STRIUM

P15 NS530 OSMOSE

P18 OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY

P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect these proposals.

Comparing discussion of the following proposals:

P18 OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY

P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect both proposals.

There is an intense discussion about the prize categories Winner and Runner up.

P12 ME856 A(U)STRIUM

P15 NS530 OSMOSE

There is unanimity of the jury to keep these proposal as Special Mentions.

## Evaluation:

P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG

There is unanimity of the jury to award this project as Winner.

P18 OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal as Runner up.

P12 ME856 A(U)STRIUM

P15 NS530 OSMOSE

There is unanimity of the jury to keep these proposals as Special Mentions.

## FINAL RESULTS

**°WINNER: VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER KISS THAT FROG**

Authors

**FRANCESCO MARRAS** (IT), architect

**ADRIANO DESSI'** (IT), architect

**AURORA PERRA** (IT), architect

**FRANCESCA OGGIANO** (IT), engineer-architect

**SILVIA MOCCI** (IT), engineer-architect

**PHILIP GROSCH** (IT), architect

**FEDERICO ARU** (IT), architect

Collaborators

**FEDERICO SERCIS** (IT), student in architecture

BONARCADO , Italy



## °RUNNER UP: OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY

Authors

**NELA KADIC** (AT), architect urbanist

**VERA SERIAKOV** (AT), architect urbanist

VIENNA , Austria

## °SPECIAL MENTION: NS530 OSMOSE

Authors

**LUIS MASIA MASSONI** (ES), architect urbanist

**FABIO CAVATERRA** (IT), architect

PARIS France

## °SPECIAL MENTION: ME856 AUSTRIUM

Authors

**JAKUB PUDO** (PL), architect

**AGNIESZKA MORGA** (PL), architect

**EWA ODYJAS** (PL), architect

**KONRAD BASAN** (PL), architect

SOSNOWIEC, Poland

## WINNER

### >P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG

*Local Commission: "According to the jury, this proposal features a poetic dealing with the subject of landscape as a refuge, and with water both in its representational and conceptive approach. Although the economic challenges of the task have not been met, the soft development of the proposal is interesting and sparks off discussion on housing quality in relation to landscape and considering wilderness as a public space. Urbanity in its classical sense will never be generated through this proposal, but it is exactly this contradiction and dealing with nature that are so innovative and valuable. The situation of the parking houses is neither understandable, nor is urban densification conceivable."*

The jury appreciates the poetic dealing with water, nature and its wilderness as a very strong, sensitive and site specific concept of the project. Landscape and a network of water basins are intended as public space which invites the inhabitants to rediscover community values relevant to nature and open air spaces. The concept proposes living in the nature in various typologies and providing multifunctional units called ju(MP) (joint unit MultiPurpose) offering diverse adaptable spaces for common uses and a combination of living and working. The proposed time strategy shows a sensitive adaptation of the site starting with infrastructural preparation for nature and water management and followed by housing typologies densifying according to the needs of the future.

Although the representation of the first phase in plan is misleading and the proposed architecture is unanimously not appreciated and heavily discussed, the project is considered as an added value in housing and appropriate for the site in St Pölten to create and discover a Genius loci.

## RUNNER UP

### >P18 OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY

*Local Commission: "The proposal of an elastic set of rules for the creation of urban elasticity and adaptability to societal change is interesting and triggers essential discussions about housing construction and urban construction. The proposal evades the subject of housing*

*at first glance and tries instead to answer the question of how a city can develop as an organism. The conceptive approach and the high demand for social mix in the urban fabric are honourably mentioned. At the same time, the generic lack of quality is criticised by some jury members. The concentration of a dense compact structure and generation of central clear space in the west as well as the focus on open landscape in the east initiate positive discussions within the jury. The convincing adaptability of the proposed set of rules could enable a development of the site over a longer period. At the same time, the typological attractiveness of housing in the local context of St Pölten is challenged due to the displayed lack of quality."*

The project of an elastic framework of urban rules creating a socially diverse mix of 60-70% long term inhabitants to 30% short term inhabitants like asylum seekers and other temporary stay guests is appreciated as an essential political statement and interesting conceptual approach. The theoretical research, its representation and the positioning of St Pölten in a greater radius in Austria offers a vision of a new dense neighborhood of the future and raises the question how to create society in adaptable times. The project is considered as a valuable contribution to the European discourse, nevertheless the site specificity for the site in St Pölten is missing.

### **SPECIAL MENTION**

#### **>P15 NS530 OSMOSE**

*Local Commission: "The new city block" prototype as a vision of a new city is an interesting conceptive reaction to the problem of creating suburban housing with urban density. The stacked combination of housing and parking seems convincing and adaptable and creates quality. The central public space in the centre of the site, the "rambla" as a north-south linking element and the green space in the east are perceived as a clear concept. The porosity of the development is positive, although often also perceived as restless and fringing. A stage-wise realisation is conceivable, and keeping the contaminated areas clear convinces."*

The proposed prototype "the new city block" is appreciated as an interesting typology marrying the idea of a block and a carpet, of single family houses and parking spaces. The high amount of private and semi public outdoor spaces giving the courtyards to the neighborhood in search for spontaneous use and gardening is considered as a high quality. Although the new city block is conceived as an too urbanistic approach to the specific site in St Pölten, it is an interesting contribution to the housing discourse in European.

### **SPECIAL MENTION**

#### **>P12 ME856 A(U)STRUM**

*Local Commission: "The concept of a set of rules for a dense carpet structure is convincing and interesting. The conceptive mode of representation of these rules, the programmatic distribution and creation of appealing atmospheres in the open spaces are especially mentioned and are convincing. Moreover, the urban set of rules seems robust enough to adapt to future developments and to be adaptable and improvable in the course of different development stages - which due to the concept cannot be fixed to a location. The distance from the contaminated area and the neutral transition to the Traisen river are equally convincing."*

The typology of a modular grid for a low rise densified carpet embedded in the landscape is conceived as an interesting typology. The diagrammatic representation does not correspond to the seductive images describing the atmospheres of the two public and

semi-public open spaces. Although the proposed underground parking facilities are conceived as not desirable and affordable, the set of urban rules is a valuable contribution to the housing discourse in European.

#### **>P04 EM645 REMEMBRANCE & FREEDOM**

*Local Commission: "The significance of a megastructure as a collision of landscape and built structure is acknowledged as an attempt to establish identity. The differentiation of orientation and grain of this megastructure seems interesting. Another advantage of this meandering megastructure is seen in its adaptability: changes of form and a stage-by-stage development are conceivable. However, the height development is irritating. The wooden structure as a layer in front of the housing development seems interesting and referring to the location - even in the sense of an overgrowing of this structure by landscape or uncontrolled growth. In comparison, stigmatisation of the past and the exclusively gloomy representation are unanimously and heavily criticised. The staging of the barracks as central - and gloomily represented - courtyard of a housing development is perceived as insensitive in dealing with the history, while the patios created through the meandering form are considered as of variable quality, also in respect to address generation."*

Whereas noise protection and the definition of different neighborhoods are recognized as a positive result of the meandering form of the megastructure, the jury unanimously considers the stigmatization of the historical past as not appropriate for housing.

## **FINAL DISCUSSIONS AND VOTES**

### **GRAZ**

#### **WINNER**

G13 - LN889 - WALZER

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal as Winner.

### **WIEN**

#### **WINNER**

W05 - JP322 - PUBLICQUARTIER

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal as Winner.

### **BRUCK/MUR**

#### **RUNNER UP**

B12 - VQ812 - TOGETHER

There is a discussion to nominate the proposal either as Runner up or as Special Mention.

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal as Runner up.

### **LINZ**

#### **WINNER**

L03 - AS609 - ALL TOMORROWS PARTIES

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal as Winner.

#### **SPECIAL MENTION**

L15 - ZD169 - LINKING LINZ

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal as Special Mention.

### **ST PÖLTEN**

#### **WINNER**

P23 - VJ839 - JUMP IN THE WATER

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal as Winner.

#### **RUNNER UP**

P18 - OM575 - ELASTIC CITY

There is unanimity of the jury to award this proposal as Runner up.

#### **SPECIAL MENTIONS**

P15 - NS530 - OSMOSE

P12 - ME856 – A(US)TRIUM

There is unanimity of the jury to award these proposals as Special Mentions.

## **FINAL RESULTS**

### **GRAZ**

#### **°WINNER: LN889 WALZER**

Authors

**BUSE MIHAI** (RO), architect

**MARTON TÖVISSI** (RO), architect

Collaborators

**TAMÁS FISCHER** (HU), architect

FRANCE, France

## **FINAL RESULTS**

### **WIEN**

#### **°WINNER: JP322 PUBLICQUARTIER**

Authors

**BLAŽ BABNIK ROMANIUK** (SI), architect

**ANNA KRAVCOVA** (SI), architect

**DUŠAN STUPAR** (SI), landscape architect

Collaborators

**DRAGAN POPOVI** (RS), 3D designer

LJUBLJANA , Slovenia

## **FINAL RESULTS**

### **BRUCK/MUR**

#### **°RUNNER UP: VQ812 TOGETHER**

Authors

**LOPEZ UJAQUE JOSE MANUEL** (ES), architect

**GARCÍA TRIVIÑO FRANCISCO** (ES), architect

**PSEGIANNAKI KATERINA** (GR), architect

ELCHE , Spain

## **FINAL RESULTS**

### **LINZ**

#### **°WINNER: AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES**

Authors

**BENNI EDER** (AT), architect

**THERESA KRENN** (AT), architect

VIENNA , Austria

**°SPECIAL MENTION: ZD169 LINKINGLINZ**

Authors

**MARÍA VASALLO** (ES), architect

**SOFÍA SOLANS** (ES), architect

**ISABEL SANCHEZ** (ES), architect

MADRID , Spain

**FINAL RESULTS**  
**ST PÖLTEN**

**°WINNER: VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER KISS THAT FROG**

Authors

**FRANCESCO MARRAS** (IT), architect

**ADRIANO DESSI'** (IT), architect

**AURORA PERRA** (IT), architect

**FRANCESCA OGGIANO** (IT), engineer-architect

**SILVIA MOCCI** (IT), engineer-architect

**PHILIP GROSCH** (IT), architect

**FEDERICO ARU** (IT), architect

Collaborators

**FEDERICO SERCIS** (IT), student in architecture

BONARCADO , Italy

**°RUNNER UP: OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY**

Authors

**NELA KADIC** (AT), architect urbanist

**VERA SERIAKOV** (AT), architect urbanist

VIENNA , Austria

**°SPECIAL MENTION: NS530 OSMOSE**

Authors

**LUIS MASIA MASSONI** (ES), architect urbanist

**FABIO CAVATERRA** (IT), architect

PARIS France

**°SPECIAL MENTION: ME856 AUSTRIUM**

Authors

**JAKUB PUDO** (PL), architect

**AGNIESZKA MORGA** (PL), architect

**EWA ODYJAS** (PL), architect

**KONRAD BASAN** (PL), architect

SOSNOWIEC, Poland

# EUROPAN 13 Recommendations

**GRAZ**

**WINNER**

**>G13 LN889 WALZER**

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Connections

- >The appearance and connection of the entrance of the southern tunnel should be improved.
- >The diagonal connection from the Eggenberger Straße to the Water Tower in the north should be overworked.
- >The openings and connections to the Water Tower are essential and should be overworked without losing the tension between framing the square and providing porosity to the inner-courtyard-system.

### Open spaces

- >The atmospheric concept of the courtyards – their specific character and materialization – should be worked out more carefully in cooperation with a landscape architect: especially the "forum idea" of the central urban courtyard should be elaborated, showing different urban scenarios. It will be the new central plaza and not a park.
- >The connection between the courtyards should be improved and worked out.

### Architecture

- >An overall artistic concept is an important strategy: different architects can be involved in implementing the architecture, but there should be a overall concept structuring the key elements of the architecture. The winning team should operate as overall artistic director, implementing one part of the architectural project.
- >The tectonic system of points or short slabs sitting on a plinth with courtyards that are framed by an arcade should be deepened in the architectural articulation of the project, The project should explore and develop the tension between a unitary structure that gives coherence to the urban ground and the articulation of different architectural pieces, avoiding the gesture of a homogeneous megastructure. The two layers of the tectonic structure (different point-buildings on top of a plinth with courtyards) provides an appropriate syntax for managing this tension.
- > Phasing can be easily addressed – the robust structure is
- >A mix of different uses and innovative housing is key for endowing the urban structure with the respective programmatic energy that is a must for a site in this excellent location. The city and the site-owners should look for a developer that is not only aware of this responsibility but able to develop successfully the necessary programmatic mix, including the diversity of the housing programme.

### About the definition of architecture and the next steps

- >The jury has been highly aware that the issue of architectural definition is a sensitive topic when it comes to the evaluation of the winning project, especially addressing the fact that Europan has been asking for an architectural project, not only for an urban strategy that concretizes the actual masterplan-study. After a process of long considerations the jury agrees that the seeming lack of architectural detail is not only a superficial judgement, but a logical outcome of the conceptual architecture-strategy: Instead of addressing the architectural elaboration in the usual way (details of facades, specific ground floor plans) the project's architectural grammar is based on a typological development that is highly precise and "waits" to be deepened in the next steps, when the parameters of the brief specify respectively.



For these next steps a careful selection procedure has to be set up: on the one hand the European partners have to lure in the appropriate developer(s). In order to do this successfully the partners have to define clearly the criteria of qualification which such a developer must offer in order to guarantee the successful implementation of the projects' qualities.

On the other hand the European winning team will need strong partners in the realm of planning and design: an ambitious call for highly qualified partner architects and a landscape architect, should be initiated.

## **WIEN**

### **WINNER**

#### **>W05 JP322 PUBLICQUARTER**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### Strategy

>The projects needs strong local partners on various levels:

1. local political power and the support of the city-administration
2. a strong coordinator/mediator for coordinating the long term process.
3. The strong integration of European Austria in the first phase of the process

For the preparation of the initial phase European and the city of Vienna should set up a workshop structure addressing specific actors and topics.

#### Project

>The part around Schrödinger-Platz shall consider the importance of a diagonal connection that elongates the movement along Bernoullistraße to the main crossing point at Wagramer Straße.

