

EUROPAN 13

MINUTES TO THE SECOND JURY MEETING

ZAGREB, NOVEMBER 14th, 2015.

Present jury members: Sonja Leboš, Damir Hrvatin, Bojan Baletić, Simon Hartmann, Jordi Querol, Krešimir Rogina, Nikola Radeljković

Present substitute jury members: Kristina Careva, Vanja Rister

Present European structure: Iva Bedenko, Secretary

Mr. Rogina gave a short report about the EUROPAN Forum of cities and juries that was held the week before in Bratislava. During the presentation of the preselected projects, two of the entries were considered as the most conceptually polar - RU384 S IS FOR SAVA and SD837 - EVENT HORIZON. Discussion about these projects does not affect the work of the jury.

At the beginning of this jury meeting in Zagreb, it was important to consider the possibility of implementation of the EUROPAN competition projects in Croatia, especially on this year's four locations in Zagreb.

Mr. Rogina presented some of the main questions important for the methodology of the selection – What would we like to develop on those four sites? What is the programme these sites are capable to receive? What is the framework for the ideas? After thinking about the questions, all selected works from the first round of jurying process were taken into consideration. The reviewed works were: **LA377 - Sava Sports Venues**, **GC560 - ZagrebBackgrounds**, **RU384 - S IS FOR SAVA**, **SD837 - EVENT HORIZON**, **CB596 - SWAP ON THE RIVER**, **ND520 - Play my Sava** and **VZ184 - HEY ! THERE IS A RIVER BEYOND**.

Some of the jury members noted that the program of this competition, with its four sites, is a too complicated task for one competition. Mr. Baletić said that these locations were chosen because they have a great potential. Many of these works are giving good answers on the requirements of the sites but it is important to see which of these proposals is the most „charismatic“ one.

At 11:00 all other projects from the competition were brought in the conference room, as a reminder of some of the topics that may be crucial for the final decision. They were not reconsidered.

The jury agreed that in this case is hard to choose the first and second prize, because there is no project that has an appropriate solution for all four sites. They also agreed, in order to improve the

first prized project, that the list of the written recommendations at the end of the selection process is required. They agreed that the winning project needs to be modified at some level, no matter which one from the seven is chosen.

The president of the jury, Mr. Rogina, pointed out the need for realistic dimension of the first prized project that should be presented to the investor, which is the City of Zagreb, and at the same time this project needs to be interesting enough to make changes with its proposal. The implementation of the project is required.

In this first round, two of seven works were excluded from the further competition – **LA377** and **GC560**, with unclear possibility to be implemented in the end, and with a project having a stronger energy, rather than construct and form.

RU384 and **SD837** are not well developed on overall level. They have a strong programme without a clear design language (RU384) or a strong formalistic approach which dominates in the project (GC560). They are again mentioned and considered as two extremely polar solutions. Those two works were excluded in the next round of the competition.

Before the lunch break (13:00), there were three works left that were reconsidered for the first prize of the EUROSPAN 13 Zagreb competition – **ND520**, **CB596**, **VZ184**.

ND520 is seen as the solution open to further negotiations, new possibilities, playful, with an emphasis on entertainment. This project is made for the people, it provokes them to do something, to make a change in this part of the city of Zagreb.

In a short comparison of these last three works, **CB596** and **VZ184** were presented as two polar solutions with clear and strong concepts, and **ND520** was defined as something in between those two, without such a strong impact. The whole jury agreed that **ND520** needs to be excluded from the further process.

In the final jurying round there were two works left - **CB596** and **VZ184**, which were both considered one more time with their advantages and disadvantages.

VZ184, in its highly analytical approach, is a project that becomes a poetic, and in its graphics a bit naive, series of gardens for the people who love to spend their time on the levee of Sava. Mr. Rogina also said that this project is not just about „gardens“, it is also a well solved strategy on its

master plan level. The rest of the jury agreed that this project does not have a presentation strong enough for the first prize.

CB596 with its strong graphic expression, complexity of the project and generic approach does not avoid the difficulties of this location but faces them 'heroically'.

