

EUROPAN 17 SWEDEN REPORT OF THE JURY
2023-12-04**Number of entries 43**

Nyköping Skavsta 7

Piteå 6

Rimbo 8

Skellefteå 13

Växjö 9

Composition of the jury

- Fredrik Drotte (SE), Chairman of jury, Architect and planner, Head of urban planning and innovation at Vincero
- Cecilie Andersson (NO), Architect and Ph.D in Architecture, Vice Rector and Associate Professor at Bergen School of Architecture
- Camilla van Deurs (DK), Architect and Ph.D in Urban design, Chief City Architect of the City of Copenhagen
- Björn Förstberg (SE), Architect, Founding architect at Förstberg Ling
- Johan Paju (SE), Landscape architect, Founder of Paju Arkitektur och Landskap
- Rebecca Rubin (SE), Architect and Urban planner, Assistant Professor at KTH School of architecture, Head of social sustainability at Sveafastigheter, MDA, Mayors Design Advocat, GLA London
- Meike Schalk (SE), Architect and Ph.D. in Theoretical and Applied Aesthetics of Landscape Architecture, Associate Professor in Urban Design and Urban Theory, Docent in Architecture at KTH School of Architecture

Substitutes

- Moa Andrén (SE), Architect, Founding architect at AndrénFogelström
- Klara Wahlstedt (SE), Architect and urban planner, Co-founding architect Studio Träda, Urban planner at Uppsala municipality

PHASE 1: Preliminary analyze by a Technical commission

The national secretariat has verified that all proposals comply with the competition rules and were possible to include in the jury evaluation. All submitted proposals conformed to the rules and have been evaluated during the jury process. Before the first jury meeting, the municipalities have composed a technical commission that analyzed all the submitted proposals with focus on how the content of the proposals related to the questions asked in the competition briefs. The site representatives presented their analysis of the content in relation to the competition brief during the first meeting with the jury. The site representatives were asked to make objective presentations and to avoid subjective evaluations in terms of good or bad.

PHASE 2: First meeting of the jury to make a preselection among the entries
Jury meeting 1, 4-6/10 2023 at Architects Sweden, Stockholm

PARTICIPATION OF THE JURY

Day 1, 4/10

Jury members with a vote (present marked in bold)

Fredrik Drotte (SE)
Cecilie Andersson (NO)
Camilla van Deurs (DK)
Björn Förstberg (SE)
Johan Paju (SE)
Rebecca Rubin (SE)
Meike Schalk (SE)

Site representatives present, but with no voting right

Tobias Ossmark, Municipality of Nyköping
Björn-Emil Tunebäck, Municipality of Nyköping
Charlotta Holm Klinth, Explore Skavsta
Florian Steiner, Municipality of Piteå
Britta Pedersen, The Swedish Transport Administration
Mattias Lidén, The Swedish Transport Administration
Linda Bystedt, Municipality of Skellefteå
Harriet Wistemar, Municipality of Skellefteå
Sebastian Gårdendahl, Municipality of Växjö
Kerstin Ivansson, Municipality of Växjö

Day 2, 5/10

Jury members with a vote (present marked in bold)

Fredrik Drotte (SE)
Cecilie Andersson (NO)
Camilla van Deurs (DK)
Björn Förstberg (SE)
Johan Paju (SE)
Rebecca Rubin (SE)
Meike Schalk (SE)

Site representatives present, but with no voting right

Tobias Ossmark, Municipality of Nyköping
Florian Steiner, Municipality of Piteå
Linda Bystedt, Municipality of Skellefteå
Harriet Wistemar, Municipality of Skellefteå
Sebastian Gårdendahl, Municipality of Växjö
Kerstin Ivansson, Municipality of Växjö

Day 3, 6/10

Jury members with a vote (present marked in bold)

Fredrik Drotte (SE)
Cecilie Andersson (NO)
Camilla van Deurs (DK)
Björn Förstberg (SE)
Johan Paju (SE)
Rebecca Rubin (SE)
Meike Schalk (SE)

