



Jury Statement - Innovation Competition: Sege Park stage 2

Sharing for Affordable and Climate Smart Living in Sege Park, Malmö

Sharing for Affordable and Climate Smart Living is the Swedish version of six parallel competitions being held at six different locations throughout the Nordics. The national competitions are being held in two stages and this Jury Statement refers to stage 2 of the Swedish competition, to be implemented in the former hospital area of Sege Park in Malmö. The competition was launched on 07.10.2015. The closing date for proposals for stage 1 was 17.12.2015. By the competition's closing date, 19 entries had been received. Four teams were chosen to go forward to stage 2, each receiving a sum equivalent to NOK 300,000 as remuneration for refining and developing their proposal. Stage 2 has been underway since 04.02.2016. This Jury Statement refers to the four proposals received in stage 2, one of which has been named as the overall winner of the Swedish competition. A separate Nordic competition will be held in which the four chosen proposals from the Swedish competition will have the opportunity to participate.

The Swedish jury is comprised of:

Milan Obradovic (Chair), City of Malmö Executive Board Member.

Karin Bradley, Associate Professor, Urban Planning and Environment, Royal Institute of Technology.

Eva Engquist, former Vice-Vice-Chancellor at Malmö University.

Åke Iverfeldt, Chief Executive, Mistra.

Klas Johansson, Director of Real Estate at City of Malmö.

Christer Larsson, Director of City Planning at City of Malmö.

Anne-Margrete Thagaard, architect from Kirseberg.

Maria Wetterstrand, former Member of the Riksdag, consultant.

Kerstin Åkerwall, Director of Environment City of Malmö.

Competition criteria

The selection of the four successful proposals from stage 1 was based on two main criteria:

- the level of innovation and development potential of each entry with regard to the challenges, targets and criteria presented in the competition programme, and
- the documented competence of each team, their combined expertise and the ability of the team to solve the task set by the competition.

After stage 1, the jury shared important aspects regarding required development with the selected entrants. During stage 2, two seminars have been held with the competing teams; one at which a pitch-and-match was arranged with potential developers in Sege Park and one at which Malmö Innovation Arena arranged a workshop at which the teams were able to discuss pre-arranged questions with a broad audience, after which a number of inspirational lectures were held on various themes related to the competition task. After these activities arranged by the competition organisers, the teams themselves have been able to initiate the contacts they desire, for example with potential developers or other sources of inspiration. Over the course of stage 2, the competition entries have evolved and come up with some interesting solutions



to the various challenges posed by the competition. However, there are still many questions that have not received more than a passing illumination.

The criteria on which the jury has judged the proposals in stage 2 are:

- Extent of reduction in building and surface space through sharing.
- How well the proposal answers the goal of decreasing the emission load per person per year towards 2 ton CO₂ in 2025.
- How the proposal contributes to the reduction of housing costs, costs for mobility and other living costs so that people on below average incomes can live in Sege Park.
- How well the proposal contributes to wellbeing and social sustainability.
- How the sharing solutions in the proposal can be used by residents with different lifestyles and preferences regarding collectivity, so that people without specific interest in collective housing solutions can use the financial and climate benefits.
- How well the solutions could become an integral part of Sege Park's character and identity, in line with the City's ambitions for the area. How well the proposal shows ambitions and qualities on a local and human scale.
- How likely the proposal is to attract the attention of inhabitants as well as local and international visitors, whether those with a particular interest or the general users of the urban space.
- The possibility to realise the proposal, whether in whole or in part, in Sege Park in a near future.

For the three central criteria: extent of reduction in building and surface space; decreasing the emission load per person per year; and reduction of housing costs, costs for mobility and other living costs - the entrants have been tasked with providing a detailed account of their proposal.

All entries specify apartment solutions that should comply with the programme's demand for 20% less area per person. These apartment solutions are shown with varying levels of detail and with different degrees of compliance with current Swedish building regulations, BBR. Taken as a whole, the impression is that the proposed housing solutions are not particularly attractive for broad groups within the housing market, although they may appeal to certain segments. The solutions are not particularly detailed and it would be interesting to receive a more in-depth study and analysis of how apartments that fulfill the requirement for reduced area might look.

All four proposals base their calculations regarding a decrease in CO₂ impact on extensive lifestyle changes on the part of residents. This applies primarily to the transition to a mainly vegetarian diet and to staycations – holidays spent at home instead of travelling. The entries describe a lifestyle that requires a particular interest and, in all likelihood, even specific groups of residents, a kind of eco-hipster. The ambitious target set by the competition of reducing CO₂ impact to a maximum of 2 tons per resident and year cannot be met solely by the design of housing and the residential area. An interesting question that remains to be answered is the extent to which this reduction to 2 tons per person and year can be achieved simply by physical reconfiguration and, equally interestingly – what percentage of the remaining reduction can be achieved for a wider population with no great interest in adopting a more environmentally friendly lifestyle.

