

europan 11

GUIMARÃES (PT)

EUROPAN 11 Competition – Silvaes, Guimarães, Portugal

1/3

Jury's Final Report

The jury met in two sessions, on September 23 and November 19, 2011, respectively, to evaluate the projects received and assign the rating and awards as foreseen in the competition rules. The jury's attendance was complete in both sessions:

Manuel Correia Fernandes, Architect, Chairman of the jury, appointed by the Institute of Housing and Urban Renewal, O'Porto

Maria Manuel Oliveira, Architect, Guimarães

Ana Roxo, Architect, Urban Planner, Lisbon

José Mateus, Architect, President of Lisbon Architecture Triennale, Teacher at IST, Lisbon

Manuel Fernandes de Sá, Architect, Urban Planner, O'Porto

Teresa Andresen, Landscape Architect, Professor at O'Porto University

Antoni Remesar, Urban Design & Public Art Researcher, Barcelona, Spain

José Maria Ezquiaga, Architect, Teacher, Madrid, Spain

Ulrike Sacher, Architect, Munich, Germany

Professor Arch. Pedro Brandão, Secretary-General of European Portugal and on behalf of the Technical Committee also participated in the meetings, without voting rights, and assumed the role of writing down the report.

1. The Process

The first Jury's meeting was preceded by a Technical Committee meeting held on September 9, according to the report the written.

The meeting of the Technical Committee intended to proceed with the unpacking of the entries and verify their compliance with the Rules and the Program in accordance to the foreseen proceedings. This meeting report was organized in files, informing on each entry's compliance with the Rules, for all 26 proposals received; based on those, the jury decided to accept all entries as valid.

The first working session of the Jury took place on September 23 in Guimarães and was preceded by a visit to Silvaes, the Competition's site. In this first session, the Jury assessed the proposals

overall, taking into account both notes received from the Technical Committee regarding compliance with the program and the criteria laid down in the Rules:

- Conceptual content;
- Contributions in terms of innovation reported to the general theme of European, to the quality of European urbanity and new challenges of urban sustainability.

2/3

The first vote, on absolute merit (referred to the set of criteria with equal weight) resulted in the selection of a set of 14 proposals (list in Annex 1). These would be subject to a second evaluation on relative merit, in order to select a shortlist of 20% of the total (5 entries). The international benchmarking, of comparative analysis, at the Forum of Cities and Juries to be held in Oslo on 4 and 5 November 2011, shall focus on the proposals thus selected.

For every proposal was recorded a summary of the assessment with a review of the jury on their strengths and weaknesses (Annex 3). The jury has delegated on Arch. Ulrike Sacher its representation at the International Forum to be held in Oslo.

The Technical Committee held a second meeting on November 2, aiming to report on the feasibility of implementing the results of the competition in the current context and the elements that, in the final evaluation of proposals, may be taken into account. With this objective, the criteria laid down for the second phase of evaluation were:

- Relevance of the proposed program in relation to the site's program objectives;
- Potential for integration into a complex urban process.

Thus, a technical verification has been made to the proposals selected by the Jury in the first phase of evaluation, on the relevance of those issues.

The report to the Jury, also includes a memo with the outcome of the Forum held in Oslo, as for the international review of the proposals (Annex 2).

2. Final Meeting of the Jury – Deliberations

At the final meeting of the Jury, held on November 19, the jury assessed the pre-selected entries according to the criteria specified in the Rules:

- Relationship between the concept and the site;
- Relevance to the theme issues - issues of sustainable development;
- Relevance of the proposed program in relation to site's program objectives;
- Potential for integration into a complex urban process;
- Innovative aspects of the proposed public spaces;
- Attention given to the relationship between housing and other functions;
- Architectural quality;
- Technical quality.

As a result of this assessment, the jury concluded:

- AP707: Good contribution for an idea to a more sustainable park, connecting agricultural uses with companies' activities - provides a basis for discussion about the site and the community

identity to be developed. However, an excessive image of "rurality" deviates from the program goals on the integration in a centrality image.

- GU270: A well done analysis, understandable and useful for discussion and further development. Approaches the question of centrality with both an attractive image and uses. The project gives meaning to the road structure and shows clear intentions, such as regarding the central "boulevard" concerns, admitting flexible use through means of phased implementation.

- MM406: It involves a major operation with a centralized real estate promotion. Its stiffness does not meet goals easily managed. From the ecological point of view, the green is void of a program (it is residual and not sustainable) and from the image's point of view, will be less noticeable by the local community.

- VJ911: Instead of a self-sustaining green corridor (with agriculture or forest, for example), the proposal incorporates a high investment in building the park. The contribution to a discussion is not served by an image that is somewhat artificial, poorly connected to the set of activities offered, and somewhat out of scale.

- XX005: The suitability to the area characteristics is underlined (ownership structure, topography). However, the proposal's positive aspects on a time-phased management are not translated into an overall strategic vision. The proposal is mostly based on separate projects (procedural flexibility), without encouraging an approach on an overall idea for the set.

On the recommendation of the Technical Committee, proposal MM333 (not pre-selected) was also re-analyzed with same detail. While acknowledging its potentialities for the development process, the Jury didn't find in the proposal a sufficient input to the process of discussion and further development.

In the final analysis, preceding notations on all proposals were verified, using the same criteria, after which the Jury proceeded to vote for the award of prizes. On a first vote for the Winner it was registered an *ex aequo* vote counting for entry GU270 and entry XX005, with four votes each and one vote on entry MM406. On a second vote, with the result of 5 votes against 4, it was decided to award the Winner prize to GU270 proposal. In voting for the Runner-Up, it was decided unanimously to award proposal XX005.

It was also decided to distinguish the three remaining pre-selected proposals with Honorable Mentions.

The sealed envelopes, with the identification of the competing teams will be opened in a public session for the removal of anonymity, on November 28 by 18:30 pm, as announced on European Portugal's website; the Jury Chairman will be represented by Arch. Ana Roxo, herself also a Jury member (Annex 4). At that time the results will not be disclosed - they will be announced simultaneously by the 17 national secretariats and European Europe on December 15, as stated in the competition rules.

Finally, the jury decided to recommend to Guimarães Municipality, an announcement of the results included in the program of the European Capital of Culture (as agreed with the respective Foundation) and provide opportunity for the possible development of the winning proposal, initially through a task of organizing the discussion and submit a set of alternative procedural and programmatic scenarios, involving relevant recipients of possible types of intervention. The outcome of this debate will help to proceed to the definition of an action program.