

**SECOND JURY ROUND OF EUROPAN 11, SITE SZEGED**

As Hungary is an associated member of EUROPAN 11 the projects of the site Szeged are evaluated together with the projects of the Vienna (AUT), Linz (AUT), Graz (AUT) and Peje (KOS) site by the same jury.

**MEMBERS OF THE JURY****ARCHITECTS:**

Klaus KADA (Graz/ Aachen) – President  
Liza FIOR (muf/ London)  
Mirza MUJEZINOVICS (EUROPAN 8 winner, Oslo)  
Rolf TOUSIMSKY (European 7 winners, Salzburg)

**PERSONALITIES:**

Angelika SCHNELL (architectural theorist, Berlin/ Wien)  
Kaye GEIPEL (architectural critic/ bauwelt Berlin)

**CLIENTS:**

Wolfgang SCHOEN (director of housing agency WAG/ Linz)  
Patrick GMÜR (director of the department of urban planning/ Zürich)

**REPRESENTATIVE OF THE REPUBLIC:**

Sabine OPPOLZER (cultural critic/ ORF, national broadcast corporation/ Wien)

**REPRESENTATIVE OF HUNGARY:**

Tamás LEVAL (architect, Budapest)

**REPRESENTATIVES OF KOSOVO:**

Lulzim KABASHI (architect, Zagreb)

THE JURY HAS 11 VOTES.

**Attending without a vote:**

VLAY, Bernd; architect, General Secretary of EUROPAN Austria  
STREERUWITZ, Lina; architect, Secretary of EUROPAN Austria  
NAVARRO, Alfredo; architect, General Secretary of EUROPAN Kosovo  
SZABÓ, Árpád; architect, National Coordinator of EUROPAN Hungary (minutes)

**VENUE**

Oslo School of Architecture and Design (Maridalsveien 29, 0175 Oslo), Croquissalen  
on the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> of November (Saturday and Sunday), 2011

All members of the jury have received in advance the full site file of the Szeged site, the technical report analyzing all the handed in projects, the minutes of the first jury of September 10<sup>th</sup> and has had a possibility to look at the digitally handed in files of the competition projects.

**MINUTES****5<sup>th</sup> of November**

At the beginning of the process the competition brief is shortly presented by the representative of European Hungary.

The jury formally accepts the decisions of the first jury of Szeged, makes no recommendations for bringing back projects that have been eliminated in the first jury and proposes to discuss only the eight preselected projects:

02-LV132	LINKED INTEGRATION
04-JD827	The red balloon
06-AK222	DOMB
08-YL995	stop
09-BF158	LINES OF FORCE
17-HO329	CULTIVATING RÓKUS
25-BO121	BOUNDARY
36-AE011	SZEGED 2.0

The eight preselected projects are briefly presented to the jury based on the technical report.

**6<sup>th</sup> of November**First revision of the projects:

The jury looks at and discusses the projects one after the other.

## 36 – AE011

- It creates a small town with all the necessary functionality of a city
- The P+R does not seem to be solved, its building seems to be small. It does not really integrate P+R into the program

## General remark

- Parking in general is not solved coherently in the projects. The problem of high ground water level and a relatively large number of parking places makes it difficult to solve this issue, so it should not be considered as a major aspect of evaluation.

## 36 – AE011

- Different public spaces created, but the role of these public spaces is not clear
- The main issue of the project is density. It behaves as a central area and it uses the idea of density as a productive issue.
- No real context shown on the surrounding. The project follows a strategy to fill a “leftover” area with buildings.
- It uses a “grid” so the context is not really relevant in the approach.
- No reference on the political and social context
- The area is solved to serve the “needs” of a private investor -> the project is too pragmatic

## 08 – YL995

- It is an interesting project creating a complex spatial framework.
- Uses the hall for parking, which seems to be a good idea.

## General remark

- Contamination and pollution of the area is one of the great problems of the site.
- Contamination makes implementation difficult and problematic so EUROPAN is especially important to show a clear architectural strategy.

## 17 – HO329

- It is a landscaping solution. The courtyards could look like that in a few years if nothing happens on the area.
- The project generates discussion between the various green elements of the surrounding and of the site.

## 02 – LV132

- The only project that introduces play as a tool for generating urban life.

## 04 – JD827

- Composes an essay and frames the already existing elements. Frames the drama of the site.

## General remark

- All projects are mainly pragmatic and deal with the different morphological variations of the building possibilities except for 04-JD827 and 17 – HO329

## 17 – HO329

- It is a very simple block system with some added value. It uses an old urban typology, but when this typology was widely used contamination was not a problem.
- Creates urban public square for the surrounding.

