



REPORT OF THE BELGIAN JURY
SESSION 11 OF EUROPAN COMPETITION

FIRST SESSION

Liège (B), October 14 and 15 2011

NATIONAL MEMBERS

Public Authority representative

Martine RIDIAUX, Architect, representative of the operational General Direction of territorial planning of Wallonia

Client representatives

Benoit DISPA, Mayor of Gembloux

Renaud KINET, Architect, office of the of Urban planning of Liège

Architects

Pierre GOT, Urban planner, Tournai

Didier LEPOT, Architect urban planner, Liège BE/Maastricht NL

FOREIGN MEMBERS

Architects

Ronan ABGRAL-ABHAMON, Architect, Europan 7 winner, Paris FR

Patrick GENARD, Architect, Madrid ES

Personalities

Philippe PANERAI, Architect, teacher, Urban planning Award 1999, Paris FR

Alain PELISSIER, Architect, urban planner, Professor ENSA Paris-Val-de-Seine, Doctor, Paris FR

SUBSTITUTES

Joël MATRICHE, Journalist Le Soir, Bruxelles

Jean Michel DEGRAEVE, Architect, Habitat concept, Maison de l'Urbanité, Rixensart

Meeting of Friday, October 14, 2011

After a morning dedicated to visiting the sites of Sambreville and Marche-en-Famenne by members of the jury, hosted by the authorities of each town, the deliberative session begins at 2:30 pm in Liege. All members are present.

The jury will have to evaluate 41 projects submitted for the site of Sambreville and 43 projects submitted for the site of Marche-en-Famenne.

1. Themes and procedures of Europan

Introduction speech by Pierre Sauveur, President, recalling to the attention of the jury some important points:

- Projects must fit into the **theme** of Europan which is "The resonance between the Territory and Lifestyles. What kind of architectures for sustainable cities?"
- the judging process is made of **three steps**, the second will be held at the Forum in Oslo in November 2011, in which open discussions will take place with international experts on the projects selected by this jury at this first session.

2. Election of the Jury President

Pierre GOT is unanimously elected President of the Jury.

3. Methodology for the evaluation of the projects

1. The jury chooses to begin its analysis with the projects presented on the site of Marche-en-Famenne.
2. The jury sets up his methodology: Projects will be evaluated 10 projects at a time.
 1. Step 1: Discovery of each project by members of the jury individually and silently.
 2. Step 2: Project by project detailed look at the technical analysis.
The technical analysis addresses the following aspects:
 - Compliance of the documents submitted
 - General concept Site of reflection / Site of action
 - Review of attribution criteria
 3. Step 3: Discussion about each project and first selection (projects are either eliminated, kept, or kept with reservation)
 4. Step 4: Second look at the retained projects, comparative analysis and new selection : selected, selected with reserve.
 5. Step 5: Discussion of selected projects with reserve: consensus or vote

A. Site of Marche-en-Famenne

Discussion of each project and first selection

AA 210

Project not retained

Project considered out of scale. The proposed size is excessive.

The applicant or applicant team does not seem to have approached the local built correctly. The project creates an inadequate barrier between the future urban boulevard and the old part of the town.

AM 777

Project not retained

The project does not meet the program

It offers a sensible idea, however, with the addition of a garden, but the jury feared a "false good idea", too weak to carry the project.

BB 012

Project retained

The applicant or applicant team seems to have been attentive to the slope of the site (proposes a specific cross-section plan).

However, the jury is divided on this project.

The jury feared a "fake" good idea, expressed in "kitsch" type of architecture

The project also seems to lack strength, remains embryonic and too conventional.

BB061

Project not retained

The jury sees an original idea that seems quite relevant.

It seems to be expressed in the perspective proposed but it is not handled adequately. The jury regrets a lack of sensitivity in the expression.

The interesting idea of opening the city is not found in the actual processing of the project.

BE 016

Project retained

Coherent project, at a good scale, except in the handling of the "bow" of the project (corner building)

BE 010

Project not retained

Project considered out of scale, too chaotic.

The jury does not see the benefit of the corridor proposed

Antinomy between the project that promotes transparency, but actually blocks too much.

BS 590

Project not retained

The applicant or applicant team does not seem to have understood the context and the challenges of the site.

"bar" shaped project not interesting enough and too rigid.

Choices inappropriate to the site.

CCO40

Project not retained

Despite the qualities of scale, an interesting and kind use of volumes, the project seems unrealistic.

Nearly half of the housing is located in confined and complex spaces, generated by the choice of a diagonal orientation.

FA 074

Project not retained

Project not selected because of its unfinished proposal.

The project calls to mind small houses, but which seem to "float" on a commercial ground floor.

The project also presents a reflection on the corner of the site, but unfortunately treated in a too classic manner.