Compliance with the requirement for affordability for those on below average incomes has, in accordance with the competition organiser's instructions, been stated in relation to current



average total expenditure for various types of family. The entries' proposals for achieving affordability are also closely linked to lifestyle changes, with a diet consisting of a large amount of self or locally grown vegetables and with reduced travel based on staycations. A technical and social solution for increased growing of vegetables presented by three of the four proposals is greenhouses on the roofs of the buildings. Overall, Sege Park will have very low exploitation and it is difficult to justify costly, complicated and technically difficult cultivation on roofs when there is ample space available at ground level. None of the proposals give any reliable figures for housing costs or a cost level that is accessible to those on a below average income. New-build homes have higher housing costs and the question remains as to how these might be reduced.

The quality of the proposals with regard to other social criteria – regarding wellbeing; appealing to residents with a range of lifestyles; and attracting the attention of Malmö residents, visitors from Sweden or international visitors – is largely linked to what is said and thought about lifestyle changes. The proposals have comprehensive, and in some cases radical, descriptions of how life is to be lived in Sege Park. However, they are far less forthcoming in describing or presenting exactly how this new way of life is to be achieved. Several of the entries present local apps to be used for communication within Sege Park or Malmö in general in order to facilitate sharing and other environmentally friendly activities. The jury's contention is that these types of local communication channels and platforms do not have the same potential as more general and widely used platforms. Another tool intended to facilitate sharing and presented in a number of the proposals is some kind of local 'currency' - coins, points or similar. Remuneration for services rendered, environmentally sound behaviour, etc. is paid in the local currency and can then be used to buy locally grown produce, services from others, etc. The Swedish Tax Agency calls this type of activity *bytesringar*, known internationally as Local Exchange Trading Systems, and have expressed the opinion that for tax purposes, this kind of exchange of services should be dealt with in the same way as if the payment method were money. Another aspect of the sharing issue is the financing and administration of the communal elements that replace individual access to functions in each and every home. Some entries propose ideas for how this could be achieved but even here a host of issues remain to be ironed out; economic, legal and in terms of areas of responsibility.

Also included in the task was a requirement to show how the proposal fits with Sege Park's intended over-all environment and how it can be implemented, in whole or in part, in a near future. One central issue facing the over-all environment is how the existing buildings can be utilised and developed so that they contribute to fulfilling the aims of the residential district. Two of the proposals present ideas about how existing buildings could be used for progressive development as part of a diversified range of business and housing solutions. However, two of the proposals refrain from tackling these aspects. One of the tasks facing the entrants has been to generally adapt their proposal to Sege Park, while at the same time allowing for a scale-up for use in other environments. The proposals must provide a solution to the challenges at hand, while also contributing to the export of Swedish and Nordic ideas and applications. The proposals have been concretized to various points along the road to implementation in Sege Park and the winning proposal is that which, in the jury's judgement, is closest to reaching its goal; even if some further development is required before it can be fully realised. The export of finished housing and built environment solutions lies somewhat farther in the future. Another aspect is how the proposals have developed Sege Park's links to its immediate surroundings, within the Kirseberg district and to Malmö as a whole. Several proposals have primarily looked at Sege Park in itself without giving thought to its connection to its



surroundings. One factor for the exploitation of Sege Park is that it is yet not integrated within Malmö. Specific efforts are required to get to grips with this.

Judgement on the entries in stage 2

FIRST PRIZE: It Takes a Block

Team stage 2: Kjellander & Sjöberg Arkitektkontor: Ola Kjellander, Johan Pitura, Erlend Lindstad, Hannes Haak, Björk Tryggvadóttir; ATKINS: Elias Prokofiev, Fredrik K Karlsson, Lina Störby, Natalie Coquand; BOGL: Jens Linnet, Karl Johan Baggins; STED: Martin Hjerl, Rosa Lund, Marie Dyhr Caspersen, Søren Lahn, Alex Holman, Marianne R. Moth; architecture students: David Ottosson, Gudmund Bladh.

It Takes a Block is the winner of the competition on Sharing for Affordable and Climate Smart Living. The proposal presents an intensively utilised neighbourhood with mixed housing and various forms of management that offers opportunities for various forms of living and provides possibilities for the development of sharing and community from the perspective of residents. The proposal can also be applied in other places and can work as a concept for densification. It will also be possible to successively develop the concept for implementation in coming stages of the Sege Park development. The block includes one of the existing buildings and the proposal presents an idea of a timeframe for successive development in several stages through co-creation and entrepreneurship. The apartments are based on two prefabricated modules, 40 m² and 20 m² respectively, that can be combined. The proposal has a clear tree and trees theme. Construction is proposed to be entirely in timber, something which is positive for both the living environment and from a general environmental perspective. The apartment solutions call for further development.

