



EUROPAN A

# EUROPAN 12

## Austria, Kosovo, Hungary

Minutes of the second jury session: **Austrian Sites**

Paris, 10. & 11.11.2013

Austria	Amstetten
	Graz
	Wien Kagran
	Wien Siemensäcker
Kosovo	Gjilan
Hungary	Budapest

## EuropAN 12 Austria, Kosovo, Hungary

Sunday, November 10 & 11, 2013, CND, Paris

1:00pm – 7:00pm and 09:30am – 6:00pm

Present: Voting members of the jury:

A: REPRESENTATIVES OF CLIENTS

**Jürg Degen**, head of department of urban development, Basel (CH)

**Elisabeth Merk**, head of department of urban development, Munich (DE)

B: URBAN / ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

**Henri Bava**, Landscape Architect, AGENCE TER, Professor at the TU Karlsruhe, Paris/Karlsruhe (FR)

**Christoph Luchsinger**, Architect, Professor at the TU Vienna, Luzern/Vienna (CH)

**Markus Pernthaler**, Architect, Graz/Vienna (AT)

**Marcel Smets**, Architect, Professor at the KU Leuven/Belgium (BE)

C: PERSONALITY

**Michelle Provoost**, Architectural Historian, Director of the International New Town Institute (INTI) in Almere, the Netherlands (NL)

REPRESENTATIVE EUROPAN HUNGARY

**Peter Istvan Balogh**, Landscape Architect, Phd., Associate Professor at Corvinus University, Budapest (HU)

REPRESENTATIVE EUROPAN KOSOVO

**Lulzim Kabashi**, Architect, Zagreb (HR)

Present: EUROPAN (non-voting):

**Bernd Vlay**, Architect, General Secretary EuropAN Austria

**Pia Spiesberger**, Architect, Member of EuropAN Austria

**Rron Tresi**, Architect, General Secretary of EuropAN Kosovo

**Arpad Szabo**, Architect, National Coordinator of EuropAN Hungary



**EUROPAN A**

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

The jury decides unanimously to nominate:

Michelle Provoost as president of the jury.

Marcel Smets as vice president of the jury.

The jury consists of 9 votes for all sites.

Bernd Vlay 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.

1st prize: 12.000€ runner up: 6.000€

The jury decides to first discuss the projects, then to make a further preselection and leave the final decision for the second jury day, afternoon of Monday 11<sup>th</sup> of Nov.

Michelle Provoost, president of the second jury.

Distribution of first prize and runners up

In between the 4 Austrian sites the prizes (in total 4 winners and 4 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 European competition.

Preliminary remarks (Marcel Smets)

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

At the same time the jury has to consider that European 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 European 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.

## **GRAZ**

### **BB533 FOXES & HEDGEHODGS**

“The fox knows a lot of things but the hedgehog only knows one big thing” – the project translates this quote from an ancient Greek text in a typological strategy: fox-buildings are carpet-type-buildings, open for a variety of programs; Hedgehogs are multi-storey point types, specialized on housing.

What binds these two types together in terms of space?

It looks like a chess game of figures which does not result in an urban plan, rather providing an additive and random collection of urban types.

Although the In-between spaces are described, they are absent in the plan, showing the in-between as a big white surface, which is left over.

Markus Pernthaler introduces the context of the Smart City project, which embeds the European site in its context. Instead of developing a plan for the whole extended study site area, the brief was asking for a detailed response to the strategic challenge of the project site: the school development is not clear in the future, this is why the projects have to develop an urban plan that provides scenarios with different options, switching between housing and school program and respecting the heavy traffic road which will not be relieved from traffic in the future – in addition to heavy load and car traffic a tramway route will be implemented.

The project does not respond to the condition of the noise. If one considers that the brief asks only for a built-intervention on the western side of the road, the remnants of foxes and hedgehogs do not establish a concept any more, losing the critical mass which they would need in order to understand the intention of the project.

### **GF328 SMART BASE**

Uses two rather remote references of Hilbersheimer and SANAA, the project establishes a unifying structure, aesthetically and programmatically, absorbing school and housing with urban uses in one single structure.

Concerning the issue of tabula rasa and the value of the existing buildings, Markus Pernthaler explains that the buildings are in a rather bad condition and that a smart reactivation would have to be considered as a cultural reference to the industrial history of the site. The topic of preservation was given as a choice for the competitors.



**EUROPAN A**

The proposal is highly schematic, 'What happens with the ground floor surface when there is no school?'

The north-south orientation of the housing is not convincing and not addressing the noise issue. On the other hand the orientation of the blocks does not block the open view to the western hills for the surrounding areas. Although the project demonstrates a convincing rigidity, the performance of its scale and inner programming is problematic. The blocks are too slim; the vertical organization of the housing program does not address the problematic interface between the privacy of living and the common uses on the roof (no in-between between public and private).

East-west Crossing is considered not to be sufficient (one urban connection as an inner pathway)

There is a certain paradox if one reflects Hilbersheimer's concept of a lower city and an upper city, being based on separation, whereas the intention here seems to be one of integration.

In the end the project suggests an interesting ambiguity, being object and structure at the same time. This ambiguity results in a series of contradictions which could be described as a paradox: a structure which is too open and therefore has too many constraints. A structure for one architect, an open system with a gated neighbourhood, a megastructure with no flexibility for phasing. A nice archipelago for communal spaces inside without references to the public space outside.

## **IA264 THE BUCKET LIST – FEEL THE CITY**

The project creates a whole set of proposals to increase and trigger people's emotions in relation to a variety of qualities which are created out of the "already there" of the place, reading its potential as a mixture of actions, situations and spatial developments. It follows that the overall plan is edited as a manual which suggests a series of steps to be taken: organizing intermediary events, activating objects through competitions, promoting informal zones and fringe-area for everyday situations and desires. The manual introduces the identity of the area as the amalgam of hard- and software operations, in which infrastructural interventions (bridge), re-cycling of abandoned structures (industrial shed) and technological topics are linked to scenarios of appropriations by different people.



The response to the different urban situations is sensitive, providing a flexible framework, the implementation in phases seems to be possible;

For parts of the jury the megastructure along the road is a rather rude and problematic proposal. Although the structure looks open its flexibility can be questioned. As well the question of permeability is not addressed convincingly: how does the translucent, semi-transparent structure appear when it will be filled up?

On the other hand, the suggested configuration and strategy make the project the only one which introduces a credible urban atmosphere, giving identity to the road and making visible all kind of possible activities which should be there, providing an urban vision for the place.

### **LG 181 POLYRHYTHMIC FIELDS**

The concept of a polyrhythmic landscape, which receives the different rhythms of its inhabitants, is seen as a convincing approach, introducing the added value of a 24-hour-use of green spaces. Moreover, a chessboard-system suggests an intensification of the relationship between clusters of built development and green areas, at the same time offering a balanced interface between built development and outdoor spaces.

The transversal small access roads appear as micro public spaces, defining the rhythm of the chess-board system.

Numerous smart city elements (gardens/green houses on the roof, local food productions, etc) complement the design concept. Parts of the jury consider the diagrammatic approach to be too technical and boring, but maybe this inconspicuous appropriateness is exactly the quality of the project, showing a sensitive consideration of the surroundings. The jury observes a certain ambiguity between site specificity and a generic diagram, addressing a system of guidelines for a follow up procedure. Rather than a project, it seems to be a "pre-project", before the arrival of architecture.

The jury agrees that in the case of Graz the strategy of a programmatic openness is decisive. Which of the projects is flexible enough for what is coming up? The first implementation step will be a study for the winning team in order to deal with the concrete program.

The plea is made to eliminate BB533 & GF328:

yes/no 8/1 = eliminated



**EUROPAN A**

The ambition of the city is a lively urban vision neighbourhood, which is clearly better addressed in the Bucket List-project (IA264). On the other hand, Polyrythmic Fields (LG181) offers a framework which has a higher development potential, even if the urban vision is not so explicit and the architectural qualities are still absent.

For the moment the jury agrees not to vote for a winning project: both projects demonstrate qualities but none of them seems to be a clear winner. The jury prefers to continue with the other sites and come back to the final decision later.



## **AMSTETTEN**

### **BX808 RAILITAGE**

The project introduces a mix between an ecological and a heritage approach, in which the global vision is not very clearly articulated! What is the relationship between heritage and ecology?

The project restricts the brief too much to a question of merely local qualities, showing a lack of coherence between the sites, ignoring the competition brief.

The brief demands to link the sites with a masterplan, but the project relies rather on the implementation of high-quality individual architectures, which makes the urban strategy very vulnerable.

Project site nr 1 is the most appropriate response to the context, the other interventions are not so convincing. The structure of project site nr 1 is attractive but will never be realised.

Especially the response on project site nr 3 (complementing the engine shed) is not convincing.

### **EM320 PERISCOPES**

The project provokes with a controversial starting point: to make a wall as a link. With the wall the project fixes the dimension of the area along the railway tracks.

The response of the sensitive reading of the regional context is rather a work of art than an urban strategy, using, to give an example, literally the technique of screening in order to relate the place to its wider context.

It is very harsh to say that this part of Amstetten is a place without an identity.

The project can be seen as a work which is specifically made for the idea's part of the European-competition, bringing topics on the table whose discussion enriches the perspectives of the place, working rather as an installation, addressing performance, temporariness and city festivals with "historical costumes"

The jury appreciates the productive historical dimension of the project, e.g. the proposal of an inside/out "castle" as a re-interpretation of the agricultural building types which now visit Amstetten, adapting their identities in order to cultivate the non-place of the European site.



**EUROPAN A**

## **PJ864 OPEN**

The project introduces a typological strategy, which suggests the deliberate distribution of a variety of urban types with an urban scale. These types are as much adaptable as they are suggesting a mix of uses, bringing a rather urban image and optimistic programmatic bandwidth to Amstetten.

Parts of the images remind the jury of a corporate campus, raising the question if the project is too urban and too dense.

On the other hand the combination of different typologies is interesting if one sees the proposal as an ambitious manual that triggers a dynamic discussion and process.

Concerning the balance between demand and proposal, project site nr1 shows the most convincing proposal.

The jury discusses the potential of the typological strategy: How open is OPEN?! Is the concept still strong if one reduces half of the density?

## **ZZ344 RAIL BANK RIVER**

The project offers a strong local network, its inconspicuous layout can be seen as an urban strategy which promotes modesty on a strategic level, offering flexible development of housing. On project site nr1 the proposed typology introduces two layers and isolates the space along the railtracks – for parts of the jury this is not a very appropriate approach.

The jury discusses the quality and scale of suggested housing development on project site nr3. Although there are convincing moments in the idea about the living environment, the chosen configuration of types and their “grain” are not convincing to parts of the jury.

Especially the fringes (row of housing in the south, “housing wall” to the rail tracks) do not respond appropriately to the situation. The project is full of good intentions which can be appreciated but unfortunately do not result in a quality which sufficiently meets the expectations.

The plea is made to eliminate BX808 (Railitage): yes/no 9/0 = eliminated  
It is not convincing to complete the engine shed geometrically to a circle.  
The project is too much reliant on the architectural quality.

The plea is made to eliminate EM320 (Periscopes) for first and second prize:  
yes/no 9/0 = eliminated

Although OPEN (PJ864) might be “far over the top” it shows a convincing approach on project site nr1. The way it opens up from the street and the way it makes an edge to the railway without blocking the flows lead to the creation of an inner urban quality. The urban configuration of a permeable ground figure offers a robust structure, larger cuts between the buildings would be possible without losing the project’s inner coherence. For the other competition sites the concrete solution might be less interesting than the strategy which the project offers for all of the sites; the idea to work with a mix of types which addresses the twofold identity of the place, giving the city a stronger vision about its options in the future. Especially interesting is the project’s relationship with the quality of horizontality: the development spreads out elegantly along the railtracks, being open to both sides, to the city and to the railway.

Rather than criticizing its exaggerated scale/density it might be interesting to see the potential of the typological strategy, opening up new visions for possible options.

The jury unanimously nominates PJ864 and ZZ344 for the prize category.

The plea is made to nominate PJ864 (Open) for first prize: yes/no 6/3

The plea is made to nominate ZZ344 (Railbank River) as runner up: yes/no 9/0

## **WIEN KAGRAN**

Presentation of all three projects:

### **ER202 KALEIDOSCOPE**

Hybrid high-density blocks create vertically organized micro-environments, absorbing the car-infrastructure in their mixed-used-basement; housing develops on top of the basement-block.

### **ZZ810 MONUMENT IN FERTILE COUNTRY**

A remarkable analysis of the urban development-pattern, based on a collage of coherent patterns which follow the historical plots of agriculture; elevated pedestrian bridges provide a connection to the surroundings; at the tramline the project suggest a square; the relationship between the large-scale-analysis and the project is not so clear.

### **RA980 EN POINTE**

Arches create a generous public space on ground-level which is animated by numerous programs; Being not based on any historical analysis of the site the project can be seen as a tabula-rasa insertion of an urban environment with generic historical references to the idea of urbanity, Housing is accommodated within the bars that hover on top of the arches; due to their equal heights the parallel bars form a horizontal roofscape of partly public spaces, being connected by bridges; the bars also serve as connecting elements to the neighbouring area across the highway.

Common in all three projects:

A base structure with housing above, avoiding a monofunctional program.

Among the incoming projects these 3 are the most radical ones.

Christoph Luchsinger reminds the jury of the discussion in the preselection-round, recommending all three preselected projects to be given a runner up prize in order to allow a deeper exploration of their specific approaches in a dialogue-based planning procedure after the competition, also considering the possibility to improve the approaches through combining certain ideas in a new way.