FV 296***Project retained***

The project is considered interesting although there are few overview images to judge clearly. The jury feels it has insufficient information to understand everything, but decides to retain the project in order to have more time for proper understanding.

GD 542***Project not retained***

Despite the care taken to create a wide variety of housing, the project proposes no integration to the urban context.

The project denies the city, turning mainly in the other direction.

We also find some inconsistencies in the operation of traffic.

GP 570***Project retained***

The project offers an interesting mix of housing, but on the other hand, the plans are of poor quality.

It also gives well-adapted suggestions about the parking lots.

The architectural language is deliberately modern, using slate on the front.

The jury, however, is divided on the slightly massive architectural ensemble as well as the use of this material on the front.

GS 801***Project not retained***

Project not selected because it feels unfinished.

Despite a front side rather well studied on the old city side, the front side on the boulevard is not interesting enough.

HB 189***Project retained***

The jury is sensing a lot of strength from the conceptual project, which also does great things with the difficulty of the plot.

The jury, however, regrets the option in the orientation. It seems that switching the side of the Boulevard and the side of the ancient city would have been more appropriate.

The jury also regrets the architectural expression of the corner building, not very opportune.

HZ 158***Project not retained***

The jury regrets a proposed program that is overloaded

The applicant or applicant team has made too many new proposals when the existing program was already quite heavy (amphitheater, ...).

The jury also regrets the lack of clarity of the panels, not offering images to clearly visualize the project.

IC 051***Project retained***

The jury is sensing a lot of quality in this project which succeeds to integrate into the site with simplicity. Beautiful urban solution, original.

The jury appreciates the judicious use of empty spaces, the differences in levels (terraces).

In addition, the project proposes a new link to the old site in addition to the existing alley.

The jury, however, is reserved about the architectural expression in total contrast with existing buildings.

JJ 373***Project not retained***

The jury regrets the extreme options, without integration to the site.

In addition the project is considered unrealistic in terms of budget.

KB 001***Project not retained***

Project does not comply to the guidelines for both the content (poor integration to the site) and the form (panel dimensions, language used in the book).

KK 123***Project not retained***

The jury regrets an response inadequate to the site.

The project is considered banal, served by an poor expression of proposed facades.

KW 101***Selected Project***

The jury retains the project mainly for the interest he has in terms of traffic.

LC 180**Project not retained**

The jury regrets too rigid an expression of a project which lacks transparency
Project feels unfinished.

THE 113**Projet non retenu**

The jury regrets the lack of originality of the project.
In addition, treatment of the angle of the plot is considered not harmonious.

LU 307**Project not retained**

The jury regrets a monolithic proposal (although with variations in shape) for a fairly complex problem.
The project shows a lack of sensitivity in the apprehension of the site.

MA 312***Project retained***

Project treated at the right scale and offering an interesting diversity in the types of housing.
The jury, however, is skeptical about the proposal made by the applicant to extend the proposed project on the same frame.
The jury notes some weaknesses in the land development.

MD 100**Project not retained**

Project not retained due to poor choice of scale. The proposed buildings are too high for the site.
The project is confusing, there is no plan of the ground floor, which makes it difficult to follow.
Despite taking into account the north / south orientation of the place, shown in the different treatment of the facades, the project has poor spatial organization of housing (passageway in front of the living rooms, ...)

MA 745**Project not retained**

Project not retained because of its inadequacy to the site.
It is not a good answer to the problems at hand, among other things because of the lack of parking spaces proposed.
Project seen as "naive" by the jury

ML 014**Project not retained**

Original idea, but poorly treated.
The project offers too little housing.
The height of proposed buildings is very important and not sufficiently justified by the project.
The public square inside the project does not seem justified at this location, and may often be deserted.

ML 234**Project not retained**

The answer seems completely unsuited to the proposed site.
The proposed project is deemed "anti-urban"
It seems there was a misunderstanding of the site and program.

MU 808**Project not retained**

The jury considers the project unsuitable to the location, out of context
The treatment of the gable seems inappropriate to the site.
In addition, there is a contradiction between the material advertised as used and its representation on the panels.

NO 146**Project retained**

The jury retains the project because the opinions are divided.
Despite certain qualities, the project is too compact and its rigor is disturbing.

PH 808**Project not retained**

"anti-urban" option. Its presentation recalls of an alignment of houses whose succession of ridge, too regular, is felt as paradoxical.

The jury also wonders whether the proposed project (plan aligned to the rear and indented in the front) would not have benefited from being "inverted"

Treatment of the gable is not regional.

The jury, however, salutes the very clear presentation of the project which makes it very understandable.

PK 300**Project not retained**

The jury did not retain this project, considered completely out of scale.

The number of housing units proposed (90) and the number of parking spaces (24) are much too big for the site.

PR 224**Project retained**

Project retained for its originality, for the interesting reflection it proposes, and for the creation of two public spaces.

The solution is however considered a little too radical.

