

**INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION OF IDEAS FOR A PRIVATE ENTERPRISE
CONCERNING THE AREA OF THE FORMER FIUME VENETO (PN) COTTON MILL**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE
16/17/18 APRIL 2004**

Members of the Selection Committee:

Adams Graham (nominated by the Municipality recommended by U.I.A.)

Gargan Giampaolo (nominated by the Association of Engineers of the Pordenone Province)

Girardi Luigi (nominated by Friuli Venezia Giulia Autonomous Region)

Hempel Adreas Gottlieb (nominated by the Organizing Body)

Iwamura Kazuo (nominated by U.I.A.)

Missio Pierluigi (nominated by Friuli Venezia Giulia Autonomous Region)

Querol Jordi (nominated by the Organizing Body)

Ravnikar Vojteh (nominated by Association of Architects of the Pordenone Province, A.P.P.C.)

Deputy Members:

Bratuleanu Anca (nominated by U.I.A.)

Lazzari Luciano (nominated by Municipality)

Start of the work of the Selection Committee at 9.15.

In addition to the regular Members and deputies of the Selection Committee, also present are arch. Walter Bigatton, representing the Friuli Venezia Giulia Autonomous Region and arch. Alberto Gri, President of the Pordenone Architects Order, without the right to vote or take part in the discussion.

The Coordinator arch. Giancarlo Ius presents all the Members of the Selection Committee and briefly illustrates certain contents of the Notice and the terms for the presentation of the works. He declares the work open and hands over to arch. Jordi Querol, the most senior Member of the Selection Committee. After a short debate, arch. Andreas Gottlieb Hempel is proposed as, and unanimously nominated President of the Selection Committee. Arch. Hempel accepts the task.

Arch. Kazuo Iwamura informs the Selection Committee that he has to leave them on Sunday morning; therefore, arch. Anca Bratuleanu shall substitute him for the day on 18/04/2004.

The President expressly asks if the Members of the Selection Committee have had relations with the Ideas Competition participants. All participating in the work declare not to have collaborated in any way in drawing up the projects presented.

The Coordinator gives information regarding the pre-selection work and the preliminary examination and on the procedure of the preparatory work, carried out by the use of brief summarizing documents and blacking out the marking with a progressive arrival number. The envelopes containing the nominations of the participants are kept in a safe in the town hall. Furthermore, he also explains that certain projects are incomplete (business plan). Only two are without a report and one arrived ruined by water. Very few contain the .DWG. One is without the sealed envelope with the identification documents.

The business plan is missing, particularly in certain projects presumably foreign, but the actual contents of the project can give an indication of the economic feasibility.

Upon invitation of the President it is decided that papers other than those requested by the notice shall not be examined. On the other hand, all projects with the sending date 7/04/2004 are accepted. Furthermore, he states that the projects which respond to quality requirements must be judged first of all, as consequence the details should not be overvalued but the contents must be evaluated, therefore the project conceiving will prevail even if the business plan or a part of the report with the motive and description of the project are missing.

It is confirmed that the first three projects classified may be integrated through negotiation, as foreseen by the Notice. The reality of the area of the works is analysed, making a comparison of the territory of Fiume Veneto with the province of Pordenone, getting some ideas in this sense.

The current destination of the usage of the area, defined as industrial and green, is specified. It is clarified that the instructions for the Notice are not too binding and that the Notice allows the competitors ample freedom of choice as a Competition of ideas guarantees.

The Coordinator, upon invitation by the President, explains the voting system which has been established on the basis of the evaluations and proposals arising during the preliminary organizing meeting, called on 1st March 2004 and in which a great part of the Members of the Selection Committee participated.

The voting program is tested by voting for roughly ten projects chosen casually, in order to become familiar with the computer programs written for the occasion.

The voting-paper foreseen shows the evaluation criteria established, which shall be observed:

- project conceiving,
- business plan,
- observing the instructions of the Competition Notice.

Each Member of the Selection Committee has at his/her disposal 100 points for each project, divided up as follows: project conceiving 70 points, business plan 20 points, observing the Notice instructions 10 points.