**EUROPAN A**

The plea is made to nominate all three projects as runners-up that shall be developed further on in a cooperative planning procedure: yes /no 8/1

## **WIEN SIEMENSÄCKER**

### **AT162 GRASSSTITCH**

The project uses a block structure with a central green connection to the train stop, introducing a familiar urban strategy.

Would the idea of Grassstich also work if we only consider site 1, or would it be rather a fragment whose potential will only unfold if the project is completed to the north?

Grassstich is a traditional project, showing a quite “normal” masterplan without anything exciting, but also without anything wrong. On the one hand, there is a lack of innovation, on the other hand the familiar grid system has high flexibility in time, the ideas are not so bad, but not so surprising or innovative either. For a winner of Europän, the jury expects for more innovative impulses.

### **MB511 CLUSTER STREETSCAPE**

°The project suggests an overall landscape strategy introducing strips of landscape on several locations in the surroundings and on the project and study site area. In general the jury highly appreciates the landscape approach as a strategy to create structure and identity without restricting too much the built development along the landscaped strips.

°At certain locations the simple systematic system turns out to be too schematic: the orientation and configuration of the strips on the Europän site do not convincingly connect to the train stop, a fact which can easily be improved in the future steps of implementation.

The arrangement of a sequence of generic building-islands along the green strips allow for a maximum of variety in the built development with a convincing spatial syntax.

Therefore it is easily possible to react on different types and a certain range of density within the system (it shall be tested if it is possible to reach the density given in the competition brief). The project is highly adaptable, and offers stable qualities through a certain robustness: being rather a promising scheme than a fully detailed design the open future of Siemens can be easily embedded.

### **DF936 URBAN SOFTWARE**

Based on a comprehensive development matrix that works with parameters of participation, object-development, configuration of types, living models, and dynamics of growth.



Even more radical than Cluster Streetscape, the project does not deliver an architectural design but a manual, which suggests possible scenarios of development. Especially convincing is the commitment in the development of the housing programme, which reappears as a productive coexistence between different living-models. The mixing of these models provokes and enriches the rhythms of the living programme so that a new syntax for community life seems to be possible, emerging out of the living-programme itself. In the way how the project addresses the activation of in-between spaces through its construction of “diverse” neighbourhood, “urban software” demonstrates a contemporary response to the dominance of housing within recent urban developments – urbanity becomes an ingredient of the living programme. Facing a successful implementation process the proposed matrix is dependent from the exceptional commitment of the developers, which will have to face a highly complex implementation process beyond routine. Parts of the jury question if the dependency on complexification is the right response in this context.

For parts of the jury the random assembly of types on site 1 are problematic, especially when it comes to the relation between density and the mixed typological configuration. The axonometry’s scale (site 1) does not correspond to the proposed density, lacking an appropriate reaction to the neighbouring areas (single family homes). The overall concept shows a fragmenting approach; especially the hybrid objects of study area 2 create doubts about their programmatic adaptability.

Cluster Streetscape and Urban Software show highly interesting approaches. Considering the pressure of a fast forward going implementation process, the simplicity of Cluster Streetscape seems to be more appropriate.

The plea is made to keep AT162:     yes/no   2/7

The plea is made to keep NM195:    yes/no   0/9

The plea is made to nominate MB511 (Cluster Streetscape) for first prize: yes/no   8/1

The plea is made to nominate DF936 (Urban Software) for first prize:        yes/no   1/8

The plea is made to nominate DF936 (Urban Software) for runner up:        yes/no   9/0

## LUNCH BREAK

Rron Tresi, secretary of Europán Kosovo, explains the importance to give a clear and strong sign to the city. In case of one runner up-project the municipality needs to know clearly about the reasons to decide for a runner up, getting the information about the strong and the weak points of the project, and how to approach its potential in the follow-up procedure. The jury underline that the lack of a first prize demonstrates the necessity of reconsidering carefully the qualities of the nominated runner up project. Europán Austria offers to support Europán Kosovo in the implementation process.

## Special mentions

A special mention has to be an innovative project showing an exceptional approach which has not to be linked to the local site conditions at any prize, but must give an interesting impulse for the discussion on contemporary urbanistic and architectural discourse.





**EUROPAN A**

## FINAL DISCUSSIONS AND VOTES

### GRAZ

LG 181 POLYRHYTHMIC FIELDS as runner up:	yes/no 9/0
IA264 THE BUCKET LIST as runner up:	yes/no 9/0
The pleas is made to give GF328 SMART BASE a special mention:	yes/no 6/3

### AMSTETTEN

PJ864 OPEN as first prize:	yes/no 6/3
ZZ344 RAILBANK RIVER as runner up:	yes/no 9/0
The plea is made to give EM320 Periscopes a special mention	yes/no 9/0

### WIEN KAGRAN

The plea is made to nominate all three projects as 3 runners up:                    yes/no 8/1  
All three projects should be deepened further in the framework of a dialogue-based  
procedure which should start with a workshop reflecting on common potentials.

### WIEN SIEMENSÄCKER

MB511 CLUSTER STREETSCAPE as first prize:	yes/no 8/1
DF936 URBAN SOFTWARE as first prize:	yes/no 1/8
DF936 URBAN SOFTWARE as runner up:	yes/no 9/0



**EUROPAN A**

## FINAL RESULTS

### GRAZ

#### °Runner up: IA264 THE BUCKET LIST

Authors

**SEBASTIAN JENULL** (AT), architect

**SANDRA TANTSCHER** (AT), architect

Collaborators

**REINHILD WEINBERGER** (BR), architect

**WILFRIED STERING** (AT), building engineer

**THOMAS PERZ** (AT), computer graphic designer

#### °Runner up: LG 181 POLYRHYTHMIC FIELDS

Authors

**KATJA ALJAZ** (SI), architect

Collaborators

**MATEJ MEJAK** (SI), student in architecture

#### °Special mention: GF328 SMART BASE

Authors

**SALCEDO GARCIA HECTOR** (ES), architect

**MONGE FERNÁNDEZ JAVIER** (ES), architect

**RODRÍGUEZ CARRASCOSA MARIEM** (ES), architect

Collaborators

**RODRÍGUEZ BARBUDO JOSÉ JAVIER** (ES), student in architecture



**EUROPAN A**

## FINAL RESULTS

### AMSTETTEN

#### °Winner: PJ864 OPEN

AUTHORS

**RAMON BERNABE SIMO** (ES), architect

**TOMAS LABANC** (SK), architect

#### °Runner up: ZZ344 RAILBANK RIVER

AUTHORS

**TAO WANG** (CN), architect

**ZHE WANG** (CN), architect

**HUIBIAO WU** (CN), architect

**XIANJUN ZHOU** (CN), architect

COLLABORATORS

**ALESSANDRA MARCON** (IT), architect

#### °Special mention: EM320 PERISCOPES

AUTHORS

**GONZALO GUTIERREZ** (ES), architect

**ADRIÁ ESCOLANO** (ES), architect



**EUROPAN A**

## FINAL RESULTS

### WIEN KAGRAN

#### °Runner up: ER202 KALEIDOSCOPE

Authors

**HANS FOCKETYN** (BE), architect

**MIQUEL DEL RIO SANIN** (ES), architect

#### °Runner up: RA980 EN POINTE

Authors

**LORENA DEL RIO GIMENO** (ES), architect

Collaborators

**BHATIA NEERAJ** (CA), architect

**DEAN CARLY LILLIAN** (US), student in architecture

**ALICIA ELLEN HERGENROEDER** (US), student in architecture

**DE YI** (US), student in architecture

**JONATHAN DIETRICH NEGRON** (US), student in architecture

**WEI ZHAO** (CN), architect

#### °Runner up: ZZ810 MONUMENT IN FERTILE COUNTRY

Authors

**MARCO CORAZZA** (IT), architect

**CASTELLI GIULIA LUNELLA CAROLINA** (CH), architect

**ALESSANDRO MINGOLO** (IT), architect urbanist

Collaborators

**SILVIA MARTA FLAVIA DI STEFANO** (IT), student in architecture

**SARA SAGGIORATO** (IT), student in architecture

**GIULIA MININI** (IT), student in architecture

**DANIELE TORRESIN** (IT), student in architecture

**VICENZO DI SALVIA** (IT), graphic designer



**EUROPAN A**

## FINAL RESULTS

### WIEN SIEMENSÄCKER

#### °Winner: MB511 CLUSTER STREETSCAPE

Authors

**MIRIAM LISKOVA** (SK), architect

Collaborators

**MARIAN DUSINSKY** (SK), architect

#### °Runner up: DF936 URBAN SOFTWARE

Authors

**ENRIQUE ARENAS** (ES), architect

**LUIS BASABE** (ES), architect

**LUIS PALACIOS** (ES), architect

Collaborators

**ALMUDENA CANO** (ES), architect

**PAULA FERNÁNDEZ** (ES), student in architecture

**KERSTIN PLUCH** (AT), student in architecture

**ANA PRIETO** (ES), student in architecture



**EUROPAN A**

# EUROPAN 12

## Recommendations: Austrian Sites

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### GRAZ

Europan will manage a workshop with the two runner up teams, representatives of the city and Waagner-Biro. The two runner up teams shall respond to special questions which are not answered satisfyingly in their projects. For organizing the workshop and paying a fee to the teams, Europan will use the remaining prize money of 6.000 Euro.

### LG181 POLYRHYTHMIC FIELDS

How strongly are the free spaces dependent from the polyrhythmic concept?

What are the guidelines for the design-development of the project, leading to architectural quality?

How do the hybrid types perform?

- > What happens if the type splits in half?
- > Is the variation of heights possible?
- > What about the quality of the flats?

### IA264 BUCKET LIST

What about the idea of the megastructure concerning the necessary phases?

Necessary how it would really work if you split up in different phases. We don't know if it works if we split it up in different phases. How does the megastructure work in phases?

Quality of public space? What is it? To put the school in 6 floors is considered to be a problem, problem of depth. How is public space linked to each other? Is it really the right choice to bring the urbanity into the block?

1. Demonstration of the quality of public space, urbanity and their interrelationship
2. Description of the architectural motivation:
  - > relation between structural performance and symbolic representation (water, iconic object/historical structure).
  - > performance of the megastructure: flexibility (split up in different phases, reorganization of school, architectural value/assets of the megastructure (not only suggestive images)
  - > block structure on the east side/masterplan of the surroundings etc
  - > the appropriateness of the scale



**EUROPAN A**

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### AMSTETTEN

#### PJ864 OPEN

- >The issue of landscaping has to be addressed and improved strongly, the involvement of a landscape architect is highly recommended.
- >The openness of the in-between spaces has to be specified.
- >The idea of mixing different typologies has to be adapted when it comes to scale and demands: the development focus should not lie on the chosen result but on the conceptual system of mixing typologies in a certain manner.
- > A programmatic competition with the uses of the centre has to be avoided.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

### WIEN KAGRAN

#### ER202 KALEIDOSCOPE

- >issue of base = fundamental as an added value. But how to implement the whole type, considering the dependency of housing of a huge volume that has to be filled with programme.
- >issue of big scale – and in between spaces – if the type absorbs a lot of activities in its verticality, how does the urban ground work, both, spatially and programmatically?
- >how does the program of the base interfere with housing, and how the two come together?
- >The concept of the hyper-dense hybrid type exists all over Europe, but always in a city context. How can the concept be reinterpreted in this specific context?

#### ZZ810 MONUMENT IN FERTILE COUNTRY

- >In what way is the fragmentation in horizontal and vertical development a potential?
- >There is a lot of formalism in the project, what happens if we simplify it, or balance the relation between the horizontal and vertical elements in a new way?!
- >What are the advantages of a public space that works as a suspended megastructure (public deck)? The inflexibility concerning a malleable implementation process causes gigantic problems; either you take it all or you do not take it! The megastructure has to be reconsidered, respecting issues of phasing and indeterminate future steps.
- >The unit that gives the place an identity is a unit which relates to the history of landscape, to take these units and make out of them a collage city of different neighbourhoods is promising. But how does the interface between these enclaves work? What about the fringes of these developments? The project has to consider the local border conditions, especially its relation to the adjacent area southwest of the project site.
- >The idea of the urban strategy erodes in the architectural project. The translation from the large scale agricultural structure into the local qualities of the architectural project must still be demonstrated.



## **RA980 EN POINTE**

An explicit statement with a strong generic solution, somehow glorifying the potential of the site: How can this “Piranesi” approach become a feasible strategy?

>Housing does not work with the proposed urban concept (issues of noise protection, light, density), an improvement of the types of living would be necessary.

>The relationship between housing and public space, between density and open space (vaults/mass) has to be re-considered.

>The physical bridges do not connect – the concept of connection has to be reconsidered.

>The arches are not very appropriate to overbridge the motorway, scale and feasibility have to be reconsidered.

The jury summarizes the added value of considering all 3 projects at once:

The projects provoke a discussion on new perspectives concerning the long-term transformation of such areas, bringing together issues of different scales and topics: structure of the peripheral landscape, identity and micro-spatial qualities, landscaping, breaking up the limits, hybridization of buildings/types, phasing-strategies.

With these projects the city of Vienna receives a broad bandwidth of inspirations. Together with the three teams the city shall render more precisely these inspirations formulating a concrete strategy for the upcoming process of transformation. This includes an agenda with concrete goals, taking the project site as a pioneering example for a forward-looking urban transformation that might turn the monofunctional enclave to an unprecedented mixed neighbourhood.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

### WIEN SIEMENSÄCKER

#### MB511 CLUSTER STREETSCAPE

The relationship between access system and building block should be revised!

The dimension and quality of the landscape-strips have to be reconsidered.