The jury also has reservations about the scale of the project (seems high), as well as the quality of life offered in these units fully glazed ("Aquarium")

RU 690**Project not retained**

The jury regrets the massive size of the project, considered out of scale.

The jury also regrets a lack of dialogue with the surroundings.

The expression of the gable (bow of the project) is inopportune.

SA 187**Project not retained**

The project is considered completely out of scale and poorly adapted to the context.

Also it does not meet the program since it does not offer housing.

SU 241**Project not retained**

The project is considered out of scale and poorly adapted to the context.

The jury can not comment on the quality of housing whose interiors are not drawn.

SV 751**Project Retained**

The project seduces the jury with his well studied approach.

The project takes advantage of the narrowness of the plot with a clever arrangement of housing.

The jury, however, regrets the lack of opening to the south.

UM 111 " SOFT TRANSITION "**Project not retained**

The project was not retained because deemed unsuitable to the context and out of scale.

Denial of the site, no effort for integration.

The jury regrets lack of sensitivity and understanding of the context

UM 111 " LIVING ON THE HINGE "**Project not retained**

The project was not retained because deemed unsuitable to the context, too rigid.

Project too linear for the site.

WG 437

Project not retained

The project was not retained because deemed unsuitable to the context

The proposed project, although built on columns is seen as massive and inappropriate at this location.

XC 437

Project retained

The jury decided to retain the project for the choice of scale.

However, the project does not meet the program because even if the proposed idea is appealing, it does not meet the constraints of the project's current urban boulevard.

The organization of housing also needs to be reviewed.

XL 246

Project not retained

The jury regrets the ground treatment of the project (ground floor "transparent" on which the units appear to "float"), unsuitable for the site.

The jury also regrets poor housing distributions and orientations.

ZI 345

Project not retained

The project presents a problem of scale, ill-chosen for the site.

It is not adapted to the location.

The bays in the facade also seem not coherent with the site.

After this first round, 12 projects were selected:

BB 012
BB 016
FV 296
GP 570
HB 189
IC 051
101 KW
MA 312
NO 146
PR 224
SV 751
XC 437

Second look at selected projects, comparative analysis and new selection

Some projects stand out and receive at this stage unanimous approval from the jury except for some reservations, these are projects are:

BB 016
GP 570
HB 189
IC 051
MA 312
PR 224
SV 751

The debate resumes around the remaining projects which are

BB 012
FV 296
101 KW
NO 146
XC 437

BB 012

Reminder of the first comment :

The applicant or applicant team seems to have been attentive to the slope of the site (proposes a specific XXXXX). However, the jury is divided on this project.

The jury feared a "fake" good idea, expressed in architecture "kitsch"

The project also seems to lack strength, remains embryonic and too conventional.

Project not selected in the second round

The project is too formal and lacks originality

The proposed garden does not seem realistic.

The jury regrets a "fashion" expression of the project

FV 296

Reminder of the first comment :

The project is considered interesting although there are few overview images to judge clearly. The jury feels it has insufficient information to understand everything, but decides to retain the project in order to have more time for proper understanding.

Project not selected in the second round

Despite an interesting variety of volumes, the project is not deep enough in its treatment of facades.

The coherence of the project is linked to its wholeness. However it requires the demolition of two neighboring houses, not provided in the program and not feasible.

KW 101

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury retains the project mainly for the interest he has in terms of traffic.

Project selected in the second round

The scale of the project is correct.

Some jury members are divided, however, finding the project outdated and lacking originality.

NO 146

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury retains the project because the opinions are divided.

Despite certain qualities, the project is too compact and its rigor is disturbing.

Project not selected in the second round

The project is considered too compact, too harsh.

The jury regrets a lack of sensitivity to context.

XC 437

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury decided to retain the project for the choice of scale.

However, the project does not meet the program because even if the proposed idea is appealing, it does not meet the constraints of the current project of urban boulevard.

The organization of housing also needs to be reviewed.

Project not selected in the second round

The project can not be selected because of its non-realistic proposal to modify the project of the new urban boulevard.

Discussions on projects retained with reserve - consensus or vote

After the second round, 8 projects are still in the running:

BB 016
GP 570
HB 189
IC 051
KW 101
MA 312
PR 224
SV 751

Of these eight projects, 4 are selected unanimously:

BB 016
GP 570
IC 051
SV 751

The jury decides to vote on the 4 remaining projects:

HB 189 3 votes against, 4 votes for , 2 abstentions Project selected
MA 312 4 votes against , 5 votes for, Project selected
PR 224 6 votes against, 3 votes for, Project not selected
KW 101 7 votes against, 2 votes for, Project not selected

In conclusion, are selected for this first phase of jury the 6 projects having the following codes:

BB 016
HB 189
GP 570
IC 051
MA 312
SV 751

The session of Friday, October 14 is closed at 7:00 p.m..