After further debate and after having tested the program, unanimously the Selection Committee decides to vote, in this first phase, only for the project conceiving, corresponding to 70 points.

The first voting starts, with the commitment to re-evaluate, in a next voting, a group of projects (30 - 40) first ones classified.

The work of the Selection Committee is suspended at 13.00 after the examination of the first twenty-five projects. The Mayor and the Municipal Council Secretary take their greetings to the Selection Committee.

The work re-starts at 14.30 and, after having examined another seventy-five projects, the session is adjourned at 19.45.

On 17th April 2004 the Selection Committee re-starts the work. The remaining fifty-one projects are examined. Upon invitation by the President, after an ample discussion and evaluating various opportunities, it is decided that in the afternoon the first forty projects classified shall be examined plus eight projects picked out for reconsideration, one for each regular Member of the Selection Committee and that the following points shall be awarded:

- 0 = negative judgement;
- 35 = neutral judgement;
- 70 = positive judgement.

The first forty projects classified are:

Project Number	1st vote	2nd vote	
In order of position	Votes obtained	Votes obtained	Position of the first 18
1082	315	280	4
1042	300	350	2
1027	287	210	16
1078	284	175	18
1077	276	245	12
1062	273	140	
1080	267	245	8
1029	265	245	7
1030	257	70	
1114	253	140	
1026	253	280	6
1021	253	385	1

1054	253	245	11
1104	249	175	
1035	247	105	
1034	247	140	
1033	234	140	
1048	233	70	
1081	229	245	9
1036	226	35	
1069	225	175	
1079	223	315	3
1025	221	210	15
1032	220	175	
1043	218	175	
1127	217	105	
1049	215	280	5
1105	213	105	
1007	212	70	
1142	212	245	13
1003	211	210	17
1111	207	140	
1108	207	245	10
1123	205	210	14
1055	203	105	
1110	202	70	
1106	200	140	
1012	200	175	
1028	200	70	
1050	199	140	

The eight projects picked out for reconsideration are:

1018	169	70
1023	117	0
1064	148	70
1087	162	105
1117	197	140
1120	180	140
1130	160	70
1138	196	105

The work re-starts at 14.30. The results of the second vote are shown in the table above.

Subsequent to further discussion, it is decided to examine in a third round the first eighteen classified. Seeing that six projects of equal merit with 175 points (the projects are: 1012, 1030, 1032, 1043, 1069, 1068) have been classified in eighteenth place, it is decided unanimously to admit project 1078 which, at the first vote had the highest mark (284).

At this point, upon the President's proposal, the opportunity to evaluate the business plan is discussed, and considering the instructions of the Notice for all the eighteen projects. It was decided to vote for all eighteen projects again, using the voting method originally proposed by the Coordinator which, please note, foresaw a maximum mark of 100 points for each Member of the Selection Committee, divided into three evaluation marks: project conceiving 70 points, business plan 20 points, observing the instructions of the Notice 10 points .

The result of the subsequent vote is the following:

Pos.	Project	Project conceiving	Business Plan	Observing the instructions of the Notice	Total
1	1049	353	151	77	581
2	1079	388	103	77	568

3	1042	355	126	64	545
4	1080	328	116	77	521
5	1054	324	105	70	499
6	1081	328	96	68	492
7	1029	279	133	64	476
8	1082	379	23	68	470
9	1021	381	37	40	458
10	1026	288	105	60	453
11	1077	313	40	59	412
12	1108	305	26	79	410
13	1078	279	57	65	401
14	1142	307	6	79	392
15	1027	250	95	42	387
16	1025	276	45	40	361
17	1123	288	0	37	325
18	1003	220	0	16	236

The Selection Committee decides to meet at 9.00 on 18th April 2004 in the building where all the projects received have been exhibited. The work of the Selection Committee is suspended at 19.45.

On 18th April 2004 at 9.00 the Selection Committee re-opens the proceedings in the building in which all the works have been exhibited. Arch. Anca Bratuleanu substitutes arch. Kazuo Iwamura. First of all, the graphic works of the first eighteen projects classified are grouped together and, subsequent to extensive discussion, it is decided to include seven proposals in a restricted evaluation: 1026, 1029, 1042, 1079, 1081, 1123, 1142.

