

JURY REPORT 'Reclaiming the Street' competition

In April and May 2010, students, artists, skateboarders and designers from all over the world submitted 85 design concepts for the open submission - competition 'Reclaiming the Street.' For 'Reclaiming the Street', MAMA was seeking ideas and designs for an object, environment or an intervention in urban public space that would offer a playful but functional space for skateboarders as well as other users.

The submitted concepts were shown in Rot(t)erdam (Meent 119-133, Rotterdam) from June 13th to July 25th, 2010. A jury specialized in the field of skateboarding, visual arts and architecture nominated four concepts, while the public chose the fifth nominee. The five nominated ideas would be further developed in the fall of 2010 into feasible designs. A second jury consisting of professionals will choose the winning design. The nominees and those who received honourable mentions will appear in a publication, which will be released in 2011. One of these 5 nominated designs will hopefully be realized in the city of Rotterdam.

Jury Report

On **Friday 18th of June 2010**, the jury came together at Rot(t)erdam. The jury members were: Elger Blitz (co-founder of the design and engineering bureau Carve and former skateboarder), Elma van Boxel (ZUS – Zones Urbaines Sensibles), Dees Linders (Sculpture International Rotterdam), Florian Waldvogel (Kunstverein Hamburg and former skateboarder), Louisa Menke (skateboarder, photographer) and Gyz La Rivière (artist, designer, former skateboarder). Four nominees were selected with the majority of the jury's votes and a fifth one was chosen as reserve. A number of concepts received an honourable mention.

The public voted for the fifth nominee through voting ballots placed in the exhibition. If the public's choice would have been similar to the jury's choice, than the jury's fifth reserve nominee would have taken part in the competition. This was not the case.

The jury has nominated the following proposals:

The Car Crash set / Fun is Awesome (Marten Koster, Hassel Dekker, Bjorn Eulink, Renee Reijnders – Gouda, The Netherlands)

Twist And Shout (Romi Khosla Design Studio – New Delhi, India)

& (Carlos Antonio Ruiz Tapia, San Juan Cuautlancingo – Puebla, Mexico)

Red Height Design (Tevfik Mehmet, Bahadır Altinkaynak – Ankara, Turkey)

The public opted for:

De Badkuip (Maurizio Scarciglia, Luis Oliva Andrad NAUTA architecture & research – Rotterdam, The Netherlands)

As for the fifth 'reserve' nominee, the jury voted for **The PLR System** (Mike Dix, Sandy Anderson, Dundee, Scotland). The aforementioned received a honourable mention.

Each jury member had the possibility to pick his or her personal favourite based on specific qualities and aspects of the designs, which, at times did not fulfil the assignment's criteria, and so, did not get nominated. However, the following received an honourable mention:

Equalizer (Koen Klok – Rotterdam)

Skate snake (Anne-Marie van Splunter – Amsterdam)

The Inteskated Environment (Van Plan designers for public space – Amsterdam)

Super Surface (Philippe Brysse & Christina Perez Guillen – Beijing, China)

In{TER}clusion (Benjamin Ruswick – Reston, USA)

RoofTopLandSkate (Frank Timmers, Thijs Schokkenbroek, Robbert Fokker – Rotterdam)

Lords of Rotown (Rik den Heijer, Carolina Sumares – Rotterdam)

The Jury Report

The number of submitted proposals and the average quality of the designs pleasantly surprised the jury. The competition and its criteria had been taken seriously. More than half of the submitted proposals came from outside the Netherlands, from Africa and even China. A diversity of locations and contexts were presented.

The jury judged the submitted proposals according to the assignments criteria:

- To what extent is the design applicable to different locations?
- Does the design contribute to an improvement of the quality (such as an increased use, or urban dynamism) of the chosen location(s)?
- Does the design stimulate multiple use and in which way?
- Is the design suitable and attractive for skateboarders?
- How playful is the design?
- Are there sufficient possibilities to realise the design: is the choice of form and material realistic, feasible and acceptable?
- How original is the idea and how creative is the solution?

The majority of the concepts- with some modifications - would be plausible to implement in multiple locations. Some of the submissions did not sufficiently meet the assignment's criterion of a design with multiple functions, a concept that is not only interesting to skateboarders. Improving a location by multiplying its use was an important criterion for the jury. Many concepts submitted proposed variations on already existing skate parks – or 'skatable' street furniture or objects. These concepts did not seem to do much for the existing locations and were considered unoriginal and unnecessary. Showing insight on the concept's feasibility is one point but it was not a determining factor for the nomination of the 4+1 ideas.

