Reduce/Reuse/Recycle stands for a successful shift in value from waste to reusable material. The three Rs form a waste hierarchy in which avoidance comes first followed by direct use and, in third place, recycling which changes the properties of the material. The same logic may be applied in setting up a new value system to address existing buildings: the fewer changes that are made and the less energy used, the better the process.

By using the logic of Reduce/Reuse/Recycle, various strategies of remodelling can be classified on the basis of the relationship between old and new, the depth of intervention and the degree of modification. Treating built architecture as a substantial and formal resource opens up a wide range of possibilities and approaches. Reduce/Reuse/Recycle shows projects and perspectives by architects who take a positive, empowering view of existing structures as an inspiration and motivation for further development. The quality of the projects shown here lies in the intelligence of their strategies and not in the spectacular form of their interventions.
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The 3R waste hierarchy classifies and evaluates methods of dealing with waste according to energy consumption and energy loss: the less the material has to be processed, and the less energy required to do so, the better.

The 3R system is often portrayed as a pyramid. At the top is Reduce, preferably avoiding waste entirely. Below that comes Reuse, in which items that might otherwise be discarded are used again. At the bottom of the pyramid is Recycle, which involves transforming materials into new products.

Applying this logic and evaluation directly to architecture would have an enormous impact.

The smallest intervention would suddenly be the best one—and no change at all would be even better still. It is an approach that may at first appear at odds with architecture. After all, architects are usually called upon to change or renew what already exists, and they are expected to do so as thoroughly and radically as possible.

There are rights and wrongs to applying the Reduce / Reuse / Recycle formula to architecture. It makes sense in terms of energy-saving, but might still architectural developments seeking new criteria and priorities. On the other hand, it can help to promote the evaluation of architectural intervention, and weighing up whether an intervention is appropriate or not.

We have selected eleven strategies of refurbishment and arranged them in an order that corresponds to the logic of waste hierarchy: from the least to the most elaborate intervention. Unlike the 3R waste hierarchy, however, this sequence does not represent strict evaluation. In architecture, in addition to physical energy, other energy factors also play a role: the potential inherent in built architecture has to be considered in terms of architectural, historical, functional, structural, and social aspects, as well as those of design. After all, in architecture, there are cases when complete remodeling is appropriate due to the importance of the task and its specific characteristics or on grounds of economics and, as far as possible, objective analysis of the existing structure.

It is, however, this same architecturally holistic consideration of what is appropriate that connects back to the 3R system. Each measure implemented must result in an improvement commensurate with the energy expended.

The architecturally applicable 3R hierarchy includes strategies aimed at avoiding or minimizing intervention (Reduce); strategies aimed at maintaining, adapting and extending (Reuse); and also the material and ideal re-introduction of existing architecture, either formally or ideally, into architectural circulation (Recycle). The change of perspective provided by applying the 3Rs to refurbishment opens up new ways of looking at such aspects as perception, behavior, and conservation, which are fundamental ways of dealing with existing buildings. The 3R shift in viewpoint clarifies how priorities are set and indicates why recycling has so little traction in architecture in the current economic climate.

The strategies are rarely implemented in their purest form. Often, a variety of strategies can overlap, coincide, or contradict each other. Each of the projects presented in the exhibition exemplifies a particularly inclusive aspect of the strategy.

Muck Petzet
This “looking” is constructive, an integral part of the design process

it’s all we are. We try to slightly alter the meaning of certain terms used in the discourse through the way we use them. Could you explain how you conceptualized as well as experienced the relationship between analysis and design in the studio and in the seminar?

JL: [...] The “Findlings” seminar and the “dramatyp” studio were both dealing with the same issues but in very different ways. For the seminar the final product [...] was one single image of an architectural ‘footprint’. Through this image, we wanted each student to generate an architectural vision, which, while originating from built reality, would transform the immediate reactions of an organism to its perceived properties of their sites, students partaking in the studio were also asked to operate in three dimensions, addressing further issues such as building structure. They were required to work with architectural forms of representation: black-and-white drawings drawn to scale, with pre-determined line weights and a structured axonometric projection, floor plans, sections, [...]. [...] the drawings as a form of abstraction and as a way to list the things the students had taken note of, [...] a matrix for vocabulary for an architecture dictionary.

UF: The sites for their design projects was along the path of Wuppertal’s floating tram, running fourteen kilometers between Oberbarmen at one end and Wuppertal at the other. The students looked at the areas and around the twenty stations in between, seeking for locations where they might intervene, [...].

UF: [...] We took a stroll with the students as an exercise in collectively contemplating the city, and then speculating about what could be done with it. It didn’t take long before there were sites where students called “Over there! Check it out!” Another would say: “Do you know this place?” Totally relevant! As a result, our stroll did not follow a fixed path, but was determined by constantly being astir. This method was highly episodic, like a game, an architectural game that involves meandering, pointing, exchanging ideas about what could be done with a particular place, improvising architecturally. In order to learn how to speculate in this way, strolling is fundamental.