Meeting on Saturday, October 15, 2011

B. Site of Sambreville

Discussion of each project and first selection

AA 851

Project not retained

The jury appreciated the idea of a cantilever at the existing bridge to create a new connection to the other side of the Sambre.

On the other hand, the density of housing proposed is far too low, and the infrastructure is disproportionate compared to the number of housing proposed.

Project rather confusing overall.

AF 389

Project not retained

The project rejected because non-compliant. The project is not anonymous.

AF 579

Project not retained

While the jury considers the idea of the "quartz center" (culture, shops, business, services, nursery) interesting, it regrets the disproportionate scale assigned to it.

The jury also regrets that the proposed density is too low and the frame of the plan too rigid.

AG 368

Project not retained

The jury considers the basic principle of the project (polders) very unadapted to the site.

The various assignments given to the "slats" (fishing, forestry, ...) seem difficult to implement, and contribute to an ecological exaggeration.

Although the frame of the project fits the sinuosity of the existing road network on which it is connected, the jury regrets a certain rigidity of the project.

The jury, however, sees qualities in the proposed volumes.

AM 367

Project not retained

Based on a repetitive frame, the project aims at being scalable (density adaptable according to the number of units and their variable heights)

The jury, however, remains skeptical about this type of solution.

The jury also regrets difficult movement within the blocks, due to lack of reference.

The idea of adding a sports field while a similar structure exists in the vicinity seems inadequate.

The study of mobility is not convincing.

AV 013

Project not retained

Project deemed unrealistic.

The proposed planned demolition (demolition of the town hall to rebuild towers) is inadequate.

The project achieves a good density but it is mainly due to the capacity of the towers rebuilt on the bank opposite to the site of action.

BF 780

Project retained

The jury retains this project which shows a good overall urban planning reflection.

This scalable concept provides guidelines for multiple uses.

The approach to the water in the project is interesting

The housing density proposed and the road infrastructure seem too large and could certainly be reduced.

BH 030

Project not retained

The project is somewhat prisoner of its concept.

The idea for dockside shops could be interesting, but the implementation of businesses on such a large area is not realistic (the viability of these businesses would already be difficult to consider in the city center ...)

The proposed lacks a connection with the other bank.

BN 981

Project retained

The jury retains this project for its urbanistic reflection more than for the project itself.

It installs in R+4 and R+6 buildings along existing roads to clear the site and give it an ecological value, and it creates a new connection between the two banks.

However, the jury is divided on the treatment of the bank

The jury also appreciates the clarity of presentation of the project (including its cross-section plan).

CB 276

Project not retained

Despite an approach actively including both banks of the Sambre, the project is not successful enough, it lacks clarity and information (eg no plans other than mass plans, no information on the number of housing).

The principle of the humid valley is a concept also challenged.

The jury also regrets the lack of hierarchy between motorized and pedestrian traffic.

CC 323

Project retained

The jury appreciates the overall reflection.

The proposed housing has an adequate size, an interesting typology, along the existing road network, preserving much of the site (central park)

The inhabited bridge is an original idea but not very realistic, and expensive.

Independently of the completion of the bridge, the project is simple and easily phasable.

CT 011

Project not retained

The project is out of scale, much too dense.

It seems that there is poor understanding of the context. The project is too urban for Sambreville.

DB 201

Project retained

The jury finds the project adequate, consistent and realistic.

It also welcomes the proposed treatment of the towpath.

EM 268**Project not retained**

The project is out of scale, far too complex.

Project unrealistic, especially in terms of construction over the Sambre (waterway with boat traffic)

ES 202**Project not retained**

The concept of housing is inadequate. Risk of ghettos although some views presented are of interest.

The idea of traffic along the east bank is unwelcome.

FF 059**Project not retained**

Hybrid project, presenting an addition of things containing anything and everything ...

The project does not sufficiently take into account the site, the contact with water is not successful: proposal for a "wall" of offices there.

The idea of creating a new link between the two banks, however, is appreciated.

FG 023**Project selected**

The jury appreciates the connection created with the existing city, the buildings leaving visual links towards the Sambre and the desire to integrate nature in the city.

However, the jury notes a few contradictions such as between the density shown in plan and the one presented in perspective, the "green" roof and their representations in perspective ...

The jury also regrets some weakness in the efficiency of traffic.

GA 002**Project not retained**

Despite an interesting approach, the project does not meet the program and does not bring a relevant answer to the problem at hand.

It appears that the applicant or the applicant team has abandoned the word "neighborhood" to concentrate on "eco".

GA 175**Project not retained**

The jury finds the overall composition confusing and not accomplished.

He regrets the lack of clarity in the status of roads, inversion of the location of houses and their gardens in places makes the composition hybrid.