For the final discussion, the seven projects chosen are taken into the Selection Committee's meeting room.

The Selection Committee discusses the essential aspects in detail:

- the project shall respect the existing buildings;
- the project shall have a direct relation with the surrounding environment and the town;
- the project shall observe an adequate scale for the location;
- the project shall constitute an attractive centre for the regional territory;
- the project shall guarantee the integration of the various urban functions, avoiding monofunctions;
- the west side of the island shall be developed as a park for the public (green area);
- the proposed intervention shall correspond to the future town centre;
- the project chosen shall propose a strong structure for producing future changes along a long-term period;
- essential shall be a pleasant human atmosphere offering a high quality lifestyle, avoiding the risk of building parts of the town isolated from the context.

The Selection Committee is convinced that a Competition of Ideas cannot present an absolute final solution. The project chosen must offer tips, ideas and the possibility to be developed in accordance with the above-mentioned requirements and aspects and future necessities.

Furthermore, it shall also offer a sustainable prospective for collaboration among the parties involved in the enterprise.

In line with this general discussion, the Selection Committee moves on to the heart of the discussion regarding the first seven projects classified and decides after some votes unanimously or by majority the following:

- project 1142 is eliminated ;
- projects 1026 and 1029 are recommended, considered of equal merit (€6.400,00 each);
- project 1023 is recommended with special mention by the Selection Committee (€6.400,00);
- project 1079 is classified in third place (€12.800,00);
- project 1081 is classified in second place (€20.000,00);
- project 1042 is classified in first place (€28.000,00).

In compliance with the instructions of the Competition Notice, the first three classified shall be informed regarding the negotiation procedure in the order of classification, starting with the first classified.

The Selection Committee highlights the essential aspects of the first six projects classified:

1042

Positive aspects:

the concentration of the buildings in a new quarter near the existing town centre;
 the preservation, the renovation and reconversion of the old factory;
 the position of the Civic Centre in an urban park with theme gardens and vegetable gardens;
 the placing of a natural park on the south-west side of the island.

Negative aspects:

the proposal of a residential block in the form of an arena outside the area – a symbolic building not suitable for the structure of the location;
 the trees situated at the north-east entrance of the island have been removed;
 the project is, according to the concise business plan, inside the average of the Competition requirements.

1081

Positive aspects:

the scale and the dimension of the whole project seem most appropriate for the existing environment;
 the green areas are excellently integrated;
 the orientation which originates the work consists of a line which crosses the island, with the church as the perspective point, the reduced traffic viability.

Negative aspects:

an oversized car park on the east side, almost like an entrance door;
 the almost complete demolition of the old building;
 the lack of a strong central idea, which would result innovative for a centre in this situation;
 in accordance with the business plan, the project is slightly below the average of the Competition requirements

1079

Positive aspects:

the Civic Centre, the theatre, the museum and the central square are directly connected with the town Centre;
 the residential area offers solutions which guarantee a high quality lifestyle;

the dimensioning of the residential quarter;
the reduced traffic viability.

Negative aspects:

the scale, the volumes and the architectonic forms and expressions of the buildings in the central area;

the park area on the west side of the island is not integrated with the residential area;

the latter is conceived as being completely separate from the central area – there is not an integration of the functions;

the business plan is inside the average of the Competition requirements.

1123

The project offers a suggestive vision of the future town centre;

a convincing drawing-up of the project is lacking;

proposing only a sports area in the centre of the island cannot fulfil the requirements of the Notice for an economic balance of the works.

1026

The projects offers an innovative idea for a centre in this situation;

the alignment of the buildings from east to west offers a good combination of functions;

the architectonic mass accumulation for the central services can be criticised;

the Borgo della Memoria proposal is a fascinating idea.

1029

The project offers a clear and economical solution but presents no special characteristics, taking into account the works area;

the Selection Committee criticises the separation of the residential functions from the Civic and commercial Centre;

also the scale, the architectonic forms and expressions do not seem appropriate for this location.

