



E17 JURY STATEMENT

RUNNER UP

BACK OFF!

CE648

1st stage assessment - local commission: Jury member 1: Very strong idea, but it's too big for Celje, scale is very important. The task has a very logical concept. We need concepts like this, but maybe not as solutions. This intervention could be anywhere, it is not specific.

Jury member 2: I think it's the most possible vision for the next step after the intervention can be made. But the question is still: if the people will accept the land that is in this kind of process, and it will be for 15 years before it gets really green, as a safe and healthy space, will they visit it or use it? Or will it just be land behind the fence? I like it as a response in a symbolic way.

Jury member 3: Water and vegetation are very important on this site, and this project preserves it.

Jury member 4: This project would bring interesting pathways, so it's probably not necessary to be built so high in the sky. The pathways could be built very quickly and cheaply.

So this would be interesting as some kind of landscape project that brings a new perspective to this area.

Jury member 5: The task has an immediate impact and creates a narrative shift in the area. It is quite open and raises a question about the boundary of the landscape. The circle might be too big, it needs further calculations. The meaning of the project does not change, even if the form of the intended intervention changes.

Jury member 6: This one has a really strong narrative. It's a kind of irony that I really find interesting. For example, this elevated pathway kind of corresponds with some kind of natural reserve area. This is actually the opposite of the former industrial area.

Jury member 7: At first glance, it gives a very strong message, and it might also be the most pragmatic in the terms of money regarding others. This project is special because it first distances people from nature, and later lets them into the area and foresees an intervention for them.



Final assessment - international jury: The project is valued because of the different approach they have taken and recognition of existing conditions. The jury appreciates a very clear and determined time frame, but some of the jury members have doubts as to whether this is really feasible. What proves most valuable is the suggestion of a process, of stepping back and then reapproaching, rather than the actual timeframe.

General discussion arises regarding the elevated walkway, whereas it can amplify the sense of danger on one hand and on the other it could have didactical consequences. The idea that is presented would be equally powerful whatever the height of the walkway. The jury agrees that elevated walkways can encourage people to reflect on the landscape and promote a sense of care for the land. That also allows some areas to be left undisturbed, while in others rewilding is key. It is very much appreciated for this statement to be taken to the city and use it as design research, showing the value of doing less. In that sense the project can be understood as an educational resource.

The scale of the bridging structures and the lack of urban complexity are discussed as the weaker part of the project, but the connections the project establishes are very meaningful and well thought out. Given the strength of the project's idea, a more daring approach towards existing buildings would also be appreciated. However, the project's general vision and statement is powerful.