

Market Fountain Competition

Minutes Judging panel meeting on 3rd and 4th December 2018

Organiser

City of Chemnitz
Urban Development and Construction Department
Friedensplatz 1
09111 Chemnitz
www.chemnitz.de

Procedural coordinators

Steffi Mehner
Martina Schönherr

Secretary

Steffi Mehner

The jury for the two-phase public international design competition to construct of a market fountain in Chemnitz met to finalise phase one of the competition on 03.12.2018 at 9:10am at the Stadtbad in the city of Chemnitz, first floor meeting room, Mühlenstraße 27, 09111 Chemnitz.

Attendees were welcomed by Mr Michael Stötzer, mayor of Chemnitz, who also wished them a successful session. He thanked all those involved for arranging the meeting and the jurors for their willingness to be part of this important decision for Chemnitz.

1. Attendance and constitution of the judging panel

Mr Stötzer, as representative of the organiser and mayor of Chemnitz confirmed attendance.

Mr Tino Fritzsche of City Council Community Group for CDU/FDP excused himself for the duration of the panel session, with his place being taken by Mr Sandro Schmalfuß, VOSI/PIRATEN Group.

The resulting judging panel was composed as follows:

Expert panel members with voting rights:

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| - Ms Susanne Altmann | Cultural historian and author, Dresden |
| - Dr. Frédéric Bußmann | Art historian, General Director of the Chemnitz ArtCollections |
| - Prof. Karl Clauss Dietel | Artist and designer, Chemnitz |
| - Mr Matthias Flügge | Rector of the Academy of Fine Arts Dresden |
| - Prof. Else Gabriel | Professor of Sculpture, Weißensee Academy of Art Berlin |
| - Mr Stefan Leiste | Landscape architect, Chemnitz |
| - Prof. Jörg Steinbach | Professor of Surface Design, University of Applied Sciences
Zwickau, Faculty of Applied Arts Schneeberg |

Deputy expert panel member (without voting rights):

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| - Mr Ferenc Csák | Art historian, Head of Chemnitz Department of Culture |
|------------------|---|

Specialist panel members with voting rights:

- Mr Michael Stötzer Mayor in charge of Urban Development and Construction, Chemnitz
- Prof. Dr. Christian von Borczyskowski, Henry van de Velde Gesellschaft, Sachsen e.V. (Henry van de Velde Society)
- Mr Ulf Kallscheidt City Council, SPD fraction
- Mr Thomas Lehmann City Council, BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN fraction
- Mr Kai Tietze City Council, DIE LINKE fraction
- Mr Sandro Schmalfuß Fraction staff member, VOSI/PIRATEN fraction

Deputy specialist panel member (without voting rights):

- Mr Joachim Zschocke City Council, PRO Chemnitz fraction

The rules for representatives were explained. In particular, it was noted that all panel members were required to be present on both days. While the specialist panel members could be temporarily replaced by their deputies as long as they remained involved in the decision-making process, it was different for expert panel members. If an expert panel member was absent, they would be required to appoint another expert panel member in their place for the duration of the remainder of the proceedings. Any replacement would have to have been present for the all sessions to date.

Election of the Chair

Mr Stötzer nominated Prof. Else Gabriel as Chair and Mr Flügge as her deputy. All panel members were content with these suggestions.

Appointment of Secretary

Ms. Mehner was appointed as Secretary.

Assurances from attending panel members

All panel members confirmed that they

- had had no knowledge of any submissions up to this point
- had not, up to this point, exchanged views with competition participants and would not do so for the duration of their service as panel members
- would refrain from making assumptions about the author of any submission

Obligations of attendees

Mr Stötzer required all panel members to evaluate designs objectively based solely on the competition rules, and to respect the confidentiality of the deliberation process.

2. Acceptance of the Chair by Ms. Gabriel

Presentation of judging panel session procedure and voting procedure

After the report on the preliminary assessment there will be a neutral presentation of all designers. A hand-out and presentation will be made available next to each original. Originals will be hung and arranged by code number. Due to the large number of submissions, approx. 4 hours are scheduled for this presentation. Afterwards, panel members will consider the individual designs for approx. 1 hour. In a first round of voting, panel members will select all the submissions meriting further discussion by the judging panel. This will be done by attaching red dots. Every piece of work that has at least one dot will progress to round 2. Depending on how many works are selected, further proceedings will be discussed after the first round of voting.

Ms. Gabriel pointed out that at any point in the proceedings it would be possible to request that an eliminated work be brought back in for consideration.