Site representatives present, but with no voting right

Tobias Ossmark, Municipality of Nyköping
Linda Bystedt, Municipality of Skellefteå
Sebastian Gårdendahl, Municipality of Växjö
Kerstin Ivansson, Municipality of Växjö
Annika Andersson, Municipality of Norrtälje
Emil Ödegaard Jacobson, Municipality of Norrtälje
Emelie Handsbo, Municipality of Norrtälje
Olle Huusko, Tranvik projekt

GENERAL METHOD OF EVALUATION, CRITERIA AND WAY TO PRESELECT

1. The site representatives made a brief presentation of the city, the competition site, and the competition brief. The site representative presented each submitted proposal briefly and focused on technical aspects without evaluating the projects.
2. The jury and site representatives independently selected which projects they wanted to bring up to further discussion.
3. Discussion, comparison, and preselection of proposals. Only the jury had a vote, but the site representatives could participate in the discussions.

The jury members had access to all the projects before the meetings, and all projects were exhibited site per site in the room of the jury discussions.

The jury has pre-selected the best projects before a definitive selection. For all sites the jury has been preselecting proposals for further discussion that complement each other both in terms of strategies for the site and in relation to the theme Living cities. For some sites, the jury has selected additional proposals that were considered in need of a more in-depth reading before being eliminated from the final selection.

The jury has been consensual in their decision, and no voting has been required.

RESULT JURY MEETING 1

Nyköping-Skavsta:	3 preselected projects
Piteå:	3 preselected projects
Skellefteå:	3 preselected projects
Växjö:	4 preselected projects
Rimbo:	3 preselected projects

PHASE 3: Second meeting of the jury

Jury meeting 2, 15-16/11 2021 at Architects Sweden, Stockholm

PARTICIPATION OF THE JURYDay 1, 15/11

Jury members with a vote (present marked in bold)

Fredrik Drotte (SE)
Cecilie Andersson (NO)
Camilla van Deurs (DK)
Björn Förstberg (SE)
Johan Paju (SE)
Rebecca Rubin (SE)
Meike Schalk (SE)

Site representatives present, but with no voting right

Tobias Ossmark, Municipality of Nyköping
Florian Steiner, Municipality of Piteå
Britta Pedersen, The Swedish Transport Administration
Mattias Lidén, The Swedish Transport Administration
Linda Bystedt, Municipality of Skellefteå
Harriet Wistemar, Municipality of Skellefteå
Sebastian Gårdendahl, Municipality of Växjö

Day 2, 16/11

Jury members with a vote (present marked in bold)

Fredrik Drotte (SE)
Cecilie Andersson (NO)
Camilla van Deurs (DK)
Björn Förstberg (SE)
Johan Paju (SE)
Rebecca Rubin (SE)
Meike Schalk (SE)

Site representatives present, but with no voting right

Tobias Ossmark, Municipality of Nyköping
Charlotta Holm Klinth, Explore Skavsta
Sebastian Gårdendahl, Municipality of Växjö
Annika Andersson, Municipality of Norrtälje
Emil Ödegaard Jacobson, Municipality of Norrtälje
Emelie Handsbo, Municipality of Norrtälje
Olle Huusko, Tranvik projekt

GENERAL METHOD OF EVALUATION, CRITERIA AND WAY TO SELECT

1. The Site representatives and Jury members gave a report from the Forum in Vienna and the working groups they have participated in.
2. The Site representatives informed the jury about the local exhibition and if there were any reactions from the public.
3. The Jury members presented the selected projects of which they have made a profound reading.
4. The Site representatives made technical comments to the presented projects.

5. Question raised if any of the eliminated projects should be brought to the discussion again.
6. General discussion around the projects.
7. The jury confer alone and give their motivations for the winner, runner-up and special mention.

The goal for the jury discussions was for the jury to arrive at a consensual decision by discussion. No voting has been required. The jury has gradually eliminated projects in order to arrive to the final selection. By the end of the last session the jury had a global discussion around the jury evaluation and the winning projects.

The jury's opinions will be made public as an appendix to the jury report.