- > Siemens shall initiate a test with the winning team, verifying if on site nr 1 the floor area ratio of 1.5 enables an attractive housing development
- > The physical and visual connections, especially between the strips, have to be improved, giving special attention to the connection between site 1 and the railway-stop. .
- > A green masterplan (grüner Rahmenplan) for structuring the hierarchies of use: guidelines for design, organization of gradients of privacy/publicness, etc

#### DF936 URBAN SOFTWARE

The project shall be integrated in the implementation process, because it offers highly ambitious living programs. Even if only a minority of user groups might feel themselves addressed by the project it could enrich considerably the quality of the housing environment if it is tested on one of the building islands.



**EUROPAN A**

# EUROPAN 12

## Amstetten

Minutes of the first jury session: Local Commission: **Amstetten**

Amstetten, 14th of September 2013



**EUROPAN A**

## Europäer 12 Amstetten

Saturday, September 14, 2013

10:00am – 5:00pm

Present:

**Ursula Puchebner**, Mayoress, City of Amstetten

**Manfred Heigl**, Director of urban planning, City of Amstetten

**Valerie Freinberger**, Department of urban planning, City of Amstetten

**Günther Sterlike**, ÖBB-Real Estate Management GmbH

**Thomas Klausner**, ÖBB-Real Estate Management GmbH

(Substitute for Kurt Wilhelm, architect from ÖBB-Real Estate Management GmbH)

**Peter Riepl**, Architect, Linz/Vienna

**Andreas Hofer**, Architect, TU Vienna

**Christoph Luchsinger**, Architect, Professor at the TU Vienna, Lucerne/Vienna

**Alexander Schmoeger**, Architect, Vienna

(Substitute for Markus Pernthaler, Architect, Graz/Vienna)

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

**Pia Spiesberger**, Architect, Member of European Austria

Additional distribution list

**Kurt Wilhelm**, Architect ÖBB-Real Estate Management GmbH

**Markus Pernthaler**, Architect, Graz/Vienna, National Jury European AT

## **Welcome and presentation of all participants**

Kurt Wilhelm replaced by Thomas Klausner.

Markus Pernthaler replaced by Jury Substitute Alexander Schmoeger.

## **Presentation of the two-stage Europan 12 jury procedure**

Bernd Vlay briefly presented the two-stage Europan 12 jury procedure and announced the “forum of cities and juries” in Paris.

It was the first time that site representatives were eligible to vote.

The local commission consists of seven votes, with five votes being local and two belonging to the national jury (Markus Pernthaler, Christoph Luchsinger).

The national jury consists of seven international votes and will choose the prize-winners in Paris. The site representatives taking part in the forum in Paris have the opportunity to get to know the national jury at a meeting.

Official announcement of winners takes place on 13/12/2013.

Winners may, however, be informed in advance in secret. The national secretariats are responsible for overall supervision.

## **Aims of Amstetten**

Mayoress Ursula Puchebner welcomed those present and gave a brief description of the increased interest of Amstetten in the entrance to the city.

## **Presentation of the Site Amstetten**

Manfred Heigl gave a brief presentation of the project sites and the brief.

Günther Sterlike made some additional comments.

Both site representatives confirmed that the city’s objectives and the objectives of the ÖBB coincide.

## **Aims of Europan**

The goal of the local commission is to shortlist 15 to 20% of the 18 projects submitted for the second round of judging in Paris; this means a preselection of four projects.

These preselected projects will be discussed at the forum of cities and juries in Paris, with the final selection made in the second jury, the national jury of Europan Austria with



**EUROPAN A**

international judges. A first prize can be awarded with additional runners-up or a first prize alone or – in the event of projects of equal merit – three runners-up. It is also possible to award an special mention (cf. purchase prize).

Each member of the national jury can recall projects, but must state grounds for doing so.

### **Task criteria**

Europán points out that the criteria are taken into account in judging the projects.

Europán is a competition for ideas followed by a process of realisation; this process must be covered in the discussion. The local commission is encouraged to judge the projects in terms of conceptual quality; the overall urban strategy for Amstetten must be discussed above all in the sense of the topic *Adaptable City* and innovative urban development. Attention must be paid to whether the various sites are strategically linked, whether a timeline is portrayed, and how the existing structures are handled. Owing to the early availability of site nr1 (as formulated in the competition brief), the project focusing on site nr 1 must be discussed in particular.

As formulated in the competition brief, both faces of Amstetten (towards the flow of the railway and towards the city) must be taken into account in the project.

The city: A strategy is crucial as the project involves development for the next thirty years and long-term success must be guaranteed.

Question by Christoph Luchsinger: The competition brief defines razor-sharp areas, does this not contradict a strategy?

Answer by ÖBB: No, no contradiction, these are the exact site boundaries of the ÖBB areas and only these can be used.

Answer by Europán: The competition brief specifically demands a strategy.

Question: Does the competition brief specify a density?

Answer by Manfred Heigl: It contains a reference to a compatible density.



**EUROPAN A**

Question by Andreas Hofer: Does the city currently have a strategy regarding identity?

Answer by Manfred Heigl: Yes, one emphasis is defined by aspects of technology. The aim is to find locations for education and research, for example “Zukunftsakademie Mostviertel”. There is also demand for a hotel. These items were also described in the competition brief.

Answer by Günther Sterlike: Yes, “Zukunftsakademie Mostviertel”, a number of market studies are also being carried out in order to identify possible uses; a qualitative advantage is time, there is no pressure of time concerning longer-term locations.

ÖBB and the city agree to target further developments regarding the process of realisation following the competition with the participation of the competition winners.

### **Jury constitution**

Bernd Vlay proposed Christoph Luchsinger as chairman of the jury.

Counter-proposal from Günther Sterlike: Peter Riepl as chairman of the jury.

The counter-proposal was accepted unanimously.

Peter Riepl was agreed as chairman of the jury.

### **Distribution of votes**

#### **Site representatives**

°Amstetten (Ursula Puchebner, Manfred Heigl)

°ÖBB (Günther Sterlike, Thomas Klausner as stand-in for Kurt Wilhelm)

°Amstetten and ÖBB

#### **Architects**

°Peter Riepl

°Andreas Hofer

#### **Architects (national jury AT)**

°Christoph Luchsinger

°Alexander Schmoeger (stand-in judge for Markus Pernthaler)



## Presentation of the technical report

Pia Spiesberger presented the technical report of each project.

## First evaluation round

Positive procedure: all projects receiving two or more votes enter the second stage.

(x – selected for second round)

NR.	CODE	TITEL	1.RUNDE		
			JA	NEIN	WEITER
A01	BX808	RAILITAGE	7	0	x
A02	CC397	Heritage of the future	0	7	
A03	EF878	PARK Inn	6	1	x
A04	EM320	PERISCOPES	5	2	x
A05	HN864	From TRAINsitory CITY to TRAINing CITY	0	7	
A06	IV592	Amstetten Train-City	0	7	
A07	JU234	SPEED FIBERS	7	0	x
A08	KC528	BRANDING AMSTETTEN	0	7	
A09	MR662	THE RAILWAY OF AMSTETTEN	0	7	
A10	NQ526	HUBSTETTEN	2	5	x
A11	OT187	IBA Amstetten	4	3	x
A12	PJ864	OPEN	7	0	x
A13	RB043	Amstetten kisses you wellcome	0	7	
A14	TT013	Rail Way of Life	2	5	x
A15	WW809	weaving	0	7	
A16	YN698	Amstetten.Zipping the City	2	5	x
A17	ZW408	shake up	0	7	
A18	ZZ344	Rail Bank River	7	0	x

Selection of the first evaluation round: 10 projects

BX808, EF878, EM320, JU234, NQ526, OT187, PJ864, TT013, YN698, ZZ344

1:00pm Lunch break



**EUROPAN A**

## Second in-depth evaluation round

Formal comment: projects with a simple majority move up in to the next round

(at least 4 votes in favour)

NR.	CODE	TITEL	1.RUNDE			2.RUNDE			3.RUNDE		
			JA	NEIN	WEITER	JA	NEIN	WEITER	JA	NEIN	WEITER
A01	BX808	RAILITAGE	7	0	x	7	0	x			
A03	EF878	PARK Inn	6	1	x	0	7				
A04	EM320	PERISCOPES	5	2	x	2	5	R	5	2	x
A07	JU234	SPEED FIBERS	7	0	x	3	4				
A10	NQ526	HUBSTETTEN	2	5	x	0	7				
A11	OT187	IBA Amstetten	4	3	x	1	6				
A12	PJ864	OPEN	7	0	x	7	0	x			
A14	TT013	Rail Way of Life	2	5	x	0	7				
A16	YN698	Amstetten.Zipping the City	2	5	x	0	7				
A18	ZZ344	Rail Bank River	7	0	x	7	0	x			

Project EM320 recalled in the second round.

### The four preselected projects are:

- BX808 RAILITAGE
- EM320 PERISCOPES
- PJ864 OPEN
- ZZ344 RAIL BANK RIVER

## Justification for the preselected projects

### **BX808 RAILITAGE**

- +The very ambitious approach taken by the project was praised.
- +The concept incorporates an overarching context.
- +The strength of the project lies in project site nr1: integration of the flow of the railway line and the granularity of urban development in relation to the nature of the place as a landmark were seen to be very good. The programme displays an urban level.
- Project site nr1: A reality check, however, reveals that it will hardly be possible to realise the design and that it will need to be adapted.
- Criticism of the proposed parameters (look to the past/present/future) of the overall strategy, which are seen to be too strongly related to material and too objectified. The project thrives on the sculptural gestures in terms of structure.
- Criticism of project sites 2 to 4.

### **EM320 PERISCOPES**

- +This project was defined as one of the most peculiar.
- +The project describes a reflection on a totally different level and assumes a very radical, polarising position.
- +The project creates very structural spaces.
- +The project is credited with a certain credibility.
- +Interesting question of the non-place, space is to remain indefinable, undeveloped places.
- +Interesting political statement according to which public spaces are used as non-commercial spaces.
- +The project explores innovative topics for the urban discourse.
- The visual projection of the surrounding area (postcard character) is criticised and puts the project in the realm of an art and culture project instead of one of urban development.
- With regard to the usability described in the competition brief, the brief was not fulfilled.
- +In connection with this, the possibility of an special mention/purchase prize was discussed.



**EUROPAN A**

**PJ864 OPEN**

- +The project was regarded as very interesting.
- +The project permits flexibility in the sense of the topic *Adaptable City*.
- +The ratio of density and open space was praised.
- +The project was credited with reliable credibility.

**ZZ344 RAIL BANK RIVER**

- +The project proposes a very pleasant urbanity.
- +While unspectacular, it is highly credible.
- +The basic metropolitan stance was praised.
- +The differentiated interspaces were praised.
- +Project site nr1 describes a very structural approach.
- +The project is capable of development and adaptation.

## Report of the Second in-depth evaluation round

### EF878 PARK INN

- +Proposal for very solid further development of the city.
- +The strategic proposal consisting of the four lines is very pleasing.
- Location 1: Criticism of the U-shaped typology; among other things, as it opens towards the railway, and thus requires a sound insulation façade.
- Criticism of the idea of arriving in the park.
- Location 3: Criticism of the courtyard structure and doubt as to whether this is an appropriate typology for urbanisation.

### JU234 SPEED FIBERS

- +Representation of a very ambitious vision.
- +A-landmark is very specific.
- The proposed percentage of greenery, 50%, is too high and insufficiently urban.

### NQ526 HUBSTETTEN

- Realisation of the vision seems to be an overly mechanical game with building.
- Seen as too pragmatic.
- Answers too specifically typological.

### OT187 IBA AMSTETTEN

- +The different approach taken by the project was praised.
- +The concept of the exhibition was seen as an interesting exploration of existing potentials.
- The vision is, however, not enough, the proposed tower of Doka slabs is interpreted as too weak.
- The concept could be interesting for the city, but not for site owners aiming to utilise their property.



**EUROPAN A**

### **TT013 RAILWAY OF LIFE**

+Concept of an additive procedure implemented in urban space which can grow was regarded as positive.

-Criticism of the 15x15m grid, choice is difficult to understand.

-The project was considered to have insufficient force for realisation.

### **YN698 ZIPPING THE CITY**

+The project approaches were seen as highly interesting at the strategic level.

-However, the configurations of the various locations are too tentative.

-Too little town, too little urban, too little density.



**EUROPAN A**

# EUROPAN 12

## Graz

Minutes of the first jury session: Local Commission: **Graz**

Helmut List Halle Graz, 9th of September 2013

## EuropAN 12 Graz

Monday, September 9, 2013

10:00am – 5:00pm

### Participants with voting rights

**Bernhard Inninger**, Director of the Department of Urban Design, City of Graz

**Bertram Werle**, Director of Urban Planning, City of Graz

**Thomas Jost**, Member of the supervisory board, Waagner-Biro AG

**Christoph Pichler**, architect, Vienna

**Josef Hohensinn**, Architect, Graz

**Markus Pernthaler**, Architect, Graz/Vienna, National Jury EuropAN AT

**Alexander Schmoeger**, Architect, Vienna

(Substitute for Christoph Luchsinger, Architect, Luzern/Vienna, National Jury EuropAN AT)

### Other participants

**Hans Frey**, Waagner-Biro AG

**Oliver Konrad**, City of Graz

**Kai-Uwe Hoffer**, City of Graz

**Bernd Vlay**, Architect, General Secretary EuropAN Austria

**Pia Spiesberger**, Architect, Member of EuropAN Austria

### Additional distributor

**Christoph Luchsinger**, Architect, Luzern/Vienna, National Jury EuropAN AT



## **Welcome and Presentation of all the participants**

Christoph Luchsinger is substituted by Alexander Schmoeger.