> A collection of data and numbers concerning the frequency of people (shopping mall public facilities, subway area, school, etc) would be a good basis for (also political) arguments for the first meeting with the city of Vienna.

## **BRUCK/MUR**

### **RUNNER UP**

#### **>B12 VQ812 TOGETHER**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### Strategy

>The Jury recommends a workshop structure and also involving the two other cities. European will support a follow up workshop structure.

#### Architecture

>It is recommended to consider the proposed roof as an allegory / symbolic umbrella for a regional cooperation: It has to be seen as a gesture. Not as a real designed roof. Therefore the architectural formulation has to be reconsidered.

## **LINZ**

### **WINNER**

#### **>L03 AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### Architecture

##### >Union Square

It is recommended to reconsider the design of the whole plaza idea and cooperate with a landscape architect. Moreover it would be interesting to also integrate some references of the existing landscape of trees on project site 1.

##### >Union Square – Level of ground floor

It is recommended to reconsider the elevated ground floor level and the idea of the “parking stack”. In the jury’s opinion this elements act as barriers and are not appropriate for an Union Square. Moreover the programmatic ground floor and its accessibility define the square.

##### >Public library & bike workshop

Introducing the program of a public library and a bike workshop is appreciated strongly, but it is recommended to overwork and rethink the connecting architectural element.

>Architectural design could be intensified.

## **ST PÖLTEN**

### **WINNER**

#### **>P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### Landscape & Water

>It is recommended to develop a clear strategy for planting and water management in relation to existing pollution and ecological criteria on site.

>The concept of growing could also work without concrete water areas, therefore the project has good development opportunities.

#### Architecture

>It is strongly recommended to overwork the architecture & typologies to develop a densification strategy in time.

#### History

>The historical context needs to be improved.



# EUROPAN 13

## JURY REPORTS: FIRST JURY SESSIONS

### Österreich

Minutes of the first jury session: Five Local Commissions of five Austrian Sites  
September 2015

Bruck/Mur, Graz, Linz, St Pölten, Wien



## **BRUCK AN DER MUR**

### **EUROPAN13 LOCAL COMMISSION**

**Friday, 09/10/2015 / 09:00 - 17:00**  
**Kulturhaus of the City of Bruck an der Mur**  
Stadtpark 1, 8600 Bruck an der Mur

#### **AGENDA**

- >Welcome - European
- >Summary of the competition brief- European
- >Objectives of site representatives - Site representatives
- >Constitution of jury - European
- >Presentation of the preliminary report on the panels - European
- >Lunch
- >Discussion and vote - Jury
- >Summary - Jury, European

#### **PARTICIPANTS**

- °**Hans Straßegger**, Mayor of the city of Bruck an der Mur
- °**Peter Koch**, Vice Mayor of the city of Bruck an der Mur
- °**Robert Pichler**, Director of Urban Planning, City of Bruck an der Mur
- °**Georg Deutschmann**, City of Bruck an der Mur
- °**Günter Koberg**, Head of Department 16 – Traffic & Construction, Federal Province of Styria
- °**Bernd Pitner**, Department 16 – Traffic & Construction, Federal Province of Styria
- °**Thomas Pucher**, Architect, Graz
- °**Alexandra Stingl**, Architect, Trofaiach (substitute for Hans Gangoly)
- °**Max Rieder**, Architect, Urbanist and Lecturer, EUROSPAN13 Jury
- °**Christian Kühn**, Architect and Critic, EUROSPAN13 Jury

#### **EUROPAN ÖSTERREICH**

- °**Bernd Vlay**, General Secretary European Austria
- °**Pia Spiesberger**, European Österreich
- °**Christina Linortner**, Preliminary report

### **Welcome and introduction of all participants**

Since Hans Gangoly is absent, Bernd Pitner took Alexandra Stingl's seat until she arrived (at about 10:30 am). No points were granted during this time. Alexandra Stingl replaces Hans Gangoly.

### **Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure Europan13**

Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure of Europan 13 and announcement of the Forum of Cities and Juries in November 2015 in Bratislava.

The local commission consists of seven votes, of which five are local votes and two are of the international Austrian Europan jury (Max Rieder, Christian Kühn).

The international Austrian Europan jury consisting of seven international votes will select the winners.

Between the Forum and the jury session, Europan Österreich organizes a meeting of the site representatives and jury members: Sunday, 11/08/2015 / 9:30 am - 1:00 pm, Vienna

Forum of Cities and Juries: 11/06 and 11/07/2015, Bratislava

Second jury session: 11/08 and 11/09/2015, Vienna

Official announcement of the winners takes place on 12/04/2015

Winners may be informed in advance if confidentiality is ensured. National secretariats are in charge of the overall organisation.

### **Objectives of the local commission**

The local commission ensures a pre-selection of 15 - 20% of all submitted projects for the 2nd jury session. These pre-selected projects will then be discussed in the Forum of Cities and Juries in Bratislava, and submitted to a second final international jury.

It is possible to award either a first prize and several runners-up or a unique first prize or - in the event of equivalent projects - three runners-up. It is also possible to award an Honorable Mention. Each jury member of the second jury session has the opportunity to give non-selected projects a second chance, but has to give reasons for it.

### **Criteria for the competition brief**

Europan draws the attention to the importance of Europan criteria upon evaluation of the projects.

Europan is a competition of ideas with a subsequent implementation process; this process will have to be dealt with during the discussion. The local commission shall appraise the projects according to their conceptive quality; the overall urban strategy will have to be discussed especially in the sense of the theme *Adaptable City 2* and innovative urban development.

### **Focus of the task according to the competition brief**

The Bruck an der Mur site requires projects that combine the regional and local level on the project site, in order to obtain an open-use "Haus der Mitte" (Center house of the region). Sustainable strategies for the public space shall be developed individually for this site, which react in an adequate way to the delicate framework conditions, especially to the heavy traffic load and spatial island situation. Through the provision of soft mobility connections to adjacent urban districts, it should be possible to strengthen their edges as well as their links with the city centre. The concept of the design process and concepts for intermediate use are an integral part of the task.

### **Objectives of the city**

The city of Bruck is seeking scenarios for a future-oriented development of the project site, which neither compete with the city centre nor with the Smart City project in the railway station district. The aim is to find urban approaches to link those bordering urban islands presently cut off by the highly frequented federal roads Wiener, Leobner and Grazer Straße in Bruck Süd, and connect the project site with the city by creating high-quality public (green) spaces. A retail centre has been expressly refused in favour of realising a mixed use, which would benefit not only the urban region but also the city itself. In the long term, it is proposed to build a rapid transit railway station right next to the site.

## Constitution of jury

Max Rieder is elected president of the jury.  
Christian Kühn is elected vice-president of the jury.

## Votes

### Site Representatives

°Hans Straßegger  
°Robert Pichler  
°Günther Koberg

### Architects

°Thomas Pucher  
°Alexandra Stingl (replacing Hans Gangoly)

### Architects (International Jury AT)

°Max Rieder  
°Christian Kühn

## Preliminary Report

Presentation of the preliminary report of each project

## Scoring system

Positive scoring system:

>4 positive points per jury member.

>It is not possible to distribute more than one point per project.

>Not all the 4 points need to be assigned.

>A total of  $4 \times 7 = 28$  can be assigned.

PRESELECTED PROJECTS

BRUCK / MUR

NR.	PROJECT NUMBER	TITEL	POINTS		PRE-SELECTED
B01	DL821	NESTED CENTRALITY	3		
B02	ER712	MUMÜQ - MURMÜRZQUARTIER - SMART CONNECTION	0		
B03	HA981	ATTR_ACTIVE_CONNECTIONS	0		
B04	OR961	CREATIVE TOPHOGRAPHY	0		
B05	QF877	BEYOND BOUNDARIES	6 x		PRESELECTED
B06	QG993	anBandeln	2		
B07	UF537	FRAME	1 * x		PRESELECTED
B08	UF786	SEE YOU SOON	0		
B09	VF573	BRUCK Share	0		
B10	VJ061	A negotiated archipelago	2		
B11	VL281	BRUCK'S ON TRACK	0		
B12	VQ812	TOGETHER	0 * x		PRESELECTED
B13	VR153	LIKE A BRIDGE OVER TROUBLED WATER	3 *		
B14	WD697	ENTER THE VOID	5 *		
B15	XC007	SWITCHYARD - From Tailgate Party to Industrial Thinkbelt	1 * x		PRESELECTED
B16	YB639	STEIER LAND MARK	0		
B17	YF334	black swan	2 * x		PRESELECTED
B18	YU202	OPEN YOURCE URBANISM	3 *		

28

8 projects have been awarded 0 points, 10 have been awarded points.  
A total of 28 points were awarded.

**First evaluation session:**

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 0 points.

*B12 VQ812 TOGETHER*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect any of the remaining 0-point projects.

**Second evaluation session:**

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 1 point.

*B07 UF537 FRAME*

*B15 XC007 SWITCHYARD*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep both proposals in mind.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 2 points.

*B06 QG993 ANBANDELN*

*B10 VJ061 A NEGOTIATED ARCHIPELAGO*

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect the two proposals.

*B17 YF334 BLACK SWAN*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 3 points.

*B01 DL821 NESTED CENTRALITY*

After detailed discussion, there is unanimity of the jury not to preselect this proposal.

*B13 VR153 LIKE A BRIDGE OVER TROUBLED WATER*

*B18 YU202 OPEN YOUR URBANISM*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep both proposals in mind.

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 5 points:

*B14 WD697 ENTER THE VOID*

After detailed discussion, there is unanimity of the jury that despite achieving a high score, this proposal shall not be preselected, but kept in mind.

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 6 points:

*B05 QF877 BEYOND BOUNDARIES*

There is unanimity of the jury to definitely preselect this proposal.

**Last in-depth evaluation session:**

One proposal has definitely been preselected:

*B05 QF877 BEYOND BOUNDARIES*

Comparing discussion of 7 projects

*B07 UF537 FRAME*

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect this proposal.

*B12 VQ812 TOGETHER*

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect this proposal.

*B13 VR153 LIKE A BRIDGE OVER TROUBLED WATER*

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect this proposal.

*B14 WD697 ENTER THE VOID*

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect this proposal.

*B15 XC007 SWITCHYARD*

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect this proposal.

*B17 YF334 BLACK SWAN*

The jury decides to preselect this proposal with a recommendation for an Honourable Mention.

*B18 YU202 OPEN YOUR URBANISM*

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect this proposal.

The following five projects have been preselected:

- >B05 QF877 BEYOND BOUNDARIES
- >B07 UF537 FRAME
- >B12 VQ812 TOGETHER
- >B15 XC007 SWITCHYARD
- >B17 YF334 BLACK SWAN

Jury statement regarding pre-selection of the five projects:

**B05 QF877  
BEYOND BOUNDARIES**

The jury emphasises the high quality of the public spaces and how the teams handles the different height levels. The rapid train railway station is integrated very well due to the generous railway station forecourt. The clear grid structure forms a barrier to the north, which on the one hand protects from noise and on the other, attenuates the connection with the neighbouring districts. The seemingly high rate of elaboration of the proposal appears as very realistic and quickly realisable. However, it bears the risk of ending up as a mere investor project without potential for development.

**B07 UF537  
FRAME**

This proposal is recognised as based on a key idea and is discussed as a structurally interesting contribution. Above all, its significance as a landmark contributes to giving the project site a recognisable address. The stepwise design and building stages are in principal considered as positive, however, the architectural and programmatic detailed design and “making” have been criticised as not radical enough. Whereas the first stage of temporary use of the ground floor finds approval, the transverse bars provided for subsequent uses are considered as unsatisfying. The jury underlines the lack of reaction to the urban environs outside the proposed parking ground/green space exchange.

**B12 VQ812  
TOGETHER**

The proposal includes extensive urban development solutions and is able to dissolve the large linear infrastructural structures of the federal roads Leobner and Grazer Strasse and particularly the northern part of the Wiener Strasse into space-like structures This leads to a significant improvement towards a high-quality public space beyond just mere beautification which, however, needs to be scrutinised with regard to the increased traffic volume.

The proposal to introduce a processual and participatory development based on modular space structures on the site is seen by the jury as principally positive. This could however, also be realised at a different already existing site (vacancy). The experimental fundamental idea that new spaces can lead to new social forms is undermined by the rather conventional positioning of the hall structure which is described by the jury as *unscandalous*.

**B15 XC007  
SWITCHYARD**

The proposed second road, parallel to the Wiener Strasse, is seen by the jury as positive. The urban consolidation at this axis seems appealing and will be continued systematically at the project site in a clear manner. Additionally, the generally high flexibility of use and the open architecture of the proposed buildings are widely approved. Temporary utilization as a landscape park based on private transport with drive-in possibilities can very quickly be transformed into a permanent traffic-free zone. Also, it bears a high identification potential. The typology and the design as a campus should be seen as flexible, since it seems rather unlikely that this location will be solely used for educational purposes.



**B17 YF334****BLACK SWAN**

The proposal is discussed by the jury as a pictorial didactic model on several levels: It focuses on the megastructure highway/railway as a local peculiarity. It not only highlights them but, as a kind of revenge, it superimposes the city to these megastructures. The megastructure itself has a belleveue character. By being a system in itself, it opens up space for small-scale structures, which however, remain isolated from the city. Additionally, the proposal points out the importance of infrastructural consideration for future developments. The jury notes that the proposal, in its current state, would not be able to be realised; the critical mass of users is missing and the possibility of dilapidation cannot be precluded from the beginning. The proposal has to be seen as a starting point for the clarification of fundamental issues. There is unanimity with regard to a recommendation for an Honourable Mention.

**Jury statement regarding projects not pre-selected in the first evaluation session:****B01 DL82****Nested Centrality**

The detailed focus and proposition beyond the project site were considered as positive. The project site is not seen as an island but as a kind of differentiated sequence of urban and green spaces which are linked to the city centre and could very well be realised. A clear axis to the city centre is created. However, the building structure, which is at the same time consolidated and permeable, also presents different options. The collage-like presentation of the designed architecture at a first glance hides the use of traditional urban design tools and reveals a lack of virtuosity.