The three other proposals

Having Less is to Live More

Main team: Sweco Architects: Nike Rosvall, Lucy Roth, Urban Skogmar.

Collaborators: Thomas Greindl, Beatrice Eckord, Niels Jakubiak Andersen, Sarah Sonne Glatz, Carlos Martinez, Anders Åsberg, Anna Brunow, Frode Birk Nielsen, Karin Bovin Pennanen, Johanna Eriksson, Susanna Hultin, Ann Legeby, Therése Ryding.

Having Less to Live More presents an interesting story about the future. It also has an interesting scale between what the residents *need to have* in the home and what is *good to have* that can be located outside the home. However, this scale has failed to make much of an impact on the organisation of what is contained in the home and outside respectively. Instead, the homes have traditional functions. All apartments are proposed to be 107 m² and in the form of tenant-ownership (Swedish: bostadsrättsförening). These are designed so that larger or smaller areas can be divided and rented to lodgers. The entry's proposed target group for the area is not that assumed in the competition programme but rather those who might otherwise have considered moving to an own house in the suburbs. The deposit required for a tenant-owner apartment and rent will be high in comparison to what a family with a below average income can afford. It is proposed that social diversity be achieved by renting to lodgers from economically weaker groups, something which falls back on the interest of individual tenant-owners in taking the initiative. Calculations of housing costs have been



carried out in collaboration with professional building contractors. The proposal's solution for financing and management of the common areas is interesting but its implementation is in no way guaranteed. The proposal is well prepared and includes a number of striking and admirable points. However, the deviation from the programme is too great for the proposal to be deemed to have answered the fundamental questions on which the competition was based.

Circularity

The Core Team: Hifab AB: Anette Gustavsson; Kjellgren Kaminsky Arkitekter: Danilo Chiesa, Joakim Kaminsky; Mareld Landskapsarkitekter: Jonas Lööv, Martin Allik, Oskar Ivarsson; Linnalabor/Hifab: Kadri Koppel; Outhouse.fi: Katja Lindroos.

Broader team: Lena Jarlöv; Vägen ut!: Pernilla Svebo Lindgren; Hemsö: Sofia Lagerbald; Serneke: Sean Kelly, Jonas Håkansson; Student LU: Nora Harms; Student CTH: Xinmin Zhuang; Hifab: Gulnara Shavaliyeva.

The text of Circularity provides a comprehensive description of a green outdoor environment concept with among other things a proposed habitat for lesser spotted woodpeckers as a character/umbrella species. The proposal features a clear cultivation concept. This is positive and can provide Sege Park with a profile but the significance of the concept is exaggerated. The concept for the outdoor environment has not been expressed as strongly in the physical design of the proposal other than in the design and use of the central green axis with its bewildering array of square boxes with a variety of intended uses and characters. The team has collaborated with two potential developers on building design for the future exploitation of Sege Park. This is positive and the design of the buildings is realistic and in close harmony with the plans for Sege Park. The proposal has some good ideas about the process for developing the existing buildings. The recycling of building materials in accordance with the proposal's principles is also appealing.

Bring Your Plant

Team stage II: Metamorf Design: Jesper Sjöstrand; Marketport Scandinavia: Ute Petrich; Raumzeit: Jan Läufer; Byggråd: Göran S Eriksson; Student MAH: Johannes Wolf, Josephine Mittag; Edvard Sjöstrand; Urban Stories: Caroline Axelblom, Andreas Olsson; Human Habitat: Ronnie Markussen, Mikkel Kjaer.

One of the qualities that motivated the inclusion of Bring Your Plant in stage 2 was Generator Street, a road through the area containing a number of common activities and opportunities for shops and other businesses proposed to be a showroom and experimental workshop for the whole region. The idea of Generator Street has not been developed to any great degree during stage 2. The proposal's presented future buildings are comprised of tower blocks linked in pairs by a balcony/bridge on the third floor. The advantages of this type of building for Sege Park are not obvious. This competition entry is one of those that includes the launching of an app to facilitate sharing, along with a local currency for Sege Park which can also be used in the rest of Malmö. The proposers feel that this will strengthen community and sustainability in Sege Park and in the City of Malmö. It is possible that these tools may prove significant but, in all probability, a more general app would prove more useful than a local one. The entry has developed proposals for the renovation of the ground floor of the existing hospital building to create housing and also presents ideas for the use of some of the other buildings within Sege Park, which is positive. The financial summary presents a housing cost of less



Jury Statement - Innovation Competition stage 2 03.06.2016
Sharing for Affordable and Climate Smart Living in Sege Park, Malmö

than SEK 5000 per month for the average family. However, nowhere in the proposal is there any clarification as to how such a low cost might be achieved. The proposal includes a Youth House for the area's teenagers. The team behind the entry has carried out an ambitious survey of 40 young people in Malmö as a basis for the design and content of the building.