

# Minutes

## (Excerpt)

**Date | Time**

Monday, 17.09.2019 | 09:00 - 20:40

**Place**

EnBW City, Schelmenwasenstraße 15, 70567 Stuttgart-Fasanenhof

**Attendees****Expert jurors**

Prof. Markus Allmann, Prof. Dörte Gatermann, Prof. Gesche Grabenhorst, Guido Hager, Andreas Hofer, Dr. Detlef Kron, Achim Nagel, Peter Pätzold, Matthias Sauerbruch, Michael Trinkner

**Specialist jurors**

Dr. Wolfgang Eckert, Thomas Fuhrmann, Frank Heberger, Florian Kommer, Martin Körner, Alexander Kotz, Steffen Ringwald, Hannes Rockenbauch, Petra Rühle

**Deputy expert jurors**

Ingo Kanehl, Carolin zur Brügge, Johannes Hoffmann, Tobias Micke, Arthur Numrich, Arne Rüdener

**Deputy specialist jurors**

Vereina Gehrman-Linnerth, Marco Geis, Gabriele Munk, Dr. Carl-Christian Vetter, Jürgen Zeeb

**Experts**

Winfried Börner, Wolfgang Kastner, Nadine Kuhla von Bergmann, Robin Renner, Suzana Spehar, Tatjana Strohmaier, Holger Strutz, Andreas Herrmann

**Resident Experts**

Katharina Doedens, Julia Heisele, Sivany Kanagalingam, Ingrid Schwerdtfeger, Kerstin Steidle

**Competent Chamber of Architects**

Gabriela Magg

**Preliminary examiners**

Marc Drewes, Kordula Koller, Almut Seeger

**Preliminary examiners and procedure support**

Uwe Dahms, Marius Kinzel, Isabell Legler, Nils Rogel, Julie Teuber

**Guests**

Annette Baltzer, Matthias Dammann, Charlotta Eskilsson, Melanie Gaßner, Matthias Groß, Andreas Lorey, Laura Scheffelmeier, Markus Schmid, Christian Siegle, Florian Wiesner,

STA	<b>A positive development in Stuttgart. The new Stöckach.</b> Excerpt of the minutes from the jury meeting for the first phase	2/10 01.10.2019
-----	---	--------------------

### Item 1 Welcome and introduction (09:05)

Frank Heberger, CEO of EnBW, welcomed attendees and underlined the significance of the project for both the EnBW and the city of Stuttgart. He again outlined the objectives of the project to create a model quarter which is sustainable at an ecological, economic and socio-cultural level. The quarter should have its own identity, offer a high quality of life, it should be outward-looking and open. He noted that the task at hand involved treating the existing buildings and area with respect whilst not being afraid of making changes.

The jury is the first point-of-call for an urban architectural development which will considerably change and shape the quarter in the next decades. Mr. Frank Heberger thanks the attendees for their support and said he was looking forward to an interesting day with positive content and urban planning solutions.

### Item 2 Jury composition (9:20)

Uwe Dahms (C4C) noted who was present at the meeting. Thomas Erk (specialist juror) and Patrick Gmür (expert juror) were excused from the meeting. Thomas Erk was represented by Mr. Marco Geis and Mr. Gmür was represented by Mr. Ingo Kanehl for the rest of the proceedings.

All other jurors and their deputies with voting rights were noted as present. It was thus concluded that the jury was complete and that it had a quorum for the duration of the meeting.

All experts, preliminary examiners, employees of the competition supervisor who were present and guests - even if they were not mentioned by name in the competition brief - were admitted to the jury. This meant that everyone was entitled to be present in accordance with the RPW.

#### Election of the Chair

Prof. Markus Allmann was unanimously elected (abstaining from the vote himself) as jury chair, Prof. Matthias Sauerbruch was elected Deputy Chair - also unanimously and with Sauerbruch abstaining.