The winner was selected by a vote from every member of the jury. There were five (5) jury votes for the project **CB596** to two (2) jury votes for the **VZ184** (*voting results: 5-2*).

The first prize - **CB596**

The second prize - **VZ184**

In conclusion, the jury agreed and pointed out that on the list of recommendations for the first prize winners improvement of the winner's solution is definitely required in the further steps of the project's development. The list is as follows:

- **the places need to have both a social and a physical identity**
- **the four sites are very different regarding their context: center vs periphery, emptiness vs residential/shopping/public; one approach to all the sites can not be used, it would be more appropriate to use four different logic systems for each site**
- **the fifth site is the river, and it is important to activate the river surface but do it realistically**
- **after the competition the City of Zagreb and European should organize a seminar and invite the authors of the two prize-winners to elaborate on the entries and to bring light onto the social context**
- **the jury recommends that implementation of the first site of the entry that won the first prize would be a good start**
- **for the third site, the entry that won the second prize provides an interesting process**

The jury members have given their comments on the preselected entries, as follows:

CB 596

Before explaining in detail the main reasons why the Jury awarded first prize to this entry, we would like to underline a very important aspect: CB 596 is a presentation that complies perfectly with our RECOMMENDATION with regards to the city of Zagreb as we outlined in that writing.

This is very important. The rules of EUROPLAN require that a first and second prize are awarded.

Understanding that, the jury, unanimously convinced that among the 26 presentations has not found

one that offered a generally satisfying solution, we turned our attention to the aforementioned CB 596. Studying this project we noted several important aspects:

- 1 - Three levels of interventions
- 2 - Appropriate uses in the 4 sites
- 3 - Ability to create visual links
- 4 - Sustainability approach

And finally a 5th point very important to the Jury:

This project offers to the city of Zagreb the possibility to adopt some excellent solutions that other presentations have offered. This would mean that the final project would be based on the CB 596 conceptions, intermixed with partial positive solutions taken from other presentations.

The work of CB 596 is aiming to reach a good connection between the four sites, it has a very clear graphic outline and a very reasonable intellectual view point. The different uses of the four sites are also well built in.

The Jury wishes to express its positive reaction noting the interest this work is applying in its forceful approach towards creating VISUAL LINKS in order to attract people who would normally settle in areas of the old, historically structured Zagreb.

Almost all members of the Jury believe that, with the appropriate tools, this work regenerates the totality of the four SITES and give to their existing character a new physical and social identity without forgetting an adequate structural and ecological approach.

VZ184

The proposal “Hey, there is a river beyond!” reads the four sites as four very different conditions of how the urban fabric interacts with the River Sava. The authors therefore adopt a two-lane strategy: on one hand they try to increase the continuity of soft traffic circulation along Sava connecting existing paths with new links and increasing their functionality. On the other hand they develop a strategy of diversification of the four sites to a broad range from urban activation to give back the entire site four to the ecosystem of Sava. Intelligent tools of urban acupuncture and a carefully designed process of participation envision the change of the sites from their existing state to the carefully drawn visions.

The jury highly appreciated the careful and skilled work, which is able to develop a clearly stated and convincing idea for each one of the four sites. Nevertheless the jury was not convinced that the proposed elements are strong enough to really trigger the change towards more urban activity stated in the project description and therefore awarded the proposal with the second prize.

Nevertheless the jury would appreciate if the city of Zagreb would carry on the methodology and

parts of the urban project of “Hey, there is a river beyond!” and suggests that the authors will be given the chance to explain their ideas during a gathering with the municipality.

LA 377

The good side of this project is that it concentrated on all four projects sites as one organism.

However, while working on the metabolism of that hypothetical "organism" and developing the first phase of its program, the authors concentrated only on the sport activities, what prevented them to open up to a larger scale of possibilities but also already existing activities. Talking about that first phase, they again placed the excessive value on the locker rooms, which are facilities that can hardly serve as "good mood" attractors.