Preliminary assessment report

The preliminary assessment was concerned with verifying compliance with the parameters, criteria and stated specifications for competition entries in line with competition documentation.

In total, 114 competition entries had been submitted with an author statement. The submissions were labelled by their authors with a six-digit number, which were replaced by codes numbering 1001 to 1114. Any indications of the author were removed during preliminary assessment. All submissions were pre-assessed in the same way.

All competition entries were received or identifiably submitted by the due date, with the required documents having been submitted in full by the authors.

The preliminary assessment was conducted on the 17th, 18th, 19th and 22nd October 2018 by the Historic Monuments Protection Authority, the Market Regulatory Authority, the Civil Engineering Office, the Green Spaces Office, the City Planning Office and the Department of Culture.

Comments on requirements for the following submissions:

- 1023: doubled at 1031
- 1046: is a temporary project that only partially fulfils the remit
- 1112: only photos, no explanation of idea, no indication of measurements or materials

The jury unanimously decided to allow all works to be evaluated.

Finally, Ms. Mehner explained the structure of the preliminary assessment report, which outlines the results of the preliminary assessment and presents each submitted work on two pages. The notes from the preliminary assessment were added. All information provided by the authors of the designs had been reviewed, where possible.

Information session

From 9:45am, Ms. Mehner and Ms. Schönherr explained all individual designs in ascending order, based on the submitted sketches, explanations and plans.

The information session was interrupted at 10:00am for a coffee break and resumed at 10:10. The information session concluded at 12:50pm with a long break, with the time being used by panel members to engage individually with the submissions.

1. Voting

The first round of voting was on the basis of individual votes by panel members. The aim of the first round was to identify all submissions to be discussed in greater detail in the judging panel session. For this, all jurors with voting rights were given red dots with which to mark the submissions that interested them. All submissions that did not receive a red dot were eliminated.

The first round concluded at 2:15pm. 50 submissions were marked with a red dot (cf. document 1) and proceeded to the next round. All other submissions were unanimously eliminated.

2. Voting

The jury agreed on the following procedure: all submissions marked with a red dot to be called out in order (beginning with No. 1001). In each case, one panel member would make the case for the submission in question. Voting would follow after a further round of discussion. If more than three of the 13 jurors with voting rights were in favour of a submission, it would progress to the next round.

At 2:25pm an in-depth discussion compared the 50 submissions remaining. Based on the judging criteria outlined in the competition documentation, the judging panel discussed the design concepts in detail.

After no. 1070 the panel took a 10 minute break, resuming at 3:10pm.

The outcome was that 22 works were eliminated as a result of conceptual weaknesses. 28 works were taken forward into the next round.

No requests were submitted for the return of eliminated works.

Thus the second round of evaluation concluded at 4:30pm.

3. Voting

Voting procedure was discussed. This time all submissions receiving a majority of votes cast, i.e. at least 7 out of 13 votes, would proceed. The order of the submissions was changed, with no 1114 being considered first this time.

Every individual submission was discussed in detail and views exchanged. Many of the submissions were not of sufficient artistic quality.

From the 28 submissions discussed, seven were selected.

- 1109 Silver Fountain
- 1090 untitled (abstract forms)
- 1066 Rainbow
- 1052 Datsch
- 1043 untitled (Arc)
- 1010 untitled (Fontain)
- 1001 Fountain House

Ms. Gabriel closed the meeting at 6:30pm and indicated that there would be an opportunity to request the return of eliminated submissions the following day.

Day 2

All participants were present. There was a quorum, as on the previous day.

4. Voting

Six requests were submitted for the return of eliminated submissions.

- 1070 Pluviophilia
- 1079 untitled (water bowl)
- 1030 There used to be more tinsel
- 1088 Tiered Fountain
- 1012 untitled (glass lion)
- 1076 untitled (fantasy)

These were discussed and voted on by majority (in the same way as the 3rd round of voting). Two of the submissions, Nos. 1079 and 1070, were re-nominated.

After a break, in which all nine submissions were displayed side by side for the purposes of comparison, a final discussion took place.

5. Voting

After a final call for individual panel members to speak out against any individual submission goes unanswered, there was a vote by simple majority on whether all nine submissions should be included in the second phase.

Voting result: 11 for
 2 against
 no abstentions

The author explanations for the selected designs were opened and the names of the artists made known.

Voting closed. The panel agreed to commission the designers to develop their competition entries in line with the competition documentation.

The panel made no further recommendations.