#### Designation of the minute-taker

Uwe Dahms and Nils Rogel (C4C) agreed to take the minutes.

#### Explanation of procedure, confidentiality declaration and notes on personal responsibility

Prof. Allmann chaired the meeting and summarised the established procedure laid down in the RPW for a two-phase, anonymous competition procedure and the judging criteria for the first phase.

The objective of the meeting was to select 12 entries for further processing in the second competition phase during critical assessment of all entries. In the first round of assessment, it is only possible to exclude entries by unanimous decision, in the other rounds of voting this will be possible by a simple majority - according to the RPW, it is not permitted to abstain from a vote.

The chair reminded the jury of the personal responsibility they bear to the awarding authority, the competition participants and the public. He asked the jury to carry out their duty with focus and discipline. He noted that the anonymity of the procedure must be upheld and emphasised the confidentiality of the discussions that would take place during jury meetings until the end of the jury meeting for the second phase: Official statements would only be made via the minutes of the jury meetings at the end of the two-phase procedure.

Chair also verified via declaration by the attendees that they

- had not spoken to participants about the competition task and its solution and would not speak to them about this for the duration of the competition,
- that they had no knowledge of the competition entries prior to the competition (unless they had been involved in the preliminary examination),
- that they would treat deliberations with confidentiality,
- they would ensure all entries remain anonymous and
- would refrain from expressing any suspicions they had regarding the identity of any participants.

The **assessment criteria** listed in the competition brief and discussed during the jury colloquium were again confirmed and were to form the basis of decisions in the upcoming assessment rounds.

#### Quality of urban planning

- Overall structural concept / quality of urban planning concept
- Insertion into the urban-spatial setting
- Spatial quality of private and public open spaces
- Address and identity formation
- Design and impact of building structures
- Distribution and assignment of building and spatial functions
- Transport infrastructure, thoroughfare concept
- Sustainability of the urban development
- Ecological aspects in the urban development
- Feasibility

#### Quality of use

- Expected quality of use of the housing
- Expected quality of use of the non-residential units
- Compliance with the space and area programme (floor area and number of apartments)
- Usage flexibility of buildings, ground floor configuration

---

STA	A positive development in Stuttgart. The new Stöckach. Excerpt of the minutes from the jury meeting for the first phase	4/10 01.10.2019
-----	--	--------------------

---

### Item 3 Report from the formal preliminary examination (09:30)

A report with the results of the preliminary examination and individual reports on the entries - 2 sides DIN A4 per entry - were laid out for all attendees on the meeting room tables. A scoreboard template was also distributed so that all jurors had the possibility to keep an overview of the voting results. Mr. Dahms presented the report of the preliminary examination:

#### Receipt of entries

Date for submitting competition entries was 23 August 2019 and 30 August 2019 for the models.

**83** competition entries were submitted.

The entries were anonymously submitted to the coordinating office C4C | competence for competitions, Lützowstraße 93, 10785 Berlin. The online files were submitted via a data transfer platform and the plans, explanatory texts and relevant forms were also submitted in paper form either in person, by post or courier.

All participants submitted their entries on time. All entries received were included in the preliminary examination.

#### Period of preliminary examination

The preliminary examination was conducted at the C4C office between Monday, 26 August 2019 and Monday, 9 September 2019.

#### Labelling of entries

The date of receipt, code numbers and type and state of packaging were recorded during the examination. The sealed envelopes with author declarations were locked away in a safe place. Disguise numbers between 7001 and 7083 were stuck in a random order on top of all code numbers which corresponded to the relevant entries.

#### Anonymity of entries

Anonymity of participants was preserved during submission of entries.

Some consignments which could not be sent anonymously due to certain rules of various courier services were anonymised immediately after receipt - by employees of the coordinating office who were not involved in the preliminary examination.