**B06 QG993****anBandeln**

The jury considers the interesting programmatic approach of the Welcome Centre as rather positive. However, the spatial implementation lacks a typological equivalent to the committed programme as well as a corresponding connection to the urban context. The significance of green spaces and lightness in comparison with other proposals are honourably mentioned in the beginning, but a later discussion revealed no space-building qualities.

**B10 VJ061****A negotiated archipelago**

The interdependence of different scales and the rigorous pursuit of the design idea of Archipelago on all design levels are acknowledged by the jury. By means of comparison, the proposal addresses concrete problems. The proposed modular system on the project site introduces a new order, which allows for a range of realisation possibilities including smaller initiatives. However, the proposal is weakened by its concrete urban design articulation such as the serial arrangement of infrastructural bars leading to a pillar-forest on the ground floor.

**B13 VR153****Like A Bridge over Troubled Water**

Re-naturalisation of Weitentabach river is considered as a valuable approach in principle. The jury also highlights the connection to Hochangertal valley as well as the two attractive footways connecting the site to the city centre proposed as new features. However, the proposal does not possess the envisaged architectural quality of elaboration and presentation. The basic idea of opening up Weitentabach is not consequently carried out.

**B14 WD697****Enter the Void**

The proposal designed as a park works as a kind of city glacis dimensioned for mega-events, which extends Hochangertal beyond the rails and highway to the edge of the city.

As a fairground, it becomes a direct competitor of the medieval city main square. However, when it comes to real mega-events, it can hardly compete with the neighbouring Red Bull Ring festival grounds, if executed in the proposed manner. The radical urban renovation of Murer Vorstadt on the basis and in continuation of the Gründerzeit grid cannot be implemented in the long run due to existing ownership situation and property rights.

**B18 YU202****Open Source Urbanism**

The participatory and bottom-up approach of the proposal is initially discussed in the light of a possible interim use. Although the basic idea finds approval, the rather trivial use of current key words without in-depth research relating to self-organised design processes and the lack of a proper project idea are criticised. The proposed initiative would rather suit unoccupied housing units in the city centre. Experiences of proposals recently implemented have shown that there is not enough energy in the region for this kind of project.



## GRAZ

### EUROPAN13 LOCAL COMMISSION

**Monday, 09/21/2015 / 9:00 am - 5:00 pm**

**Loft Reininghaus**

Reininghausstraße 11a, 8020 Graz

#### AGENDA

- >Welcome - European
- >Summary of the competition brief- European
- >Objectives of site representatives - Site representatives
- >Constitution of jury - European
- >Presentation of the preliminary report on the panels - European
- >Lunch
- >Discussion and vote - Jury
- >Summary - Jury, European

#### PARTICIPANTS

- °**Bernhard Inninger**, Director of Urban Planning, City of Graz
- °**Eva Benedikt**, Department of Urban Planning, City of Graz
- °**Christopher Kreiner**, ÖBB-Real Estate Management GmbH
- °**Karin Ehlers**, F. Hanschmann GesmbH
- °**Andreas Kleboth**, Architect, Graz
- °**Martin Zechner**, Architect, Graz
- °**Max Rieder**, Architect, Urbanist and Lecturer, EUROPAN13 Jury
- °**Florian Sammer**, Architect, EUROPAN13 Jury Substitute (Replacing Christian Kühn)

#### EUROPAN ÖSTERREICH

- °**Bernd Vlay**, General Secretary European Austria
- °**Pia Spiesberger**, European Österreich
- °**Peter Peterzell**, European Österreich
- °**Fabian Wallmüller**, Preliminary report

## **Welcome and introduction of all participants**

Florian Sammer replaces Christian Kühn.

Eva Benedikt takes the vote of Bernhard Inninger.

## **Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure Europan13**

Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure of Europan 13 and announcement of the Forum of Cities and Juries in November 2015 in Bratislava.

The local commission consists of seven votes, of which five are local votes and two are of the international Austrian Europan jury (Max Rieder, Christian Kühn).

The international Austrian Europan jury consisting of seven international votes will select the winners.

Between the Forum and the jury session, Europan Österreich organizes a meeting of the site representatives and jury members: Sunday, 11/08/2015 / 9:30 am - 1:00 pm, Vienna

Forum of Cities and Juries: 11/06 and 11/07/2015, Bratislava

Second jury session: 11/08 and 11/09/2015, Vienna

Official announcement of the winners takes place on 12/04/2015

Winners may be informed in advance if confidentiality is ensured. National secretariats are in charge of the overall organisation.

## **Objectives of the local commission**

The local commission ensures a pre-selection of 15 - 20% of all submitted projects for the 2nd jury session. These pre-selected projects will then be discussed in the Forum of Cities and Juries in Bratislava, and submitted to a second final international jury.

It is possible to award either a first prize and several runners-up or a unique first prize or - in the event of equivalent projects - three runners-up. It is also possible to award an Honorable Mention. Each jury member of the second jury session has the opportunity to give non-selected projects a second chance, but has to give reasons for it.

## **Criteria for the competition brief**

Europan draws the attention to the importance of Europan criteria upon evaluation of the projects.

Europan is a competition of ideas with a subsequent implementation process; this process will have to be dealt with during the discussion. The local commission shall appraise the projects according to their conceptive quality; the overall urban strategy will have to be discussed especially in the sense of the theme *Adaptable City 2* and innovative urban development.

## **Focus of the task according to the competition brief**

-outlook for implementation

-Europan's innovative character

-complexity of the task

-degree of connectivity of pedestrians and cyclists

-noise control

-closeness to railway is important / appropriation of this space

-road network is important (also parallel to railway)

-economical use of public space/open areas

-recognisable address of buildings: nameable, recognisable, accessibility via public space

-dealing with Waagner Biró Strasse quality for road space

-dealing with existing buildings! Must also work if these buildings are maintained.

-differentiated qualities of open space

-connection to and from the railway/tunnel is important!

-facade seen from railway / facade to both sides is important!

-free space hierarchy: division is necessary. Private sphere: where? Public sphere: where?

-subject: adaptability

-height distribution is important

### **Constitution of jury**

Max Rieder is elected president of the jury.

Florian Sammer is elected vice-president of the jury.

### **Votes**

#### **Site Representatives**

°Eva Benedikt (replacing Bernhard Inninger)

°Christopher Kreiner

°Karin Ehlers

#### **Architects**

°Andreas Kleboth

°Martin Zechner

#### **Architects (International Jury AT)**

°Max Rieder

°Florian Sammer (replacing Christian Kühn)

## Preliminary Report

Presentation of the preliminary report of each project

## Scoring system

Positive scoring system:

>7 positive points per jury member.

>It is not possible to distribute more than one point per projects.

>Not all the 7 points need to be assigned.

>A total of 7\*7=49 can be assigned.

PRESELECTED PROJECTS

GRAZ

NR.	PROJECT NUMBER	TITEL	POINTS		PRE-SELECTED
G01	AX274	URBAN VILLAGE	1		
G02	BI657	LINK	6 x		PRESELECTED
G03	BJ198	GRAZ UNITED	4 *	x	PRESELECTED
G04	BW417	SMART Office Home Office	0		
G05	EQ080	GRAZ EKIMAE	1		
G06	GD022	durch'lässig	2 *	x	PRESELECTED
G07	GU504	URBAN NETWORK	0		
G08	GX882	OPENING WESTERN DOORS	0		
G09	HX593	Hanging Gardens	0		
G10	JH225	Typical life	0		
G11	JK597	Sponge	0		
G12	KB780	BAHNHOFberg	0		
G13	LN889	WALZER	6 x		PRESELECTED
G14	MN706	(in)BETWEEN PUBLIC SPACES	0		
G15	NW553	SOFT CELLS	4		
G16	OH884	CURTRAIN RISES	0		
G17	PB988	KALEIDOSCOPIC URBANISM	0		
G18	QS516	the many faces	2		
G19	QY533	WEST LEND GRAZ	5 *		
G20	RJ113	train town	0		
G21	RL252	B-side	2		
G22	RO068	Graz - tres turres habemus	0		
G23	RS467	the silhouette city	0		
G24	SH664	Stadt Land Fluss	0		
G25	SL978	Collaging Continuity	4 *	x	PRESELECTED
G26	TD438	flexibility	1		
G27	WA662	Graz in transition	3 *	x	PRESELECTED
G28	XN535	Enfilade	2		
G29	XP789	IN BETWEEN	1		
G30	YO537	SIEBEN HÖFE	0		
G31	YP626	(SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM	3 *	x	PRESELECTED
G32	ZT432	City On The Tracks	0 *		
G33	ZT522	lines, points, fields	0		

47

17 projects have been awarded 0 points, 16 have been awarded points.

A total of 47 points were awarded.

### First evaluation session:

Discussion of all 17 proposals obtaining 0 points.

*G32 ZT432 CITY ON THE TRACKS*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect any of the remaining 0-point projects.

### Second evaluation session:

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 1 point.

G01 AX274 URBAN VILLAGE

G05 EQ080 GRAZ EKIMAE

G26 TD438 FLEXIBILCITY

G29 XP789 IN BETWEEN

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect these proposals.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 2 points:

*G06 GD022 DURCH'LÄSSIG*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

G18 QS516 THE MANY FACES

G21 RL252 B-SIDE

G28 XN535 ENFILADE

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect this proposal.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 3 points.

*G27 WA662 GRAZ IN TRANSITION*

*G31 YP626 (SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 4 points:

*G03 BJ198 GRAZ UNITED*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

G15 NW553 SOFT CELLS

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect this proposal.

*G25 SL978 COLLAGING CONTINUITY*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 5 points:

*G19 QY533 WEST LEND GRAZ*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 6 points:

*G02 BI657 LINK*

*G13 LN889 WALZER*

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect these proposals.

**Last in-depth evaluation session:**

The following proposals have definitely been preselected:

*G02 BI657 LINK*

*G13 LN889 WALZER*

Comparing discussion of the following proposals:

G19 QY533 WEST LEND GRAZ

G32 ZT432 CITY ON THE TRACKS

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect these proposals.

*G03 BJ198 GRAZ UNITED*

*G06 GD022 DURCH'LÄSSIG*

*G25 SL978 COLLAGING CONTINUITY*

*G27 WA662 GRAZ IN TRANSITION*

*G31 YP626 (SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM*

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect these proposals.

**The following seven projects have been preselected:**

**>G02 BI657 LINK**

**>G03 BJ198 GRAZ UNITED**

**>G06 GD022 DURCH'LÄSSIG**

**>G13 LN889 WALZER**

**>G25 SL978 COLLAGING CONTINUITY**

**>G27 WA662 GRAZ IN TRANSITION**

**>G31 YP626 (SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM**

## **Jury statement regarding pre-selection of the seven projects:**

### **G02 BI657**

#### **LINK**

Zoning of the site into seven lots is considered as extremely positive with regard to their visual penetrability in east-west direction. An exciting skyline is created, which can be implemented in stages - even by different architects. The layering of the individual buildings according to a polygonal basis - inspired by historical views of streets of the historic centre of Graz - and rectangular towers create exciting semi-public spaces on the upper floors that are accessible via a three-dimensional road network. According to this logic, semi-public functions are also offered on the upper floors, thus creating an interesting typological mix. The distribution of the shopping centre onto several buildings - key word Open Air Mall - is appraised as positive. Sound insulation against the railroad is mainly ensured by a glazed acoustic wall along the rails, by the layout of the towers and the orientation of the housing units. The jury criticises the insufficient circulation in the north-south direction, as well as the lack of address generation for individual buildings that can only be accessed via other buildings.

### **G03 BJ198**

#### **GRAZ UNITED**

The idea of continuing urban road networks and the subsequent division of the site into four separate lots that can be developed individually, creates a robust urban development concept with lively and square-like expanding road spaces. Smooth transitions to adjacent public spaces and underpasses with attractive free space quality are generated. The jury also highlights the clear zoning of free areas into public streets and semi-private green spaces on the roof of single-storey base buildings. Development of the base, however is criticised regarding their formal randomness. An informal, almost village-like atmosphere is created, which, however, is considered as too suburban given the location in the city. Integration of existing buildings is appreciated as an idea which, however, appears realistic only if completely rebuilt owing to the constructive overlap with the base buildings.

### **G06 GD022**

#### **DURCH'LÄSSIG**

Through a linear development in the north-south direction, the site is clearly zoned into a western urban part and a landscape part with open space in the east. The structure reflects a series of different detailed building typologies, which may vary in height and configuration according to the desired functional mix and predetermined building density. The robustness of this layout is as convincing as is its high degree of flexibility. By its very nature, however, this flexibility is limited to the design stage. The functional mix and the open spaces between the functional units of the upper floors are appreciated just as is the representation of the temporal development of the implementation. However, the strict linearity of the concept prevents an optimum use of the site. The landscape space facing the railway appears too large and not sufficiently divided in order to be actually used.



**G13 LN889****WALZER**

An exciting interplay of positive and negative spaces is triggered by complete development of the site using a 5-storey slab out of which patios are stamped and onto which additional pane-like volumes are added. These spaces can be read as resulting from a series of open and closed public spaces between the eastern railway station forecourt and the western park adjacent to the depot. By its different scales (large: towers, medium: slab, small: arcaded courtyards), the proposal succeeds in creating connections to the city as well as to the immediate environment and to the future users of the building. Integration of the neighbouring site is particularly convincing. This neighbouring site features existing buildings which as backdrops, form one of the facades of the central inner courtyard, or could also be gradually replaced by new buildings. The economic dealing with public space results in the emergence of compact and clearly programmable free space, as well as of a permeable ground floor. Yet, the central courtyard could be made more urban-looking, since it is used as a market. The dimensioning of the north-south connection between the central courtyard and the water tower square is seen critically and should be dealt with in a more generous manner. The jury also suggests a more intensive use of the roofs as open areas. It is noted that the proposal does not contain any relevant figures relating to the programme - no Table of Program was submitted. Distribution of functions and gross floor areas can be grossly determined on the basis of the information on the posters. The proposal as a whole convinces because of its simplicity, typological variety and formal smartness. The given task is solved not in a spectacular, but conclusive way, so that the proposal seems very appropriate for realisation.