The jury, however, recognizes real qualities in the atmosphere proposed (perspective views)

The jury also notes contradictions between the cross-sectional representations and the perspectives (Gateway Bridge)

GE 357**Project not retained**

Despite some originality, the jury can not retain this project that remains at the stage of an idea which can not be perceived as a whole.

IE 421**Project not retained**

Despite a reflection extended to a wider area, the project feels unfinished.

The concept is based on an open process, not clearly defined

The number of housing is not specified.

II 111**Project not retained**

The jury regrets a poor urban organization.

The option is sketchy and speculative.

The jury, however, appreciates the clarity of the cross-section plans presented.

The jury also has reservations about the concentration-like atmosphere of the housing proposed.

JC 123**Project not retained**

The jury regrets the morphology of the proposed habitat is not adapted to the site.

It also has reservations about the risk of ghettoization of the proposed housing, leading to a high density.

KY 285**Project not retained**

The jury regrets the lack of seriousness in the investigation.
The project ignores the existing situation and is not adapted to the site.

LS 046**Project not retained**

The jury finds the project unimaginative.
In addition, the proposed density is too low and traffic organized along the Sambre regrettable.

N 521**Project not retained**

The jury considers the project not of high quality.
The project is vague and not well defined
The role of the car for example is not addressed

OH 503**Project retained**

The jury appreciates the simplicity of the project as a whole, the proposed diverse typology of the buildings, but regrets the density proposed, too high for the site.
The creation of a link between the two banks is appreciated. Its form (ferry boat ?) does not seem appropriate.
The jury ponders about the opportunity to move the existing station

OO 000**Project not retained**

The jury can not retain this project completely out of scale, and showing a complete misunderstanding of the site.

PI 314**Project not retained**

The jury retains the idea of moving the station (bridge station) as quite interesting.
However the project has some intentions but few reflections on the reality of the site.
It also contains little information on the architecture.

PZ 001**Project not retained**

The jury notes a weakness in urban planning and a project not sufficiently polished.
He also finds inconsistencies within the information drawn.

QA 207**Project not retained**

The jury can not retain this project, which demonstrates a lack of true consideration of the site and its issues.
The proposed solution is unrealistic and too systematic.
Building on stilts does not seem to be an adequate option and is not part of a "sustainable" logic.

RM 749**Project retained**

The jury particularly appreciated the intention (original diagram), but regrets the development of the project.
Treatment of the original idea non-adequate

RW 930**Project not retained**

The jury considers the project off topic.
He regrets too weak a reflection on the reality of the site.

SG 013**Project not retained**

The project provides an original idea (a new channel). It sees an interesting intimate relationship with water.
However the project remains unrealistic, and many technical problems (water levels, ...) are not resolved.

SS 333

Project not retained

The proposed development plan is banal and outdated. The reproduction of a traditional lot is not adapted for this site.

TS 069

Project not retained

The project density is too low. He scatters the housing in a pavilion-like distribution which is outdated. The housing grid is too classic, and too distant from an urban context.

In addition, the question of the car is not addressed.

By trying too hard to analyze the outside of the site, the applicant or applicant team seems to have forgotten to address the issue of site itself.

TT 123

Project not retained

Despite an interesting idea to work on smooth transitions, based on a well-thought method of vernacular development, the project does not take sufficient advantage of the site.

In addition, the question of the car is not sufficiently addressed.

UU 004

Project not retained

The jury regrets a project off topic and outside of the program.

WW 511

Project not retained

The applicant or applicant team does not present plans, but instead a cartoon showing an implementation of the project.

The project is interesting for its reflection about a strategy for action.

However the jury can not accept this proposal which does not provide answers to the issues at hand.

XJ 220

Project retained

The jury appreciates the original thinking of the candidate or the candidate team that offers an additional reflection to the program.

The idea of primarily re-densifying the city with scattered actions, occupying the city's wholes, allows to create on the site of a European a "landscaped area between recreation and nature"

ZK 009

Project not retained

Despite some interesting atmospheres proposed, the project seems confusing.

Project seems to not take into account the characteristics of the site.

After this first round, 8 projects were retained:

BF 780

BN 981

CC 323

DB 201

FG 023

OH 503

RM 749

XJ 220

Second look at selected projects, comparative analysis and new selection

BF 780

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury retains this project which shows a good overall urban planning reflection.

This scalable concept provides guidelines for multiple uses.

The approach to the water in the project is interesting

The housing density proposed and the road infrastructure seem too large and could certainly be reduced.

Project selected in the second round

The jury decides to select this project for its well-adapted consideration of the site, the quality of its modest and realistic proposals, and the interesting general atmosphere that it creates.
The jury, however, suggests to reduce slightly the density of housing and the number of roads.

BN 981

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury retains this project for its urbanistic reflection more than for the project itself.

It installs in R+4 and R+6 buildings along existing roads to clear the site and give it an ecological value, and it creates a new connection between the two banks.