#### Completeness of deliverables

The entries were verified for completeness according to the deliverables requested in the competition brief with the following result:

- 22 participants submitted one presentation plan. 61 participants submitted two presentation plans.
- In the following entries, the plans were either not submitted as requested or only submitted as requested in part, or submitted in other formats than required: 7007, 7008, 7033, 7039, 7040, 7048, 7050, 7065, 7083.
- The following entries were missing printed presentation plans by the date of the jury meeting: 7083.  
The plans that were digitally uploaded were used for the preliminary examination.

The plans were printed by the competition supervisor's office for presentation before the jury.

- For the following entries no further explanatory documents were submitted (form on urban development parameters, explanatory report, author's declaration): 7027, 7078, 7083.
- For the following entries, no upload was received but the data was submitted on a data storage device: 7030.
- Models were submitted for all entries. Some components were damaged during transport of some models. These were fixed by the modeller and an employee of the C4C office. Models which did not fit into the surroundings model were also modified accordingly.

**Aside from the above-mentioned points, all entries were complete.**

#### Admission of submitted entries

All entries were admitted into the procedure by the jury.

#### Presentation of the preliminary examination report

Content and structure of the report were explained to the jury and questions on this were answered. The report shows the results of the preliminary examination in the form of a comparative overview as well as individual reports on each competition entry.

#### **A | Overview**

On two double pages are the site plans for all entries. On another double page is a comparative chart illustrating the gross floor area (GFA) of all entries.

#### **B | Individual reports**

Each entry is set out over two pages on which there is an account of the preliminary examination, a model photo, a scaled-down version of the participant's plan and free representations with disguise participants' numbers. The accounts of the preliminary examination are comprised as follows:

##### Quotation:

The quotation is a succinct description of the guiding idea which is chosen by the participant. In some of the entries, the limit for the number of characters was exceeded for formulating their guiding idea and so the quotation was shortened by C4C.

##### Model photo

The photo shows the model submitted for the relevant entry inserted into the surroundings model.

##### Participant site plan

The plan depicted is a scaled-down version of the site plan for the relevant entry.

##### Selection of further participant representations

Each participant was allowed to submit further representations in any form they choose to illustrate ideas better.

##### Preliminary examination text

During the preliminary examination a summary was written for each entry as well as short bullet points broken down into different topics.

#### Breakdown of site plan

The breakdown of the site plans was created according to the development plan submitted by participants. This breakdown includes a schematic roof plan with number of storeys and eaves heights as well as entrances. Existing buildings, new buildings and additions of new storeys and marked distinctly from each other using a colour key.

#### Diagrams

The pie chart depicts the percentage of the built-over area above ground of the total free space. This figure is also shown in comparison to entries with the lowest amount of built-over area, with the highest amount of built-over area and with the average amount of built-over area for all submitted entries.

The bar chart shows the total floor area in comparison to other entries. The first bar represents the floor area submitted by the relevant participant and compares this quantity to the lowest amount of floor area (71,070 m<sup>2</sup>), the average (87,800 m<sup>2</sup>) and the largest amount of floor area (117,530 m<sup>2</sup>).

Furthermore, the opinions of the experts on their relevant specialist fields and subject areas are also depicted on a scale. For instance, the individual criteria for the preliminary opinion for the bullet point "urban integration" were: Distance between buildings by density and height for the point "traffic": public transport connections, circulation and avoidance of through traffic.

More detailed and additional opinions on the other topics were to be provided by the present experts during the meeting.

### **Item 4 Informative round (09:35)**

The informative round began: all 83 entries were shown one after the other with explanatory diagrams, model photos and the presentation plan both in original size and enlarged via a presentation onto two large high-resolution screens.

Alongside the urban design concept, the focus of the presentation was on the number of storeys, how the participant had dealt with existing buildings, the concept for circulation and open spaces, and any distinctive features.

The informative round was briefly interrupted for a coffee break (11:10-11:20) and ended at 12:15pm.