**G25 SL978****COLLAGING CONTINUITY**

The meandering perimeter block development enables optimal use of the site, creating an exciting inner courtyard and free space that are clearly delimited against the outside. The overall ensemble thus features an inviting gesture. Inner and outer space interpenetrate and are provided with several footpaths enabled by the development partially on stilts. The utility of open areas facing the railway is discussed in a controversial manner. The neighbouring site is integrated in the overall layout in a natural way. The existing development can be substituted through completion of the perimeter block development at a later moment. Due to the meandering development, the outer surfaces and the noise load in the direction of the railway are maximised - a problem, which can be solved by taking appropriate measures such as double facades or sound-insulated loggias.

The represented functional mix with public facilities up to the upper floors convinces as much as the neutral utilisation structure, which promises a good divisibility into individual construction stages. Nevertheless, there is a doubt whether the intended unifying structure and facade design are able to respond ideally to the different challenges of all uses.

**G27 WA662****GRAZ IN TRANSITION**

Due to a procedural approach, a new image of the city is formulated that is completely independent of any master plan, but rather based on open-end initiatives and design and realisation processes of different parties. A productive and informally designed urban space evolves that is able to react to all possible opportunities in a flexible manner. Building structures already existing on site and railway tracks are consequently reused, in order to establish initial activities (Fab Lab, Food Coop, etc.). Buildings existing on the neighbouring site also blend naturally into that ensemble.

New buildings along the railway tracks intended for a later stage of the design process renew the subject of self-finishing noble building shells. The development along Waagner-Biró-Strasse enables an extension of the square at the water tower as well as a spacious access to pedestrian passageway in the south. The use of roofs for sports and urban gardening is considered as positive. The architectural quality of the new buildings, however, is criticised: The design is not consistent with the innovative power of the conceptual approach. This overall conceptual approach to the specific plot with its clear ownership is questioned and discussed. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to establish a classical zoning plan on the basis of the proposed procedural development. In this case, a zoning plan would have to specify spatial and temporal framework conditions for a free development of the proposal.

**G31 YP626****(SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM**

By organically combining a 2-storey base zone with tower typologies, a differentiated transition from public (ground floor) to semi-public (base zone) and private open spaces (towers) is enabled. In this context, the base zone bears the potential for being transformed into an attractive link, if providing an adequate range of offers. The spatial situation around the square at the water tower is particularly convincing. Public use of the upper levels of the highest tower and the installation of social and cultural activities is also appreciated. However, the excessive mass of the proposal (approx. 58,000 m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area, density = approx. 4.0) is criticised. There are also major reserves regarding the height of the towers (up to 66 meters).

## **Jury statement regarding projects not pre-selected in the first evaluation session:**

### **G01 AX274**

#### **URBAN VILLAGE**

The proposed contemporary interpretation of the modernist subject “High-riser in park” holds considerable potential with regard to the creation of semi-public spaces in the slab developed in a three-dimensional way. The different distribution of the height points seems conclusive insofar as those points are linked to the existing building, and creates an exciting silhouette. The line-like seven-storey development along the railway line though, which forms a barrier to the city, is criticised because of its height with regard to the necessary noise protection of the semi-public areas behind it. The height seems oversized. The slenderness of the towers is considered as inefficient. The proposal as a whole seems too schematic and too serial.

### **G05 EQ080**

#### **GRAZ EKIMAE**

The collage-like urban development seems promising because of its thorough flexibility. Its expressive silhouette is considered as extensible. The construction of a second railway station hall is original, but its constructive interpretation is too conventional. Another problem is the location of the hall, which completely interrupts the north-south oriented public space. In general, the degree of elaboration of the proposal is considered as insufficient.

### **G15 NW553**

#### **SOFT CELLS**

Zoning of the site into six island-like open courtyard typologies creates a pleasant series of different well-defined free spaces featuring specific qualities. The open road network between these islands is slightly slanted in order to ensure the connection to the neighbouring movement spaces (streets, underpasses). These charming inner worlds can be wandered through easily. The free spaces enclosed in the form of curved, bar-like constructions, is comprehensible from a spatial point of view, but functionally incomprehensible. The jury also criticises the autistic attitude expressed through the proposal, which does not react to the environment. There is no representation of its outer shape and in that respect, the given urban subject has completely been neglected.

### **G18 QS516**

#### **THE MANY FACES**

The combination of three towers and a linear development along the railway creates an exciting duality with an interesting interspace of an amorphous shape on level -1. The open ground floor provides lightness, whereas the shape of the facades of the towers and of the linear development forms a conclusive formal bracket for the whole proposal. The proposal is criticised for being motivated too formally, though, and its aesthetic approach is exhausted when looked at more closely. The jury also criticises that the facades facing Waagner Biró Strasse are dominated by staircases.

### **G19 QY533**

#### **WEST LEND GRAZ**

The zipper-like layout of 15 spot houses on a one to two-storey base creates a moderate silhouette with semi-open terraces on the first floor. The public space in the centre of the site is well protected from noise and functionally satisfying. However, the serial arrangement of the individual buildings is not differentiated enough. Urban life cannot be imagined here. The architectural shaping of the individual buildings remains superficial and from a material point of view, the proposal is not sophisticated enough.

**G21 RL252****B-SIDE**

A linear development along the railway and comb-like arranged bars built on stilts create a series of courtyard situations that divide the plot in a north-south direction, enabling passageways. The extension of the square at the water tower as well as a large access to the pedestrian passageway in the south is highlighted. However, too much public space is left open. A more private interpretation of the two southernmost courtyards could mitigate this problem. The proposal as a whole is a valuable response to the task, without too many flaws, but lacks a strong tangible idea.

**G26 TD438****FLEXIVILCITY**

This proposal is discussed as an interesting contribution to the articulation of the forecourt facing the Eggenberger Strasse. The overall concept is seen with a critical eye though, since it can only be implemented by integrating the neighbouring plot.

**G28 XN535****ENFILADE**

A base zone characterised by arcades and tower typologies above create a line of clearly delimited public spaces, which enables an optimum network of paths running through the plot in all directions. The allusion of the arcades to historical models is perceived as a possible ironic quotation, but cannot establish a specific connection to the site. The jury criticises the ground plans, because some of the sanitary facilities can only be accessed via unheated loggias. The underground mall, which connects the pedestrian passageway in the south with the Eggenberger Strasse underpass, is considered as unnecessary with regard to strengthening public space.

**G29 XP789****IN BETWEEN**

A four-storey meandering base zone with two towers above on the north and south end of the plot creates an exciting suite of public free spaces facing Waagner Biro Strasse, each of them featuring a different character. However, the media facade of the development opposite the railway is considered as too delimiting. The semi-public free spaces behind this facade are not attractive enough.

**G32 ZT432****CITY ON THE TRACKS**

The intention of the project, i.e. to trigger a discourse on the Graz skyline, is challenged by the jury, which considers the proposal as being too mono-structural. The arrangement of five towers of equal height (67 m) to one another appears monotonous and as a sampling of known facade typologies - keyword: New York Twin Towers. In relation to the place, this approach is incomprehensible and more appropriate for office typologies than for housing. The proposal as a whole lacks diversity.



## LINZ

### EUROPAN13 LOCAL COMMISSION

**Friday, 09/25/2015 / 9:00 am - 4:00 pm**

Caseli GmbH Gästehaus  
Voestalpine Straße 3b, 4020 Linz

#### AGENDA

- >Welcome - European
- >Summary of the competition brief- European
- >Objectives of site representatives - Site representatives
- >Constitution of jury - European
- >Presentation of the preliminary report on the panels - European
- >Lunch
- >Discussion and vote - Jury
- >Summary - Jury, European

#### PRESENT

- °**Wolfgang Schön**, Director of WAG Wohnungsanlagen GesmbH.
- °**Jan Wagner**, Head of Project Development, WAG Wohnungsanlagen GesmbH.
- °**Horst Irsiegler**, Asset Management WAG Wohnungsanlagen GesmbH.
- °**Gunter Kolouch**, Department of Urban Planning, City of Linz
- °**Heinz Lang**, Architect, Salzburg
- °**Christoph Karl**, Architect, Wien
- °**Max Rieder**, Architect, Urbanist and Lecturer, EUROSPAN13 Jury
- °**Christian Kühn**, Architect and Critic, EUROSPAN13 Jury

#### EUROPAN ÖSTERREICH

- °**Bernd Vlay**, General Secretary European Österreich
- °**Pia Spiesberger**, European Österreich, Preliminary report

## **Welcome and introduction of all participants**

Gunter Amesberger is replaced by Gunter Kolouch.

## **Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure Europan13**

Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure of Europan 13 and announcement of the Forum of Cities and Juries in November 2015 in Bratislava.

The local commission consists of seven votes, of which five are local votes and two are of the international Austrian Europan jury (Max Rieder, Christian Kühn).

The international Austrian Europan jury consisting of seven international votes will select the winners.

Between the Forum and the jury session, Europan Österreich organizes a meeting of the site representatives and jury members: Sunday, 11/08/2015 / 9:30 am - 1:00 pm, Vienna

Forum of Cities and Juries: 11/06 and 11/07/2015, Bratislava

Second jury session: 11/08 and 11/09/2015, Vienna

Official announcement of the winners takes place on 12/04/2015

Winners may be informed in advance if confidentiality is ensured. National secretariats are in charge of the overall organisation.

## **Objectives of the local commission**

The local commission ensures a pre-selection of 15 - 20% of all submitted projects for the 2nd jury session. These pre-selected projects will then be discussed in the Forum of Cities and Juries in Bratislava, and submitted to a second final international jury.

It is possible to award either a first prize and several runners-up or a unique first prize or - in the event of equivalent projects - three runners-up. It is also possible to award an Honorable Mention. Each jury member of the second jury session has the opportunity to give non-selected projects a second chance, but has to give reasons for it.

## **Criteria for the competition brief**

Europan draws the attention to the importance of Europan criteria upon evaluation of the projects.

Europan is a competition of ideas with a subsequent implementation process; this process will have to be dealt with during the discussion. The local commission shall appraise the projects according to their conceptive quality; the overall urban strategy will have to be discussed especially in the sense of the theme *Adaptable City 2* and innovative urban development.

## **Focus of the task according to the competition brief**

>creation of two architecture poles (project site 1 and 2)

>adaptability of the typological concepts (project site 1 and 2) should be checked for capability of development

>creation of a centre

>address generation and enhancement of the public space (improvement of connections, relation to open space)

>neighbourhood initiatives for more attractive interspaces (project area 3)

>organisation of mobility (Europastrasse, parking lots)

>innovative approaches in housing construction (adaptability, mixing, living in the centre)

>possible partial elements to be discussed

## **Supplement of WAG and of the City of Linz**

>Intent to have the project realised by WAG (with the purpose to demolish the existing shopping centre in project site 1 at the beginning of 2017 and to immediately start the process of implementing the architectural project).

>creation of a basis for the design of a lay-out plan

## Constitution of jury

Max Rieder is elected president of the jury.  
Christian Kühn is elected vice-president of the jury.

## Votes

### Site Representatives

- °Wolfgang Schön
- °Jan Wagner
- °Gunter Kolouch (Stellvertretend für Gunter Amesberger)

### Architects

- °Heinz Lang
- °Christoph Karl

### Architects (International Jury AT)

- °Max Rieder
- °Christian Kühn

## Preliminary Report

Presentation of the preliminary report of each project

## Scoring system

Positive scoring system:

- >4 positive points per jury member.
- >It is not possible to distribute more than one point per project.
- >Not all the 4 points need to be assigned.
- >A total of  $4 \times 7 = 28$  can be assigned.

PRESELECTED PROJECTS

LINZ

NR.	PROJECT NUMBER	TITEL	POINTS		PRE-SELECTED
L01	AH005	1km limit experience	0		
L02	AN522	DER ERSTE PLATZ	0		
L03	AS609	ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES	7 x		PRESELECTED
L04	CW890	A 21st Century Housing Zoo	3 * x		PRESELECTED
L05	GH544	WINTER GARDEN	0		
L06	HJ601	UPDATING LANDSCAPES FOR PEOPLE	0		
L07	OF271	DENSITY VARIETY IDENTITY	0		
L08	QR869	Ökolyzer	0		
L09	RD532	programmatic GROUNDSQUARES	0		
L10	TM151	INVISIBLE OED	5 x		PRESELECTED
L11	UG952	CONSTRUCED LANDSCAPES	0		
L12	WI743	FOLLOW THE YELLOW BRICK ROAD	0		
L13	XS115	RIGHT TO CREATE	6 * x		PRESELECTED
L14	YM689	COLLABORATIVE DUALISM	0		
L15	ZD169	LinkingLinz	2 * x		PRESELECTED
L16	ZN818	YOU AND ME / re-inhabiting the in-between	1		

24

10 projects have been awarded 0 points, 6 have been awarded points.  
A total of 24 points were awarded.

**First evaluation session:**

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 0 points.

There is unanimity of the jury to not preselect any of these proposals.

**Second evaluation session:**

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 1 point:

*L16 ZN818 YOU AND ME*

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect this proposal.

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 2 points:

*L15 ZD169 LINKING LINZ*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 3 points:

*L04 CW890 A 21st CENTURY HOUSING ZOO*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 7 points:

*L03 AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES*

There is immediate unanimity of the jury to preselect this proposal.

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 6 points:

*L13 XS115 RIGHT TO CREATE*

After a comprehensive discussion, this proposal causes disagreement within the jury. The proposal is kept in mind.

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 5 points:

*L10 TM151 INVISIBLE OED*

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect this proposal.

**Last in-depth evaluation session:**

The two following proposals have definitely been preselected:

*L03 AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES*

*L10 TM151 INVISIBLE OED*

Comparing discussion of the following two proposals:

*L04 CW890 A 21st CENTURY HOUSING ZOO*

*L13 XS115 RIGHT TO CREATE*

After a long discussion, the jury unanimously decides to preselect both proposals.

Discussion of proposal:

*L15 ZD169 LINKING LINZ*

The jury decides to preselect this proposal with a recommendation for an Honourable Mention.

