

## Introduction

Dear guests,

Let me start by saying I'm not an architect. Don't worry, the majority of the jury members are. I'm clarifying this so explicitly because this architecture competition is not just an architectural tour de force, but also a place where visual arts can be presented. Certainly in the last hundred years, a field of tension has arisen between architecture and the visual arts. Even just a couple of years ago, the architect Jo Coenen, in his capacity as the Government Architect, stated that architecture is the mother of the arts. This actually took place during the presentation of a book about the visual arts exhibited in government buildings. Could there be a hierarchy and was architecture higher up the ladder than other forms of art? Or does art deserve a refuge and, if things go to plan, this shelter will be so designed that it deserves the name architecture?

In any case, this competition did not request a design for a cathedral, but instead one for a pavilion in which architecture and various art forms could amplify each other.

Well then, 14 designs were submitted, of which the jury was unaware from which design agency they originated. Only after the jury had finished its work, were – in the presence of all jury members - the office names attached to the earlier codes.

The order in which I'm now going to discuss the designs is completely random:.....

### **A FLOATING ROOM** by STUDIOGRUBER

The first proposal we were presented with, was immediately a grand gesture. The pavilion resembles a large helium balloon. Its membrane is made of aluminium-coated foil. Filled with sufficient helium to keep the roof afloat. The skewed cube with its planar faces and straight edges is held in shape by a matrix of fishing lines knotted to straps.

A successful attempt has been made to set down the image of a pavilion. The vision that Peutz developed for the Glaspaleis has been brought up to date by this agency, in transparency, in construction and in use of materials. The jury was charmed by the integral detailing, including the use of the balloon ballast as seating. Although there are concerns about the reflective effect of the exterior canvas.

The jury is also curious about the technical realisation of the pavilion, especially the introduction of the helium. The jury can imagine that, if wind was to circle under the canvas, the helium could reach the lower regions of the pavilion, through which the pitch of the conversations amongst the visitors would rise slightly.....

The pavilion will sway in the wind and, in doing so, attract the attention of the public. The floating character of the pavilion will define the location. The shell is a whole and evokes the suggestion of an internal structure.

The open construction will have consequences for the programmes due to the air-conditioning and safety.

### **BLURRING BORDERS** by Gagat International

The blurring borders proposal is a whole different kettle of fish. Instead of a building, the agency proposes a unitised system, which allows the curator to create customised interventions at different locations. The idea of a white cube overhauled through a modular system of walls that can be positioned in space. The setting appears theatrical and that is exactly where the objection lies. They indicate to want to replace the minimized context of the white wall with a maximum of references, but the choice of modular forms has a fairly dominant effect.

The basic idea of an inside-out museum is interesting, but in the opinion of the jury insufficiently fleshed out. On the one hand, the structure is open and, on the other, the displays are fairly inaccessible.

The jury is charmed by the attempt to bring art to the public instead of the other way around. The proposal also provided considerable space for other art forms aside the visual arts.

### **SMART** by SzturHärterArchitekten

The Symposium, Music and Art proposal, SMART for short, is a closed volume with an inclined track around an open space. Although the pavilion offers an exceptional spatial experience to those walking around the inclined track, it will not offer enough opportunity for exhibitions, as there are no architectural facades. It appears to be a meeting place where various artistic interventions could take place.

However, the jury established that the idea seems familiar and is not innovative.

The jury really liked the e-bay shopping list for component parts with which the pavilion could, in principle, have been constructed. However, on the other hand, the construction of such a pavilion seems fairly complicated.

### **SCHUNCK\*** by ANORAK

The proposal for the similarly named SCHUNCK\* is a glass pavilion that can be expanded modularly with an unmistakable reference to the characteristic columns in the original SCHUNCK\* building by Peutz. The reference is so strong that there is a genuine concern if there is still enough space to exhibit with all the columns, so closely spaced.

The pavilion appears very elegant, almost a mirage. The proposal is pure architecture. However, the dimensions of a pavilion that make such an architectural statement also make it vulnerable. The pavilion's appearance can lose magnitude if the dimensions of the pavilion are not in relation to the surrounding objects amongst which it may be situated. Which makes this proposal location-dependent.

### **ONE CONCEPT- THREE DESIGNS** by mo systeme

As the title indicates, this proposal offers the possibility of arriving at three different designs. They also mention the speed with which they can be constructed. The grid on which the three designs are based remains the same and is formed by containers. The degree of extravagance can be determined by the size of the bubbles that can be added to the basic construction. The use of colour makes the pavilion even more striking. The combined effect will offer the visitor an exceptional spatial experience. In a practical sense, it is possible to make a large space with the containers, a facilitating and a sculptural version is possible.

Even so, it appears as though the designers are posing questions and have not taken enough of a stance themselves. There is no focus in the design proposal. There are only slight typological differences between the three designs. The jury is of the opinion that the more quickly the pavilion can be constructed, the more powerful the design.

### **SCHUNCK PAVILJOEN HEERLEN** by hanenberg & huhs

The design of the pavilion now up for discussion is extremely clear from the presentation. The construction looks similar to a house of cards. Although, in the case of other designs, the functionality was sometimes lacking, this design is considered too anonymous. The design appears exchangeable and would be suitable for every imaginable situation.

The jury would like to see more innovative aspects in the design. A version in cardboard would have been more exciting.