However, the jury is divided on the treatment of the bank

The jury also appreciates the clarity of presentation of the project (including its cross-section).

Project not selected in the second round

The jury is divided on the housing presented and their density.

He regrets the treatment of the bank with concrete, too present in the project.

CC323

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury appreciates the overall reflection.

The proposed housing has an adequate size, an interesting typology, along the existing road network, preserving much of the site (central park)

The inhabited bridge is an original idea but not very realistic, and expensive.

Independently of the completion of the bridge, the project is simple and easily phasable.

Project selected in the second round

The jury decides to select this project for its original approach (park on the main site and housing along existing roads) but believes that this idea is perhaps not the most suitable for the site.

DB 201

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury finds the project adequate, consistent and realistic.

It also welcomes the proposed treatment of the towpath.

Project selected in the second round

The jury confirmed its first opinion on the coherence of the project, its qualities of atmosphere and its good use of space.

FG 023

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury appreciates the connection created with the existing city, the buildings leaving visual links towards the Sambre and the desire to integrate nature in the city.

However, the jury notes a few contradictions such as between the density shown in plan and the one presented in perspective, the "green" roof and their representations in perspective ...

The jury also regrets some weakness in the efficiency of traffic.

Project not selected in the second round

The jury regrets too much partitioning between homes and offices, an unclear relationship to the Sambre.

He fears a false simplicity and shows a lack of affirmation in the approach.

It confirms its previously issued positive assessment on the proposed road link with the existing city.

OH 503

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury appreciates the simplicity of the project as a whole, the proposed diverse typology of the buildings, but regrets the density proposed, too high for the site.

The creation of a link between the two banks is appreciated. Its Form (ferry boat ?) does not seem appropriate.

The jury ponders about the opportunity to move the existing station

Project selected in the second round

The jury appreciates the hierarchy of circulation (decrease in traffic near the bank)

The jury remains divided on the proposed idea to move the existing station.

RM 749

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury particularly appreciated the intention of the party (original diagram), but regrets the development of the project.

Treatment of the original idea non-adequate

Project not selected in the second round

The jury confirms the qualities of the basic concept, unfortunately, poorly served by the treatment of the project, not sufficiently polished.

XJ 220

Reminder of the first comment :

The jury appreciates the original thinking of the candidate or the candidate team that offers an additional reflection to the program.

The idea of primarily re-densifying the city with scattered actions, occupying the city's wholes, allows to create on the site of a European a "landscaped area between recreation and nature"

Project selected in the second round

The jury was unanimous in saluting the intelligent reflection of the project and decides to select the project for the next step.

The jury decides to keep at 5 the number of retained projects at this stage :

In conclusion, are selected for this first phase of the jury the 5 projects having the following codes:

BF 780

CC 323

DB 201

OH 503

XJ 220

The meeting is closed at 5:00 p.m..

Done in Liège, on November 10, 2011

Pierre GOT

President of the Belgian jury of session 11 of European competition



REPORT OF THE BELGIAN JURY
SESSION 11 OF EUROPAN COMPETITION

SECOND SESSION

Liège (B), November 19, 2011

NATIONAL MEMBERS

Public Authority representative

Martine RIDIAUX, Architect, representative of the operational General Direction of territorial planning of Wallonia

Client representatives

Benoit DISPA, Mayor of Gembloux

Renaud KINET, Architect, office of the of Urban planning of Liège

Architects

Pierre GOT, Urban planner, Tournai

Didier LEPOT, Architect urban planner, Liège BE/Maastricht NL

FOREIGN MEMBERS

Architects

Ronan ABGRAL-ABHAMON, Architect, European 7 winner, Paris FR

Patrick GENARD, Architect, Madrid ES

Personalities

Philippe PANERAI, Architect, teacher, Urban planning Award 1999, Paris FR

Alain PELISSIER, Architect, urban planner, Professor ENSA Paris-Val-de-Seine, Doctor, Paris FR

SUBSTITUTES

Joël MATRICHE, Journalist Le Soir, Bruxelles

Jean Michel DEGRAEVE, Architect, Habitat concept, Maison de l'Urbanité, Rixensart

Meeting of Saturday, November 19, 2011

The session begins at 9:30.

All members are present except Mister Genard and Mister Lepot, excused.

Jean-Michel Degraeve is present. From an alternate member, he becomes an effective member and joins the other members of the jury.

Joël Matriche, 2nd alternate, could not be present.

As a reminder, 11 projects were selected after the first session of the jury:

For the site of Marche-en-Famenne: 6 projects

BB 016

HB 189

GP 570

IC 051

MA 312

SV 751

For the site of Sambreville: 5 projects

BF 780

CC 323

DB 201

OH 503

XJ 220

Mr. Sauveur, President of Europan Belgium reminds the jury the different types of awards that the jury may award: winner, runner up, honorable mention. This explains the value of each type and the number that can be attributed in Belgium according to the rules.