**The following five projects have been preselected:**

**>L03 AS609 ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES**

**>L04 CW890 A 21st CENTURY HOUSING ZOO**

**>L10 TM151 INVISIBLE OED**

**>L13 XS115 RIGHT TO CREATE**

**>L15 ZD169 LINKING LINZ**



## **Jury statement regarding pre-selection of the five projects:**

### **L03 AS609**

#### **ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES**

The overall concept, the overall representation and the high degree of elaboration are unanimously considered as very convincing and of high quality. Both the urbanistic integration (layout of individual buildings and height development) and the architectonic formulations (arrangement of functions, innovative adaptable housing floor plans and addressing of underrepresented user groups) are appraised as clear high-quality answers to the task. The fact that a central place is created is highly lauded, as are the connections to Albert Schöpf Siedlung development, the porosity of the dam and the parking space with an integrated skatepark playground: all of them are convincingly positive approaches.

### **L04 CW890**

#### **A 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY HOUSING ZOO**

The sober orthogonality and the spatial interlinking with the neighbourhood (continuation of Albert Schöpf Siedlung axes) are considered as characteristics of an interesting urbanistic concept, which suggests an exciting interplay of spatial sequences and simple architectural rhetoric. Moreover, it promises sufficient typological flexibility in urban construction. This positive processual nature of the proposal is outweighed by a few weak points: the elaboration of typology and its, most probably, difficult implementation. The seemingly random distribution of volumes and the realisability are challenged - partially due to the depths of individual building units. This proposal is discussed in detail and compared with proposal L13 XS115 RIGHT TO CREATE during the last evaluation session. Both proposals are pre-selected because of the jury's disagreement.

### **L10 TM151**

#### **INVISIBLE OED**

The conceptual analogy with other urban squares in Linz seems interesting, albeit not entirely comprehensible. Although the creation of the represented urban square situations in project site 1 seems essential and is discussed as positive, the fact that such a situation could be considered as too intimate is considered as a weakness. The arrangement of functions, the sufficiently represented architectural language of the facade division and the possibility of views are mentioned as strong points. The fact that the element of the designed square interlaces with Albert Schöpf Siedlung is discussed as worthwhile. Transformation of Europastraße in a shared space is seen with a critical eye though, because it is considered as not realisable according to requirements of the competition task. The 52-m height development is partially considered as an exaggerated urbanistic gesture, which can, however, be easily mitigated by removing a few storeys.

### **L13 XS115**

#### **RIGHT TO CREATE**

Although the continuation of the axis of the existing Dorfstraße into the Albert Schöpf Siedlung development and its integration in project site 1 is appreciated as the major urbanistic component of the project by the jury, the end of the axis close to the health centre is criticised. The proposal of two housing block typologies raises the question as to whether this gesture is strong enough to create a new centre. The represented flat typologies and the quality of the flat floor plans have weaknesses and are criticised in the context of this special task. This proposal is discussed in detail and compared with proposal L04 CW890 A 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY HOUSING ZOO during the last evaluation session. Both proposals are pre-selected because of the jury's disagreement.

**L15 ZD169****LINKING LINZ**

The logic of the conceptive approach is well worth mentioning. The overall representation and its aesthetic softness are convincing. The paradox character of the overall concept triggers fundamental discussions and speculations regarding new value systems in our society, expressing the response of a new generation with new value systems and means of communication. The proposal includes an open-use platform for a trading market, instead of a Spar market, coupled with a technological centre and collaborative and participative housing. Although realisation seems impossible, the convincing logic of the conceptive approach is worth an Honorable Mention.

**Jury statement regarding projects not pre-selected in the first evaluation session:****L16 ZN818****YOU AND ME / re-inhabiting the in-between**

The proposed typology with patios to improve the light exposure is acknowledged as positive. However, the proposed patios on parking level with the integrated playgrounds are not considered as added value. The concept of a new topography along the Europastrasse dam, with the new sports level for young people is a positive point. This is counteracted by the represented housing typologies and flat floor plans, which possess no evident quality.



## ST PÖLTEN

### EUROPAN13 LOCAL COMMISSION

**Thursday, 09/24/2015 / 9:00 am - 4:00 pm**

Meeting room ground floor, house A  
Ecoplus. Niederösterreichs Wirtschaftsagentur  
Niederösterreichring 2, 3100 St Pölten

#### AGENDA

- >Welcome - European
- >Summary of the competition brief- European
- >Objectives of site representatives - Site representatives
- >Constitution of jury - European
- >Presentation of the preliminary report on the panels - European
- >Lunch
- >Discussion and vote - Jury
- >Summary - Jury, European

#### PARTICIPANTS

- ° **Jens de Buck**, Head of Department of Urban Planning and Development, City of St Pölten
- ° **Bernadette Schwab**, Ecopoint, City of St Pölten
- ° **Peter Wondra**, WWE Wohn- und Wirtschaftspark Entwicklungsgesellschaft m.b.H
- ° **Robert Hahn**, Head of Project Development Bauträger Austria Immobilien
- ° **Richard Zeitlhuber**, Architect, Herzogenburg
- ° **Much Untertrifaller**, Architect, Bregenz/Vienna
- ° **Max Rieder**, Architect, Urbanist and Lecturer, EUROPLAN13 Jury
- ° **Christian Kühn**, Architect and Critic, EUROPLAN13 Jury

#### EUROPAN ÖSTERREICH

- ° **Bernd Vlay**, General Secretary European Austria
- ° **Pia Spiesberger**, European Österreich, Preliminary report
- ° **Peter Peterzell**, European Österreich

## **Welcome and introduction of all participants**

All jury members entitled to vote are present.

## **Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure Europan13**

Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure of Europan 13 and announcement of the Forum of Cities and Juries in November 2015 in Bratislava.

The local commission consists of seven votes, of which five are local votes and two are of the international Austrian Europan jury (Max Rieder, Christian Kühn).

The international Austrian Europan jury consisting of seven international votes will select the winners.

Between the Forum and the jury session, Europan Österreich organizes a meeting of the site representatives and jury members: Sunday, 11/08/2015 / 9:30 am - 1:00 pm, Vienna

Forum of Cities and Juries: 11/06 and 11/07/2015, Bratislava

Second jury session: 11/08 and 11/09/2015, Vienna

Official announcement of the winners takes place on 12/04/2015

Winners may be informed in advance if confidentiality is ensured. National secretariats are in charge of the overall organisation.

## **Objectives of the local commission**

The local commission ensures a pre-selection of 15 - 20% of all submitted projects for the 2nd jury session. These pre-selected projects will then be discussed in the Forum of Cities and Juries in Bratislava, and submitted to a second final international jury.

It is possible to award either a first prize and several runners-up or a unique first prize or - in the event of equivalent projects - three runners-up. It is also possible to award an Honorable Mention. Each jury member of the second jury session has the opportunity to give non-selected projects a second chance, but has to give reasons for it.

## **Criteria for the competition brief**

Europan draws the attention to the importance of Europan criteria upon evaluation of the projects.

Europan is a competition of ideas with a subsequent implementation process; this process will have to be dealt with during the discussion. The local commission shall appraise the projects according to their conceptive quality; the overall urban strategy will have to be discussed especially in the sense of the theme *Adaptable City 2* and innovative urban development.

## **Focus of the task according to the competition brief**

>urban integration

>mobility / connection to neighbourhoods and to the rapid train station

>Wohnen Plus/Housing with added value: innovative living quality. Which added value can be created via programmes?

>dealing with landscape

>dealing with history

>dealing with a future Bright City

>development capacity in several stages and adaptability to future developments

>challenge of homogeneity/ repetition - irritation is important

## Constitution of jury

Max Rieder is elected president of the jury.  
Christian Kühn is elected vice-president of the jury.

## Votes

### Site Representatives

°Jens de Buck  
°Peter Wondra  
°Robert Hahn

### Architects

°Richard Zeitlhuber  
°Much Untertrifaller

### Architects (International Jury AT)

°Max Rieder  
°Christian Kühn

## Preliminary Report

Presentation of the preliminary report of each project

## Scoring system

Positive scoring system:

- >5 positive points per jury member.
- >It is not possible to distribute more than one point per project
- >Not all the 5 points need to be assigned.
- >A total of  $5 \times 7 = 35$  can be assigned.

PRESELECTED PROJECTS

ST PÖLTEN

NR.	PROJECT NUMBER	TITEL	POINTS		PRE-SELECTED
P01	AD390	CUBE SCAPE	1		
P02	EA974	PARK VILLAGE	2 *		
P03	EI507	SHARINGARDEN	1 *		
P04	EM645	REMEMBRANCE & FREEDOM	4 x		PRESELECTED
P05	FE101	SHARING THE STRIPS	0		
P06	FE342	Das Glück liegt auf der Straße	2 *		
P07	HP471	COLLECTIVE THRESHOLDS	0		
P08	IF947	St Pölten Zentrum Nord	0		
P09	U716	COMMONS GENERATOR	2		
P10	JF144	Sankt Pölten: Building for growth and adaptability	1		
P11	LY046	LINES & MARKS IN NATURE	0		
P12	ME856	A(US)TRIUM	6 x		PRESELECTED
P13	MO463	HORTUS NOVUS	0		
P14	ND948	BORN TO BE WILD	1		
P15	NS530	OSMOSE	5 x		PRESELECTED
P16	OD367	Over - Garden	0		
P17	OG377	INTO THE WOODS	1		
P18	OM575	THE ELASTIC CITY	3 * x		PRESELECTED
P19	OV795	DIE #SEHNSUCHT DES HERRN K	1		
P20	RG489	GLANZVOLLE AUSSICHT(EN)	0		
P21	TG954	LIVING IN THE WOODS	0		
P22	TZ619	AM TRAISENDAMM	0		
P23	VJ839	Ju(mp) in the water - kiss the frog	0 * x		PRESELECTED
P24	VO670	BUILD IN CITY	0		
P25	WC952	THREE IN ST PÖLTEN	0		
P26	WZ385	DIE VIERTE KANTE	1		
P27	XK984	CROSS CITY	0		

31

13 projects have been awarded 0 points, 14 have been awarded points.  
A total of 31 points were awarded.

**First evaluation session:**

Discussion of all 13 proposals obtaining 0 points:

*P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect any of the remaining 0-point projects.

**Second evaluation session:**

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 1 point:

*P03 EI507 SHARING GARDEN*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect any of the remaining 1-point projects.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 2 points:

*P02 EA974 PARK VILLAGE*

*P06 FE342 DAS GLÜCK LIEGT AUF DER STRASSE*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep both proposals in mind.

There is unanimity of the jury not to preselect any of the remaining 2-point projects.

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 3 points:

*P18 OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 4, 5 and 6 points:

*P04 EM645 REMEMBRANCE & FREEDOM*

*P12 ME856 A(U)STRIUM*

*P15 NS530 OSMOSE*

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect all three proposals.

**Last in-depth evaluation session:**

The following proposals have definitely been preselected:

*P04 EM645 REMEMBRANCE & FREEDOM*

*P12 ME856 A(U)STRIUM*

*P15 NS530 OSMOSE*

Comparing discussion of the following proposals:

*P12 ME856 A(U)STRIUM (already preselected)*

*P03 EI507 SHARING GARDEN*

After a long discussion, the jury unanimously decides not to preselect the proposal P03 EI507 SHARING GARDEN.

Discussion of proposal:

*P18 OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY*

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect this proposal.

Comparing discussion of the following proposals:

*P02 EA974 PARK VILLAGE*

*P06 FE342 DAS GLÜCK LIEGT AUF DER STRASSE*

There is unanimity of the jury to not preselect any of these proposals.

*P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG*

The jury decides to preselect this proposal with a recommendation for an Honorable Mention.

**The following five projects have been preselected:**

**>P04 EM645 REMEMBRANCE & FREEDOM**

**>P12 ME856 A(U)STRIUM**

**>P15 NS530 OSMOSE**

**>P18 OM575 THE ELASTIC CITY**

**>P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG**

## **Jury statement regarding pre-selection of the five projects:**

### **P04 EM645**

#### **REMEMBRANCE & FREEDOM**

The significance of a megastructure as a collision of landscape and built structure is acknowledged as an attempt to establish identity. The differentiation of orientation and grain of this megastructure seems interesting. Another advantage of this meandering megastructure is seen in its adaptability: changes of form and a stage-by-stage development are conceivable. However, the height development is irritating. The wooden structure as a layer in front of the housing development seems interesting and referring to the location - even in the sense of an overgrowing of this structure by landscape or uncontrolled growth. In comparison, stigmatisation of the past and the exclusively gloomy representation are unanimously and heavily criticised. The staging of the barracks as central - and gloomily represented - courtyard of a housing development is perceived as insensitive in dealing with the history, while the patios created through the meandering form are considered as of variable quality, also in respect to address generation.

### **P12 ME856**

#### **A(U)STRUM**

The concept of a set of rules for a dense carpet structure is convincing and interesting. The conceptive mode of representation of these rules, the programmatic distribution and creation of appealing atmospheres in the open spaces are especially mentioned and are convincing. Moreover, the urban set of rules seems robust enough to adapt to future developments and to be adaptable and improvable in the course of different development stages - which due to the concept cannot be fixed to a location. The distance from the contaminated area and the neutral transition to the Traisen river are equally convincing.

### **P15 NS530**

#### **OSMOSE**

“The new city block” prototype as a vision of a new city is an interesting conceptive reaction to the problem of creating suburban housing with urban density. The stacked combination of housing and parking seems convincing and adaptable and creates quality. The central public space in the centre of the site, the “rambla” as a north-south linking element and the green space in the east are perceived as a clear concept. The porosity of the development is positive, although often also perceived as restless and fringing. A stage-wise realisation is conceivable, and keeping the contaminated areas clear convinces.

### **P18 OM575**

#### **THE ELASTIC CITY**

The proposal of an elastic set of rules for the creation of urban elasticity and adaptability to societal change is interesting and triggers essential discussions about housing construction and urban construction. The proposal evades the subject of housing at first glance and tries instead to answer the question of how a city can develop as an organism. The conceptive approach and the high demand for social mix in the urban fabric are honourably mentioned. At the same time, the generic lack of quality is criticised by some jury members. The concentration of a dense compact structure and generation of central clear space in the west as well as the focus on open landscape in the east initiate positive discussions within the jury. The convincing adaptability of the proposed set of rules could enable a development of the site over a longer period. At the same time, the typological attractiveness of housing in the local context of St Pölten is challenged due to the displayed lack of quality.