C: As educators you must draw from a body of language and experience that is particular to your own generation. For example, Wuppertal’s floating tram features in Wim Wenders’ [...] nineteen-seventies road movie Alice in the Cities. [Are you the generation to redo over these?] Together we spent sections of our disparate urban regions [...]?

JL: The visiting professorship in Wuppertal was an opportunity for me to return to places where I spent my youth: Euxian, Wuppertal, Heiligenhauzen. I wanted to use and see the narrative potential and intensity of these places. The chair was asked to fill on an interim basis was called “Baumen im Bestand” [Building within Existing Structures]. If you take “existing structures” to include everything that is there, from spectacular to banal, from ruinous to tend and ugly, then it must be possible to pick up on and develop the qualities of these places architecturally by working with the existing structures.

UF: When I studied with Fabio Reinhardt and Miroslav Sík at ETH Zurich, we discovered the importance of urban peripheries. The analogies and references we used in designing buildings were no longer the icons of architectural history—still a subject of postmodernism at the time—but rather anonymous architecture, often industrial buildings, “The Lindner”, Werner Lindner’s book Bauten der Technik, was one of our bibles. When I moved to Germany, I got to know cities that were utterly foreign to me, from Karlsruhe to Frankfurt am Main and Kassel, and later Berlin. I learned to see the city in a new way not as a beautiful, finished object, but as an evolving organism, interspersed with vacant sites involving architectural intervention. The Wuppertal films by Wim Wenders, Tom Tykwer, and Benjamin Quabeck depict very specific views of this city. And Jörg Leeser talked about Wuppertal. He sent a stream of photographs of things he wanted me to see, this is how the city became familiar to me from a distance, even before the semester began.

JL: One of the key influences on my approach to architecture and the city was Peter Eisenman’s thinking on semiotics. He sees architecture as a discipline that engages language as a means to contemplate and the process of architectural perception. Disease later broadened the context of Eisenman’s ideas by contemplating and incorporating megalopolies, the city and its history, and the ordinary and the everyday. Because of our different backgrounds, working closely with UF on a studio and seminar was exciting and unpredictable.

C: [...] Together with your students, you combed through the area along the floating tram, taking note of the things you saw. To what extent did prior knowledge of what you saw influence the students’ search for suitable sites and the development of their projects there? Knowledge of postwar urban planning, the processes of modernization and rationalization trends, building materials? How did you link observations with knowledge?

UF: We both accumulated baggage during our studies, while working for architectural firms and on our own, as well as through teaching. We both have backpaks, and we cannot simply cast them aside. But we would like to think that the contents of these backpaks are diverse enough for us to develop our teaching in response to our students’ ongoing discourse, and in a way that the outcome of the students’ work remain unpredictable. If we ever tried to impress our students we did so by displaying our knowledge because of the contents of our backpaks, but by our unafraid in front of some obvious building and demanding that they really look at it.

JL: It was important to us that the students be able to begin working without any particular prior knowledge about the history of architecture and planning. In this sense, the observation phase—looking at what was there—and the selection phase—choosing sites—looked place largely while the students were still getting to know the sites. In the course of their further investigation, their passive observation/knowledge was gradually replaced by more active interventional knowledge. The students documented the city by taking photographs and drawings, and looking up information about the city and its various histories. They also looked for older and more recent plans of the city and its buildings. Typically, no plans existed, which meant that students had to work out the dimensions themselves, [...] Through this process, [...] the students were able to translate the physical manifestation of building into an abstraction, [...].

UF: This process was interesting for us as well. And since the close study of the city developed its own dynamic, it happened very quickly. All of the sudden, the students had plans. And these plans included things that are normally omitted but which are useful as inventories of particular situations: lamps, advertisements, and so on—micro architecture. [...] We always tried to get students to observe the fundamental things, to look close-up, to document their impressions and ideas about the spaces. We wanted students to consider what was there, including the smallest of details, [...].

UF: We mainly focused on anonymous architecture, the sort of architecture that is not listed by scholars. [...]. We looked at primary material that had not yet been researched by scholars, [...].

JL: We introduced and discussed all sorts of perspectives, ideas, and references with the students but we wanted to free them from the burden of having to come up with ingenious designs. We told them, “think like a craftsman! How wide is it? How large is it? What should it contain? Does it need a window?” [...]. We wanted the students to develop their projects free from the imperative of design ambition.