In the second phase this proposal came up with the series of, as they called it, totems. The role of the totems is to indicate the presence of the near-by river in the center of the city, since they would be placed at the numerous international events and festivals that Zagreb houses throughout the year. Unfortunately, this very interesting segment of the proposal was not elaborated well enough, while instead the uninteresting tower was put in the perspective.

The third phase of the project is oriented towards organization of a sport event that should enhance the longitudinal flows. How to achieve that was a question vaguely posed, but never answered, not even in a form of a draft.

Some other interesting types of content and program were also built in the proposal, but in a very unconvincing way, as for example ornithological park.

To sum up, the proposal started from an interesting point of view, indicating an interesting possibility of infiltrating the network of visual attractors strategically placed within the city, that could serve to emphasize the importance of the river in the city. However, it failed in elaborating these interesting possibilities in more explanatory or descriptive manner, interrupting the potential of a good idea with arbitrary introduced elements that cannot increase the social and other values of being near the river.

Instead of locker rooms, a much more inviting set of urban furniture should have been set in order to boost the metabolism of the network of locations, defined as organism.

GC 560

The project, titled “Zagreb Backgrounds”, begins from the interaction between the city and the nature, construction and the river, and finally, from solid and void.

The Sava river is the main element of the project concept, whose uniquenesses shape urban and natural widening, which demands specific articulation. This concept includes redefining the relations between solid and void in the urban image of the city, permeates the river in the city, or the city in the

river. The river and city have a perennial relationship, however, through the “Zagrebackgrounds”, this relationship is intensified by recovering disused scaffolded structures and implementing new geometries.

Basic elements of “Zagrebackgrounds”, such as lightness, temporality, permeability, modest aspect and availability of the scaffolding system is what makes it attractive as the base material. A palette of standardised recovered parts and the combination of it, result in a tailor made landscape.

Project offers different activities and purposes on various locations:

1/RIVER GATE – through installation for vehicles and boats, fulfilled with temporary purposes and devices (viewpoints, wardrobes, storages) the river Sava and lake Jarun are connected.

2/360° - cultural center with new structure and open space on the roof, which becomes city viewpoint.

3/ BACK TO THE ROOTS – support to the current state –housing neighbourhoods gardens.

4/ GET IT LOUD – space for public function – new structure becomes platform for large format events.

Project is interesting, offers different activities and purposes on specific locations, and proposes the implementation models. Furthermore, project is very well graphically presented. However, project remained on the concept level, with lack of further development (in functional-technical aspect, as well as design), which had been evaluated as insufficient for the prize.

ND 520

The work is based upon the notion that the whole area around the banks of river Sava within the Zagreb metropolitan area should be considered a unique, extra large public space. The concept is consequently developed into a proposal of production of a system of floating platforms that can be arranged in various compositions enabling different usages, from pontoon bridge to large floating stage, from piers to playgrounds. This particular proposal is the highlight of the project and presents an important contribution to the whole competition. Besides this achievement, the authors failed to develop cohesive solutions for the selected locations, but instead propose vague programs with insufficient design details and articulation. For instance, at 3rd project site the proposition consists of immense scaffolding structure for building of the platforms, as a kind of public shipyard, neglecting the issues of technology, security and management of such an undertaking. At site 2, the authors propose tree huts but don't pursue the design further than a symbolic "logo". Altogether the authors moved the topic of the competition from the 4 proposed sites to possible uses of the river, which is welcome and useful for future thinking on the subject, but lacked the concentration and effort to develop the proposals into serious blueprints, both in terms of programs and objects. Additionally,

the work suffers from scarcity of consistent design language, personality and attitude. No matter how much the jury appreciated the "Punk boat factory", the result was insufficient for an award.

RU384

The starting point of this competition entry is a theoretical approach the authors call urban kinesis – the application of movement to participative urbanism. The focus is on the involved citizen and his capacity of perception and action. The base for such citizen capacity building would be the development of their collective movie. The sites on the river and Sava itself are just locations for different phases of the process: development, pre-production, production, post-production and distribution view-Sava. The elaborated process that takes a year is interesting to follow as well as the links it makes with other seasonal cultural programs in Zagreb. The finished movie that documents the participation process and the city transformation would be, according to the authors, interesting enough to be shown in Berlin.