The Selection Committee finds that, among the projects in the Competition, a complete solution resolving all the complex problems set by the Notice, has not been identified. The Members of the Selection Committee, however are confident that the prize-winning projects offer overall, a solid base for the necessary refining of the project and of the works requirements, through the integration of the various proposals included in these projects.

After the discussion and after having approved the judgement above said on every single proposal, the President asks that the envelopes with the personal data of the participants shall be collected from the safe in the town hall. At 16.10, in the presence of the Selection Committee, the Coordinator gives the envelopes to the President. The President verifies that they are entire and sealed, goes on with their opening and checks the documents inside. The documents contained in the envelopes of the first six proposals classified are in compliance with the Notice instructions.

Therefore, the estimated pass-list is the following:

1st place

Progressive No.: 1042

Marking No.: 987I654V321F

Head of the Team: Arch. **Guido Masè**, Trento, Italy

2nd place

Progressive No.: 1081

Marking No.: 187447676DEC

Head of the Team: Arch. **Likopoulou Ekaterini**, Athens, Greece

3rd place

Progressive No.: 1079

Marking No.: 712584467GDA

Head of the Team: Arch. **Christopher Green**, F.G.C. Architectes Associes, Hotel de Fontcuberte, Aix-en-Provence, France

Recommended with special mention by the Selection Committee

Progressive No.: 1123

Marking No.: 3491158E77GE

Head of the Team: Arch. **Nevzat Oguz Ozer**, Istanbul, Turkey

Recommended, considered of equal merit

Progressive No.: 1026

Marking No.: 4189C256E974

Head of the Team: Arch. **Annarita Ferrante**, Bologna, Italy

Progressive No.: 1029

Marking No.: 198G75D63G42

Head of the Team: Arch. **Gianpietro Franceschinis**, Cassacco (Udine), Italy

The President asks the Coordinator to verify the regularity of the registration of the teams of the six first proposals according to the rules of the Notice. In case the team of the winning proposal has not provided for the registration to the Competition, his/her exclusion and the substitution in sequence with the next proposal are foreseen. The seventh proposal which has been examined and excluded during the last voting (proposal no. 1142) shall be included in the group of the recommended projects. In case of more than one proposal is excluded, the amount or the amounts corresponding with the last prizes will not be awarded.

At 16.50, in the presence of the Mayor, the confirmation of the prize-winning projects with due reservation of verifying the correct registration to the Competition of the first projects classified, is announced.

At 17.00 the President closes the meeting of the Selection Committee being grateful for the collaboration of all the Members. He thanks the Coordinator for the perfect preparation which has greatly helped the work of the Selection Committee. Furthermore, the President is grateful to the owners who have organized an international Competition in order to identify a high quality project solution and wishes a future positive process of its realization.

Fiume Veneto, 18 April 2004

Members of the Selection Committee

President: Hempel Adreas Gottlieb (nominated by the Organizing Body)

Adams Graham (nominated by the Municipality recommended by U.I.A.)

Gargan Giampaolo (nominated by the Association of Engineers of the Pordenone Province)

Girardi Luigi (nominated by Friuli Venezia Giulia Autonomous Region)

Iwamura Kazuo (nominated by U.I.A)

Substituted on Sunday 18/04/2004 by:
Bratuleanu Anca (Deputy Member: nominated by U.I.A.)

Missio Pierluigi (nominated by Friuli Venezia Giulia Autonomous Region)

Querol Jordi (nominated by the Organizing Body)

Ravnikar Vojteh (nominated by Association of Architects of the Pordenone Province, A.P.P.C.)

Deputy Member:
Lazzari Luciano (nominated by Municipality)

Note of the Coordinator added to the minutes of the meeting of the Selection Committee

On 19th April 2004 another proposal (1152) has come to the address of the premises of the property Isola del Fiume S.r.l. The due date for the receipt of the projects, according to the Notice of the Competition, was 13th April 2004. Although the sending postmark has resulted suitable with what requested by the Notice (7 April 2004), the project has arrived beyond the due time and sent to an address different from that of the Competition Secretary. However, the Selection Committee would not have the chance neither to make any formal evaluation about the admission of the work nor to judge it since at 17.00 of the 18th April 2004 the work of the Selection Committee has been closed.