**P23 VJ839**

**>P23 VJ839 JU(MP) IN THE WATER – KISS THE FROG**

According to the jury, this proposal features a poetic dealing with the subject of landscape as a refuge, and with water both in its representational and conceptive approach. Although the economic challenges of the task have not been met, the soft development of the proposal is interesting and sparks off discussion on housing quality in relation to landscape and considering wilderness as a public space. Urbanity in its classical sense will never be generated through this proposal, but it is exactly this contradiction and dealing with nature that are so innovative and valuable. The situation of the parking houses is neither understandable, nor is urban densification conceivable.

**Jury statement regarding projects not pre-selected in the first evaluation session:**

**P01 AD390**

**CUBE SCAPE**

The transition from west to east in the programme, height development and twisting of the individual building units seem positive in principle. However, the innovative claim is not evident.

**P02 EA974**

**PARK VILLAGE**

The even distribution of the building structure seems generally positive. The interspaces between the spot houses, however, seem too homogeneous; the architectural and innovative claim is not evident.

**P03 EI507**

**SHARING GARDEN**

The concept of compact low building developments, the cul-de-sac circulation per carpet cluster and the good fitting into a stage-by-stage development are considered as positive. However, the articulation of the green outside spaces between the carpet clusters lacks innovative claim.

**P06 FE342**

**DAS GLÜCK LIEGT AUF DER STRASSE**

Hierarchy of outside spaces and the representation of these qualities are discussed very positively. However, the block structure suggests a city without connecting points, although the high degree of connectivity is displayed in a diagram. On the one hand, it is considered as positive that the leisure areas do not overtly emphasise the existing river meadow vegetation, while on the other, the differently staged patios rather resemble a theme park as an in-depth dealing with the existing natural landscape.

**P09 IJ716**

**COMMONS GENERATOR**

This ribbon-like structure as an allusion to the railway and the Traisen river (as well as to the historical village layout) is a key feature of this proposal. Its concept of enabling the creation of a clear structure of the public green space is acknowledged as positive. However, the landscape quality of exterior spaces is not evident.

**P10 JF144**

**SANKT PÖLTEN: BUILDING FOR GROWTH AND ADAPTABILITY**

The compact concentration of the structure which clearly delimits the river meadow landscape as well as the creation of public accesses to this landscape is considered as positive. Housing typologies, however, do not feature enough innovative claims.



**P14 ND948**

**BORN TO BE WILD**

The claim to generate an address by means of a megastructure is considered as positive and is discussed as such. The spatial quality of the large courtyard, the play with terraced heights and the location of the access balcony oriented to the courtyard (instead of to the outside), however, are seen with a critical eye.

**P17 OG377**

**INTO THE WOODS**

The concept of cluster formation in a dense forest is considered as interesting and worth a discussion. However, in this case, the cluster is challenged owing to its housing quality, accessibility and courtyard situation.

**P19 OV795**

**DIE SEHNSUCHT DES HERRN K**

The dense compactness of the blocks and their mixed use lead to a positive discussion. However, housing quality does not seem innovative enough.

**P26 WZ385**

**DIE VIERTE KANTE**

The contextual integration of the project in the local situation is expressly mentioned, despite having ignored the ownership conditions of the Glanzstoff site in the east. The proposed housing typologies, however, do not feature enough innovative claims regarding the quality of living.



## WIEN

### EUROPAN13 LOCAL COMMISSION

Thursday, 09/17/2015 / 10:00 am - 4:00 pm

#### Multimediaraum MA21

Department 21

District planning and land use

Rathausstrasse 14-16, 1010 Vienna

#### AGENDA

- >Welcome - European
- >Summary of the competition brief- European
- >Objectives of site representatives - Site representatives
- >Constitution of jury - European
- >Presentation of the preliminary report on the panels - European
- >Lunch
- >Discussion and vote - Jury
- >Summary - Jury, European

#### PARTICIPANTS

°**Andrea Eggenbauer**, MD21, Department of Urban District Planning and Land Use, City of Vienna

°**Andreas Trisko**, MD18 Head of Urban Development and Planning, City of Vienna

°**Georgine Zabrana**, Executive Group for Construction and Technology, Urban Planning Group, City of Vienna

°**Andre Kozel**, District of Wien Donaustadt, City of Vienna

°**Christoph Chorherr**, Local Council, City of Vienna

°**Rüdiger Lainer**, Architect, Vienna

°**Anna Detzlhofer**, Landscape Architect, Vienna

°**Max Rieder**, Architect, Urbanist and Lecturer, EUROPAN13 Jury

°**Christian Kühn**, Architect and Critic, EUROPAN13 Jury

#### EUROPAN ÖSTERREICH

°**Bernd Vlay**, General Secretary European Austria

°**Pia Spiesberger**, European Österreich

°**Lina Streeruwitz**, Preliminary report

## **Welcome and introduction of all participants**

Thomas Madreiter is represented by Georgine Zabrana.

Ernst Nevrivy is replaced by Andre Kozel.

## **Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure Europan13**

Presentation of the 2-stage jury procedure of Europan 13 and announcement of the Forum of Cities and Juries in November 2015 in Bratislava.

The local commission consists of seven votes, of which five are local votes and two are of the international Austrian Europan jury (Max Rieder, Christian Kühn).

The international Austrian Europan jury consisting of seven international votes will select the winners.

Between the Forum and the jury session, Europan Österreich organizes a meeting of the site representatives and jury members: Sunday, 11/08/2015 / 9:30 am - 1:00 pm, Vienna

Forum of Cities and Juries: 11/06 and 11/07/2015, Bratislava

Second jury session: 11/08 and 11/09/2015, Vienna

Official announcement of the winners takes place on 12/04/2015

Winners may be informed in advance if confidentiality is ensured. National secretariats are in charge of the overall organisation.

## **Objectives of the local commission**

The local commission ensures a pre-selection of 15 - 20% of all submitted projects for the 2nd jury session. These pre-selected projects will then be discussed in the Forum of Cities and Juries in Bratislava, and submitted to a second final international jury.

It is possible to award either a first prize and several runners-up or a unique first prize or - in the event of equivalent projects - three runners-up. It is also possible to award an Honorable Mention.

Each jury member of the second jury session has the opportunity to give non-selected projects a second chance, but has to give reasons for it.

## **Criteria for the competition brief**

Europan draws the attention to the importance of Europan criteria upon evaluation of the projects.

Europan is a competition of ideas with a subsequent implementation process; this process will have to be dealt with during the discussion. The local commission shall appraise the projects according to their conceptive quality; the overall urban strategy will have to be discussed especially in the sense of the theme *Adaptable City 2* and innovative urban development.

## **Focus of the task according to the competition brief**

>Masterplan scenario / this is not an architectural project!

-development perspective - representation of the strategic development work during the next few years

-"trigger function": Which changes are triggered?

-identification of significance of "Zentrum Kagran": How can proposals contribute to this? Positioning in the face of large-scale structures such as Donauzentrum?

-Connection to Forum Donaustadt / a counterbalance to Forum Donaustadt is important.

>Public space

-connection of various public spaces

-overcoming of barriers in public space, sequence of public squares, areas and linking paths taking into account the speed of pedestrians

-upgrading of Schrödinger Platz

-interfaces with Donauzentrum / Foodmarket

>Donauzentrum (DZ)

-trigger an impulse for the DZ to move (create a counterweight)

-overlaying the large interior space with the exterior space: How can the two "parallel systems Exterior and Interior" be interlaced?

-opening up of DZ / Foodmarket

>Programme

-How can a mixed-use residential district develop?

>Urban footing with integration of VHS and DZ / housing district

-no requirements regarding heights and density

>Mobility

-creation of a public space in the course of a possible future traffic change

-how can awareness be raised? What structures should agglomerate? How can traffic be dealt with?

### **Constitution of jury**

Max Rieder is elected president of the jury.

Christian Kühn is elected vice-president of the jury.

### **Votes**

#### **Site Representatives**

°Andrea Eggenbauer

°Georgine Zabrana

°Andre Kozel

#### **Architects**

°Rüdiger Lainer

°Anna Detzlhofer

#### **Architects (International Jury AT)**

°Max Rieder

°Christian Kühn

## Preliminary Report

Presentation of the preliminary report of each project

## Scoring system

Positive scoring system:

>3 positive points per jury member.

>It is not possible to distribute more than one point per project.

>Not all the 3 points need to be assigned.

>A total of  $3 \times 7 = 21$  can be assigned.

PRESELECTED PROJECTS

WIEN

NR.	PROJECT NUMBER	TITEL	POINTS		PRE-SELECTED
W01	AQ531	Liminal City	3 x		PRESELECTED
W02	CR949	donau STADT zentrum	0		
W03	DE852	MOSAik	0		
W04	DI324	adaptABILITY	2 *		
W05	JP322	PUBLICQUARTIER	6 x		PRESELECTED
W06	KJ694	VIENNA - GREEN LIGHT CIRCULATIONS	0		
W07	OI694	The module	1 *		
W08	OT605	KAGRAN'S NEW HUMAN FLOW	2 *		
W09	SI060	Integrating Clusters I Increasing Diversity	7 x		PRESELECTED
W10	ZL946	VIENNA'S RIBBON	0		

21

4 projects have been awarded 0 points, 6 have been awarded points.

A total of 21 points were awarded.

### First evaluation session:

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 0 points.

There is unanimity of the jury to not preselect any of these proposals.

### Second evaluation session:

Discussion of the proposal obtaining 1 point:

*W07 OI694 THE MODULE*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep this proposal in mind.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 2 points:

*W04 DI324 ADAPTABILITY*

*W08 OT605 KAGRAN'S NEW HUMAN FLOW*

There is unanimity of the jury to keep both proposals in mind.

Discussion of all proposals obtaining 3, 6 and 7 points:

*W01 AQ531 LIMINAL CITY*

*W05 JP322 PUBLICQUARTER*

*W09 SI060 INTEGRATING CLUSTERS / INCREASING DIVERSITY*

There is unanimity of the jury to preselect these proposals.

### Last in-depth evaluation session:

The following proposals have definitely been preselected:

*W01 AQ531 LIMINAL CITY*

*W05 JP322 PUBLICQUARTER*

*W09 SI060 INTEGRATING CLUSTERS / INCREASING DIVERSITY*

Comparing discussion of the following proposals:

*W07 OI694 THE MODULE*

*W04 DI324 ADAPTABILITY*

*W08 OT605 KAGRAN'S NEW HUMAN FLOW*

There is unanimity of the jury to not preselect any of these proposals.

**The following three projects have been preselected:**

**>W01 AQ531 LIMINAL CITY**

**>W05 JP322 PUBLICQUARTER**

**>W09 SI060 INTEGRATING CLUSTERS / INCREASING DIVERSITY**

**Jury statement regarding pre-selection of the three projects:**

**W01 AQ531**

**LIMINAL CITY**

The proposal suggests a coordinated strategy on a social, economic and spatial level. According to the system “trial and error”, a series of temporary events are projected which serve as a planning tool that integrates various actors and enable restructuring in several stages. From a spatial point of view, the proposal focuses on Schrödinger Platz, which is surrounded by a large 2-storey basement into which the urban space continues. A cluster of high-rising structures is arranged above. The complex strategic approach, the creation of an equivalent to Forum Donaustadt, and of a new centre with high density within the high-rise cluster, is highlighted as positive. Considering an extension of DZ is interesting; however, the suggestion does not go far enough. The large basement developing towards the interior is questioned because of its impact on public space. The floor area of the high rises is considered as too low and thus as inefficient.

**W05 JP322**

**PUBLICQUARTIER**

By radically re-designing the place, it was aimed to create a new centre for Kagran: Publicquartier. The area around the underground station is redesigned step by step, thus creating a generous urban space with public facilities on a hot spot next to the underground station. The Donauzentrum is shifted in the direction of Schrödinger Platz, in order to avoid it being intersected by Wagramer Strasse. The proposed high rises in Donauzentrum are well accessible from the existing infrastructure and give evidence of an efficient dealing with the ground as a valuable resource in a growing city. A new urban space is created by shifting the Donauzentrum and redefining the horizontal and introverted structure as a new permeable development. This new space will not only become a contemporary urban centre in Kagran, and as such an attractive front court of the underground, but also act as an attractive link to Forum Donaustadt. The clear and bold development strategy is praised by all jury members as a very interesting and challenging approach.

**W09 SI060**

**INTEGRATING CLUSTERS – INCREASING DIVERSITY**

The project suggests filling the gap in the urban fabric and delimiting new spaces by means of new buildings: through the extension of the Bernoullistrasse planned for pedestrians and cyclists only, an attractive forecourt for Donauzentrum is created. Attractive spatial sequences are created by the adjacent triangular square which is surrounded by public buildings such as a cultural centre or a museum. The conceptive incorporation of Bernoullistrasse is mentioned and interpreted as an interesting and logical approach. The suggested functional crust along the Donauzentrum facade and the “movement space island” on the street crossing are discussed as positive.

## **Jury statement regarding projects not pre-selected in the first evaluation session:**

### **W04 DI324 ADAPTABILITY**

An organically shaped network of bridges is connected to the accesses to Donauzentrum, pulling the internal circulation network towards the outside. The east-west axis is transformed into a park. On Schrödinger Platz, the linking figure ends in a high rise.

The jury praises the proposal as an interesting approach to re-consider conventional urban spaces by applying new geometries. However, few other solutions for the concrete task are recognisable.

### **W07 OI694 THE MODULE**

A modular grid structure is laid on the project site as a pattern and as a 3D framework with open use. Schrödinger Platz receives a large-scale monumental cube. Although the poetic idea of how to develop the city of Vienna is honourably mentioned, the proposal is seen as inadequate for the site and for the task.

