



EUROPAN  
AUSTRIA

## E16 JURY STATEMENT

### PRESELECTION

#### LINZ FOOD LANDSCAPE

PK230

**1<sup>st</sup> stage assessment - local commission:** The aim of the project is to connect the residents of Froschberg through the medium of food. The focus is on the local production of food, according to the principle "from field to counter". It envisages a series of "micro-architectures", built by and with the residents, to be located in the open spaces of the settlement. These will serve as recreational, harvesting, storage or shelter spaces for both human and non-human residents.

The project only minimally affects the existing buildings by adding staircases. The landscape interventions, the themes of urban gardening, animals in the city and ecological themes are seen as good, but the project falls short, "waiting for the architecture". For part of the jury, the project clearly fails to meet the brief in the first round of discussion, as it neither shows architecture nor offers proposals for re-densification.

In the further course of the discussion, the focus shifts to the project's approach, as an idea of a future programme for Froschberg as something that is intrinsically fine. The project states that what is there is already good. The theme of open space was always of high importance in the spectrum of the EUROPAN competition. What constitutes a "Living City" in the future? This project does not try to destroy the existing qualities, but to develop them into an organism. The value mechanism here is not re-densification, but intensification of the natural and landscape aspects.

The project addresses the shift in thinking towards the Anthropocene, of animals and nature in urban space. It is no longer only important that people are well, it is also important that animals, the environment, nature are well - nature as a sphere and atmosphere. The project would offer impulses and suggestions for this, as it develops a caring care for the place. It is noted that it is absurd that such a mountain with such a development exists at all in Linz near the railway station, it is a miracle. Now the Froschberg is about to be transformed. The project could serve as a vision in this process, possibly as a warning finger. Therefore, the project should be taken along as recognition or appreciation, at least as a contribution to the discussion.

This project discusses the terminology of „metabolism“ in its purest form. It is to be considered in dialogue with other projects in terms of community building and participation. It is discussed that the project could be part of another project but cannot stand alone. It would have to be accompanied by the jury and its selection would have to be justified; it would be problematic to stand alongside other



architectural projects without comment. Instead, it should be a valuable contribution to the overall situation and the broad spectrum of the EUROPAN competition.

**Final assessment - international jury:** Even so the project tries to do as little as possible, the jury finds it very interesting how it engages with people by proposing interventions in the outdoor space. It implies a kind of pride and appreciation for the use of public space. Its focus on the in-between areas and its care dedicated to the series of objects placed in the landscape, is appealing. A sort of contradiction between the idea of creating an intensive gardening topic and looking at folies, does not only show in the panel's faint drawings on wilderness. The jury is therefore sceptical whether this approach goes far enough. Important needs or requirements for the comprehensive transformation-process of the landscape have been left aside. They could have been easily included in such a strategy.

Red brick extensions are proposed for the existing buildings, guaranteeing barrier-free access to all flats. Their appearance seems unnecessarily monumental and contradictory as for their use-value.

The question remains if it is sufficient to focus the building-transformation process mainly on solving the problem of accessibility and – roughly speaking – giving the community some poetic elements in the garden. How these two interventions are linked in order to create a promising dialogue between the transformation of buildings and landscape is not evident at all. In this respect the jury also wonders why the general strategy for the entire site does not contextualise itself as there are clearly different situations in the area. Although “Linz Food Landscape” introduces a promising concept, it ultimately does not deal sufficiently with the parameters and potentials of the site.