## **Presentation of the two-phase jury procedure of Europen 12**

Bernd Vlay gives a brief presentation of the two-phase jury procedure in Europen 12 and announces “the forum of cities and juries” in Paris. This is the first time that site representatives have the right to vote.

The local commission comprises seven votes. Two of these votes are held by the national jury (Markus Pernthaler, Christoph Luchsinger)

## **Jury constitution**

Markus Pernthaler is unanimously elected as the jury chairman.

Deputy for the city Graz: Christoph Pichler (Design Council member)

## **The competition brief**

Bernd Vlay describes the tender criteria in brief:

> In line with the “Adaptable City” concept Europen does not sponsor a ready-made architectural project, but seeks out a strategic approach suitable for further development, and which also extends a promising framework for architectural development.

> The challenge here is in the achievement of an intelligent zoning of the project site to the west of Waagner-Biro-Strasse: Residential development to the north, school in the south and a “joker” in the centre, whether or not the campus option will be taken up (optional campus programme or residential development).

> The free space challenge: 15m<sup>2</sup> of free space for each pupil = 13,000m<sup>2</sup> / 2 hectares project site

Will it be possible to organise a highly compact school operation, where the free spaces can be integrated in the building? How can these free spaces be used by people other than school pupils? The school project should at all events reach the guideline density of a 1.4 floor area ratio as intended by the City for the project site.

> The west: a sensitive approach for the link to the residential area is called for, above all in the north.

> East of Waagner-Biro-Strasse: all the tender stipulates here is formulating the quality of public space (e.g. by keeping links open, or with further thinking on the green network): but despite this 90% of the projects propose construction development. The evaluation of the typological qualities should concentrate first and foremost on the area to the west of the Waagner-Biro-Strasse.

### **Repetition of the competition rules**

The jury should primarily evaluate the projects in the context of their conception quality and against the background of the Adaptable City topic; and thus examining typology quality, basic concepts, flexibility for the future.

Europan is an ideas competition followed by an implementation process; this process should be taken into account in the discussion.

The aim is for the local commission to make a preselection of 15 to 20 % of the work submitted, or in other words to preselect about 4 projects.

Markus Pernthaler draws attention to the confidentiality that applies until after the final jury session in Paris.

### **Procedure**

Markus Pernthaler suggests the following procedure:

1. Presentation of the technical report by Bernd Vlay for each project.
2. A first evaluation round: A positive procedure is when – a project goes on into the second round after receiving two votes or more.
3. Second in-depth evaluation round: projects with a simple majority move on to the next round (from 4 to 3).

#### 4. possible recall of the projects

Every member of the national jury has the opportunity to bring back projects for recall, but reasons must be given for doing so.

#### **Markus Pernthaler asks for a short statement on the expectations of the two site partners (the City of Graz and WaagnerBiro)**

Bertram Werle:

A short account of the project site and its role in the Smart City project: what should be developed here is an urban district of the city with mixed uses, good public transport connections and a compact density. Green areas and public thoroughfares, a park and a social infrastructure are also to be developed. The European mandate in this context is to test the innovative mixed school and residential usage.

Bernhard Inninger:

The development of densities and heights should take into account the transition to the residential area in the west.

In the east, towards the railway, a density of 2.0 is foreseen, which potentially when the development has an appropriate architectural quality could exceed 2.5.

The European project site:

A density of 1.4 is to be aimed at for the European project site (the transition section to the residential area in the west). Appropriate transitions/graduated heights are to be taken into account in this (higher and denser adjacent to WaagnerBiro, flattening out towards the residential west).

The urban planning objective is to establish the winning project in concrete terms in the scope of developing a master plan: a design concept for the master plan should be developed out of the winning project.

Werle: European as a good basis for sounding this out.

Thomas Jost/Waagner Biro:

What WaagnerBiro has as an objective is to find a new use for an area that is no longer in use.

The following development scenario exists here:

There will be interest in good utilisation when a concept emerges that is acceptable to everyone. Europán could generate a basis for this. In the context of new uses Waagner Biro sees a certain level of time pressure behind the clarification of the location potential and of the development scenario.

Bernd Vlay presents the technical report for each project.

**A short explanation by Markus Pernthaler on two points anchored in the framework plan:**

**1. Railway noise protection**

Noise protection is essential in the core area and in the general residential area to the west, with continuous barriers along the railway track as one of the exclusion specifications.

**2. Configuration of the green areas and the thoroughfares is also anchored in the plan.**

Some 20 percent of the entire site is green space. The offsetting of the green spaces is the result of long discussions. Some minor changes to the framework plan can be envisaged, but maintaining the basic character of the public space is a mandatory requirement.



**EUROPAN A**

## First evaluation round

Positive procedure: all projects receiving two or more votes enter the second stage.

NR.	CODE	TITEL	Erste Runde		
			Ja	Nein	weiter
G01	BB533	FOXES & HEDGEHOGS	4	3	x
G02	BU589	SMART CITIZEN	0	7	
G03	FS319	enklaven, kreuz und andere annehmlichkeiten	0	7	
G04	GF328	SMART BASE	6	1	x
G05	GM516	2013 - 2033 / HYBRID WAY	2	5	x
G06	IA264	The Bucket List -Feel the City	6	1	x
G07	IC816	Wohnen+	0	7	
G08	LG181	Polyrhythmic fields	4	3	x
G09	LI032	Urban Quilt	0	7	
G10	LQ076	Metabolic Tango	2	5	x
G11	MK705	Hierarchy of open spaces	0	7	
G12	OD255	U.P.D.II_Urban Parallax Dream	0	7	
G13	ON834	Urban / Nature: Relinking, Share, Intensify	5	2	x
G14	PB056	December 21th: A place to the sun	3	4	x
G15	VN837	SQUARED STREET	3	4	x
G16	WD052	VOID FIRST	4	3	x
G17	WV376	Urban resource_ a vision for the Waagner-Biro site, Graz	0	7	

Selection of the first evaluation round: 10 projects:

BB533, GF328, GM516, IA264, LG181, LQ076, ON834, PB056, VN837, WD052

1:00 pm Lunch break

Thomas Jost receives the contract from European Österreich with the request that he returns it signed to the Vienna address.



**EUROPAN A**

## Second in-depth evaluation round:

Formal comment: projects with a simple majority move up in to the next round

(at least 4 votes in favour)

(R = Recalling)

NR.	CODE	TITEL	Erste Runde			Zweite Runde			Vorauswahl	
			Ja	Nein	weiter	Ja	Nein	weiter	Ja	Nein
G01	BB533	FOXES & HEDGEHOGS	4	3	x	6	1	x	7	0
G04	GF328	SMART BASE	6	1	x	6	1	x	7	0
G05	GM516	2013 - 2033 / HYBRID WAY	2	5	x	0	7			
G06	IA264	The Bucket List -Feel the City	6	1	x	7	0	x	7	0
G08	LG181	Polyrhythmic fields	4	3	x	5	2	x	7	0
G10	LQ076	Metabolic Tango	2	5	x	1	6			
G13	ON834	Urban / Nature: Relinking, Share, Intensify	5	2	x	2	5			
G14	PB056	December 21th: A place to the sun	3	4	x	0	7			
G15	VN837	SQUARED STREET	3	4	x	2	5	R	0	7
G16	WD052	VOID FIRST	4	3	x	3	4			

## Recall procedure for the VN837 SQUARED STREET project because

+shade has been dropped as an exclusion argument

+attempt to re-capture something of the former industrial heritage atmosphere through use of bridges

Comparison discussion of VN837 and GF328

Both projects have a problem with noise protection.

Both projects only function autonomously only on the project site itself and are not aligned with the surrounding sites.

In the context of the whole area in consideration VN837 has a more original effect in its approach while GF328, however, has greater clarity in its structural formulation and it is more "airy" in the upward perspective.

Vote: VN837 yes/no: 0/7

The four preselected projects are:

**BB533 FOXES & HEDGEHOGS**

**GF328 SMART BASE**

**IA264 THE BUCKET LIST – FEEL THE CITY**

**LG181 POLYRHYTHMIC FIELDS**

## Justification for the preselected projects

### BB533 FOXES & HEDGEHOGS

- + Theoretical approach, a pattern covering the entire area, each field plays with a typology
- + A flat typology as a reference to the history of the location
- + A successful balance between the urban development quality of the intervening spaces and picking up on what is already there.
- + Transformation of above ground parking lots to concentrated and stacked multi-storey parking has permitted the positioning of the hall in the landscape
- + Explicit open spaces concept: wilderness, meadows, trees
- + Reduced display
- + The site plans have an absorbing spatial quality
- + High potential for flexibility, the site plan as a repertoire programme
- + The idea of a central square is a very good first intention
- + A mixed structure appears to be functional
- + The 30 year period appears interesting
- + No display of an architectural language

### Comment of Bernd Vlay/Europán:

- + Programmatic reference to the literature
- + A big mandate on the implementation process, necessity for an open space and use concept to guarantee thorough mixing.

### Review of the project site:

Clear taking up of the road, green area, buildings at selected point ensure penetration of the green area, a flat typology making a high programmatic claim

## **GF328 SMART BASE**

- + Flexibility despite the rigid structure of the buildings is praised
- + The idea of a broad surfaced ground floor structure with an open programme appears to be very exciting
- + Overall concept, the 2nd level is significant
- + Clear concept for the continuous ground floor podium zone with mixed use residential/school
- + The podium zone creates protected open spaces
- + - The podium still needs to be developed on the side next to the road, but it is feasible
- The quality involved in the blending of school and residential is not presented, it would be very interesting
- The rigid arrangement of the bar structure along the WaagerBiroStrasse does not provide noise protection. On the contrary, it is a sound conductor taking noise into the apartments.

A question in reference to a diagram

Public space as a reserved ground floor area for the school: can a type of this kind be functional?

How much flexibility can the project bear? How flexible is this rigid structure?

## **IA264 THE BUCKET LIST – FEEL THE CITY**

- + The idea of creating atmospheric places
- + The ground plan is very simple and clear, this simplicity is praised
- + A very simple and clear definition of how something new can be developed
- + The bar element as a linear urban design gesture is given a relatively complex structure
- + Inclusion of existing typologies
- + The use of additional underground stories (for sport) keeps the upper surfaces free
- + The bridge suggestion (as the only project!)
- + implied high architectural qualities in the graphics



## **LG181 POLYRHYTHMIC FIELDS**

- + An approach to a residential and school mix is given here
- + A sympathetic solution for the building structure
- + Convincing ground plan
- + The high density is pleasing and the envisaged densification is credible
- + The east has not been dealt with as wished in the project task requirements.
- + The project is self-explanatory
- + Lively silhouette
- + Situation of the interior spaces
- + A lively and balanced mix and distribution of open spaces
- The WaagerBiroStrasse has been deliberately given an appearance that is ragged, but controllably so

The question is raised in discussion about the definition of the Waagner Biro Strasse.

## Report of the Second in-depth evaluation round

### GM516 2013-2033 / HYBRID WAY

-The feasibility of the school "growth" is doubted

### LQ076 METABOLIC TANGO

+The process-like character is seen in a positive light

-Problem of open spaces as isolated cells, this co-existence of isolated spaces is assessed as problematic.

-A logical causal further development of the project is lacking

### ON834 URBAN/NATURE: RELINKING, SHARE, INTESIFY

+Appreciation of the structural project conception, the idea is clearly perceptible

+The cluster graining is conceivable, although not presented

+The handling of greenery, the very clear individual plots and parking are praised

+Maintaining of the one WaagnerBiro Hall and its situation in the second row

-Some specific elements contradict the specified framework plan

-The expansion of the forecourt facing the List Hall is surprising, but assessed to some extent as problematic. What is the quality of this square?!

-The campus option has not been explicitly dealt with

-The problem of noise protection

### PB056 DECEMBER 21TH: A PLACE TO THE SUN

+The alternative approach is praised

+The possibility for densification and the grid of dependencies are evaluated positively

+Multiple specialised uses for the parking spaces is included in the framework plan

-The 21.December project has no real relevance; it is too much of a mere eye-catcher

-The ground plan is seen as too dense and not ecological (the scale is too small)

-The project does not provide a basis for concrete implementation

-The project negates important approaches in the framework plan

-The expansion capability for the school will not function



**EUROPAN A**

-The concept will no longer work at all when faced with the requirement that bigger structures are essential

### **VN837 SQUARED STREET**

- +Appreciation for the thoroughness of the approach (east west direction/green space, imaginary bridging-over of the Waagner Biro Strasse)
- +A very committed concept, elegantly deterministic buildings
- +The extensibility of the courtyards into the air is very interesting
- +The linear structure works hand-in-hand with the history (longitudinal structure)
- The lack of flexibility is criticised because the courtyards are large and complex structures
- The suitability of the ground floor zone for residential purposes is questioned
- The noise protection is not functional

### **WD052 VOID FIRST**

- +Appreciation of the very clearly formulated ideas (apartment block and school building)
- +The U-shape implies feasibility; the approach is assessed as having a very high chance for realisation
- +The block variant for the creation of inner spaces is assessed positively
- +A very direct path to a solution, but this was also criticised
- A highly pragmatic entrance, without much excitement
- No mixing/or layering on each other of school and residential use could be recognised

**Debate about further procedures:**

Markus Pernthaler outlined the further procedures:

The first point is to wait for the Europan competition procedures, the rededication process will then start simultaneously.

The aim is to commission the winner after the conclusion of the competition with the making of a study/cooperative procedure on the feasibility of implementing the space allocation plan in cooperation with everyone involved. The study will form the basis for the development plan.

The school/residential interface is an exciting aspect for further implementation (architectural project). The City has the obligation to put the school out for open tender in the form of a competition.