### **Item 5 Discussion and assessment rounds (12:20pm)**

After the informative round, an initial discussion began on the urban planning approaches and the concepts in general. The jury praised the high quality of entries and recognised that there was a broad range of diverse solutions which offered a good basis for selection of entries for further processing in the 2nd phase.

The discussion became more lively and differing opinions were heard when it came to the integration of the site in the city, spatial arrangements and connections, building arrangement and scale, paths and squares, the character of the quarter, inclusion of existing buildings in the new design concept and the variety and types of use of the spaces proposed. The jury also spent time talking about and reflecting on the functional

arrangement of ground floor level spaces to be used by the public, the future development potential of the proposed typology, the quality of the public, semi-public and private green and open spaces, as well as how participants dealt with the topography.

#### First round of assessment (12:35pm)

A decision was made to start with the first round of assessment. Mr. Allmann reminded attendees once more that in order to exclude an entry from the procedure in the first voting stage, the jury must vote unanimously to do so. It is possible for a jury member to file for the entry that has been excluded to be reinstated at any time.

The first round of assessment began. The entries and models were shown on a screen. The entries were assessed one after the other. Entries for which no immediate support was voiced within the jury were looked at more closely and a vote was then held as to whether the entry should remain in the procedure for further assessment or not.

Under consideration of the above-mentioned criteria, the following 12 entries received no vote and were eliminated from the competition:

**7016, 7020, 7022, 7029, 7031, 7048, 7049, 7063, 7067, 7070, 7075, 7080.**

The first round of assessment ended at 13:05. A lunch break followed until 13:35.

#### Second round of assessment (13:35pm)

The second round of assessment began after the break. From this round onwards, a simple majority was sufficient for a decision to include or exclude an entry.

The expert jurors took it in turns to summarise first the conclusions of the previous discussions on each entry and then make a plea for or against that particular entry. The discussion once again became more lively when it came to the integration of the site in the city, spatial arrangements and connections, building arrangement and scale, paths and squares, the character of the quarter, inclusion of existing buildings in the new design concept and the variety and types of use of the spaces proposed. Jurors spoke about compliance with spatial requirements and construction regulations.

STA

**A positive development in Stuttgart. The new Stöckach.**

Excerpt of the minutes from the jury meeting for the first phase

8/10

01.10.2019

The jury decided as follows on whether the relevant entries should remain in the procedure:

Share of votes (YES/NO)

<b>7001 (12/9)</b>	7002 (3/18)	<b>7003 (13/8)</b>	7004 (0/21)	7005 (0/21)	7006 (8/13)
7013 (3/18)	7014 (4/17)	<b>7015 (11/10)</b>	7017 (3/18)	7018 (9/12)	7019 (0/21)
7021 (0/21)	<b>7023 (19/2)</b>	7024 (8/13)	7025 (0/21)	<b>7026 (19/2)</b>	7027 (0/21)
7028 (7/14)	7030 (8/13)	7032 (0/21)	<b>7033 (16/5)</b>	7034 (0/21)	7035 (4/17)
7036 (0/21)	<b>7037 (15/6)</b>	7038 (2/19)	7039 (0/21)	7040 (0/21)	7041 (7/14)
7042 (6/15)	7043 (0/21)	7044 (0/21)	7045 (6/15)	7046 (7/14)	7047 (0/21)
7050 (3/18)	7051 (0/21)	7052 (2/19)	7053 (0/21)	7054 (0/21)	7055 (3/18)
7056 (8/13)	7057 (0/21)	7058 (0/21)	7059 (4/17)	<b>7060 (14/7)</b>	7061 (10/11)
7062 (0/21)	7064 (3/18)	7065 (8/13)	7066 (2/19)	7068 (8/13)	7069 (2/19)
7071 (4/17)	<b>7072 (13/8)</b>	7073 (3/18)	7074 (4/17)	7076 (2/19)	7077 (3/18)
7078 (2/19)	7079 (1/20)	7081 (4/17)	7082 (0/21)	<b>7083 (17/4)</b>	

This meant that the 10 entries with disguise numbers **7001, 7003, 7015, 7023, 7026, 7033, 7037, 7060, 7072** and **7083** remained in the procedure for further assessment rounds.