FINAL EVALUATION

Nyköping-Skavsta

Winner:	VY311 Forest city
Runner-up:	SZ333 Nurture nature
Special Mention:	VM735 The sweet spot

Piteå

Winner:	PK099 Solander Ring
Runner-up:	ZC802 Reclaiming territories
Special Mention:	NV874 Lagom

Rimbo

Winner:	CM620 Somewhere over the Ringbo
Runner-up:	SZ555 Re-connecting Rimbo
Special Mention:	LL596 8 strategies for Rimbo

Skellefteå

Winner:	KP974 Safescape
Runner-up:	GP259 Influencer Flod
Special Mention:	OE661 The octopus enigma

Växjö

Winner:	ET032 Generative Care
Runner-up:	PY094 Glänta
Special Mention:	WV801 Länka

Signature, 2023-12-04



Fredrik Drotte, Chairman of Jury

EVALUATION COMMENTS BY THE JURY EUROPAN 17 SWEDEN:

NYKÖPING

Winner: Forest city

Through strong craftsmanship based on a robust diagram-driven analysis *Forest City* convincingly, shapes a credible and flexible urban structure, with green streets and a strong, welcoming central space. The concept of urban space is built on developing urbanity in close harmony with preserved contiguous nature and important green corridors, supported by a visually powerful language that inspires a discussion of how far such a concept can be taken.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The jury considers the proposed narrow natural corridors to be too thin, and the solitary pine trees too delicate to be feasible. It is suggested that the proposal delve deeper into examining the site's existing nature and its needs, developing the proposal's core ideas based on these considerations. The square's scale is deemed too large in relation to the site and structure. Further study is also advisable for the proposal regarding building design, how the "Big-box" structure will connect to the overall structure, and the proposal's relationship with the broader surroundings and with Nyköping city.

Runner-up: Nurture nature

In a captivating manner, *Nurture Nature* highlights the potential of creating several small workplace neighbourhoods, broken into small-scale urban spaces with central gathering squares, by incorporating green wedges connected to important green corridors. The jury is also intrigued by the description of how to adapt various types of activities within the same block structure. The area is gracefully accessed through a larger plaza at the northern end of the central High Street. The close connection of the built structures to nature within these integrated green wedges is seductively illustrated. A car-free internal structure has been achieved through a clever solution for car traffic access close to the surrounding main street.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The jury's feedback to *Nurture Nature* primarily revolves around uncertainties regarding the feasibility of the proposal's central ideas and, consequently, the conditions for developing these ideas during a more extended development process. The jury questions whether the very small building dimensions of the neighbourhoods, which do not correspond to conventional measures for offices or residences (if the latter were to become possible in the future), impose too great a demand for specialized program content. Additionally, there are concerns about whether the strong circular shape foundation of the proposal's surrounding form might pose a restrictive aspect for structural development.

Special mention: The sweet spot

The jury would like to award *The Sweet Spot* an honourable mention and to commend *it for its* meticulously described and engagingly illustrated concept of clustering activities in the area around recreation, public health, and food production. All of these are highly relevant issues of utmost importance for society's long-term sustainable development.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The jury would like to see the described vision in the actual proposed solutions. The block structure is too loosely sketched out and the proposal reads more like a wish list than a realistic plan.

Winner: Solander ring

Solander Ring demonstrates a good understanding of the site and convincingly showcases quality in holistic thinking with a high level of craftsmanship. Thoroughly examined and proposed urban spaces are gathered around two strategically important points: the designs around the station and the placement of the ring-shaped bridge. The other two bridges are logical consequences of the overarching green ring around the city, which, in a straightforward and engaging manner, accentuates and shapes barrier-breaking connections. The campus park south of the station points to an interesting and credible approach that should be further studied in its entirety, potentially serving as a stepping stone forward depending on industrial development.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The buildings and urban spaces connecting the structure to the west need further study and illustration. This also applies to the proposed development in other areas. The conceptual execution of the design for the connections over the railway has a simplified and somewhat formalistic character. Their functionality and design should be explored in more depth. From a long-term perspective, there is merit in investigating a placement that more directly extends from Kyrkbrogatan. The proposal is unclear regarding the future function of Timmerleden.