The jury believes that the presence of skateboarders in public space already contributes to the experience and quality of a location. And that by allowing a specific use or a function, new uses can arise. However, to claim for instance, that a bench can be used by skateboarders and others is not a creative approach.

The nominations

The Car Crashset / Fun is Awesome (By Marten Koster, Hassel Dekker, Bjorn Eulink, Renee Reijnders – Gouda, Nederland) consists of different installations of car wrecks covered by a coloured synthetic material that connects the cars to the ground, turning it into a skatable surface. This offers a playful, notable, and colourful location that will be equally attractive to skaters, passers-by and spectators. It has sculptural qualities and is suitable for skating only if the floor surface around and on the objects is included in the design. Another issue is how the plastic moulding can result in skatable surfaces and angles.

Both the scale and the location are flexible aspects in this concept. It may be adapted to different spaces and different configurations, from big to small, from one car in one place, to several cars on multiple spots the city, to a graveyard of cars. This monumental design also refers to the car's role in art history, urban culture, and recycling. It can also be seen as an ecological critique on the use of cars, and a questioning of the notion of sustainability.

The character and form of the design enforces a different way of skating, it challenges skaters to 'conquer' it. In their attempt of doing so, the object becomes skatable.

It has a colourful appearance, which makes it a cheerful design.

Critical points: is this not yet again another skate park? There are some doubts about the use of the plastic moulding as a surface: how this will be applied will be the key factor for success.

Twist and Shout (By: Romi Khosla Design Studio, New Delhi, India) is a simple elongated twisted strip made of wood, in 3 different sizes. It also possesses a high sculpture quality that 'disguises' the object as an art object, thus also giving it a visual appeal to non-

skaters. In short, an original and sophisticated design, not a mainstream skate-object: all would like to see it in the city.

The shape challenges the skater because it does not appear to be designed around the traditional idea of skating. It's almost a work you could see in the Boijmans museum, but then made skatable. Please note: it must have the correct length for it to enable skating. The space and ground surface needed for mounting and landing around the object must be considered thoroughly.

Red Height Design (By: Tevfik Mehmet, Bahadır Altinkaynak - Ankara, Turkey) can be described as in-situ, coloured "blobs" made of concrete poured over existing objects or spots in the city. These blobs mark curbs, sidewalks or other objects as a place for skating. They also add an extra element: the blobs make the objects/spaces skatable by turning ridges and ledges into surfaces.

In the blobs, poles are enclosed illuminating and marking the skatable spot.

The jury considered this to be a good, simple, and original concept, that connects good skating spots together without adding new objects all the while making these places better for skating. However, the illuminated poles are considered detrimental to the design and to the idea. It is seen as superfluous and should be excluded from the concept. The jury finds the "guerrilla" concept of the 'Build your own skate obstacle' attitude positive but controversial. The design not only makes the streets and areas compatible for skaters but also facilitates an interesting use for pedestrians, cyclists, roller skaters, the elderly and the handicapped. A skate-map for the city is created. With this design skate-spots are created with material and not with objects (except the poles), reminiscent of the American flat curbs. Skaters in the city are involved in a playful manner and the concept brings together several groups of people. What needs critical attention in the development is the pole and its appearance: maybe it's too much like pop art? Another question is: is this concept illegal in any way?

& (By: Carlos Antonio Ruiz Tapia - San Juan Cuautlancingo, Puebla, Mexico) is similar to a swimming pool but turned inside out. It has the shape of an empty swimming-pool that is mounted on a floating raft, placed in the water. The jury is positive about the fact that water plays an important role in the concept and is being considered in this case as a public space. Also, the reference to the origins of skateboarding in empty swimming pools is a great find. At the same time, this form can be very problematic for skateboarding. The questions that were raised by the jury were: how do you get on the raft? How can other users use it? How do you ensure that your board does not disappear in the water? How can the object be drained? Apart from the water: what is the added value?

Public's vote:

De Badkuip (By: Maurizio Scarciglia, Luis Oliva Andrade, NAUTA architecture & research, Rotterdam)

The winner of the public's votes is a Rotterdam-based office. Since it was not in the selection of the jury, there is no extensive jury rapport on the proposal. Therefore, we provide a selection of the visitors' remarks and some additional comments by the jury made during the judgment.