Dr. Eckert transferred his voting right between 13:55 and 14:40 to his representative Ms. Gehrman-Linnerth.

Mr. Kotz transferred his voting right from 12:15 until the end of the meeting to his representative Dr. Vetter.

The second assessment round ended at 19:10 and was interrupted for a break between 16:45 and 17:05. In order to prepare for any possible requests for reinstatement of eliminated entries it was decided to allow the jurors 15 minutes to look through potential entries on their own and also receive advice from the experts and the preliminary examination team.

#### Requests for reinstatement 2nd assessment round (19:25)

Following a brief discussion, requests for reinstatement were filed for disguise numbers **7006, 7008, 7012, 7018, 7030, 7056, 7061, 7065** and **7068**.

After an individual discussion on each entry a vote was taken for each again on whether they should remain in the procedure with the following result: The jury decided by simple majority on whether entries should be reinstated as follows:

Share of votes (YES/NO)

7006 (9/12)	<b>7008 (11/10)</b>	7012 (9/12)	7018 (10/11)	7030 (4/17)	7056 (5/16)
<b>7061 (12/9)</b>	<b>7065 (15/6)</b>	7068 (3/18)			

This meant that the entries with disguise numbers **7008, 7061** and **7065** were now back in the competition.

The second assessment round ended at 20:10.

Qualifying for the second phase

The jury unanimously voted to recommend the 13 remaining entries with the following disguise numbers for further processing in the second phase:

**7001, 7003, 7008, 7015, 7023, 7026, 7033, 7037, 7060, 7061, 7065, 7072, 7083**

The share of the competition money which was set aside for fees will be split between the 13 participants. The awarding authority assured attendees that it would check whether it was possible to increase the competition fund to ensure a certain amount of compensation is distributed to participants in their individual fees.

Following the second round of assessment, the jury gave the following recommendations for further processing in the second stage:

- The requirements of the competition brief must be taken into account.
- Particular attention should be paid to the required 60,000m<sup>2</sup> of living space which must be credibly proven.
- Attention is also explicitly drawn to the "appropriate density" mentioned in the brief.
- It must also be certified in a credible way that the space envisioned for the new substation is in close proximity to its current location.
- The substation may not be overbuilt or assigned a different function (e.g. living space or sports hall).
- It must be proven that a child daycare centre and sports hall are found on the competition site.
- The distances between buildings must be recognisably maintained and should be verified by all participants.
- Considerations on how to deal with high noise levels which could possibly occur as a result of the envisioned use concepts must be schematically represented and checked for their plausibility.
- For entries which exceed the level of storeys found in the surrounding area, appropriate considerations should be made and represented in the entry for dealing with potential vista and shadowing problems and any impact on the city's skyline.
- A coherent and plausible open space concept must be represented and explained.
- Where additional storeys are to be built on existing buildings, it must be plausibly explained how this construction is feasible.

---

STA	<b>A positive development in Stuttgart. The new Stöckach.</b> Excerpt of the minutes from the jury meeting for the first phase	10/10 01.10.2019
-----	---	---------------------

---

### **Item 6 Conclusion of meeting (20:40)**

The Chair thanked all jury participants for their focused and constructive cooperation. He relieved the preliminary examination team of their duty, thanked the procedure support staff for their professionalism in preparing and conducting the meeting. He also thanked the EnBW on behalf of the jury for their support in preparing and conducting the meeting, providing the meeting room and technical equipment.

Mr. Heberger thanked all those involved in the procedure on behalf of the awarding authority for the productive meeting in a cooperative atmosphere and also thanked the Chair for the expedient and skilful way he led the meeting. He emphasised the high quality of the entries chosen for the second phase which meant that an excellent end result is in store.