Such an approach definitely stood out among the entries to the competition. It illustrates one side of the spectrum among the received works: strong emphasis on the program and citizen involvement and very little or no interest for the sites themselves and their urban potential and character. This unique approach kept this proposal in the discussion into the second stage of the jury work. In the end this proposal had to provide answers to a number of concerns: is the "selfie" culture so strong to motivate people for such a program, who manages the process, it is a one-off program so what happens later on the sites, etc? Regarding this questions the jury was left empty handed. This kind of approach is only interesting and could be viable for one site (for example no.2) and in combination with some other proposals that give form to the site.

SD837

Proposal named Event Horizon provides four different more or less iconic structures for four offered sites by the river Sava. Since it was a unique approach in the competition, the entry was chosen among the finalists. It was especially praised for its marvellous perspective drawings which are somehow naive but highly convincing. However, by creating „carefully crafted ‘urban-active’ pockets of events“ authors somehow mistreated so called fifth site which is the river itself, in spite of their attempts to fill it up with activities which mostly already exist. Zagreb hippodrome was relocated to the site one without any credible reason other than just „breaking the ‘urban status quo’“. Site two was occupied by massive structures of „Urban frames“ with undefined „open-air rooms“. The „Green nudge“ at the site three seems the most reasonable, although univalent. The „Affordable Icon“ at the site four is beautiful indeed, but quite meaningless.

Zagreb, November 14th 2015.

Jury members:

1. Sonja Leboš
2. Damir Hrvatin
3. Bojan Baletić
4. Simon Hartmann
5. Jordi Querol
6. Krešimir Rogina

Substitute jury members:

Kristina Careva

Vanja Rister

Minutes written by:

Iva Bedenko

EUROPAN 13

MINUTES TO THE FIRST JURY MEETING

ZAGREB, SEPTEMBER 19th 2015.

Present jury members: Sonja Leboš, Damir Hrvatin, Bojan Baletić, Simon Hartmann, Jordi Querol, Krešimir Rogina

Present substitute jury members: Kristina Careva, Vanja Rister (Kristina Careva was selected to replace Nikola Radeljković)

Excused jury members: Nikola Radeljković

Present Technical committee: Ana Magdić, Sonja Sočivica

Present European structure: Iva Bedenko, Secretary

The jury meeting began at 9:00 at the Institute of Spatial Development of the Ministry of Construction. First the jury members were acquainted with the European jury procedure, and the agenda for the day. The members of the Technical committee have presented their report on the entries to the jury members, and stated that all the entries have fulfilled the formal requirements of the competition rules. After that the jury has agreed to elect Krešimir Rogina as the jury president. Kristina Careva has volunteered to act as the replacement jury member.

According to the Rules of European 13, the main evaluation criterion in the first jury meeting is the conceptual content and the degree of innovation according to the European 13 theme

The jury has agreed to do the round of the entries for three hours, and then talk about each entry.

After evaluating each entry, the jury has decided to mark the entries which have, in their expert opinion, completely missed the site requirements, and these were the following: AB260, FI275, ZE005, CI952, KG517, DX492, YX213, YU216 and VE245.

After that, the remaining entries were further examined, with particular attention given to the following elements of the projects: scenario- context reading, relation to the environment; design-morphology and means; users- citizens, tourists, possible refugees; economy and process.

The rules of European 13 state that 10 to 20% of the submitted projects are shortlisted to be evaluated at the Cities and Juries Forum which gathers the national juries and site representatives to discuss the conclusions of the European comparative analysis committee between the two national jury meetings. It aims at ensuring that the different experts participating in the evaluation process share a common culture. Projects remain anonymous throughout the procedures and are only identified by their code.

The jury has finally shortlisted 7 entries, which makes 27% of the overall number. The shortlisted entries are the following: RU384 - S IS FOR SAVA, LA377 - Sava Sports Venues, GC560 - ZagrebBackgrounds, ND520 - Play my Sava, VZ184 - HEY ! THERE IS A RIVER BEYOND, SD837 - EVENT HORIZON and CB596 - SWAP ON THE RIVER.