Bernd Vlay:

Subsidised apartment construction does not come under the terms of the Austrian Public Procurement Act, so Europan has reached an agreement with the Province of Styria here, acknowledging Europan as the competition procedure.

A joint selection of a partner architect would be a useful step for the implementation of a residential construction project in the event of a prize-winning team that is not practising in Austria.

Markus Pernthaler:

The fundamental question must still be clarified of who obtains a building right and from whom. This must be specified in the development procedure, and it is why the intermediate study phase is so important for defining the development plan and for solving the interface problems.

*After this and in the context of the tendering issue a cooperative step will be essential to make implementation possible.*

The aim is to have a development plan at all events. Moreover it will be sensible - not least in the context of Smart City - to follow up specific technologies in subsequent phases (intermediate phase for sounding out what is possible).

Using the rededication process with development plan procedures in parallel as an intermediate phase is important for three reasons:

- \*as a quality assurance measure
- \*to save time
- \*to achieve subsidised implementation for other areas.

The points that must be taken into account in the project area rededication process are:

- > the northern area can be implemented with the change to the land use plan
- > there is no need for the entire area to be dealt with in a single procedure, and thus the request to the City Planning Department to consider the dedication process against the background of the options that will occur in the course of time,

The response from the representatives of the City of Graz is that a decision has still not been made on whether the entire western side will be involved. A meeting will be held on this issue, however, on 7.10.

Thomas Jost:

In view of the time pressure here the City of Graz should seek to achieve a balance of interests for the project area as quickly as possible.

Markus Pernthaler:

A balance of interests is to be achieved between the two big proprietors. Agreement should be reached here now. A question/option still to be answered in this is: must a parking area be made at once, or will it be possible to convert a no-building zone into a public parking area at a later stage?

Thomas Jost/WaagnerBiro: for WaagnerBiro it is important to know if the school and the expansion are wanted or not.

Markus Pernthaler: Establishing a campus (from nursery through to senior classes) is an absolutely compelling idea for the school authorities, but unfortunately it is still only a wish

at the present time. This is why a tangible schedule has still not emerged. A development strategy divided into two phases could be envisaged.

Thomas Jost/WaagnerBiro: WaagnerBiro does not wish to see the plot divided up.

Markus Pernthaler:

A cooperative intermediate phase following on from the competition would be essential, for setting out all the interests and to formulate a concrete implementation procedure from all of the options.

Thomas Jost/WaagnerBiro: In respect to phased development: What can the market bear? We have investors who would be ready to take on the entire plot and they see no utilization problem once everything is developed.

Markus Pernthaler: It is important that the investors will not be competing with each other on the area as a whole and that their interests are coordinated (for example: local retailers).

Thomas Jost/WaagnerBiro: When the density is high enough then multiple local retail suppliers can be expected.

Concluding remarks from Europän Austria

The discussion on implementation shows that Europän is simply a trigger mechanism for a broadly based process in which all the stakeholders must take a committed part, if successful implementation is to be achieved.

Presenting the projects/exhibition

There were initial discussions in January for organising an exhibition of all the winning projects in Amstetten. The details still need to be settled. Talks must still be held with HDA in Graz. The exhibition period: Spring 2014

Markus Pernthaler:

It would also be a good idea to organise an exhibition on site (suggestion for the project area, the AVL Lounge).



**EUROPAN A**

Official announcement of the winners: 13.12.2013

The winners will be informed confidentially in advance. The overall formal supervision of the procedure will be in the hands of the national secretariats.



**EUROPAN A**

# EUROPAN 12

## Wien Kagran

Minutes of the first jury session: Local Commission: **Wien Kagran**

Wiener Stadtplanungshaus, 16th of September 2013



## Europan 12 Wien Kagran

Monday, September 16, 2013

10:00am – 5:00pm

### Participants

**Georgine Zabrana**, urban planning, City of Vienna

(Substitute for Thomas Madreiter, Director of Urban Planning, City of Vienna)

**Andreas Trisko**, MD 18 head of Department of Urban Development and Planning, City of Vienna)

**Rudolf Vesecky**, VERU-Liegenschaftsverwertungsgesellschaft m.b.H. (Site owner)

**Rüdiger Lainer**, architect, Vienna

**Silja Tillner**, architect, Vienna

**Lisa Schmidt-Colinet**, architect, Academy of Fine Arts Vienna

(Substitute for Markus Pernthaler)

**Christoph Luchsinger**, architect, Professor at the TU Vienna, Luzern/Vienna

**Christoph Chorherr**, city political representative

**Norbert Scheed**, districts political representative

**Bernd Vlay**, Architect, General Secretary Europän Austria

**Pia Spiesberger**, Architect, Member of Europän Austria

**Andrea Kessler**, Architect, Assistance for Europän Austria

### Additional distribution list

**Markus Pernthaler**, architect, Graz/Vienna, National Jury Europän AT

## **Welcome and presentation of all participants**

Thomas Madreiter replaced by Georgine Zabrana.

## **Presentation of the two-stage Europan 12 jury procedure**

Bernd Vlay briefly presented the two-stage Europan 12 jury procedure and announced the “forum of cities and juries” in Paris.

It was the first time that site representatives were eligible to vote.

The local commission consists of seven votes, with five votes being local and two belonging to the national jury (Markus Pernthaler, Christoph Luchsinger).

The national jury consists of seven international votes and will choose the prize-winners in Paris. The site representatives taking part in the forum in Paris have the opportunity to get to know the national jury at a meeting.

Official announcement of winners takes place on 13/12/2013.

Winners may, however, be informed in advance in secret. The national secretariats are responsible for overall supervision.

## **Aims of the local commission**

In a double-stage procedure 4-6 projects (approx. 15-20%) are to be selected for the second jury session in Paris. This new jurying was introduced in order to give local commissions of site representatives more time, one day per site.

## **Aims of Europan**

Innovative approaches are of the essence. No Europan project has ever been implemented on a hundred percent basis.

Concepts with adaptability are in demand.

Europan has a scientific focus and seeks to cross-fertilize the discourse on urban planning.

For the international jury it is also interesting to discuss new strategies and interesting concepts independently from the site.

Comments and short warm-up discussion on the (“difficult”) site Kagran:

This large site allows the possibility of playing with the critical mass.

It opens up an area of tension between the desired residential occupancy and the momentary



**EUROPAN A**

occupancy. With a future public transportation carrier a new development strategy can start.

The opinions of site representatives:

Christoph Chorherr:

What kind of city can develop here in the course of several decades?

What does the replacement for the existing buildings look like?

We need a strategy which will allow a mixed city structure to emerge from the monostructure.

The Kagran Business Park stands for a prototypical theme worldwide.

A strategic approach is required which takes up the central theme of shopping mall structures and transfers it to modern development.

Norbert Scheed:

Existing dogmas concerning Donaustadt are to be abandoned:

1. Donaustadt has unlimited development areas.
2. Someone who lives in Donaustadt needs a car.
3. The periphery is built up low.

These points are to be questioned; it is time for sharp edges!?

In terms of the urban space, Donaustadt can be compared to the Vienna Gürtel: living next-door to the railway line/motorway. We freely admit it: we are building a city!

Rudolf Vesecky:

The development of the internet has brought change for large retail chains. They are already starting to reduce their sales areas. A shift towards logistics is taking place. There is an urgent need for action now. The trend makes it clear: almost all retail sectors show a tendency towards reduced sales areas. On the other hand good access roads are becoming even more important.

Silvia Tillner points out that the difference between supplier and self-collector is important for the emergent traffic development.



**EUROPAN A**

Rüdiger Lainer says that the aspects of ritualising the process of picking up goods will need to be pointed out.

Christoph Chorherr thinks that predictions will be difficult. The overall structure must remain open to react to the actual developments.

Bernd Vlay asks if logistics areas have to be included for the implementation.

Rudolf Vesecky requests flexibility for the ground floor occupancy. The ground floor area, however, has to contain these logistics areas, but combining logistics and living should be possible.

Christoph Luchsinger questions if logistics on this site make any sense.

Bernd Vlay points out that the site's accessibility is good.

Rüdiger Lainer asserts that it is important to get away from the segregation in order to mix occupancies which appear to be incompatible!

According to Bernd Vlay the question of logistics can only be discussed once the question of scale is answered.

A short summary of the development and the site sizes follows:

Rudolf Vesecky:

33,000 m<sup>2</sup> floor area, 170,000 m<sup>2</sup> total study area

Norbert Scheed:

Together with Kagran Nord these are 300,000 m<sup>2</sup> in this urban space which have to be transformed.

140,000 cars daily use the adjacent express highway.

**To summarize, the following points/decisive criteria are determined:**

- > flexibility on the ground floor (occupancy-neutral and flexible)
- > shielding towards the traffic edges (railway line and motorway)
- > strategic potential
- > concept of mobility
- > approaches across the edges / positive impact on the surroundings



## **Jury constitution**

Bernd Vlay proposes that Christoph Luchsinger should chair the jury and Christoph Luchsinger is unanimously elected as chairman of the jury.

## **Distribution of votes**

### **Site representatives**

°City of Vienna and District of Kagran (Christoph Chorherr, Norbert Scheed)

°City of Vienna Department of Urban Development and Planning (Georgine Zabrana, Andreas Trisko)

°Rudolf Vesecky, VERU-Liegenschaftsverwertungsgesellschaft m.b.H.

### **Architects**

°Rüdiger Lainer

°Silja Tillner

### **Architects (National Jury AT)**

°Christoph Luchsinger

°Lisa Schmidt-Coliner (jury substitute for Markus Pernthaler)



## Presentation of the technical report

Andrea Kessler presents the technical report of each project.

## First evaluation round

Positive procedure: all projects receiving two or more votes enter the second stage.

(x – selected for second round, R – recall)

NO.	CODE	TITLE	1 <sup>st</sup> ROUND		MOVEUP
			YES	NO	
WK01	BC483	Wohnzimmer Kagran	0	7	
WK02	BJ879	Uber Hof	0	7	
WK03	CW548	SUB_URBAN City	0	7	
WK04	DR095	RURBAN WIEN	5	2	x
WK05	EE267	The Adaptable BOX	0	7	
WK06	ER202	Kaleidoscope	6	1	x
WK07	ET803	BONDSCAPE	2	5	R
WK08	FC442	Gitterbahn 1	0	7	
WK09	GA390	Cannibalism	4	3	x
WK10	HY280	PARK ing	4	3	x
WK11	JK336	Living in the Strip	3	4	R
WK12	KB329	(Urban)Symbiosis	3	4	R
WK13	LI121	IF_ THEN_	0	7	
WK14	LY711	"Der Zwischenstadt Anger"	4	3	x
WK15	QI124	URBAN JUNGLE	0	7	
WK16	RA980	EN POINTE	6	1	x
WK17	RJ118	KLIMTCITY	3	4	R
WK18	TM594	CHARTER CITY	0	7	
WK19	TR143	HOF AUGÉ	0	7	
WK20	VJ850	the brave new (m)all	5	2	x
WK21	WM510	PARALLEL CONVERGENCES	0	7	
WK22	XG018	BRIDGING ARCHIPELAGOS	0	7	
WK23	XN523	Amongst Fields	2	5	R
WK24	YJ395	urbanity containers	0	7	
WK25	ZZ810	MONUMENT IN FERTILE COUNTRY	5	2	x



**EUROPAN A**

Selection of the first evaluation round: 8 projects

DR095, ER202, GA390, HY280, LY711, RA980, VJ850, ZZ810

Projects ET803, JK336, KB329, RJ118, XN523 recalled in the first round.

1:00 pm: lunch break

### Second in-depth evaluation round

Formal comment: projects with a simple majority move up in to the next round

(at least 4 votes in favour)

NO.	CODE	TITLE	2 <sup>nd</sup> ROUND		WEITER	3 <sup>rd</sup> .ROUND		PRE-SELECTION
			YES	NO		YES	NO	
<b>WK04</b>	DR095	RURBAN WIEN	6	1	x	2	5	
<b>WK06</b>	ER202	Kaleidoscope	7	0	x	7	0	x
<b>WK07</b>	ET803	BONDSCAPE	0	7				
<b>WK09</b>	GA390	Cannibalism	5	2	x	2	5	
<b>WK10</b>	HY280	PARK ing	3	4				
<b>WK11</b>	JK336	Living in the Strip	0	7				
<b>WK12</b>	KB329	{Urbn}Symbiosis	0	7				
<b>WK14</b>	LY711	"Der Zwischenstadt Anger"	0	7				
<b>WK16</b>	RA980	EN POINTE	7	0	x	7	0	x
<b>WK17</b>	RJ118	KLIMTCITY	1	6				
<b>WK20</b>	VJ850	the brave new (m)all	1	6				
<b>WK23</b>	XN523	Amongst Fields	0	7				
<b>WK25</b>	ZZ810	MONUMENT IN FERTILE COUNTRY	4	3	x	7	0	x

### Third in-depth evaluation round

NO.	CODE	TITLE	3 <sup>rd</sup> .ROUND		PRE-SELECTION
			YES	NO	
<b>WK04</b>	DR095	RURBAN WIEN	2	5	
<b>WK06</b>	ER202	Kaleidoscope	7	0	x
<b>WK09</b>	GA390	Cannibalism	2	5	
<b>WK16</b>	RA980	EN POINTE	7	0	x
<b>WK25</b>	ZZ810	MONUMENT IN FERTILE COUNTRY	7	0	x



**EUROPAN A**

**The three preselected projects are:**

ER202            KALEIDOSCOPE  
RA980            EN POINTE  
ZZ810            MONUMENTUM IN FERTILE COUNTRY

The jury unanimously expresses the wish for these three projects to be developed further in the course of a cooperative workshop in order to let their different principles merge into an all-encompassing draft.