The jury questions the feasibility of the design because of its (huge) size and rather 'loud' appearance. This is not an intervention or implementation of an object into an existing space but a new space of a completely different dimension, which recalls a football arena. The jury questions if it can be adapted to a smaller and more realistic space instead of taking over or transforming an existing space. If made into a smaller scale, how can it still function (technically) for skateboarders? Afterall, its suitability for skateboarders is essential for its use.

Public:

Smart design, simple and ironic

Very nice and original

Multifunctional and unique

Smart project; capable to combine skate with public social uses

Combines in one simple gesture, functionality with irony and iconic power, flexibility.

Can be placed in several locations.

It reflects better than the other designs Rotterdam's identity of Rotterdam, as an out of scale city with skyscrapers instead of single family houses.

Mentioned several times: unlike the others. Original.

Honourable mentions**The PLR System** (By: Mike Dix, Sandy Anderson, Dundee, Scotland)

This design is based on a system of toboggans built in empty buildings and houses. The result looks like a honeycomb, which depends on the number of floors and rooms. The jury liked the idea of creating a new public space while using existing buildings; transforming the existing structure into something new. The problem of empty buildings is solved by making the space accessible. Many empty buildings would qualify to become a skate spot. The jury comments on the fact that the structure is very closed, activities and structure are not visible from the outside. Also, the jury is not sure about the skate-ability: it seems very steep.

Equalizer (By: Koen Klok, Rotterdam)

Equalizer consists of square blocks, very basic but essential skate objects that can be moved and turned around with a rail system. The jury is positive about the fact that the forms are simple and thereby non-descript, stimulating different audiences to use them. They can be placed anywhere in the city. Blocks and block forms (curbs and wheels) are the essence of street-skating.

Skate snake (By: Anne-Marie van Splunter, Amsterdam)

Skate snake consists of a series of elements that can be placed in the form of a big snake, a circle, or several smaller shapes that can be used for skating but also as objects to sit on.

The skaters in the jury are very enthusiastic about this design because it is one of the most pure skate designs but also makes a connection to the public. But others comment that it is too similar to other skate parks and has little innovation.

The Inteskated Environment (By: vanPlan vormgevers openbare ruimte, Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

The idea of this design is based on subtle changes or additions to existing cityscapes, such as extending a bicycle rack, adding a tube to a garbage can, or bending a lamp pole (for evening use). The jury likes the idea because it is simple, but funny. It is also not too expensive. Nice to skate on and quick in production.

Super Surface (By: Philippe Brysse & Christina Perez Guillen, Beijing, China)

The design is based on coloured lines forming routes which connect skate spots and objects in the city.

What is positive is the fact that the design is based on what is already available in the city. The intervention is minimal. Also, it is based on exploring the city referring to the essence of street skating. The design can be easily extended or changed over time. It is not too expensive. Skaters are integrated in the texture and happenings of the city. The negative point is the fact that skaters do not want to follow lines or routes. That's the opposite of skating and (real) exploring.

in{TER}clusion (By: Benjamin Ruswick, Reston, USA)

This design consists of a mechanism housing two spray cans placed under the skateboard and attached to the deck. The nozzle of each points down in front of the wheel, leaving marks on the ground when the skateboarder carves left or right or performs tricks. The marks form routes and figures representing the skaters style, creating interactive "murals." The jury likes the idea of making a line while skating rather than following a line.

RoofTopLandSkate (By: Frank Timmers, Thijs Schokkenbroek, Robbert Fokker, Rotterdam)

RoofTopLandSkate is based on placing skate parks or objects on (high) rooftops. The jury is divided because the concept does not open up the rooftop as a space. You cannot see the activities happening and it is difficult to get to. They stay "separated" and do not stimulate a shared use. It invokes the question of what is public space? It might be different if the rooftops were not that high or if the design would make use of "in-between" spaces.

Lords of Rotown (By: Rik den Heijer, Carolina Sumares, Rotterdam, The Netherlands)

Lords of Rotown is a big skate "cage" with an open structure, and several floors. The jury is also divided. The jury likes the fact that the structure is completely open and see-through. But it does not start from an existing situation as it has to be built completely from scratch. It also does not stimulate shared use or different functions.