The jury has drawn up comments on the entries that have not been selected. The preselected entries will be considered in detail during the second jury meeting.

THE JURY COMMENTS:

LK 751

The project proposes interesting framework for the development and temporary use of four sites. It supports current site uses and proposes to further stimulate similar uses. It takes into account different users, different design strategies, and works out time schedule for building and use.

However, on the design level, project solutions (or illustrations of future design?) comes across as naive, undefined and lacking in character. Proposed pavilions and infrastructure (paths and stairs) offer insufficient improvement on current situation. It is also unclear what is the intent of different elements in design proposal.

JU 464

The project reinforces existing (or potential) uses of 4 sites. It expands number of possible programs very precisely and outfits them with needed elementary infrastructure in efficient way.

The focus of the project are architectural pavilions meant to "unify" divergent sites and variety of its uses. However, their unnecessary complicated design pattern (derived from "main landmark of Zagreb"?) is in contradiction with plain uses of such containers: showers, toilets, storage etc. This design is simply too weak to hold the project.

KG 517

The project functions as a textbook (or toolkit) for generating self-organizing solutions. This is both its main strength and, unfortunately, its biggest weakness.

It proposes generating and reinforcing connections of (semi)vacant sites with city in order to spur new life. However it is very vague on where, and how, these connections could appear. Also, project offers devices ("*soil, volumes and vegetation*") and framework ("*line, open perimeter and closed perimeter*") for some interventions, but it neglects to offer creative solutions, reasons for it or illustration of a the new worlds or the atmospheres they would create.

YX213

This project, titled "Sewing off the grid", states some interesting conditions valuable for the proposal: 1) that elderly people represent a dominant demographic group, so the city must provide quality spaces for them; 2) analyzes the traffic and the connections among 17 city district, that again can be a valuable tool. The project also provides a list of bioclimatic design strategies, another helpful tool for the specific site that is the object of the contest.

DX492

This project, titled "Clips", creates interesting grid of usage supported by mapping the cities which find themselves on the Sava river. However, by stating that "Zagreb is not aware of the river", the proposal blocks the very fundament that it started with, and ends up in generic type of treatment of the problem.

WK738

Zagreb, Meet Sava project offers very specific and theoretically developed ideas networked in the local community, NGOs and initiatives as well as international programs such as European EaSI program for social innovation to help build the shelters or the LIFE European grant for the environment. But what is missing to the overall concept is a quality development of ideas and proposals and their actual implementation in each of the listed zones with more precise suggestion of forms of intervention, their durability and time scale.

VE245

By the project named Dating Sava authors are aiming to inaugurate „flexible public space with multiple sustainable layers“ with „one main and two secondary scenarios which include audience development“. Extremely analytic scheme presents a range of possibilities, some of which already operate today, in all possible combinations and blending. In this way ideas are being dispersed in cacophony of abstract proposals rather than clear and operative interventions that could inaugurate instant temporary solutions for the area(s).

CM 848

This entry offers a catalogue of possible approaches, with small spaces for workshops, leisure, socializing, exhibitions and similar uses; the entry uses the Sava river. The process is explained and it is easy to implement. However it brings nothing new or exciting, and besides swimming, all the proposed activities are already possible on site.

MN507

This is a rationally planned design, with no participation from the public. The entry is visually attractive and the strips revoke the non-existent bridges. 147 "rooms" to let are planned, but it is unclear whether they will be used at all and who will use them. The green space is divided into segments, which is a formal gesture. There is no communication with the river.

WX977

The architectural expression is interesting with buildings made of recycled objects, but overall the site is crowded with buildings and there is no relationship with the river. The graphic representation is good but an initially good idea wasn't adequately finished.

