Zentralvereinigung der Architekten Österreichs

Minutes of the Jury Meeting

Minutes of the meeting of the jury on the competition for redevelopment ideas for the Napoleonstadel - Carinthia's House of Architecture, held at 11.30 a.m. on the 22nd February 2008 at the Napoleonstadel, Carinthia's House of Architecture, St. Veiter Ring 10, 9020 Klagenfurt

Present: Jurij Sadar, Sadar Vuga Arhitekti, Ljubljana
Mark Blaschitz, Splitterwerk, Grauz
Ralf Wanek, Ogris-Wanek Architekten, Klagenfurt (no right to vote)
Walter Wiedenbauer, STO
Andrija Rusan, Architect, Kroatien
Doris Petautschnig (no right to vote)
Axel Hubmann, Landeskonservator
Jürgen Moravi, Denkmalamt (no right to vote)
Claudia Pritz, STO
Georg Wald, Stadtplanung Klagenfurt
Harald Weber, spado architects, Klagenfurt (no right to vote)
Reinhold Wetschko, Zentralvereinigung der Architekten

Gabriele Hradetzky (Minutes)

Architect R.Wetschko welcomes all the participating members of the jury, is entrusted with the chairmanship of the jury, and establishes that a quorum is present.
DI Georg Wald is elected as Deputy Chair, and Architect Mark Blaschitz as Secretary.
The Chairman poses the question if any member present is prejudiced in any way, and
states the obligation to secrecy. Since none of the jurors declares themself to be prejudiced, the first tour of the building is undertaken to provide information, with Architect Harald Weber (preliminary examiner) giving explanations.

In order to view the sensitive outer areas of the building a further tour is undertaken in the park outside the building with explanations by Mr. Wald (Town Planning Klagenfurt). The first viewing is concluded at 13.11.

The competition organiser makes plain once again that the focus of the task is the development of a viable idea which respects both the quality of the architecture and a sensitive handling of the existing structure.

On the basis of the assessment criteria contained in the competition brief the jurors went on to formulate and specify the following main criteria:

Handling of the conservation parameters

Planning response to the specific location and its surroundings

Appropriateness of the architectural intervention

During the first viewing those projects were dismissed which were deficient in the above respects.

Consequently, projects 1,2,5,6,8,15,17,18,21,23,24,25,28,29,31 were rejected in the first round.

In the second round, the projects were discussed in greater detail with respect to the three main criteria, and in particular were scrutinized concerning the aspects of functionality and town planning significance in accordance with the given task.

In the second round of evaluation, projects 4,7,9.10,11,19 and 26 were dismissed.

The following general typologies crystallised out of the remaining 9 projects:

- solutions involving structures of varying dimensions placed in front of and running parallel to the south side of the main building

- solutions which propose a radical covering of the interior with significant penetrations of the existing structure

- solutions which propose the utilization of the lower storey through an atrium or lowered section in front

- solutions which propose extensions to the structure on the west end of the existing building

In the third round of assessment, projects 3, 12, 13, 14, 27 and 30 were rejected..

Following lengthy discussions the three projects below were declared the winners.

Project No. 16

This project proposes a lowered extension with cellar to the western end. The shape of the building- a polygon layout - is a response to the lines of the paths in the

park. The proposal is for this part to be used as the cafe, which would create a clear functional separation from the exhibition area. This would free up space on the ground floor of the existing building which could then be successfully restructured. In the outside areas an attractive terrace zone would emerge with a strong connection to the park. The symbolism of the building is emphasised by the proposed web-like structure. The detailed planning of this solution as proposed would, in the opinion of he jury, have to be very carefully executed, in order to avoid the danger of the solution appearing temporary. From an economic point of view the suggestion of a basement level with additional sanitary units appears excessive.

Project No. 20

This project takes a minimalist approach and thus responds very sensitively to the original building and its surroundings. By arranging the office space in the underground structure at the western end, both the original structure itself and the required space within that structure are freed up.

By means of a few well-targeted interventions like glass prismas and inserts, plus the creation of a coherent base area, the building is endowed with new quality. These precise, delicate changes are applauded by the jury. The weakness in the proposal is the organisation of the interior, in particular the leaving of the cafe in the same place, since this leads to restrictions of a spatio-functional nature on the desired utilization.

Project No. 22

This project stands out in the same way as the previous one in terms of its sensitive approach to the qualities of the location and to the given spatial situation. The attaching of a minimally conceived extension by means of a connecting element to the western end is regarded as a correct and coherent solution. This allows for the separation of the different functions to the desired extent, since the operation of the cafe will now be possible in the aforementioned extension, independent of the main building. In addition, the clear restructuring of the interior of the existing building is recognised as exemplary. The situation of the terrace with its appropriate relation to the park on the south side is in accordance with the requirements. In spite of all these qualities, the design of the south-west corner still requires detailed treatment.

Zentralvereinigung der Architekten Österreichs

On the basis of the above evaluation project 16 is awarded 3rd place, project 20 2nd place, and project 22 1st place.

The Chairman of the jury proceeds to the opening of the covering letters. The prizewinner informed by phone.

1st Prize Architekturbüro Cebra

DI Stefan Holzinger
DI Christof Jocher
DI Zagrajsek Roman
Mariahilferstrasse 32, 8020 Graz

2nd Prize Architekt DI Andreas Krainer

Mitarbeiter: DI Eva Grubbauer und Anna Krainer
Konradweg 3
9020 Klagenfurt

3rd Prize nbm I notbeforemidnight Architekturbüro
Architektin DI Sonja Klingberg
Erkratherstrasse 64
D – 42329 Wuppertal
Mitarbeiter:
Jan Fischer
Kordes + Ziegenhorn Partner, Beratende Ingenieure VBA, Dresden
r+b landschaftsarchitektur, Dresden