## 25 – BO121

- It is mainly a typological and hierarchical exploration of space.
- The proposal creates a clear open space, where the quality of the open space is independent of the architectural quality. Creates an urban room
- The density seems to be too high.
- The approach is rather conceptual and uses mainly morphological gestures.

## 06 – AK222

- Creates a clear separation of the functional zones.
- It has some reflections on the social context.

## 08 – YL995

- It is an urban spatial system with subtle gestures.
- Makes an analysis -> acts local in its programmatic elements and has some smart considerations.
- The main street elevation is not deeply elaborated.
- The treatment of the corners does not contribute to the quality of the development.
- Creates a sequence of spaces, but the definition of the spaces independently is weak.
- The site is not Venice so the analogies are not really true.

## 09 – BF158

- Rejects to use a rectangular grid and creates possibilities for connecting the different sides of the site.
- The images create sequences of space.
- The strong lines are not true when we look at the context.
- The relation of the public spaces to the programmatic elements is problematic.

Second revision of the projects:

The jury decides to make a second round. In this round 1 member of the jury explains the positive and negative characteristics of the projects and after that the jury votes. After the voting the three projects getting the largest number of votes goes to the final round.

## 36 – AE011

- Little city inside an urban block
- Does not react on the issues raised by the context of the site, but carries on the problems generated by a small city

→ 0 VOTES IN FAVOR; 11 VOTES AGAINST

## 25 – BO121

- The project has a clear solution, and liberates one part of the site -> adds a new free space to the city
- It can be too dense, nevertheless it generates investment
- The inclined square is a mistake (It cannot be implemented because of the high ground-water level)
- Probably the most favorable project by a possible developer
- There is no real advantage of the big public space, the tools are interesting but not obviously positive
- Interesting project at a conceptual level, but the details are the weakness of the project  
→ 6 VOTES IN FAVOR; 5 VOTES AGAINST

06 – AK222

- Clear strategy, with not very much elaborated solutions  
→ 0 VOTES IN FAVOR; 11 VOTES AGAINST

17 – HO329

- Conceptualizes the problem of contamination.
- Envisions a new way of production and living in the city.
- Works on creating a new economic status for the residents, nevertheless the small scaled local economy is not really developed in the project.  
→ 5 VOTES IN FAVOR; 6 VOTES AGAINST

09 – BF158

- Creates a strong urban vision, with high functional density  
→ 0 VOTES IN FAVOR; 11 VOTES AGAINST

04 – JD827

- It creates a closed system which is positive.
- Inside the block it has a favorable, good spatial system → creates a nice situation (like Park Royal in Paris)
- The openings of the perimeter wall seem to be too small.
- The project creates opportunities and has a clear vision: has good ideas and it brings to the site what the city needs
- It is the “opposite” of the project 25-BO121, it frames and evaluates the site.  
→ 10 VOTES IN FAVOR; 1 VOTE AGAINST

02 – LV132

- The most important issue of the project is scale and density
- It shows a desire for dealing with social issues, e.g.: garden on top of buildings
- In its approach it is a very conventional project  
→ 3 VOTES IN FAVOR; 8 VOTES AGAINST

08 – YL995

- Interesting strategy – it creates a series of spaces and it also creates density at the same time
- It has a reflection on the realistic possibilities → puts the parking into the hall
- Gives variety and at the same time creates a balanced spatial frame
- The elaboration of the project is problematic.  
→ 3 VOTES IN FAVOR; 8 VOTES AGAINST

*The projects - 04 – JD827; 17 – HO329; 25 – BO121 – go to the final round.*

### Third revision of the projects:

The goal of the final round is to discuss the projects again and have a final decision on the winner, runner-up and honorable mention prizes.

At the beginning of the third round discussion a proposal is made by European Hungary to bring the project 02-LV132 back into the discussion. Members of the jury accept the proposal, but the president of the jury clearly states that the jury is autonomous and rejects any pressure and influence from outside to influence the final decision of the jury!

17 – HO329

- The project is good at an urbanistic level, but it does not create fine solutions in the micro scale.
- Envisions a new way of production and living in the city and works on creating a new economic status for city dwellers.

04 – JD827

- The city finds the project problematic because of low density, but it can be easily mended keeping the advantages of the project

25 – BO121

- The project has an urbanistic quality on a strategic level
- It is privatizing one part of the site and makes the other part completely public, but has its weaknesses: the density of the developed part raises a lot of functional problems that are not solved.
- Its disadvantages cannot be easily mended, so it cannot be a winning project.

General remark

- All discussed projects have drawbacks that are hard to evaluate without a precise knowledge of the local social and political conditions.

04 – JD827

- It is a fairly ordinary densification project
- Although its actual built density is low, there will be no conceptual difference if the building width is increased.