Communication

The process of further communication will be led by Mr Stötzer.

The panel agreed that the names of the selected artists would not be announced until the exhibition opens on 27th May 2019, to ensure an orderly process.

The full minutes of this session (with the judging panel explanation of its submission selections) will not be published until the end of the competition.

The eliminated designers will be informed by post or email.

Further activity

The panel will meet on 3rd June 2019, two hours before the start of the public event.

Conclusion of proceedings

At the end of the proceedings the Chair thanked all participants for their constructive approach, and said that it had led to a very good result. She thanked the preliminary assessors for their excellent documentation and exceptional guidance of the proceedings. Preliminary assessment was discharged unanimously by the judging panel.

Ms. Gabriel will continue as Chair of the panel for the next session in June 2019.

Mayor Michael Stötzer, speaking on behalf of the panel, warmly thanked the Chair for her masterful steering of the session. He thanked the members of the jury, the experts and preliminary assessors for their dedicated participation in the proceedings and their thorough preparation leading up to the session.

The session concluded at 3:00 pm.

Ms Prof. Else Gabriel*signed: Gabriel*.....

Mr Matthias Flügge *signed: M. Flügge*

Ms Susanne Altmann*signed: S. Altmann*

Dr. Frédéric Bußmann*signed: Bußmann*.....

Prof. Karl Clauss Dietel*signed: Karl Clauss Dietel*....

Mr Stefan Leiste*signed: Leiste*

Prof. Jörg Steinbach*signed: Steinbach*.....

Mr Ferenc Csák*signed: Csák*.....

Mr Michael Stötzer*signed: Csák*.....

Prof. Dr. Christian von Borczyskowski*signed: Borczyskowski*

Mr Ulf Kallscheidt*signed: Ulf Kallscheidt*

Mr Thomas Lehmannsigned: Lehmann.....

Mr Kai Tietzesigned: K. Tietze.....

Mr Sandro Schmalfußsigned: Sandro Schmalfuß.....

Mr Joachim Zschockesigned: Joachim Zschocke.....

Documentation
Voting results
Judging panel statement

Market Fountain Competition - Judging panel minutes

"√" = completed or selected
"x" = excluded

Number of submission <small>(added after panel session)</small>	Code	Timely submission (17.09.18) Postmark	Completed documentation - two A3 sheets (labelled) - author's statement (labelled)	Day 1			Day 2	
				<u>1st vote</u> Round all submissions without votes excluded	<u>2nd vote</u> Submissions voted by min. 3 out of 13 panel members progress further	<u>3rd vote</u> Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress further	<u>4th vote</u> Review and majority vote	<u>5th vote</u> Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress to 2nd phase
545848	1001	√	√	√	√	√		√
110903	1002	√	√	x				
080881	1003	√	√	x				
030415	1004	√	√	√	x			
431928	1005	√	√	√	x			
240107	1006	√	√	√	√	x		
190918	1007	√	√	x				
180456	1008	√	√	√	√	x		
231490	1009	√	√	√	√	x		
128101	1010	√	√	√	√	√		√
239016	1011	√	√	x				
974854	1012	√	√	√	√	x	x	
123789	1013	√	√	√	x			
227631	1014	√	√	x				
174528	1015	√	√	x				
170157	1016	√	√	√	x			
303030	1017	√	√	x				
241206	1018	√	√	x				
010226	1019	√	√	x				
210679	1020	√	√	√	x			
246810	1021	√	√	x				
120570	1022	√	√	x				
		double entry, see 1031						
140659	1024	√	√	x				

Market Fountain Competition - Judging panel minutes

"√" = completed or selected

"x" = excluded

Number of submission <small>(added after panel session)</small>	Code	Timely submission (17.09.18) Postmark	Completed documentation - two A3 sheets (labelled) - author's statement (labelled)	Day 1			Day 2	
				1st vote Round all submissions without votes excluded	2nd vote Submissions voted by min. 3 out of 13 panel members progress further	3rd vote Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress further	4th vote Review and majority vote	5th vote Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress to 2nd phase
1237892	1025	√	√	x				
481126	1026	√	√	x				
317456	1027	√	√	x				
382156	1028	√	√	√	x			
120987	1029	√	√	x				
190201	1030	√	√	√	√	x	x	
076915	1031	√	√	x				
541328	1032	√	√	√	x			
671432	1033	√	√	√	√	x		
280431	1034	√	√	x				
398082	1035	√	√	x				
510001	1036	√	√	x				
120863	1037	√	√	x				
384651	1038	√	√	x				
000012	1039	√	√	√	√	x		
120467	1040	√	√	x				
243521	1041	√	√	x				
080163	1042	√	√	x				
182127	1043	√	√	√	√	√		√
170857	1044	√	√	x				
240571	1045	√	√	√	√	x		
436952	1046	√	√	x				
791362	1047	√	√	√	√	x		