### **SCHUNCK ON TOUR** by Eiden+Lenzner Architekten

The proposal 'Schunck on tour' toys with the Schunck family's textile past in an exceptional manner. Their ideas are repeated, adjacent to the characteristic Peutz building, in the pavilion.

The elements from which the pavilion is comprised are loaned directly from the Glaspaleis architecture. Based on the design principle of copy and paste, sub constructions from the Glaspaleis are isolated and transplanted to other locations. The innovation is chiefly in the use of materials and the construction process. Textiles form the encasement material for the modules. The nature of the fabric remains visible in the final construction.

However, there are concerns regarding the operation of the pavilion on location, far away from the Glaspaleis. Without this reference to both Schunck and Peutz ideas, the design loses its duality and it appears as though two ideas have been mixed; those of form and context.

### **SCHUNCK\* PAVILJOEN** door [hugo11](#)

The jury assessed the design that makes an association with TV sets as powerful and provocative. The pavilion has a sculptural look and is expected to acquire an iconic value. The interior provides good opportunities for presentations in an almost white cube-like environment and the exterior appears to offer opportunities for projections. Even so, there are reservations with regard to the iconographic effect of the pavilion. There is a danger of a gimmick, which would result in a rapid loss of effect.

### **3D Puzzle** door [Hippo architecten](#)

The proposal before us truly is a puzzle! The design suggests a multifaceted realization, but the ultimate possibilities are limited. It will certainly be a job to get the panels, which form the shell of the pavilion, to connect in such a way that they fit together. This is also the major objection. The basic shapes, let's call them the pieces of the puzzle, appear to be random and the possible assembly of these pieces do not lead to added value for these fragments. A humorous nod in the presentation are the instructions that show how the fragments can be loaded into a lorry.

### **SCHUNCK PAVILION** door [ifau](#)

Should there be any confusion about what a pavilion should do, this will be cleared up by the proposal that is now to be discussed. This pavilion's design agency has created a place that complies with all the basic conditions of a pavilion, being a place where anything can take place. But that is where it starts and finishes. It is no more than a five-corner box, lacking appeal, lacking identity. Even so, something inappropriate appears to have got into their design. Their presentation contains a reference to a pentagram. A loaded symbol, which the design does not explain and is possibly even unintentional.

### **NOWMADE** door [SPECIMEN architecture](#)

The Nowmade proposal contains a semantic reference to nomadic culture and forms an interesting theme. The design appeals strongly to this architectural form we know from tents and temporary constructions, evident from the reference material that has been employed. It appears as though the construction could, in a manner of speaking, be unfolded in the blink of an eye like a harmonica, but in reality this only appears to be the case. The pavilion just has to be bolted together. The danger is that this will be obvious. There are really no objections with regard to its clarity and simplicity and, for the money it can be realised, it would be easy to place a number of modules.

### **SCHUNCK Pavillion** door [gorissendeponi ontwerpers+makers](#)

How simple can it be to make a new museum? It appears as though the design agency thought: let's pack the characteristic Glaspaleis pillars in a container and send it off on its travels. Unfortunately the jury believes that the two architectural typologies do not go together and do not enter into a dialogue with each other. The suggestion to decorate, as a gimmick, the closest street lamp as an inverted column is not appreciated.

The jury also believes that there is little interaction between the interior and exterior. As a whole it does not communicate sufficiently with the surroundings. The entrance is not inviting. You are given the idea that you are being led passed it.

### **YU3** door wiewiorra hopp architecten

YU3 refers to the forms of positioning multiple (sea) containers to form y and u forms and a triangular configuration. Of all the plans that were reviewed based on sea containers, this proposal stayed closest to the character of the containers and the jury was very positive about this. The idea itself is not original. The proposal is expressed in the linking modules that connect the containers. Here, too, details are lacking. The proposal is simple, but not an architectural design. It is an idea, no more than that.

The containers themselves are long narrow spaces and it is a great pity that the design agency has not included a proposal to create a large space with these containers.

### **SQUARE ROOTS** door space&matter

Square roots also forms a real pavilion, but in the form of a trade-fair stand. The designer knows how to exhibit. However, the question arises: does this do justice to the visual arts? The pavilion is filled with pillars and columns that are laid out both sculpturally and as constructional elements, of various dimensions, depending on whether or not they have a programme to offer the public. However, the works of art appear to be squeezed in and will have to compete with the space. The game with the pillar and columns appears forced and, in terms of design, they are not always equally elegantly positioned. The construction of the pavilion appears labour-intensive.

### **Conclusion**

These were the jury's 14 assessments for the submitted proposals. Perhaps the commentary has already given the game away slightly. Four designs remained after the first round, the pros and cons of which deserved further consideration. These were:

- Floating Room van StudioGruber
- NowMade van SPECIMEN architecture
- One concept – three designs van mo systeme
- SCHUNCK\* PAVILJOEN door hugo11

Finally, the jury reached a unanimous decision.

The winner is: Floating Room by the architects' firm: StudioGruber

### **Jury:**

Jean Boumans (chairman, visual arts consultant, Huis voor de Kunsten Limburg, Roermond)

Lex Rijkers (Resonatorcoop architectenbureau, Aschaffenburg)

Birgit de Bruin (architect, lecturer and permanent advisor with SCHUNCK\*)

Hans Vermeulen (DUS architecten, Amsterdam)

Lene ter Haar (Curator Modern and Contemporary Art SCHUNCK\*)

Heerlen, 18-8-2010