### **W08 / OT605 KAGRAN'S NEW HUMAN FLOW**

Schrödinger Platz is embedded in a re-designed public space stretching between the underground station to Bernoullistrasse. The project tries to make the existing buildings more attractive and more open by means of the surface area and the topography. A group of buildings on Schrödinger Platz surrounds a central square onto which the Donauzentrum opens. The polygonal structure enhances the formation of a new centre. Opening of the Donauzentrum and traffic bundling seem to present an adequate answer to the task. The dissolution of barriers through the newly created green space in the direction of Lettenhaufen is discussed as an interesting approach. However, strategies for upgrading the public space are lacking.



EUROPAN 13  
PARTICIPANTS  
Österreich





## BRUCK / MUR

Code	Title	Team Representative	Associates	Contributors
VQ812 RUNNER UP	TOGETHER	Jose Manuel LOPEZ UJAUQUE (ES) – architect Eliche – Spain	Francisco Garcia Trivifio (ES) – architect Katerina Psegiannaki (GR) – architect	
QF877 SHORTLISTED	BEYOND BOUNDARIES	ALBERTO MOTTOLA (IT) - architect Treviso - Italy	SIMONE GOBBO (IT) - architect DAVIDE DE MARCHI (IT) - graphic designer	MASSIMO MUNARI (IT) - architect OLGA TREBUHINA (LV) - architect DAMIANO POLO (IT) - student in architecture ALEX RECALDIN (IT) - student in architecture Martin Ewald Eggel (AT) - student in architecture
UF537 SHORTLISTED	FRAME	Franz Wiesenhofer (AT) - architect Graz - Österreich		
XC007 SHORTLISTED	SWITCHYARD - From Tailgate Party to Industrial Thinkbelt	Evelyn Temmel (AT) - architect Graz - Österreich	Bernhard Luthringshausen (AT) - architect	
YF334 SHORTLISTED	black swan	Auinger Georg (AT) - architect Graz - Österreich	Streitwieser Romana (AT) - architect	
DL821	NESTED CENTRALITY	Evgeniya Bobkova (RU) - architect urbanist Rotterdam - The Netherlands	Mrudhula Koshy (IN) - architect urbanist Ksenia Bisti (RU) - architect Francesca Becchi (IT) - architect	Regina Holzleitner (AT) - architect Martina Thaller (AT) - architect Eva Klamminger (AT) - architect COSTANZA DURANTI (IT) - architect
ER712	MUMÜQ - MURMÜRZQUARTIER - SMART CONNECTION	Ute Neugebauer (AT) - architect Bruck an der Mur - Österreich	MARCO AIELLO (IT) - architect	
HA981	ATTR_ACTIVE_CONNECTIONS	Enrico Casagni (IT) - architect Arezzo - Italy		
OR961	CREATIVE TOPOGRAPHY	Lukas Allner (DE) - architect Wien - Österreich	Severin TUERK (AT) - architect	
QG993	anBandeln	Claudia Knepper (DE) - architect Munich - Germany	Daniel Dell (DE) - architect Magdalena Vondung (DE) - architect Velichka Dyulgerova (BG) - architect	
UF786	SEE YOU SOON	JUAN M. RODRIGUEZ DIAZ (ES) - architect Rotterdam - The Netherlands	JOAN ALOMAR MATEU (ES) - architect CONXA GENÉ GARCÍA (ES) - architect JAVIER I. MORENO-VENTAS (ES) - architect CARMEN LARGACHA POLO (ES) - architect IGNACIO LLORENS CANOSA (ES) - architect	
VF573	BRUCK Share	Serafino D'Emidio (IT) - arch. and urban theorist Ascoli Piceno - Italy	Giannario VolATILI (IT) - architect Serena Armandi (IT) - architect	
VJ061	A negotiated archipelago	GONZALO JOSE Lopez garrido (ES) - architect Brooklyn - United States	Diana Cristobal Olave (ES) - architect Tania Oramas Dorta (ES) - architect Alicia Hernanz (ES) - architect	
VL281	BRUCK'S ON TRACK	Damien ROCHON (FR) - architect Strasbourg - France	Florent REVEL (FR) - employee student in arch. Mylène Lach (FR) - employee student in arch. Simon Theberge (CA) - empl. student in arch. Marco CHITTI (IT) - architect urbanist	
VR153	LIKE A BRIDGE OVER TROUBLED WATER	Stefano Manzo (IT) - architect Paris - France		
WD697	ENTER THE VOID	Hans Fockety (BE) - architect Basel - Switzerland		
YB639	STEIER LAND MARK	Jean-François Plümio (FR) - architect urbanist London - Great Britain		Andy Cunningham (GB) - landscape architect
YU202	OPEN SOURCE URBANISM	Martina Maier (AT) - architect Thüringen - Österreich	Bernhard Stubenböck (AT) - architect	



## GRAZ

Code	Title	Team Representative	Associates	Contributors
LN889 WINNER	WALZER	Mihai BUSE (RO) - architect Paris - France	Marton TÓVISSI (RO) - architect	Tamás FISCHER (HU) - architect
BI657 SHORTLISTED	LINK	Ramon Bernaba Simo (ES) - architect Barcelona - Spain		BANULS JESUS (ES) - architect GRINGHUIS ROBIN (NL) - architect
BJ198 SHORTLISTED	GRAZ UNITED	Ole Storjohann (DE) - architect Copenhagen - Denmark		
GD022 SHORTLISTED	durch'lässig	Johannes Pilz (AT) - architect Rotterdam - The Netherlands		
SL978 SHORTLISTED	Collaging Continuity	Filippo Nanni (IT) - architect Oslo - Norway	Lucia Zamponi (IT) - architect Fabio Gigone (IT) - architect Angela Gigliotti (IT) - architect	Marco Gambaré (IT) - student in architecture Margherita Borroni (IT) - student in architecture Francesca Piraino (IT) - student in architecture
WA662 SHORTLISTED	Graz in transition	Nikolas Kichler (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich	Paul Adrian Schulz (DE) - architect Michael Fürst (AT) - architect Daniel Schür (AT) - architect	
YP626 SHORTLISTED	(SUB)URBAN ECOSYSTEM	Katja Ševerkar (SI) - architect Ljubljana - Slovenia		Miha Munda (SI) - student in architecture ROK STAUDACHER (SI) - student in architecture Amrož Bartol (SI) - student in architecture Dominik Košak (SI) - student in architecture RYAN NEIHEISER (US) - architect
AX274	URBAN VILLAGE	Xristina Argyros (GR) - architect London - Great Britain		
BW417	SMART Office Home Office	Di Zhang (CN) - architect Beijing - China	John Paul Young (GB) - architect Pieter Ruben Bergambagt (NL) - architect	
EQ080	GRAZ EKIMAE	Matthias Neuendorf (AT) - architect Salzburg - Österreich		
GU504	URBAN NETWORK	Julia Klassen (DE) - architect Hamburg - Germany	Christoff Oltmann (DE) - architect Friedrich Bentler (DE) - architect	
GX882	OPENING WESTERN DOORS	DANIEL TEIXIDOR (ES) - architect Wien - Österreich	VICTORIA MAYA (ES) - architect JULIA EIBEL (AT) - architect	VALENTIN HOFER (AT) - student in architecture
HX593	Hanging Gardens	Antoine Colback (BE) - architect Genappe - Belgium	Christophe Van Raemdonck (BE) - architect	
JH225	Typical life	MATTHIEU BOUSTANY (FR) - architect Saint Maur - France	Anna BAKHLINA (RU) - architect	
JK597	Sponge	Marcello Galotto (IT) - architect Venezia - Italy	Rampazzo Alessandra (IT) - architect De Rossi Martino (IT) - architect	Vivan Martina (IT) - architect
KB780	BAHNHOFberg	Miguel Fernandez-Galiano (ES) - architect Madrid - Spain	José Sanz Gorordo (ES) - architect Laia Cervelló Sabatés (ES) - architect Regina Valle Viudes (ES) - architect Alfonso Rengifo Cavestany (ES) - architect	Marta Criado del Rey Arana (ES) - student in architecture Luis Gómez Hernández (ES) - student in architecture Javier Núñez Pérez-Seoane (ES) - student in architecture
IN706	(in)BETWEEN PUBLIC SPACES	OVIDIU MIČSA (RO) - architect Timisoara - Romania	GABRIELA PAȘCU (RO) - architect	A. - ȘERBAN MIHĂILESCU (RO) - student in architecture PAUL - EMANUEL FICUȚ (RO) - student in architecture EDUARD BENGA (RO) - student in architecture DAN - RĂZVAN DINU (RO) - student in architecture FLORIN SIMIDREANU (RO) - student in architecture NICODIM LEZEU (RO) - student in architecture RAUL - IOAN FEIER (RO) - student in architecture F. - OVIDIU PANTALICI (RO) - student in architecture



NW553	SOFT CELLS	Miklós Oroszlány (HU) - architect Budapest - Hungary	Anna Losonczi (HU) - architect Levente Gulyás (HU) - architect Zsolt Krausz (HU) - architect András Gyökér (HU) - architect Bálint Halász (HU) - architect Julia LOSONCZI (HU) - architect	Benedek Kupi (HU) - student in architecture
OH884	CURTRAIN RISES	Adrian Ruera Julian (ES) - architect Costa Adeje - Spain	Carmona García Juan Jesús (ES) - architect	Martín de la Torre V. Javier (ES) - graphic designer
PB988	KALEIDOSCOPIIC URBANISM	Ali SEGHATOLESAMI (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich		
QS516	the many faces	Luis Navarro Jover (ES) - architect Novelda - Spain	Sánchez Zaragoza Alejandro (ES) - architect Botí Sarró Jose Javier (ES) - architect Sánchez García Carlos (ES) - architect	Martín Martínez Nuria (ES) - student in architecture Melero Beviá Alfonso (ES) - student in architecture
QY533	WEST LEND GRAZ	Tim Luking (AT) - architect Graz - Österreich	Patrick Matischweiger (AT) - student in arch. Berhard Spies (AT) - architect Heinz Tschiedl (AT) - student in architecture Gerald Weismann (AT) - student in architecture	
RJ113	train town	Irene Hrdina (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich		
RL252	B-side	Valentín Kokudev (BG) - architect La Roca del Vallès - Belgium	Anna PADILLA CORCHO (ES) - architect	
RO068	Graz - tres torres habemus	Michael Daane Bolter (NL) - architect Den Haag - The Netherlands	Dorus Meurs (NL) - architect	
RS467	the silhouette city	LOLO RODRIGUEZ (ES) - architect Cordoba - Spain		
SH664	Stadt Land Fluss	Susanna Haneder (DE) - architect Munich - Germany	Plamena Lalova (BG) - architect	
TD438	flexibility	Georg Hansemann (AT) - architect Graz - Österreich	David Kacic (AT) - student in architecture	
XN535	Enfilade	Carlota de Gispert Sampera (ES) - architect Barcelona - Spain	Clara Vidal Riera (ES) - architect Paula Garcia Valdecasas (ES) - architect Lucia Millet Ferrater (ES) - architect Marta Armengol Suquet (ES) - architect Anna Lonch Sentís (ES) - architect Marta Benedicto Izquierdo (ES) - architect Ivet Gasol Escuer (ES) - architect	Eric PALAU MAYO (ES) - student in architecture Gemma Parera Vilardebò (ES) - student in architecture
XP789	IN BETWEEN	Ivo Dos Santos Henriques (PT) - architect Mataró - Spain	Florencia Finsterwald Grieco (ES) - architect	
YO537	SIEBEN HÖFE	FRANCESCO Tomasi (IT) - architect Casier - Italy		
ZT432	City On The Tracks	Alexander Giarlis (GR) - architect Rotterdam - The Netherlands	Brigitte Lenz (AT) - architect	Martin Gallovsky (SK) - 3D designer Maria Derevencova (SK) - 3D designer Jonas Brazys (LT) - student in architecture Anna Hagen (AT) - student in architecture
ZT522	lines, points, fields	Ernst Gruber (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich	Michael Klein (AT) - architect urbanist Christina Lenart (AT) - architect urbanist	



## LINZ

Code	Title	Team Representative	Associates	Contributors
<b>AS609</b> WINNER	ALL TOMORROW'S PARTIES	Benni EDER (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich	Theresa KRENN (AT) - architect	
<b>ZD169</b> SPECIAL MENTION	LinkingLinz	Sofia SOLANS (ES) - architect Madrid - Spain	Isabel SANCHEZ (ES) - architect María VASALLO (ES) - architect	
<b>CW890</b> SHORTLISTED	A 21st Century Housing Zoo	Philipp Oberthaler (AT) - architect urbanist Wien - Österreich	Gerhard Flora (IT) - architect urbanist Laura Amann (AT) - architect urbanist Rainer Ausserer (AT) - architect urbanist	Veronika Mungenast (AT) - landscape architect GENNADII Vall (UA) - 3D designer María Honcharuk (UA) - 3D designer Dmytro Lutsak (UA) - student in architecture Christian Eibel (AT) - student in architecture
<b>TM151</b> SHORTLISTED	INVISIBLE OED	Sandra Gnigler (AT) - architect Linz - Österreich	Gunar Wilhelm (AT) - architect	
<b>XS115</b> SHORTLISTED	RIGHT TO CREATE	Varun Amar KAUSHIK (IN) - architect Kielce - Poland	Agata Majcherska (PL) - architect	GOLABEK Malgorzata (PL) - student in architecture
<b>AH005</b>	1KM LIMIT EXPERIENCE	Antonio Fuentes Ruiz (ES) - architect PARACUELLOS DEL JARAMA - Spain	DEL C. HERNANDEZ ENRIQUE (ES) - arch.	MATEU JURADO ALBERT (ES) - 3D designer
<b>AN522</b>	DER ERSTE PLATZ	Beatriz Alés Gregori (ES) - architect Castello - Spain		
<b>GH544</b>	WINTER GARDEN	SALCEDO GARCIA HECTOR (ES) - architect Seville - Spain	MONGE FERNANDEZ JAVIER (ES) - architect	RODRIGUEZ CARRASCOSA MARIEM (ES) - architect RODRIGUEZ BARBUDO JOSE JAVIER (ES) - architect
<b>HJ601</b>	UPDATING LANDSCAPES FOR PEOPLE	Cantos Mateos Gonzalo (ES) - architect Seville - Spain	Gutiérrez Herrera Miguel (ES) - architect	
<b>OF271</b>	DENSITY VARIETY IDENTITY	Tomas Labanc (SK) - architect Barcelona - Spain		Maria Eugenia Silva (ES) - architect Sara Neglia (IT) - architect
<b>QR569</b>	Ókolyzer	Thomas Thanner (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich		
<b>RD532</b>	programmatic GROUNDSQUARES	Ricardo García Navia (ES) - architect Costa Adeje, Tenerife - Spain	Tortosa Esquembre Ruth (ES) - architect Martínez-A. González MARIANA (ES) - arch.	Gomez MARIANA (VE) - architect Savedra M <sup>o</sup> Ines (BO) - architect
<b>UG952</b>	CONSTRUCED LANDSCAPES	Robin Sutherland (GB) - architect North Berwick - Great Britain	Timothy Ingleby (BG) - architect	Archie CantWELI (GB) - student in architecture
<b>WI743</b>	FOLLOW THE YELLOW BRICK ROAD	Ricardo Puerta Bragado (ES) - architect Madrid - Spain	Manuel David Romero Rodríguez (ES) - arch.	Nicole Rodríguez Mejía (DO) - spatial planner
<b>YM689</b>	COLLABORATIVE DUALISM	EIRINI GIANNAKOPOULOU (GR) - architect Torino - Italy		
<b>ZN818</b>	YOU AND ME / re-inhabiting the in-between	Leonardo ZUCCARO MARCHI (IT) - architect Padova - Italy		A. Crispino Iannello (IT) - drawing technician