Market Fountain Competition - Judging panel minutes

"√" = completed or selected
 "x" = excluded

Number of submission (added after panel session)	Code	Timely submission (17.09.18) Postmark	Completed documentation - two A3 sheets (labelled) - author's statement (labelled)	Day 1			Day 2	
				1st vote Round all submissions without votes excluded	2nd vote Submissions voted by min. 3 out of 13 panel members progress further	3rd vote Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress further	4th vote Review and majority vote	5th vote Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress to 2nd phase
PEGASU	1048	√	√	x				
111077	1049	√	√	√	√	x		
654123	1050	√	√	√	x			
102102	1051	√	√	√	x			
142075	1052	√	√	√	√	√		√
44591019	1053	√	√	x				
.797173	1054	√	√	x				
129789	1055	√	√	√	√	x		
020815	1056	√	√	√	x			
551923	1057	√	√	x				
130265	1058	√	√	x				
470312	1059	√	√	x				
215286	1060	√	√	√	x			
047170	1061	√	√	√	√	x		
091111	1062	√	√	√	x			
920181	1063	√	√	√	√	x		
612718	1064	√	√	x				
180327	1065	√	√	√	x			
010976	1066	√	√	√	√	√		√
218743	1067	√	√	x				
236649	1068	√	√	√	√	x		
290135	1069	√	√	x				
112358	1070	√	√	√	√	x	√	√

Market Fountain Competition - Judging panel minutes

"√" = completed or selected

"x" = excluded

Number of submission <small>(added after panel session)</small>	Code	Timely submission (17.09.18) Postmark	Completed documentation - two A3 sheets (labelled) - author's statement (labelled)	Day 1			Day 2	
				<u>1st vote</u> Round all submissions without votes excluded	<u>2nd vote</u> Submissions voted by min. 3 out of 13 panel members progress further	<u>3rd vote</u> Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress further	<u>4th vote</u> Review and majority vote	<u>5th vote</u> Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress to 2nd phase
071180	1071	√	√	x				
644158	1072	√	√	√	√	x		
311118	1073	√	√	√	√	x		
552678	1074	√	√	x				
231070	1075	√	√	x				
230276	1076	√	√	√	x		x	
201813	1077	√	√	√	√	x		
568412	1078	√	√	√	x			
130978	1079	√	√	√	√	x	√	√
817078	1080	√	√	x				
102007	1081	√	√	x				
593654	1082	√	√	x				
774477	1083	√	√	x				
123456	1084	√	√	x				
212223	1085	√	√	√	√	x		
300903	1086	√	√	x				
130642	1087	√	√	x				
394678	1088	√	√	√	x		x	
230174	1089	√	√	x				
654321	1090	√	√	√	√	√		√
753961	1091	√	√	x				
194375	1092	√	√	x				
068239	1093	√	√	x				
129675	1094	√	√	x				

Market Fountain Competition - Judging panel minutes

"√" = completed or selected

"x" = excluded

Number of submission (added after panel session)	Code	Timely submission (17.09.18) Postmark	Completed documentation - two A3 sheets (labelled) - author's statement (labelled)	Day 1			Day 2	
				1st vote Round all submissions without votes excluded	2nd vote Submissions voted by min. 3 out of 13 panel members progress further	3rd vote Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress further	4th vote Review and majority vote	5th vote Submissions voted by the majority of panel members progress to 2nd phase
142823	1095	√	√	√	x			
912837	1096	√	√	√	x			
282118	1097	√	√	x				
124578	1098	√	√	x				
752342	1099	√	√	√	x			
315287	1100	√	√	√	x			
353833	1101	√	√	x				
010829	1102	√	√	√	x			
649153	1103	√	√	√	x			
060317	1104	√	√	x				
467310	1105	√	√	x				
120867	1106	√	√	x				
650124	1107	√	√	x				
130913	1108	√	√	√	√	x		
853210	1109	√	√	√	√	√		√
164253	1110	√	√	x				
279156	1111	√	√	x				
902564	1112	√	two A3 sheets missing, description	x				
071326	1113	√	√	√	x			
986789	1114	√	√	√	x			