**EUROPAN A**

## Justification for the preselected projects

### ER202 / WK06 KALEIDOSCOPE

This project entails – despite its clarity and simplicity – a thoroughly intelligent concept.

The structures have relatively large dimensions and have development potential.

As its immediate implementation is possible, this project is of considerable significance for the building owner.

- + novel dimension
- + relatively large shapes
- + large open spaces
- + outskirts are strengthened
- + development potential
- height differentiation not clearly elaborated

### RA980 / WK16 EN POINTE

This project strengthens surrounding neighbourhoods by integrating them via massive bridges and building ribbons

In order to implement the basic qualities of this project, the massive blocks have to be reconsidered.

- + radical approach
- + unique project with bridges and connections to the surrounding areas
- + many good ideas and approaches which should be developed
- + project adaptability
- + architecture symbolism of dominant viaduct arches and geometrical structures
- problem of orientation (sole north-south orientation) and noise protection
- small density due to the large arches



**EUROPAN A**

## **ZZ810 / WK25 MONUMENT IN FERTILE COUNTRY**

It would be necessary to simplify the project without losing its spatial qualities. Another positive aspect of the project is its detailed research concerning the surroundings and the existing buildings from whose typologies a new and complex city is formed.

+ development potential

+ differentiation of typologies

## Report of the Second in-depth evaluation round

### **DR095 / WK04 RURBAN WIEN**

This project's strategy is seen very positively. Open spaces that are architecturally interesting emerge. The exact elaboration and function of the high and massive base areas as well as the development remain unclear.

### **ET803 / WK07 BONDSCAPE**

The project Bondscape depicts a very liveable housing estate, albeit on a wrong scale. It is taken to the next round because of its ambitions.

### **GA390 / WK09 CANNIBALISM**

Cannibalism is the only project with a clear vision, an interesting continuation of the classical Viennese block and focuses on transforming the already existing shopping mall boxes. It aims at a daring interplay between large shapes and contains images of the 60s. The inner courtyards have potential, but more intelligent ground plans would be desirable. Taken together the structures have a rather frightening/daunting appearance and would not be practicable for implementation.

### **HY280 / WK10 PARK ING**

It is discussed again because it was taken into the third round. It is a simple concept which offers a lot of opportunities. The principles of its height differentiation are a reason for developing the concept further. For a EUROPAN competition, however, the project lacks a certain focus and vision.

### **JK336 / WK11 LIVING IN THE STRIP**

The project looks very friendly and vibrant due to its beautiful and colourful illustrations, but does not appear to be very trustworthy. Moreover it is not clear why the already existing shopping mall scenario has to be created artificially in the actual development area.



**EUROPAN A**

### **KB329 / WK12 URBN\_SYMBIOSIS**

Open space qualities – apart from the large green field – are missing/inadequate. Many unexposed areas and too narrow inner courtyards present a problem.

### **LY711 / WK14 DER ZWISCHENSTADT ANGER**

Der Zwischenstadt Anger looks like a machine and contradicts its social ambitions. The draft is extremely tailored to this site, the south-facing building envelope/section is not comprehensible, the western as well as the eastern structure seem very unapproachable on the outside and contain too many access balconies and too low apartments. A very clearly structured development typology does not help the project into a further revision stage.

### **RJ118 / WK17 KLIMTCITY**

This project aims to avoid the city through integration in the landscape. In principle it is beautifully and well done. However, the vineyards are an unnaturally adopted topographical instrument in Kagran and have no connection to the site.

### **VJ850 / WK20 THE BRAVE NEW (M)ALL**

The suggested principle of freedom is not consistently met – the combination of grid and system presents a problem. Public space is what is left in between. The block sizes create a certain inflexibility.

### **XN523 / WK23 AMONGST FIELDS**

The project Amongst Fields is considered to be “well imagined”. The decisive next step is missing, however, or has been left open deliberately. In this regard the project does not have enough potential to respond to the further questions concerning a strategy.



**EUROPAN A**

# EUROPAN 12

## Wien Siemensäcker

Minutes of the first jury session: Local Commission: **Wien Siemensäcker**

Wien Siemens City, 21th of September 2013

## Europan 12 Wien Siemensäcker

Saturday, September 21, 2013

10:00am – 5:00pm

### Participants

**Thomas Madreiter**, Director of Urban Planning, City of Vienna

**Andreas Trisko**, MD 18 Head of Department of Urban Development and Planning, City of Vienna

**Susanne Fabian**, MD 18 Department of Urban Development and Planning, City of Vienna

**Franz Mundigler**, Head of Siemens Real Estate CEE

**Balázs Atzél**, Siemens Real Estate Strategy CEE

**Georg Soyka**, Architect, Vienna

**Markus Pernthaler**, Architect, Graz/Vienna

**Lisa Schmidt-Colinet**, architect, Academy of Fine Arts Vienna

(Substitute for Rüdiger Lainer)

**Christoph Luchsinger**, Architect, Professor at the TU Vienna, Luzern/Vienna

**Christoph Chorherr**, city political representative

**Heinz Lehner**, districts political representative

**Bernd Vlay**, Architect, General Secretary Europän Austria

**Pia Spiesberger**, Architect, Member of Europän Austria

**Andrea Kessler**, Architect, Assistance for Europän Austria

### Additional distributor

**Rüdiger Lainer**, architect, Vienna

## **Welcome and brief introduction**

Mr Mundigler greets the jury members and presents the company Siemens and the site. Technology has taken over from production. There is a move away from manufacturing in the direction of office workplaces.

The site Wien Siemensäcker: This site was a reserved area. The Siemensäcker is singled out in the scope of the Siemens City of Vienna master plan as not being designated for operational use.

Siemens has been occupied with the Vienna location for some years.

Against this background participation in EUROPAN as a site representative is an issue of special interest for Siemens, because it is an opportunity for a fresh international and detached approach to the site question hand-in-hand with teams of young architects. There is a strong interest in exploring a wide variety of approaches. Siemens wishes to strengthen the site together with the City.

## **The two-phase jury procedure concept of European 12**

Bernd Vlay gives a brief presentation of the two-phase jury procedure in European 12 and announces the 'forum of cities and juries' in Paris.

This is the first time that site representatives are being given an equal say.

The local commission comprises seven votes, five of these votes local and two are from the national jury (Markus Pernthaler, Christoph Luchsinger)

The national jury has seven international votes and it will select the prize winner in Paris.

The site representatives at the forum in Paris will have the opportunity of a discussion for getting to know the national jury.

The official announcement of the winners will be on 13.12.2013.

The winners may be informed in advance, however, but in strict confidence. The overall supervision will be in the hands of the national secretariats.

## **Aims of the local commission**

In a double-stage procedure 4-6 projects (approx. 15-20%) are to be selected for the second jury session in Paris. This new jurying was introduced in order to give local commissions of site representatives more time, one day per site.

## **Aims of European**

Innovative approaches are of the essence. No European project has ever been implemented on a hundred percent basis.

Concepts with adaptability are in demand.

European has a scientific focus and seeks to cross-fertilize the discourse on urban planning. For the international jury it is also interesting to discuss new strategies and interesting concepts independently from the site.

European aims to filter out strategies. The question of the Siemens enclave has also been posed, and whether Siemens can also open up in terms of urban development thinking. No property developers are involved at present, and for this reason projects that will bring in new aspects for the urban development dimension are possible.

EUROPAN covers 15 countries.

Around 2000 projects are to be submitted – of these 400 projects will be discussed internationally.

There are 7 votes in the local commission. The City of Vienna will be given 2 votes.

Heinz Lehner: A question: why is the name EUROPAN and not Europlan? Bernd Vlay explains in brief how EUROPAN was established.

The adjudication criteria are also explained by Bernd Vlay.

Franz Mundigler:

The location itself is comprised of various locations:

The Siemensäcker site, the western area and the main area as components of the master plan. The Siemensäcker is not essential for operations here and it is in a process of re-evaluation. The priority use is for residential development because of the situation in the surrounding area, but it is not mandatory.

The western area was taken up for the EUROPAN competition as a link to the triangular area. There is a development plan, however, covering what are largely Siemens own uses. This is why the current Siemens core area is included, because an approach without access to background information can be more interesting.



The site north of Siemensstrasse / Site 3

There is a leasing construction on this site with a put option for Siemens.

This property can be counted in the Siemens real estate portfolio on an ownership-equivalent basis from the end of 2015.

There is no operational necessity at present, because there are still development areas for Siemens even in the core area.

Production and logistics are now in the halls with 2 production lines for electronic components. Should this change there are still, in a manner of speaking, reserve areas available.

The western area includes company car parking (2000 spaces)

Of the 5500 employees 35-40 % come to work by car. Siemens offers a total of 3000 parking spaces.

An employee competition for mobility concepts was launched recently. People who start car sharing schemes, use electric mopeds or vehicles win prizes and get free use of the underground garage.

Mr Trisko is very pleased that both areas have been included, so as to be able to take up on strategic questions.

Ambitious development densities can be realised here, but only with a gentle approach to the existing detached housing structures. How urban can this development be? A local centre close to the suburban train station would be desirable.

Siemens City is interesting as a city within the city.

Can a route through this area bring added value?

The school issue is also interesting.

The gas works – which are to undergo a transformation – are close by to the north.

Siemens is a partner in the Vienna Smart City strategy and is offering an optimal location here as a means of bringing itself in.

Bernd Vlay:

Multi-storey buildings are not wanted, but construction categories have deliberately not been defined.

Heinz Lehner explains the overall situation of the areas (including the adjacent ones).

The rail freight station is not in use now, but Austrian Railways - ÖBB is not making the site available at present. The Leopoldau Gas Works are to be developed in future.

All of this is important for the overall picture in Floridsdorf.

How many residential units will be possible for the Siemensäcker project, and for the other areas?

There are good public links to the Siemensstrasse train station.

The Siemensäcker is not linked in and probably will not be so in future.

The question has arisen in examining the school issue about whether a change of use could be possible: that of living close to the suburban railway and the industrial development area on the Siemensäcker plot.

Franz Mundigler refers to the existing master plan, which foresees the west area as the Siemens core area for the next 50 years thus leaves areas free for potential growth.

The Siemensäcker site

76,000 m<sup>2</sup>

1100 apartments for density 1

Bernd Vlay says industrial use will be ever more compatible with residential requirements in future.

Susanne Fabian: a link for the äcker site has been agreed with Siemens – a thoroughfare to the train station, or even a bus route is planned.

The diagonal section through the Siemens site is 900m long.



**EUROPAN A**

Franz Mundigler stresses once again that the focus of the planning is on the Siemensäcker. The sports facilities east of the Siemensäcker have been declared out-of-bounds for any development by the works council ("sacrosanct").

Thomas Madreiter:

New possibilities will have to be thought out as a matter of principle for the school location. A very high pressure for school space is foreseeable, and creative ideas are in demand here. The 1200 apartments are not yet a dimension requiring an own school location.

### **Jury constitution**

Christoph Luchsinger is proposed as chairman of the jury by Bernd Vlay and he is unanimously elected as the chairman of the jury.

### **Distribution of votes**

#### **Site representatives**

°City of Vienna / District of Floridsdorf (Christoph Chorherr, Heinz Lehner)

°City of Vienna Planning Department (Thomas Madreiter, Andreas Trisko, Susanne Fabian)

°Siemens (Franz Mundigler, Balázs Atzél)

#### **Architects**

° Lisa Schmidt-Coliner (jury substitute for Rüdiger Lainer)

° Georg Soyka

#### **Architects (national jury AT)**

°Christoph Luchsinger

°Markus Pernthaler

## Presentation of the technical report

Andrea Kessler presented the technical report of each project.

## First evaluation round

Positive procedure: all projects receiving two or more votes enter the second stage.

(x – selected for second round)

NO.	CODE	TITLE	1 <sup>st</sup> ROUND		
			YES	NO	MOVEUP
WS01	AT162	grass stitch	2	5	x
WS02	BW219	Vienna on the Move	1	6	
WS03	DA271	active green	0	7	
WS04	DF936	urban software	6	1	x
WS05	DZ927	Soft.mobility city	2	5	x
WS06	HN755	SIEMENSHÖFE 21.	0	7	
WS07	IV687	COME TOGETHER	4	3	x
WS08	JQ981	STRIP - SCAPE	4	3	x
WS09	LW708	CHAIN REACTION	6	1	x
WS10	MB511	Cluster/Streetscape	4	3	x
WS11	MQ062	Siemens Kreisäcker field	0	7	
WS12	MR312	Virtual Landscape. A Manual for Dynamic Zoning	1	6	
WS13	NJ462	New SiemensStadt	0	7	
WS14	NM195	Sonnenstadt	5	2	x
WS15	PC072	SIEMENSRING	0	7	
WS16	VK538	Hybrid Communities	0	7	
WS17	WB054	New Urban Vision (integrated mix)	0	7	
WS18	WB193	OSUS	0	7	
WS19	WB257	Plug, Play and Stay	2	5	x
WS20	XR092	SIEMENS UPDATE	0	7	
WS21	XX248	Walkscapes - Walking as aesthetic practice	0	7	
WS22	YV606	Hi-De Siemens City	6	1	x

Selection of the first evaluation round: 10 projects

AT162, DF936, DZ927, IV687, JQ981, LW708, MB511, NM195, WB257, YV606

1:00 pm lunch break



## Second in-depth evaluation round

Formal comment: projects with a simple majority move up in to the next round  
(at least 4 votes in favour)

			2 <sup>nd</sup> ROUND		
NO.	CODE	TITLE	YES	NO	MOVE UP
WS01	AT162	grass stitch	6	1	x
WS04	DF936	urban software	5	2	x
WS05	DZ927	Soft.mobility city	1	6	
WS07	IV687	COME TOGETHER	1	6	
WS08	JQ981	STRIP - SCAPE	0	7	
WS09	LW708	CHAIN REACTION	1	6	
WS10	MB511	Cluster/Streetscape	7	0	x
WS14	NM195	Sonnenstadt	2	5	R
WS19	WB257	Plug, Play and Stay	0	7	
WS22	YV606	Hi-De Siemens City	2	5	

Project NM195 recalled in the second round.



