



E16 KLAGENFURT Site Visit

analog & digital, 07.05.2021

12:00–12:40 live stream digital site visit via Instagram: 38 participants (no questions via chat)

12:50–13:45 zoom live discussion: 15 participants /digital and 8 participants /in situ

Minutes

INTRODUCTION

Site representative: Robert Piechl (City of Klagenfurt)

Moderation: Iris Kaltenegger (EUROPAN Austria)

Welcome to the in-situ audience and to the digital audience.

Questions from the audience in the room were repeated by the moderator, due to technical circumstances.

QUESTION & ANSWER SESSION

Q1: Which of the buildings must stay and which can be removed?

A1: Walking around, we saw that some buildings are very interesting. The two old remise-building and the maker space is a building we should work on. We don't say this must stay, but we want to suggest that this is a possibility for these buildings to become part of the overall concept. But there is no decision that the buildings have to stay.

It is also up to you, if you think buildings should be adapted, add on, or partially kept; it has to fit to your concept. The city thinks it is a valuable piece of identity for this area. If you have a very good reason to do it differently, then go for it, but you have to make your case.

Q2: When we look at the planning strategy for this area, in which kind of detail should we stick to these planning ideas?

A2: We have a strategic site and a project site. On the strategic site we expect that you show us the connection to the neighbourhood and to the train station. It should be a form of an urban



development plan. We didn't want to determine the degree of detailing. The concept must work, and key elements might need to be shown in greater detail. *[compare brief page 22]*

Q2.1: Should the proposal be based on the urban development plan?

A2.1: The urban development plan 2025+ is mainly conceptual and points out urban potentials. Themes contain sustainability, porosity, green and open space, but this can all be found in the brief. There is no detailed information as such in the urban development plan.

In case you are referring to the urban development concept for urban potentials (German version only) there is one example by architect Peter Lorenz, who made a proposal for this site eight years ago. This proposal has not to be followed. Back then there were other parameters, and the city wants to have a new plan and concept. *[The proposal by Peter Lorenz has not been added to the relevant documents for the competition, because it should not have an influence on your concept. Now that this was mentioned, we are going to add this to the documents for all participants to know of; however, this is a proposal that is not relevant for the current competition. The parameters for this site have changed from when the proposal by Arch. Lorenz was made.]*

Q3: There are four plots - could you please elaborate a bit on how the city is thinking to work with the different stakeholders, partners, what is the envisaged process, phasing...?

A3: We have four partners on the four sites, and we are all part of the steering group, who suggests developing the plots as one coherent whole. At the same time the four plots need to work on their own, as they might be implemented at different times. It is important though, that there is a good connection and exchange amongst these plots. Currently the makerspace is a pretty closed off space. The vision is for a common ground floor area, where working, living, and learning is mixed and in relation with each other throughout the entire new quartier.

Q4: I was wondering about plot III, the makerspace; In the brief it says the buildings must be kept; can they be modified, can they be adapted? And is this true for all the buildings on the site? Especially there is this small four-story office building on the right when you enter the site - does this building also has to be kept?

A4: It is up to you. The maker space should be kept, but we need some openings in this space, we can think of some higher buildings and maybe we get a combination between living and working. The plot is very huge and there is space available for ideas on what can happen here.

Europan: So, when I understand you correctly, you said before that the ground floor area should be lively and permeable. You also said, the makerspace should be kept. My interpretation is that it is mainly about keeping the ground floor level (as it contributes to the



liveliness of the place) but it is up to the participants to modify the height and add openings where needed.

Yes, correct. And how the office building is treated, is up to the participants.

Q5: Could plan material of the existing makerspace area, the swimming pool and the remise made available?

A5: We will try to get plan material within the next three weeks and will put all available information on the platform for the registered participants to download.

Q6: This is a follow up on the previous question on stakeholders. I would like to know a bit more on the focus of the usage of these buildings. At which extent we can account on the city as the owner of the space or is it more intended for commercial rent? Also, regarding housing, is it a cooperative housing or what is the economic model that is intended?

A6: On the plot of the car-dealer Sintschnig [plot IV], the investor is interested to have mainly housing - affordable and private housing. All other plots are totally free for you to decide on. In the brief the percentage of functional distribution is mentioned; However, we find it crucial to have a good mixture. Also on plot IV, we don't want to have housing on the ground floor, we don't want to have it anywhere on ground floor in the entire project site. Only plot IV, the car dealership is privately owned, all other plots are publicly owned.

Just an addition to the makerspace: This is something we have started three to four years ago; it is like a "little plant" we have to nurture in order to grow. We want it to become larger and at this prime location next to the train station perfect conditions are provided for it to happen. It is the only makerspace in this compact form in Klagenfurt; there are some smaller cells spread throughout the city.

Q7: What about the density and height and should we stick to the actual plans?

A7: Yes, 11 stories are the maximum height for buildings in Klagenfurt. The density/FAR is about 1.5 – 2.0 [see brief page 20].

Q7.1: Is there an open GIS (GeoInformationSystem)-document, a 3D-modelling document available?

A7.1: We don't think such a document can be made available; we could provide height points of the surrounding buildings. We will look into that and provide information on the Q&A section of the platform.