The jury members then discuss the methodology that they will adopt.

They decide to review individually each project before starting the discussion on each of them.

After the discussion, the jury decides to award the following prizes:

A. Site of Marche-en-Famenne

Winner: SV 751

Honorable Mention: IC 051

Sambreville site:

Runner Up: BF 780

Runner Up: DB 201

Honorable Mention: XJ 220

The judges then meet to write a common summary for each project, echoing the assessments and justifications set out in their deliberations.

A. Site of Marche-en-Famenne

BE 016 "NEW HUT! "

Good analysis of the local typology, which leads to a fitting proposal, at the right scale, except for the corner building. The "bow" of the project is indeed off scale.

The jury appreciates the contemporary treatment of the facades, with the duality of bricks and metal on the front. However, although the color of lead is consistent with the color of blue stone, questions remain about the relative darkness of the colour and the environmental qualities of the material.

The project complements the existing urban context while promoting cross-links (connections) between the old and new neighborhoods.

While responding to the program, the project proposes a coherent solution on the side of the urban boulevard, which is less the case on the side of the street.

Regarding the distribution of housing, the proposition is less convincing.

GP 570 "GATHERING PROCESS"

The project provides a strong image for the ensemble, that gives unity to the two juxtaposed buildings, like a city gate between the North Boulevard and the street on the opposite side.

However, the appearance of the corner building is too brutal. The second block conveys a certain heaviness that is not compensated by the apparent lightness and transparency of the ground floor. This lightness will not be present in the actual implementation.

The two elements define a passage between the boulevard and the historic center.

In the first part, the tallest building has three housing units extending throughout.

The other building contains six units, including three duplex all mono-oriented and whose plans, poorly studied, are of low quality.

The issue of parking is handled efficiently.

HB 189 "ONE MORE PIECE"

Contemporary solution at the right scale, that deals very effectively with the difficulty of the plot.

This solution has the merit of originality and shows good sensitivity.

However the question remains of a "buffer" canopy on the boulevard side exposed to the north. Would it not have been better to reverse the facades of the city side and the urban boulevard side?

The ground floor which forms a plinth on the boulevard side appears heavy and creates a barrier.

The pinion angle is not successful.

IC 051 "LEVEL CROSSING" Honorable mention

The quality of the project is its scale well adapted to the site, on the edge of the future urban boulevard between the West area and the old town.

The project combines public space, equipment and housing.

The modest scale of the architecture on the intersection side allows a humane use of public space while promoting a visual link with the historic center.

The project proposes a gradation of heights smoothly catching the existing buildings.

The ensemble does not accentuate the fracture of the city, but complements the project of urban boulevard in his desire to reunite.

The contemporary architecture is too contrasted with the existing buildings.

MA 312 URBAN SHELLS

The project proposes a scale compatible with the context. It revisits the old plot while maintaining a resolved rhythm differentiating each building. The visual treatment of the roofs is too mannered.

The work of wood siding is elegant and polished. The treatment without differentiation on the north side and south side is regrettable.

The glass treatment of the angle while audacious is out of context and not suited for housing.

The parking proposition is not realistic because out of scale and too costly given the number of cars.

SV 751 THE SPACE OF ENCOUNTERS Winner

The proposed houses are arranged cleverly, which allows for an elegant transition space between the boulevard and the low level street.

The project draws maximum advantage of a plot with a narrow geometry, difficult to work with.

It creates a dynamism by aligning four houses on the boulevard and withdrawing the last two houses to be aligned with the street.

The scale of the six houses is in perfect harmony with existing buildings.

A judicious work on space (full and empty), the geometry of the houses and of the interstitial spaces are used to identify each of the six houses that develop on three levels, while making them fit together and with the surrounding buildings.

The original layout of housing frees up green privatized terraces.

The clever layout in the plot takes advantage of the straight alignment of the street and the undulations on the boulevard.

The project provides two main facades that account for the narrowness of the plot.

The widespread use of wood increases the overall quality of the proposition.

Site of SAMBREVILLE

BF 780 MULTIPLE-CHOICE DISTRICT Runner Up

The project starts from an analysis of the site and its historical evolution: successive occupations, corrections of the Sambre river, to propose a strategy ... open and scalable.

Water is one of the core elements of the project by combining the Sambre and the creation of ponds for various uses: collecting rain water (river basin), phyto-purification, landscaping that conserve in every location a link to water and biodiversity.

However, the question of the feasibility and management of this option is left open.

The flexible layout of paths perpendicular to the bank creates a framework characterized by a mix of buildings promoting social diversity and by a freedom of layout allowing for the evolution of the project.

The proposal could further develop its relationship to both banks of the Sambre.

The ensemble guarantees the feasibility of a true "Eco-district."

The number of housing units and the length of roads, however, should be reduced.