**EUROPAN A**

### Third in-depth evaluation round

NO.	CODE	TITLE	3 <sup>rd</sup> ROUND		
			YES	NO	MOVE UP
WS01	AT162	grass stitch	7	0	x
WS04	DF936	urban software	7	0	x
WS10	MB511	Cluster/Streetscape	7	0	x
WS14	NM195	Sonnenstadt	4	3	x

### The four preselected projects are:

AT162            GRASS STITCH  
DF936            URBAN SOFTWARE  
MB511            CLUSTER / STREETSCAPE  
NM195            SONNENSTADT – SUN CITY

## **Justification for the preselected projects**

### **AT162 / WS01 GRASS STITCH**

The image of a continuous green space provided a sympathetic backbone with a pleasant structure. There was, however, no higher-ranking networking for the green setting. The block structure left either a residential or a commercial use open and there are selected lots each with an own identity. When a new form of mobility is to be achieved, the central parking spaces in the quarter are to be seen in a positive light. The concept can be labelled as "robust". It is comprised of lots each suitable for individual development. Space-defining qualities are also present.

### **DF936 / WS04 URBAN SOFTWARE**

URBAN SOFTWARE has the best further development potential of all the parametric projects. The 3 different basic principles behind each of the lots are clearly comprehensible in causal terms. Specific fundamental typologies are all worked through on a differentiated basis and clearly structured.

### **MB511 / WS10 CLUSTER STREETScape**

The Cluster Streetscape is to be classified as a highly pragmatic project. It is based on a simple fundamental principle. A typological variety is sought.

But the question of what the open spaces can contribute remains unanswered. The project has master plan suitability due to its mix of typologies and mixed use and it also has good further development feasibility. It is agreeably "academic", since it leaves such a lot of open possibilities. Positive mention should be made of the cul-de-sacs accommodating the green cross-links and a general focal concern with mixed use.

### **NM195 / WS14 SONNENSTADT - SUN CITY**

This incisive project is highly interesting for its eye-catching effect and as a theoretical approach. But the island typology gesture can be put to question. This Sun City suggestion



**EUROPAN A**

functions very well as an image with its centre of gravity, but in its totality it has the appearance of a playground without a recognisable urban space. The sports area along the railway is to be classified as very useful in programmatic terms.



## Report of the Second in-depth evaluation round

### **DZ927 / WS05 SOFT MOBILITY CITY**

Siemens wishes this project to go on into the next round. There are no other specialist comments on this project.

### **IV687 / WS07 COME TOGETHER**

A large gap is left to the small gardens, which is to be seen in positive terms. But parking at ground level must in general be seen as problematic and equally so the constructed blocks that could have been given a more subtle transition.

### **JQ981 / WS08 STRIP SCAPE**

Proportionality must be regarded as the main problem here. The critical mass that would allow these free spaces to be implemented in an exemplary form is never reached – even though this approach has a very attractive design. The question thus arises as a result of whether public spaces can really have these qualities. The presentation in its totality is too schematic to achieve this.

### **LW708 / WS09 CHAIN REACTION**

These thematic sites with their circular arrangement do not result in different spaces. Above all virtually no spatial qualities emerge from the building distribution on the Siemensäcker. But the different usage types over the entire Siemens are to be seen in very positive terms.

### **WB257 / WS19 PLUG PLAY AND STAY**

The time phases in this concept endow it with exciting possibilities for further design and development. The presentation is above all extraordinarily attractive, but it leaves the access questions open. There is no common stand on whether development starting from there is sensible, and above all of whether this will lead to permanent and uneconomic construction site activity.

### **YV606 / WS22 HI DE SIEMENS**

Hi De Siemens is playing with an urban crust here. This project lives from a high density, a



**EUROPAN A**

large scale and a very varied urbanity. But this can never be carried through all the way to the Siemensacker site. Even given a period of 10 - 12 years it can still only succeed in reaching through to the Siemensstrasse area. The abolition of mono-functionality is mentioned as a positive point. Also the useful approaches for a thorough vertical mix deserve acknowledgement. Noise exclusion is not foreseen. The project would be quite a different one without the rigid grid pattern that is maintained rigorously throughout the entire area.

Finally we would like to thank Bernd Vlay for participating in the jury session and Siemens for the invitation. He sees a further potential with structures suitable for development in the projects, which could lead to higher densities. Adaptability is possible in each of the projects, and this can subsequently serve as a basis for further discussion on the land use.

The international jury will meet in Paris on 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> of November. The winning projects will be announced on 13. December 2013.


**AMSTETTEN**

Code	Title	Team Representative	Associates	Contributors
<b>PJ864</b> WINNER	OPEN	Ramon Bernabe Simo (ES) – architect Barcelona – España	Tomas Labanc (SK) – architect	
<b>ZZ344</b> RUNNER UP	Rail Bank River	Tao Wang (CN) – architect Zürich – Schweiz	Zhe Wang (CN) – architect Huibiao Wu (CN) – architect Xianjun Zhou (CN) – architect	Alessandra Marcon (IT) – architect
<b>EM320</b> SPECIAL MENTION	PERISCOPES	Gonzalo Gutierrez (ES) – architect Marabella – España	Adriá Escolano (ES) – architect	
<b>BX808</b> SECOND ROUND	RAILITAGE	Manuel David Romero Rodríguez (ES) – architect Madrid – España		Lea Ingold Pradel (FR) - student in architecture
<b>CC397</b>	Heritage of the future	Sanchez Jose María (ES) – architect Madrid – España		Sanchez Maria José (ES) – architect Klenk Eva (DE) – student in architecture Gonzalez Alba (ES) – student in architecture Nuñez Elena (ES) – student in architecture Regodon Alicia (ES) – student in architecture Teran Cristina (ES) – student in architecture Oggioni Chiara (IT) – student in architecture Diez Vallejo Paloma (ES) – student in architecture Martín Rivero Jaime (ES) – student in architecture Kaabi Sofien (FR) – student in architecture Hornillos Cárdenas Ignacio (ES) - architect García-Margallo Enrique (ES) - engineer architect Francisco Sánchez (ES) - engineer architect
<b>EF878</b>	PARK Inn	Tibor Kis (NL) - architect Amsterdam - Nederland	Dorota Kolek (PL) - architect	
<b>HN864</b>	From TRAINsitory CITY to TRAINing CITY	Loris Rossi (IT) - architect Tirana - Republika e Shqipërisë	Endrit Marku (AL) - architect Laura Pedata (IT) - architect Elvan Dajko (AL) - architect	Saimir Kristo (AL) - 3D designer Rezart Struga (AL) - 3D designer Navila Zaimi (AL) - graphic designer Joana Dhiamandi (AL) - graphic designer Lorin Cezrezi (AL) - drawing technician Gjergji Dushniku (AL) - graphic designer Drilon Shamolli (AL) - student in architecture Regina Veshi (AL) - student in architecture Arber Shala (AL) - architect Elzi Fatos (AL) - student in architecture Florent Grainca (AL) - student in architecture Ray Koçi (AL) - student in architecture Vullkan Querimi (AL) - student in architecture
<b>IV592</b>	Amstetten Train-City	Patrick Hammer (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich	James Kristian Skone (AT) - architect Alexander Zach (AT) - architect Ismail Karaduman (AT) - architect	
<b>JU234</b>	SPEED FIBERS	Tomas Ghisellini (IT) - architect Ferrara - Italia		Michele Pelliconi (IT) - student in architecture Giacomo Quercia (IT) - student in architecture Lucrezia Alemanno (IT) - student in architecture Matteo Viciani (IT) - student in architecture

<b>KC528</b>	BRANDING AMSTETTEN	Stella Moulara (GR) - architect urbanist Athína - Ellás	Eleni Aidoni (GR) - architect Ioanna Alexiou (GR) - architect Emmanouil Androulakis (GR) - architect Dionysia Chasapi (GR) - architect Alexandros Kotsas (GR) - transport engineer Ioannis Antonios Moutsatsos (GR) - architect Maria Triantafyllou (GR) - architect	Eleni Daferera (GR) - architect Pandora Giamalidou (GR) - architect Danai Gkoni (GR) - architect Eythalia Velegraki (GR) - architect
<b>MR662</b>	THE RAILWAY OF AMSTETTEN: A NEW PLACE OF MEETING AND EXCHANGES FOR THE INHABITANTS AND THE PASSENGERS OF THE CITY	Amandine Riss (FR) - architect Rosheim - République française	Aude-reine Hormaine (FR) - architect	
<b>NQ526</b>	HUBSTETTEN	Marco Del Monte (IT) - architect Lammari - Italia	Chiocca Valentina (IT) - architect Dario Arnone (IT) - architect Stefania Iurilli (IT) - architect Michele Martinelli (IT) - architect Belli Valentina (IT) - architect	
<b>OT187</b>	IBA Amstetten	Sanja Utech (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich	Christina Nägele (AT) - sociologist	
<b>RB043</b>	Amstetten kisses you wellcome	Iván Valero Fernández (ES) - architect Barcelona – España	Amelia Vilaplana de Miguel (ES) - architect	
<b>TT013</b>	Rail Way of Life	Juan Manuel Delgado Diaz (ES) - architect Olivares – España	Alberto de Austria Millan (ES) - architect	Pedro Coronado Vazquez (ES) - architect Carlos Alberto Delgado Collantes (ES) - architect
<b>WW809</b>	weaving	Daniela Anzil (IT) - architect Sagrado - Italia		
<b>YN698</b>	Amstetten.Zipping the City	Sorana Cornelia Radulescu (RO) - architect Graz - Österreich	Marcus Stevens (AT) - architect Uta Gelbke (DE) - architect	
<b>ZW408</b>	shake up	Markus Vogl (DE) - architect Stuttgart - Deutschland	Sigrid Müller-Welt (DE) - architect Bence Horvath (HU) - architect Dominique Dinies (CH) - architect Anita Barthelemy (AT) - architect Mechthild Weber (DE) - architect Fabien Barthelemy (FR) - architect Zsuzsanna Werner (HU) - architect	


**GRAZ**

Code	Title	Team Representative	Associates	Contributors
<b>LG181</b> RUNNER UP	polyrhythmic fields	Katja Aljaž (SI) – architect Republika Slovenija		Matej Mejak (SI) – student in architecture
<b>IA264</b> RUNNER UP	The Bucket List -Feel the City	Sebastian Jenull (AT) – architect Graz - Österreich	Sandra Tantscher (AT) – architect	Reinhild Weinberger (BR) – architect Wilfried Stering (AT) – building engineer Thomas Perz (AT) – computer graphic designer
<b>GF328</b> SPECIAL MENTION	SMART BASE	Hector Salcedo Garcia (ES) – architect Sevilla – España	Monge Fernández Javier (ES) – architect Rodríguez Carrascosa Mariem (ES) – architect	Rodríguez Barbudo José Javier (ES) – student in architecture
<b>BB533</b> SECOND ROUND	FOXES & HEDGEHOGS	Theresa Krenn (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich		
<b>BU589</b>	SMART CITIZEN	Francisco Requena Crespo (ES) - architect Sagunto – España	Marta Skalska (PL) - architect urbanist	
<b>FS319</b>	enklaven, kreuz und andere annehmlichkeiten	Roberto Sforza (IT) - architect Rome - Italia	Maria Adelaide Pasetti Bombardella (IT) - architect	Beatrice Crescenzi Lanna (IT) - architect
<b>GM516</b>	2013 - 2033 / HYBRID WAY	Matteo Facchinelli (IT) - architect Brescia - Italia		Erica Beluffi (IT) - architect Anna Ghirardi (IT) - architect Beibhinn Delaney (IT) - student in architecture Alberto Giovagnoni (IT) - architect Marco Masetti (IT) - landscape architect Alberto Rodolfo Tomasini (IT) - student in architecture
<b>IC816</b>	Wohnen+	Irene Arranz Astasio (ES) - architect Las Rozas de Madrid – España	Mora González Miriam (ES) - architect Nieto Martino Alejandro (ES) - architect	
<b>LI032</b>	Urban Quilt	Dennis Lassche (NL) - architect urbanist Voorburg - Nederland		
<b>LQ076</b>	Metabolic Tango	Mario Rodriguez-Vina (ES) - architect Madrid – España		Agustin Lopez Ludena (ES) - student in architecture Hélène Finazzo (FR) - student in architecture
<b>MK705</b>	Hierarchy of open spaces	Valeria Piras (IT) - architect Cagliari - Italia	Demurtas Simone (IT) - architect	Ibba Barbara (IT) - architect Mussetti Federico (IT) - architect
<b>OD255</b>	U.P.D.II_Urban Parallax Dream	Dean Smith (GB) - architect London - Great Britain	Mirzahosseinkhan Arezo (GB) - architect Koroni Dimitra (GB) - architect Sorrentino Francesca (GB) - architect Ho Chi Kin (GB) - architect	
<b>ON834</b>	Urban / Nature: Relinking, Share, Intensify	Leslie Auriac (FR) - urbanist Paris - République française	Aurelie Viala (FR) - architect	Alice Rolfe (FR) - student in architecture Rosalie Pericaud (FR) - student in architecture
<b>PB056</b>	December 21th: A place to the sun	Laurent Lustigman (FR) - architect Paris - République française	Boris Girin (FR) - architect	
<b>VN837</b>	SQUARED STREET	Filippo Govoni (IT) - architect Ferrara - Italia	Elisa Greco (IT) - architect Laura Mezquita Gonzalez (ES) - architect Enrico Arbizzani (IT) - architect Riccardo Russo (IT) - architect Giovanni Avosani (IT) - architect Federico Orsini (IT) - architect	
<b>WD052</b>	VOID FIRST	Anna Romani (IT) - architect Bologna - Italia	Elena Nicastrò (IT) - architect	
<b>WV376</b>	Urban resource_ a vision for the Waagner-	Hannes Schroll (AT) - architect Innsbruck - Österreich	Michael Kapeller (AT) - architect	