Q8: How is the ownership going to be; especially now that it is publicly owned. Is the city looking for private investors?

A8: It is not decided yet, also because we are at a very early stage in this process. With EUROPAN we want to have an idea about the development of this area, and it is not in the focus who will invest.

Q9: I have a question on the existing buildings: What is the status of the structure and can they bear additional loads on the roof?

A9: We will try to answer your question. Either you can figure out by plans we are providing, or we will get a statement from a technical engineer. However, be aware that it is about an urban development concept.

Q10: In the brief it says that on the plotIV the people living in the housing block, should be rehoused on the site – is it meant on plotIV or within the whole project site.

A10: It is meant within the whole project site. We will provide information about the amount of people who live there.

Q11: Is it a final decision that the building of the swimming pool will be demolished, or is it possible to work with the building structure?

A11: Plan to move the swimming pool are already finalized. The built structure doesn't meet the hygienic and technical standards any longer. It seems obvious to demolish the building and make room for something new, however, it is up to you to work with the existing building.

Q12: is there weather data from inside the city? Because we only found information from the airport and we read that wind conditions are very different, in different areas of the city?

A12: We only know of the official weather station at the airport, which is only a couple of kilometres away from here. I don't know of any weather station in the city. I know Klagenfurt and I can say it is the same condition as at the airport; we don't have a great wind problem here in Klagenfurt.



Q12.1: Is there a noise map available for the site?

A12.1: Yes, we can provide a noise map.

Q13: It is about the program: Are you interested only in a proposal from an urbanistic point of view or are you also interested about some revolutionary program or ideas to boost this area?

A13: I can only speak for myself, but I think we should be open for revolutionary ideas – but it should also be realistic. In approximately five years' time the railway station will become a hub and Graz will be in easy reach; it will probably be interesting for developers to invest at this site. Traditional urbanism paired with a new understanding and open for a new thinking on urban strategies, should definitely be envisaged.

Europan: Central topic of the site is new learning, bringing people together and fostering exchange and new ideas; it is about exchange and sharing – the city is expecting expressive ideas, in the range of being feasible but also of being something new. Because the city is looking for a cornerstone, anchoring a new development which will influence a bigger area. That's why it is crucial to set the right tone.

Q14: Could you please elaborate a bit more on the buildings that are not part of the competition but are on that block. Did you ask them as well if they want to participate? How to work with them, how to connect with them?

A14: For us it is somehow not so easy, because on the Lastenstraße is a private house and it is not going to become part of this development. It is privately owned, so we have to deal with it as such. In the southern part there is the very new insurance building, it is an administrative building and thus kind of public. In between, we have two, three houses that are privately owned, where the city doesn't have any influence. So, the proposal has to respect these neighbours and at the same time should be open towards these plots, in case they will become part of the city one day. Then, it should be possible that the concept can expand towards these spaces as well.

Input from the audience: It is a very important link and connects Klagenfurt with the next capital city Graz. Klagenfurt will become a crucial stop and an important train station. The topic of EUROPAN15 is about mobility, where Klagenfurt will be plugged into a territorial network, the Baltic-Adriatic Corridor. Additionally, Klagenfurt will be the centre of a wider region, bringing different cultural influences together.

Q15: Is it possible to elaborate about the density again?



A15: At this project we talk about a range of density/FAR from 1.5 to 2.0. I think it is an orientation - it is not a “conditio sine qua non”. In case you decide to increase the density by a little bit, it should also work; but we have defined this as a range for the competition.

Q16: How is it with underground floors? They are intended for garages, how many underground floors can we plan? And do we need to present the underground floors in the project plans also?

A16: We wrote about the mobility concept, where there should be no individual motorized car area on the ground floor level. Structurally speaking, the ground conditions are very good here, you can build two or three levels below ground without having any water protruding. But this is not the first question for us: how many garages are below ground.

Europan: The brief asks for a mobility concept that thrives from the close proximity to the train station. Individual parking/delivery spaces have to be considered in the mobility concept, but the focus should be on alternative mobility strategies.

Q17: Is it envisaged to bring pupils together in the quarter, especially as educational institutions are numerous in the area and a lot of pupils come by train and pass by the site. Is it about this agegroup and education?

A17: It is not a clearly defined group, and the topic is not about this very “group” to meet at the site. Thematically it includes a bigger scale, such as to find a new form of temporary living, for example for one term, one year, three years while being educated. It is about several forms of “coming together” within the context of working & living & learning. This should be thought very openly. I think the ground floor should be dominated by young urban people and they are coming with the train, bus, or bicycle.

Europan: For example, the makerspace is also about “learning from each other” and sharing knowledge. It is about mentoring, mentors & mentinees; it is a lot about young people, but at the same time it is also about mixing different age groups; especially when you think about secondary education with institutions across the street of the site...

Robert Piechl: Thank you for your question and participation! We are very much looking forward to receiving interesting concepts from you.

You will have the possibility to visit the site and get inside the halls. For that you need to write an E-mail to office@europan.at and we can arrange an appointment with a site manager to meet you.

Good luck to all teams!