## ST. PÖLTEN

Code	Title	Team Representative	Associates	Contributors
VJ839 WINNER	Ju(mp) in the water - kiss the frog	Francesco MARRAS (IT) – architect Bonarcado – Italy	Federico ARU (IT) – architect Adriano DESSI' (IT) – architect Philip GROSCH (IT) – architect Aurora PERRA (IT) – architect Silvia MOCCI (IT) – engineer-architect Francesca OGGIANO (IT) – engineer-architect Vera SERIAKOV (AT) – architect urbanist	Federico SERCIS (IT) – student in architecture
OM575 RUNNER UP	THE ELASTIC CITY	Nela KADIC (AT) – architect urbanist Wien – Österreich	Konrad BASAN (PL) – architect	
ME856 SPECIAL MENTION	A(US)TRIUM	Jakub PUDO (PL) – architect Sosnowiec – Poland	Ewa ODYJAS (PL) – architect Agnieszka MORG (PL) – architect Fabio CAVATERRA (IT) – architect	
NS530 SPECIAL MENTION	OSMOSE	Luis MASIA MASSONI (ES) – architect urbanist Paris – France		
EM645 SHORTLISTED	REMEMBRANCE & FREEDOM	F. Javier Castellano Pulido (ES) - architect Granada - Spain		
AD390	CUBE SCAPE	Yvonne Biering (DE) - architect Wien – Österreich	Christoph Koehler (AT) - architect Marc Lorenz (AT) - architect	
EA974	PARK VILLAGE	Rainer Strele (AT) - architect Wien – Österreich		
EI507	SHARING GARDEN	Federico Cheloni (IT) - architect Formaci di Barga - Italy	Matteo Chelazzi (IT) - architect Giulio Margheri (IT) - architect	
FE101	SHARING THE STRIPS	Mathias Aguilar (FR) - architect Paris – France	Amandine Quillent (FR) - architect urbanist	
FE342	Das Glück liegt auf der Straße	Isa Wolke (DE) - architect Wien – Österreich	Lisi Zeininger (AT) - architect Katalin Tóth (HU) - architect Frank Schwenk (DE) - architect	MARTIN SABBATINI (AR) - architect MARIANA TELLERIA (AR) - architect
HP471	COLLECTIVE THRESHOLDS	Andres Lupianez (NI) - architect Barcelona - Spain	JOAN GALLEGO (ES) - architect MERCEDES DOZ (ES) - architect	
IF947	St Pölten Zentrum Nord	Carmen Fuentes Ruiz (ES) - architect Zürich - Switzerland		
IJ716	COMMONS GENERATOR	Julia Nuler (AT) - architect Wien – Österreich	Theresa Häfele (AT) - architect Corina Liliana Negrita (RO) - architect	Matthäa Ritter (AT) - architect
JF144	Sankt Pölten: Building for growth and adaptability	Stefano Marcinkiewicz (IT) - architect Milano - Italy	Colombo Riccardo Maria (IT) - arch. urbanist Berlendis Jacopo (IT) - architect	Romano Andrea (IT) - 3D designer
LY046	LINES & MARKS IN NATURE	Paolo Russo (IT) - architect Sassari - Italy	Fabiana Ledda (IT) - architect Annamaria Gatto (IT) - architect Antonio Cugusi (IT) - architect	Riccardo Onnis (IT) - student in architecture
MO463	HORTUS NOVUS	Jacopo Tiso (IT) - architect Venezia - Italy	CHIARA PAONE (IT) - architect ANDREA FOGLIO PARA (IT) - architect ELEONORA MOLARO (IT) - architect MATTEO CALLEGARI (IT) - architect MATTEO PAIANO (IT) - architect	
ND948	BORN TO BE WILD	Jaime Diz Sanz - (ES) - architect Madrid - Spain	R. de Landázuri Monagas (ES) - architect Ignacio Garcia Martinez (ES) - architect	Sergio Perera Concepción (ES) - student in architecture
OD367	Over - Garden	VINCENZO TUCCILLO (IT) - architect Como - Italy	MARIAGRAZIA PANUNZIO (IT) - architect MARINA BARBIERI (IT) - graphic designer LORENZO GAUDIANO (IT) - environmentalist	
OG377	INTO THE WOODS	CHRISTIAN Alvarez Gomez (ES) - architect Madrid - Spain		SUAZES MILFORD TOMAS (ES) - student in architecture



<b>OV795</b>	DIE #SEHNSUCHT DES HERRN K	Kristina Zaunschirm (AT) - architect Wien – Österreich			
<b>RG489</b>	GLANZVOLLE AUSSICHT(EN)	Juri Franck (DE) - architect Korb - Germany		Martin Kurz (DE) - architect urbanist	
<b>TG954</b>	LIVING IN THE WOODS	Louisa VARELIDI (GR) - architect urbanist London - Great Britain		Stella PAPAZOGLU (GR) - architect urbanist	
<b>TZ619</b>	AM TRAISENDAMM	Gerhard Girsch (AT) - architect Wien – Österreich		Barbara Chen (AT) - archit.and urban theorist Denise S. Girsch (AT) - architect urbanist	Zhaofeng Chen (AT) - student in architecture
<b>VO670</b>	BUILD IN CITY	MICHELE Roveri (IT) - architect Bologna - Italy		SARA MAZZOLI (IT) - architect	
<b>WC952</b>	THREE IN ST PÖLTEN	PARDO GONZALO (ES) - architect Madrid - Spain			
<b>WZ385</b>	DIE VIERTE KANTE	Yvan Okotnikoff (FR) - architect Paris – France		Mathieu DELORME (FR) - landscape architect Thibault BARBIER (FR) - landscape architect Aurélien Delchet (FR) - architect Jordan Aucant (FR) - architect urbanist Arthur Poirret (FR) - architect urbanist Lola Marthoux (FR) - architect Anne Levalois (FR) - architect urbanist	Adele Sorge (FR) - student in architecture Julie-Alisson Ducros (FR) - architect Claire Aquilina (FR) - student in architecture
<b>XK984</b>	CROSS CITY	Sara Galasso (IT) - architect Krems an der Donau - Österreich			Galasso Corrado (IT) - student in landscape Pincchetti Sara (IT) - student



## WIEN

Code	Title	Team Representative	Associates	Contributors
<b>JP322</b> WINNER	PUBLICQUARTIER	Blaž BABNIK ROMANIUK (SI) - architect Ljubljana - Slovenia	Anna KRAVCOVA (SI) - architect Dušan STUPAR (SI) - landscape architect	Dragan POPOVIĆ (RS) - 3D designer
<b>AQ531</b> SHORTLISTED	Liminal City	Jorge BARRENO CARDIEL (ES) - architect Glasgow - Great Britain	Almodovar Ruiz Francisco (ES) - architect Marhuenda Serrano Ángel (ES) - architect Liaca Bastardo José Luis (ES) - architect Ortiz Maciá Salvador (ES) - architect Muñoz Ruano María (ES) - architect Fabi Christine (AT) - architect Molina Planelles Rafa (ES) - architect Diana Silvestru (RO) - sociologist	Utrero González Víctor (ES) - architect
<b>SI060</b> SHORTLISTED	Integrating Clusters   Increasing Diversity	Claudiu SILVESTRU (RO) - architect urbanist Wien - Österreich		
<b>CR949</b>	donau STADT zentrum	Andrei Gheorghe (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich	Samina Gheorghe (AT) - architect	
<b>DE852</b>	MOSAik	Andrea Rosetti (IT) - architect Motta di Livenza - Italy	Frisiero Marta (IT) - architect	
<b>DI324</b>	adaptABILITY	Maurizio Riccardo Caudullo (IT) - architect Motta Sant'Anastasia - Italy	Erika Elisabetta Raneri (IT) - engineer architect Teresa Arrabito (IT) - engineer architect	
<b>KJ694</b>	VIENNA - GREEN LIGHT CIRCULATIONS	FRANCISCO DE ASIS P. ORTIZ (ES) - architect Granada - Spain	JOSE MARIA C. BARRERAS (ES) - architect JOSE LUIS MUÑOZ MUÑOZ (ES) - architect ALBERTO COBOS ALVAREZ (ES) - architect MARTA CERVERA VILLENA (ES) - architect	PAOLA CARPINETO (IT) - environmentalist JORGE CONTRERAS UBRIC (ES) - student in architecture ANA VICTORIA GONZÁLEZ LOBO (ES) - architect SERGIO SICILIANO (IT) - architect ANDREA TREMANTI (IT) - interior architect ELENA MARIA L. GUERRERO (ES) - student in architecture SILVIA CABRERA JIMÉNEZ (ES) - student in architecture MANUEL GODOY ROMÁN (ES) - architect DAVID CAMILO DE LAS ERAS (ES) - architect LUIS M. KIRSCHBERG (ES) - architect LUIS MARIA VILLAR PÉREZ (ES) - architect MARÍA DEL C. R. MORENO (ES) - student in architecture LUCÍA UBEDA TRUJILLO (ES) - artist FÁTIMA CASTILLA ORTIZ (ES) - architect MARÍA LALOMA GÓMEZ (ES) - architect ANGELO NASO (IT) - artist RAÚL VÍCTOR GÓMEZ (ES) - writer ESTER GARCÍA GALINDO (ES) - student in architecture ANA BELÉN GIRELA TRUJILLO (ES) - journalist SARA PAVÓN CASTILLERO (ES) - architect JUAN JOSE TENORIO FEIXAS (ES) - architect DANIEL USERO GUERRERO (ES) - building engineer OLMO JOSÉ V. DE LOS REYES (ES) - movie director ALICIA MARIA GOMEZ QUIRANTES (ES) - architect ANA MATEOS TERRÓN (ES) - student in architecture FÁTIMA MORENO LÓPEZ (ES) - painter LETICIA SÁNCHEZ BALSALOBRE (ES) - writer MARIA DOLORES HERRADOR MOLINA (ES) - writer
<b>O1694</b>	The Module	Valeria Pagani (IT) - landscaper Geneve - Switzerland	Federico Gonzalez Leone (AR) - architect	



<b>OT605</b>	KAGRAN'S NEW HUMAN FLOW	Stefano Rosselli (IT) - landscape architect Copenhagen - Denmark	Martina Rubino (IT) - architect Ana Barbosa (PT) - landscape architect Ana Fernandes (PT) - landscape architect Roy Straathof (NL) - landscape architect Fernando Teijeiro (ES) - landscape architect	
<b>ZL946</b>	VIENNA'S RIBBON	Millán Villamuelas Joaquín (ES) - architect Madrid - Spain		Marta Fernández-Bermejo (ES) - student in architecture Laura López Aspiroz (ES) - architect Estefanía María A. Reboredo (VE) - student in architecture Ángel Gabriel Álamo Álamo (ES) - student in architecture Joyce Kimi Nakano (BR) - student in architecture Estibaliz Díaz de Zúñiga (ES) - student in architecture





**BRUCK / MUR**

NATIONS	OFFICE
AT	6
IT	3
NL	2
FR	2
CH	1
DE	1
ES	1
GB	1
US	1

9 18

NATIONS	PEOPLE
IT	15
AT	13
ES	12
DE	4
FR	4
RU	2
BE	1
BG	1
CA	1
GB	1
GR	1
IN	1
LV	1

13 57

**GRAZ**

NATIONS	OFFICE
AT	8
IT	7
NL	3
FR	2
DE	2
BE	2
IT	2
NO	1
DK	1
SI	1
GB	1
CN	1
RO	1
HU	1

14 33

NATIONS	PEOPLE
ES	34
AT	21
RO	12
IT	12
HU	9
DE	6
SI	5
NL	4
GR	2
BE	2
BG	2
SK	2
CN	1
FR	1
GB	1
LT	1
PT	1
RU	1
US	1

19 118

**LINZ**

NATIONS	OFFICE
ES	8
AT	4
IT	2
GB	1
PL	1

5 16

NATIONS	PEOPLE
ES	19
AT	10
IT	4
UA	3
GB	2
PL	2
IN	1
BG	1
BO	1
DO	1
GR	1
SK	1
VE	1

13 47

**ST. PÖLTEN**

NATIONS	OFFICE
AT	8
IT	7
ES	5
FR	3
CH	1
DE	1
GB	1
PL	1

8 27

NATIONS	PEOPLE
IT	36
AT	14
ES	12
FR	12
DE	5
PL	4
AR	2
GR	2
HU	1
NI	1
RO	1

11 90

**WIEN**

NATIONS	OFFICE
AT	2
ES	2
IT	2
SI	1
CH	1
DK	1
GB	1

7 10

NATIONS	PEOPLE
ES	43
IT	12
AT	3
SI	3
PT	2
RO	2
AR	1
BR	1
NL	1
RS	1
VE	1

11 70