**WIEN - KAGRAN**

Code	Title	Team Representative	Associates	Contributors
<b>ZZ810</b> RUNNER UP	MONUMENT IN FERTILE COUNTRY	Marco Corazza (IT) – architect Milano - Italia	Castelli Giulia (CH) – architect Mingolo Alessandro (IT) – architect urbanist	Silvia Marta Flavia Di Stefano (IT) - student in architecture Sara Saggiorato (IT) - student in architecture Giulia Minini (IT) - student in architecture Daniele Torresin (IT) - student in architecture Vicenzo die Salvia (IT) - graphic designer
<b>ER202</b> RUNNER UP	Kaleidoscope	Hans Fockety (BE) – architect Basel - Schweiz	Miquel Del Rio Sanin (ES) – architect	
<b>RA980</b> RUNNER UP	EN POINTE	Lorena Del Rio Gimeno (ES) – architect Madrid – España		Neeraj Bhatia (CA) - architect Wei Zhao (CN) - architect Alicia Ellen Hergenroeder (US) - student in architecture De Yi (US) - student in architecture Jonathan Dietrich Negrón (US) - student in architecture Carly Lillian Dean (US) - student in architecture
<b>BC483</b>	Wohnzimmer Kagrán	Nikolas Kichler (NL) - architect Wien - Österreich		Liliana Negrila (AT) - student in architecture Christian Mörtl (AT) - architect Lukas Lederer (AT) - architect Julia Klaus (AT) - architect Süreya Miller (CH) - architect
<b>BJ879</b>	Über Hof	Urtzi Grau (ES) - architect Brooklyn - United States		
<b>CW548</b>	SUB_URBAN City	Giovanni Netti (IT) - architect Turi - Italia	Francesco Stefanachi (IT) - architect Micaela Pignatelli (IT) - architect Ubaldo Occhinegro (IT) - landscape architect Alessandro Labriola (IT) - landscape architect Maria Cristina Petralla (IT) - urban planner Andrea Tassinari (IT) - urban planner	Nicola Boccadoro (IT) - student in architecture
<b>DR095</b>	RURBAN WIEN	Ivan Capdevila Castellanos (ES) - architect Alicante – España	Vicente Iborra Pallares (ES) - architect	Javier Campoy Ramos (ES) - student in architecture Fernández Martínez Ana (ES) - student in architecture Tatiana Sabrina Poggi (IT) - student in architecture David Gil Delgado (ES) - student in architecture
<b>EE267</b>	The Adaptable BOX	Laurence van Benthem (NL) - architect Rijswijk - Nederland	Floris van der Zee (NL) - architect urbanist Rolf van der Leeuw (NL) - architect urbanist	
<b>ET803</b>	BONDSCAPE	Ana Boranieva (MK) - architect Skopje - Republika Makedonija	Dejan Ivanovski (MK) - architect Risto Avramovski (MK) - architect Vladimir Deskov (MK) - architect Paolina Miluseva (MK) - architect Ana Ivanovska Deskova (MK) - architect	Sara Simoska (MK) - student in architecture Marjan Dimikj (MK) - student in architecture Pavel Veljanoski (MK) - student in architecture
<b>FC442</b>	Gitterbahn 1	Adrian Verhoijzen (BE) - architect Ledeberg - België	Steven Schreurs (BE) - architect Simon De Waepenaere (BE) - engineer architect Toon Vermeir (BE) - engineer architect Karel Bruyland (BE) - architect Thomas Roelandts (BE) - architect	



<b>GA390</b>	Cannibalism	Djordje Stojanovic (RS) - architect Beograd - Srbija	Kristina Arsic (RS) - architect Milutin Cerovic (RS) - architect Andjela Karabasevic (RS) - architect Snezana Zlatkovic (RS) - architect Ruzica Jovanovic (RS) - architect Milica Tasic (RS) - architect Ivana Damjanovic (RS) - architect	
<b>HY280</b>	PARK ing	Peter Hofstetter (AT) - architect London - Great Britain		
<b>JK336</b>	Living in the Strip	Mickael Papin (FR) - architect Paris - République française	Silande Pierre (FR) - architect Carel Antoine (FR) - architect Kim Kikyun (KR) - architect	
<b>KB329</b>	(Urbn)Symbiosis	Franck Bergerioux (FR) - architect Briollay - République française		
<b>LI121</b>	IF _ THEN _	Dunja Predic (AT) - architect Beograd - Srbija	Pavle Stamenovic (RS) - architect Dusan Stojanovic (RS) - architect Zarko Uzelac (RS) - architect	
<b>LY711</b>	"Der Zwischenstadt Anger"	Stefan Gruber (DE) - architect Wien - Österreich		Petra Sopouskova (CZ) - student in architecture Gilbert Berthold (AT) - architect Philipp Soeparo (AT) - architect Veit Burgbacher (DE) - student in architecture Isabelle Wolke (DE) - architect Frank Schwenk (DE) - architect
<b>QI124</b>	URBAN JUNGLE	Julia Forster (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich	Ludovic Marx (FR) - architect Manuel Stamenkovic (AT) - architect Andreas Pfusterer (AT) - architect	
<b>RJ118</b>	KLIMTCITY	Javier Lorenzo Yañez Molina (ES) - architect Alicante – España		
<b>TM594</b>	CHARTER CITY	Adriano Ferrer (ES) - architect Orriols – España	Castañé Albert (ES) - architect	Fabian G. Diem (CH) - architectural and urban theorist
<b>TR143</b>	HOF AUGÉ	Jorge Carretero (ES) - architect Moralzarzal – España		
<b>VJ850</b>	the brave new (m)all	Matilde Igual Capdevila (ES) - architect Schaan - Fürstentum Liechtenstein	Luis Hilti (LI) - architectural and urban theorist	Christof Mathes (AT) - student in architecture Alexandra Rapeaud (CH) - graphic designer
<b>WM510</b>	PARALLEL CONVERGENCES	Enrico Forestieri (IT) - architect Milano - Italia	Matteo Pace Sargenti (IT) - architect Pietro Pezzani (IT) - architect	
<b>XG018</b>	BRIDGING ARCHIPELAGOS	Luciano Gonzalez Alfaya (ES) - architect urbanist A Coruña – España	Patricia Muñoz Núñez (ES) - architect Robert Oberbuchner (DE) - architect Silvia Gonzalez Dacosta (ES) - architect	Juan Miguel Salgado Gomez (ES) - architect Christopher French (GB) - architect Javier Rocamonde (ES) - student in architecture Luis Santalla (ES) - student in architecture Paula Mondero (ES) - landscape architect Christine Anderson (GB) - architect Gael Sanchez Rivas (ES) - building engineer Natalia Alvaredo Lopez (ES) - urban planner
<b>XN523</b>	Amongst Fields	Günter Hainzl (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich	Gideon Brimmer (GB) - architect	



<p><b>YJ395</b></p>	<p>urbanity containers</p>	<p>Anna Gutierrez (ES) - architect Barcelona – España</p>	<p>Jodri Safont -Tria (ES) - architect</p>	<p>Asun Lopez (ES) - architect Ana Marquina (ES) - architect Paulo Borquez (CL) - architect Cesar Cordoba (ES) - architect Rodrigo Alvarez (ES) - student in architecture</p>
---------------------	----------------------------	---	--	---




**WIEN - SIEMENSÄCKER**

Code	Title	Team Representative	Associates	Contributors
<b>MB511</b> WINNER	Cluster/Streetscape	Miriam Liskova (SK) – architect Bratislava – Slovenská Republika		Marian Dusinsky (SK) – architect
<b>DF936</b> RUNNER UP	urban software	Enrique Arenas (ES) – architect Madrid – España	Basabe Luis (ES) – architect Palacios Luis (ES) – architect	Cano Almudena (ES) – architect Fernández Paula (ES) – students in architecture Pluch Kerstin (AT) – students in architecture Prieto Ana (ES) – students in architecture
<b>AT162</b> SECOND ROUND	grass stitch	Anna Droege (DE) - architect Konstanz - Deutschland	Franziska Schall (DE) - architect Kilian Basfeld (DE) - architect	
<b>NM195</b> SECOND ROUND	Sonenstadt	Martin Hejl (CZ) - architect Rotterdam - Nederland	Kostya Miroshnychenko (UA) - architect Lenka Hejlova (CZ) - architect	Eugenia Bezv (UA) - urban planner
<b>BW219</b>	Vienna on the Move	Francisco Pomares Pamplona (ES) – architect Elche – España	Johannes Pilz (AT) – architect Saimon Gomez Idiabez (ES) – architect Irena Nowacka (PL) – architect	Jonathan Schuster (DE) - student in architecture Filippo Fanciotti (IT) - student in architecture Hugo Maffre (FR) - student in architecture Nicolas Lee (CA) - student in architecture
<b>DA271</b>	active green	Joëll Thepen (NL) -architect Den Haag - Nederland	Andreas Lambrinos (NL) - architect Lars Capota (NL) - urban planner Niloefar Bitarafan (NL) - architect	
<b>DZ927</b>	Soft.mobility city	Adam Bialobrzeski (PL) - architect urbanist Warszawa - Polska	Messina Maria (PL) - architect Figurski Adam (PL) - architect	
<b>HN755</b>	SIEMENSHÖFE 21.	Rolf Kuck (DE) - architect Amsterdam - Nederland	Aida Fernández (ES) - graphic designer Ilaria Conalb (IT) - interior architect	
<b>IV687</b>	COME TOGETHER	Ernst Th Gruber (AT) - architect urbanist Wien - Österreich	Christina Lenart (AT) - architect urbanist	Sofia Sorazábal (AR) - architect Manuel Hanke (AT) - sociologist
<b>JQ981</b>	STRIP - SCAPE	Marco Scuderi (IT) - architect Pescara - Italia	Mastrodonardo Luciana (IT) - architect Francavilla Giuseppe (IT) - architect	Toscana Patrizia (IT) - architect
<b>LW708</b>	CHAIN REACTION	Sören Grünert (DE) - architect New York - United States	Elena Perez Gueembe (ES) - architect Daniel Sundlin (SE) - architect	
<b>MQ062</b>	Siemens Kreisäcker	Aleksander Lalic (SI) - architect Kamnik - Slovenija	Petra Kregar (SI) - architect Sinan Mihelčič (SI) - architect	Domen Strazar (SI) - student in architecture Andraž Hrovat (SI) - student in architecture Bartol Ambrož (SI) - student in architecture Dominik Košak (SI) - student in architecture Rok Žurbi (SI) - student in architecture David Klobčar (SI) - student in architecture Lana Semečnik (SI) - student in architecture Aleksi Víčič (SI) - student in architecture Lučka Kuhar (SI) - student in architecture Nejc Kugler (SI) - student in architecture
<b>MR312</b>	Virtual Landscape. A Manual for Dynamic	Peter Stec (SK) - architect Prešporok - Slovenská republika		Marek Jarotta (SK) - artist Julia Kollathova (SK) - architect Marianna Maczova (SK) - architect Miroslav Straka (SK) - student in architecture Veronika Trnovska (SK) - architect Michaela Voracova (CZ) - student in architecture Nora Zaludekova (SK) - student in architecture



<b>NJ462</b>	Neue SiemensStadt	Alejandro Postigo (ES) - architect Madrid – España	Delgado Pablo (ES) - architect	Díez Ignacio (ES) - architect Tejedor Javier (ES) - architect
<b>PC072</b>	SIEMENSRING	Artur Borejszo (PL) - architect Rotterdam - Nederland		Jason Hilgefort (NL) - architect urbanist Leena Cho (US) - landscape architect
<b>VK538</b>	Hybrid Communities	Daniel Harrer (AT) - architect Wien - Österreich		
<b>WB054</b>	New Urban Vision (integrated mix)	Andrea Atzori (IT) - architect Portoscuso - Italia		
<b>WB193</b>	OSUS	Agustin Mari Alarcon (ES) - architect Valencia – España		Hinarejos Gonzalez Virginia (ES) - architect Camarasa Hernando Clara (ES) - architect
<b>WB257</b>	Plug, Play and Stay	Rubén Miguel Águeda (ES) - architect Madrid – España		Maria Hernandez Enriquez (ES) - student in architecture Del Castillo Tello Sergio (ES) - student in architecture
<b>XR092</b>	SIEMENS UPDATE	David Voisin (FR) - architect Paris - République française	Willy Afonso (FR) - architect Mariana Ivancovsky (FR) - architect	
<b>XX248</b>	Walkscapes - Walking as aesthetic practice	Vincent Konaté (FR) - architect Montigny-Les-Metz - République française		
<b>YV606</b>	Hi-De Siemens City	David Chinea (ES) - architect Chatou - République française	Lorenzana Ricardo (ES) - architect Francesco Vinci (IT) - architect	