CC 323 BY PASS IN CENTER CITY

The project proposes an intention, a strong and clear link crossing the Sambre and connecting the hamlet of "Vacherie".

The backing of the railway by a bridge-building that turns its back on nuisances remains a problem. The built areas stay compact and small, traffic is limited along the existing road, to give the site a mainly pedestrian usage.

The proposed buildings have a scale compatible with the local context. They include a shield wall, which provides acoustic insulation.

This space is also an element of housing distribution, a sort of internal street with expected bio-climatic virtues.

This concept appears somewhat theoretical and raises questions about energy efficiency and the actual usage of the place.

The concept is taken to its fullest by the realization of a "bridge-building" crossing the Sambre to strengthen the link between the two sides but without solving the problem of nuisance by the nearby railway.

This proposition does not appear very realistic and is not accompanied by an adequate treatment of the extremities of the bridge.

The housing concept is very repetitive. In addition, there are no proposals for more collective equipment, or infrastructure.

DB 201 CITY+SAMBRE+CITY *Runner Up*

Proposal based on a good analysis of the Sambre between Charleroi and Namur.

The main idea of a park on both sides of the Sambre is appreciated, as well as the treatment of the banks.

The anchoring of the new housing area is cleverly made to the existing road (rue de la Vacherie) and in the continuity of existing homes in the South.

Connecting the neighborhood with the city of Auvélais is provided by a new bridge for pedestrians and cycles, over the Sambre.

The project builds on the Sambre, which becomes a structural part of the project.

Well-defined hierarchy of pedestrians pathways, bike alleys and roads for cars.

Attractiveness of housing clusters around shared common spaces.

Integration of housing and nature by progressive interpenetration under the form of two combs.

Coherent, fitting and realistic at all levels, which appears to be a real sustainable neighborhood.

However, the jury regrets a cubist architecture a bit simplistic, a relationship to the dock that needs more work, and interface between the housing and the park that is unclear.

OH 503 GREAT PROMENADE

The jury questions the proposal to move the existing station.

On both sides of a new path, housing blocks accommodate various types of buildings: residential buildings on the main tracks and houses in rows.

Each block has a density, diversity and volume too complex and too urban for the site.

The important part reserved for the treatment of the bank of the Sambre is disproportionate.

The project provides a link between the two banks.

While the idea may sound attractive, the proposal needs to be considered more thoughtfully and more successfully: the "ferry" appears inappropriate for scale of the site.

XJ 220 PROSPECTIVES FOR A STRATEGY OF VACANCIES *Honorable mention*

The applicant proposes an alternative solution to that proposed by the city from a global urban analysis that includes both sides, instead of focusing only on the left bank.

This option is:

- to requalify five unused properties in the existing urban fabric near the town hall, mainly in creating housing with public spaces and local services, doing this parcel by parcel.

- on the other bank, and on the land of the site, to develop the land as an ecological corridor on both sides of the tracks, whose program includes public, semi-public, and private activities.

The jury is receptive to the suggestion of the authors of the projects, which suggest "a dissemination of new construction on paths connecting future natural areas and the created center (...). In addition to the landscape qualities, the implementation strategy using the available land, allows for road and network savings. This alternative project makes use of plots already serviced. "

It is proceeded to the opening of the sealed envelopes on the basis of project codes corresponding to the winning project, the runner ups, and the honorable mention projects.

The results are:

Site of Marche-en-Famenne

Winner:

SV751 « THE SPACE OF ENCOUNTERS»

Team and associates:

Anca Diana POPESCU, architect, Romania
Sorin Vladimir POPESCU, architect, Romania

Honorable mention:

IC051 « LEVEL CROSSING»

Team and associates:

Olivier GOFFIN, architect, Belgium
Aurélie MAES, architect, Belgium
Jérémy PLATEAU, architect, Belgium

Contributor:

Loïc HERMANT, architect, Belgium

Site of Sambreville

Runner up :

BF780 "MULTIPLE-CHOICE DISTRICT"

Team and associates:

Benoît COULONDRES, architect, France
Florence GAUDIN, architect, France

Runner up :

DB201 "CITY+SAMBRE+CITY"

Team and associates:

Danilo CAPASSO, architect, Italy
Bruna VENDEMMIA, architect, Italy
Laura FALCONE, architect, Italy
Anna SIRICA, architect, Italy
Giovanni AURINO, architect, Italy

Contributor:

Carmine CIUCCIO, student, Italy

Honorable mention :

XJ220 « PROSPECTIVES »

Team and associates:

Mathieu HOLDRINET, architect, France
Isaac STILLWELL, artist, Australia
Julien BOIDOT, architect, France
Arnaud LEDU, architect, France

The President thanks all members of the jury and the meeting is adjourned at 1:30 p.m..

Done in Liège, on November 10, 2011

Pierre GOT

President of the Belgian jury of session 11 of European competition