Runner-up: Reclaiming territories

Reclaiming Territories highlights two strategically chosen points for barrier-breaking intersections. Testing an underpass extension from Uddmansgatan, with the clever approach of shortening the distance of the passage and creating more greenery towards the lake by moving the road and railway closer together, is particularly interesting. The initiative to create an attractive public space along the green ring around the city is well-conceived. The proposed development southwest of the track inspires interesting discussions about future development.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

Reclaiming Territories requires deeper studies of functionality, structure, and design, especially concerning the proposed station. It is questionable whether the consistently busy Timmerleden can be crossed at grade at such a point. The entrance to the city in the proposal is dominated by a bus terminal and parking, while the railway station is perceived as undersized and anonymous. A further exploration of the stations function and identity creation in a future city is encouraged. The justification and design of the proposed residences south of the station need refinement, as do the proposed park areas between the road and the railway.

Special mention: Lagom



Lagom takes a strong approach by leveraging the qualities and potential of the shoreline as a regional attraction, and then delves deeper into its details with a focus on the urban front and the station. The proposed station location can be seen as the embodiment of such an attraction. The proposal raises the intriguing question of what a station at the intersection of city and nature could be and chooses the refreshing approach of wanting to break the barrier for both humans and nature as the starting point for the station's design.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The station's location in the city is perceived as too secluded to facilitate and attract eco-friendly travel. The jury wonders if the proximity to the overarching shoreline trail, the city, and the hospital justifies a placement on the eastern side instead. The jury would have wanted to see proposals for how to handle the existing rail area.

Winner: Somewhere over the Ringbo

Somewhere over the Ringbo is a convincing proposal, based on a strong analysis of existing values, with the foundation of a robust overall concept that allows a ring road to connect the local community both socially and ecologically. Through this, the proposal shapes an urban development plan within the competition area, employing a consistently executed framework for development. *Somewhere over the Ringbo* credibly presents a road layout and development phases within a structure that also captures important existing pathways and cross-connections.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

Somewhere Over the Ringbo's concept "The Yellow Path" is well-illustrated in small diagrams but only schematically described in its physical design. The jury wishes to see further development with a focus on diversification and design of various types of public spaces and pathways. Additionally, the location and functionality of the bus terminal require further examination. The jury appreciates Somewhere Over the Ringbo's attempt to preserve existing buildings, likely providing future urban spaces with a strong local connection and identity. However, the idea needs clarification and concretization. The jury also wonders about the potential development of "the yellow path" into a cycling route and how the "superblocks" will be accessed.

Runner-up: Re-connecting Rimbo

Re-connecting Rimbo's development of the green loop is a strong and well-illustrated approach that connects the urban area both socially and ecologically, adding important links to summer season activities closer to the lake. The central area around Galten and the current downtown area have been addressed in a manner that demonstrates a sound understanding of the site, with well-crafted connections to the surroundings and a convincing placement of educational facilities.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The urban structure's perimeter block pattern is perceived by the jury as schematically designed. It needs to be studied in more detail and diversified with the aim of creating greater harmony with its surroundings and a diversity of urban spaces within the competition area, especially in the southern parts of the proposal. The jury believes that the proposal's grid structure could be developed into a more enabling and flexible framework, capable of accommodating more spacious blocks. The proposal also needs to consider the possibility of preserving existing buildings.

Special mention: 8 strategies for Rimbo

The jury wishes to highlight and commend *8 strategies for Rimbo* for its inspiring commitment to maximizing preservation, the proposal's process-oriented method of deeply understanding the site, and its focus on biodiversity. *8 strategies for Rimbo* compellingly demonstrates how to create urban spaces that are based on existing industrial buildings and the larger scale of the landscape, while also providing intimacy and flexibility.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The jury believes the scale, the spatial qualities, and the functionality of the proposed central area need further study. The jury also questions whether the added buildings' small dimensions will function effectively.

Winner: Safescape

Through craftsmanship and an evolvable structure, *Safescape* convincingly handles a well-adapted scale, meticulously designed public spaces, consideration for history and the landscape, and connections to surrounding pathways and residential areas. Within permissive and inviting urban spaces, a fine sequence of interactive meeting places is drawn, through which the proposal commendably highlights the river as a central gathering point, credibly connecting existing residential areas to the activation towards the water. The continued process of the proposal is reinforced by clear diagrams that facilitate further development.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The proposal relies somewhat too heavily on dense development. It would benefit from being more inviting and connecting more to nature – by finding what is natural in the landscape and allowing it to influence the design. The proposal has not been adapted to a potential train station in the northeast. The suggested pathways are well-suited for such development, while the structure and hierarchy around meeting places and nodes in such a situation may undergo significant changes.