02 – LV132

- A simple project; which is principally a morphological exploration of the possibilities of perimeter building.
- Its traditional and realistic approach together with some qualities has a good message for the city

The president of the jury puts the following question to vote for the members:

Based on the previous discussion the final 3 projects of the competition should be: 04 – JD827; 02 – LV132; 17 – HO329, which means that instead of the project 25 – BO121, the project 02 – LV132 should be in the final three.

Result of the vote:

→ 10 VOTES IN FAVOR

*So the projects - 04 – JD827; 17 – HO329; 02 – LV132 – stay in the competition.*

The president of the jury puts the following question to vote for the members:

Although project 04 – JD827 has some drawbacks it has received the biggest number of votes in the previous rounds so it should be nominated as *Winner*.

Result of the vote

→ 10 VOTES IN FAVOR

*The project 04 – JD827 gets the Winner prize.*

The president of the jury puts the following question to vote for the members:

Projects 17 – HO329 and 02 – LV132 have advantages, so it is important to present them to the city of Szeged, nevertheless neither of them show merits that qualify them as a runner-up. Those two projects are recommended to get a *Honorable Mention* prize.

Result of the vote

→ 7 VOTES IN FAVOR

*The projects 17 – HO329 and 02 – LV132 get Honorable Mention prize.*

The final results of the competition are the following:

The WINNER is **04-JD827 - Red Balloon**

No RUNNER-UP prize is awarded.

The two HONOURABLE MENTION prizes go to **17-HO329 - Cultivating Rókus** and **02-LV132 - LINKED INTEGRATION**.

The final results of the competition after opening the authorship letters:

WINNER:

JD827	Red Balloon	team leader:	<b>Kun Tamás</b> (HUN) 15/03/1984
		associates:	<b>Mezey Tamás</b> (HUN) 15/11/1983 <b>Álmos Gergely</b> (HUN) 17/02/1984

RUNNER-UP:

-

HONOURABLE MENTION:

HO329	Cultivating Rókus	team leader:	<b>Laura Bradley</b> (GB) 03/08/1982
		associates:	<b>Sarah Robinson</b> (GB) 08/05/1982 <b>Isabella Percy</b> (GB) 15/06/1982
LV132	LINKED INTEGRATION	team leader:	<b>Vesztergom Ádám</b> (HUN) 19/05/1981
		associates:	<b>Láris Barnabás</b> (HUN) 12/12/1980 <b>Gyüre Borbála</b> (HUN) 24/11/1976, <b>Csontos Csenge</b> (HUN) 10/09/1978
		contributor:	<b>Farkas Anett</b> (HUN) 01/06/1987

The jury session closes at 21.00

2011. 11. 06. Oslo

**Recommendations of the jury for the site owner and the municipality of Szeged:**

At the project site of Szeged it has been made clear at the beginning of the competition that the site owner will not develop the site, but will use the competition as a marketing tool and will sell the project site to a developer. Nevertheless the jury appreciates the willingness of the site owner and the municipality to enter into the European competition, it recommends to take further steps before the selling of the site in order to work out a strategy that ensures the qualities highlighted in the competition and at the same time provides a feasible development framework.

The jury advocates to work on the implementation of the “JD827 - Red Balloon” project and to continue preparation works with involving the winning team in the process.

The winning project emphasizes the landscape and green quality of the site that arises from the size of the plot and from the extraordinary qualities inside the project area, but creates a strong image of built environment and social space as well. The project itself has to be understood rather as a statement which creates a new quality of landscape and public spaces inside the area. The main drawback of the project comes from the unsolved technical requirements that can be mended quite easily with keeping the qualities of the project: e.g.: the built density can be raised with widening the perimeter building strip. This has to be done with the involvement of the architects, the site owners and development experts.

The honorable mention projects show the pragmatic possibilities of perimeter building and with their presence in the discussion they can contribute to exploring the possibilities of the site, presenting examples of balanced green qualities of the inner realm and relatively large built densities.

The jury recommends the site owner and the municipality to find a way of developing the winning project even before the marketing of the site starting with a workshop with the winning team, experts, and European. The workshop shall study how the qualities based on the developed project can be further explored and put into an implementation process. This also implies that there has to be found a way of public participation in the project.

The jury would like to emphasize it as much as possible that in any case if the project goes on to the implementation phase the only way to ensure the qualities of the project is to work out some tools of public participation. The city would have to support the process *actively*, being the urban planning authority that defines and develops the regulatory body of the urban planning rules. In addition, proper means and right tools of *passive participation* have to be found in the process. This can mean a well-prepared development-contract with a future investor, but can also mean the usage of special architectural quality control tools in addition to the control tools of urban planning.