CI 952

The work CI 952 is planning a good connection between the four SITES and does it well. The work also has a very good graphic presentation and a very reasonable intellectual focus. Also the different uses of the four sites are well set in. Nevertheless, the relation between 'solid' and 'empty space' (as far as architectural solution is concerned) isn't strong enough. When the work CI 953 explains in there graphics the 'Centralities' is not enough clear. The architectonic forms presented in each site are inadequate.

AB 260

The work AB 260 provides a good yet very 'naive' uses for some of the four SITES with different uses. The 1-2 sites are so similar but comprehensible as the 4 one. The 3 one is very suggestive but difficult to understand as far as efficacy is concerned. The connection between the four sites is not defined enough, and neither is the connection between the mentioned four sites with the two Zagrebs (Old and New). In general, in every site, the morphologic solutions looks extremely disseminated and architectural expression isn't satisfactory.

YU216 – SAVA ALLÉE

This work proposes interesting method of applying little interventions and then gradually transforming them into real structures after careful observation. Proposed process paid strong attention on communication between architects and inhabitants, maybe not so much on communication between architects and government and the important role of architects as skilful mediators, especially since the task considers one of the main features of Zagreb. Some of the objections regarding proposed solutions for given sites are: not taking into account specific position within the urban structure (proximity to lake Jarun); expensive and illogical space modification (bayou); too strict use of spatial elements (wall around site); poor rapper selection (city waste hill).

RS771 – POP-UP CITY CONCEPT

Written part of this work pays attention to number of important acts such as participation, promotion, public-private partnership and diversity of public space usages as well as the need to combine the political and financial support. Unfortunately, the proposed designs for given sites don't follow those important stated acts.

ZE005 – OPENLAND

This work proposes an elaborate process of achieving continuous common park along the Sava River. It rests on detail analysis that covers both physical, social and management spheres and finishes with catalogue of references as a starting point for future development. The execution of the idea on four sites through proposed structural element seems naïve and the efficacy of the whole process in achieving quality city image is questionable.

PV361 U.F.O.

The competition entry U.F.O. reads the four sites and the whole riverbank including Sava as blank canvas in search of identity to be filled by urban life. The project therefore proposes U.F.O. in many different versions and complexities as the design tool to be placed into the blank canvas and to activate it. The jury appreciated the fact that the project addresses the river and the riverbanks in a bold and direct way and honors the clarity of the purpose which limits the design to objects for a temporary use which will test urbanity of the space. The jury regrets that the project does not really address any strategy that goes beyond the objects themselves.

FI275 Tales of the River

The competition entry Tales of the River reads the sites and the river Sava as an area which should be developed as a new kind of public space which functions as a collection of differentiated collective spaces. The design elements developed to achieve the stated goals are themed barges and so called urban rooms with peers reaching to the river Sava. The jury appreciated the fact that the project includes the river Sava into the project in an interesting and feasible way. The jury was critical about the proposed elements of design as such and about their ability to change the use of the riverbank and attract a broad variety of people due to a rather narrow range of proposed possibilities of use.

PW392 – Sophronia

The competition entry takes the starting point from literature (Italo Calvino) and develops a poetic proposal that is an event more than architectural construct. The event of moving a massive block challenges the given sites and reveals their character, engages the people and forms, via mass media, a lasting urban memory. As the massive block moves away to the next site it leaves the temporary structure that is a temporary fragment and reminder on the urban memory being created. Sophronia is a unique concept but as a proposal to the City of Zagreb it could be challenged on different levels.

Wn111

The competition entry builds a vocabulary of technological or simple elements that promote green thinking and behavior. With this vocabulary it develops a scenario for each of the sites. The approach is more a methodological exercise on how to involve the citizens. Though scenarios vary but the story for the sites seems familiar or same. We appreciate the green approach and participative character but the sites lack a sense of urban character or idea.

The jury concluded the meeting at 17:30.

Zagreb, September 19th 2015

Jury members:

1. Sonja Leboš
2. Damir Hrvatin
3. Bojan Baletić
4. Simon Hartmann
5. Jordi Querol
6. Krešimir Rogina

Substitute jury members

Kristina Careva

Minutes written by:

Iva Bedenko