Safescape should continue to maintain its design adaptation to local architecture. An additional layer of more unique design is also welcome. The urban front facing the river needs further study. The intersection of blocks, buildings, and roads with nature and the river feels unfinished. Contaminated land will need to be addressed.

Runner-up: Influencer flod

Influencer Flod, with a well-conceived overall approach in its presentation, highlights the inspiring strategy of letting the landscape be the starting point and sets the pattern for how the urban environment takes shape, with the potential to create unique values and distinctive urban spatial qualities.

Influencer Flod convincingly addresses the issue of mobility by solving car parking and positioning the train station in a way that encourages eco-friendly travel, while simultaneously promoting a high-quality car-free lifestyle.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The potential of *Influencer Flod* regarding new nature-based urban spaces is inspiring but lacks an in-depth presentation and description. To avoid the creation of a suburban no-man's-land, these spaces need further study and illustration – what type of social communal spaces will they become? What is the hierarchy between these spaces? What are the focal points for densification? The scale of the blocks portrays the landscape, but further refinement and adjustments are needed to fit the location. Skellefteå is currently heavily reliant on cars. The proposal needs to more clearly illustrate how a car-free lifestyle can be realized.

Special mention: Octopus enigma



From a holistic perspective with regards to both location and society, *Octopus Enigma* has shaped a built environment with both fragmenting and additive structures, rooted in a thought-provoking theoretical discourse. The approach is based on the concept of allowing nature to dictate the locations that can be developed. *Octopus Enigma* commendably highlights, with a poetic tone, a considerate process that considers industrial history, engages in dialogue with the local community, promotes the reuse of materials, and is adaptable in scale.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

Octopus Enigma is essentially held at a conceptual level and would benefit from a deeper description and concretization of the ideas.

Winner: Generative Care

Generative Care takes a strong approach to the question of reuse, demonstrating empathy and knowledge in its inventory and handling of buildings with different conditions and its comprehensive analysis of important existing every-day and recreational flows. Through precise interventions, new structures are added, while the overall design opens up for intersecting flows and connections to surrounding public spaces, through a comprehensive approach at the ground level.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

The starting point in the public spaces is convincing. The jury would like to see a clarification of the hierarchy, strategy, places, and landscapes, including the relationship to the park and water within these areas. The proposal has identified the crucial flows of the northeast area. There is potential to further develop this point into a strong entrance and a welcoming interconnected route for bicycle traffic. The potential gains of a larger parking facility could be examined.

Runner-up: Glänta

The strength of *Glänta* lies in the proposal's analysis and the well-crafted enhancement of the highly strategic and identity-forming southeast corner, an attractive location towards both the park and the lake. Through preservation and new design, a central meeting place for the city emerges, whose solitary form is emphasized by a generous plaza that also invites water into the competition area. The analysis of preservation potential and the material library is convincing.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

Glänta takes a comprehensive approach by opening up towards the lake. The jury questions whether the plaza, in relation to the site's and the city's conditions and needs, justifies the proposed amount of demolition. The proposal would also benefit from clarifying the reasoning behind the needed urban spaces and the sequence between them. The images are appealing but also convey a character and scale that feels unfamiliar to Växjö.

Special mention: Länka

Länka adeptly highlights, through a holistic perspective, how the site connects the area to the city and the lake, with an awareness of the need for public health and recreation. It raises thought-provoking questions about the nature of future hospitals and the roles they can play in the city. The proposal's mobility solution convincingly encourages movement by bike and on foot.

Comments for further development of the proposal:

Länka's initiative regarding public health and recreation inspires the jury. However, it is challenging to discern how the ideas are physically manifested in the environment. The same applies to thoughts about reuse. The jury perceives the proposal more as a book of diagrammatic examples.