C: It is interesting that students had to not only find sites to develop, but also imagine a client
It would be wonderful if architects designed and constructed buildings with the idea in mind that some day another architect will come along and mess it up. It seems ambiguous: they can be seen as glamorous or faded, bold or failed. [...] The failure of architecture in the city goes hand in hand with an optimism that is implicit in every plan or project today. This was the moving force for us in Wuppertal. Are we dependent on a form of architectural decay that moves the heart—the customer—rather than the minds of the students? We are not interested in the aesthetic of architectural value system. A discourse. So along with developing their own architectural praxis, we think it is necessary to show the students how to witness the history of the buildings they have been working with. Where the students have photographed—preferably acrylic glass, embalmed. However, such buildings are not of much interest to us. As architects we are interested in buildings that become valuable because of what can be done with them. The possibility of a work of architecture, especially its ability to instigate further action, is not limited to the building itself, but includes its effect on other places. For instance, we think that every building by Karl Friedrich Schinkel should be preserved. But we also think the qualities and values of Schinkel’s buildings should be measured by their potential to become something else, to influence other architecture, elsewhere. We certainly disagree with the Venice Charter and its support for the “museumization” of cities. And we try not to differentiate between high and low culture. But we are not opposed to distinguishing the value of buildings. We engage urban oddities as a kind of critique. When we talk about the continuous elaboration of the city, we are interested in the refinement of culture. Such refinement comes from an exhaustive observation of places that appear banal. That’s why Hermann C-pic is such an inspiration to us. His attention to what appears to be mundane is the basis of his architectural praxis. It shows how gains insight into the cultural knowledge with which these unremarkable things and situations are charged. The sudden development of meaning from what appears meaningless—this is the high art of architecture. This is why we ask our students to look at the world’s smallest details rather than aiming immediately for the grand plan! UF: Create your own image of a building and get excited. Forget about what has already been mentioned in a book! And if the building and what you see in it really go well, you’ll be able to excite others with it as well. In this way a building can suddenly gain value over the course of a semester and the discourse among the students. As soon as a student works with a building in an interesting manner and presents this work to the group, new qualities about the building become perceptible. As a result, the students are contributing to a discourse. So along with developing their own projects, they are generating a collective architectural value system. C: Going back to the issue of historic preservation. [...] The students’ projects don’t seem to originate in the present, just as one cannot really tell whether Peter Märklin’s buildings were designed in the 1950s or at the turn of the twenty-first century. How did the students relate to the issue of contemporaneity? JL: There is, of course, a temporal dimension to the relationship between the city and its buildings, its location, its floating—even if one can say that something is floating and one cannot sleep near it because of the incessant screeching—all of this in between lots of empty shells forever giving the view a sort of Brechtian enemy—if it makes sense at all to speak about an enemy—where we want them to love their city. Either they must love it already or they must work on it as far as they can. So we try to love it. JL: Architecture is empathy.
Florian Hailmeier: When your firm was commissioned for the rehabilitation, did today arise that two of your founding partners—Erich Heinle and Robert Wischer—had been involved in the design of the original buildings as employees in the joint venture formed by Rolf Gudtke, Curt Siegel, and Günter Wilhelm?

Moh No, we received each of the commissions through the VOF selection process [standard regulated tendering process]. But of course we were especially happy about getting the commission because both buildings are of great significance to us due to their history. Back then, the architecture department of the Technical University Stuttgart [TH Stuttgart, later the University of Stuttgart] received the direct commission for the building from the city, which was established in 1954 to the three professors Gudtke, Siegel, and William. The joint office established for this purpose was initially headed by Erwin Heinle, then later by Erich Wagner. Robert Wischer was an employee from the beginning. In addition, the fact that the collegiate building known as KII had served to house TH Stuttgart’s architecture department was very important to us—generations of architects have been trained here, including current employees of our firm.

Muck Petzet: How suitable were the existing buildings for teaching purposes? Did you have to change anything about that; the materials and the work. Taken together, the two high-rise buildings constitute an important urbanistic accent within Stuttgart’s inner-city landscape. Moreover, when viewed objectively there’s a high level of design quality in all the structures and details, and the esteem of the users has grown over the years. Despite the many deficiencies and shortcomings that have arisen, everyone involved wanted to keep the ensemble. But to do so, it had to be adapted to meet contemporary needs.

MP: Which characteristics did you pick up on in the rehabilitation?

MH: We began with a very precise survey of existing conditions. In so doing, we repeatedly discovered new, intelligent details that impressed us and challenged us to continue the intelligence and aesthetics. In particular, the rehabilitation was meant to preserve the pure character of both buildings and the clearly discernible consistency of the design. Our maxim was to only replace the materials where it was absolutely necessary.

FH: Can you provide an example?

MH: For instance, the new building services technology was supposed to accordingly remain visually restrained, like it was in the existing building. In this way we acknowledged the functional and aesthetic character of the building. Ultimately, the ensemble was able to be modernised without any significant impairment of the architectural quality and within a very tight budget, with a building standard that nearly corresponds to that of a new building. The prerequisite for this approach was the outstanding quality of the existing buildings. Our working method was therefore to accurately examine things, evaluate them, deliberate, and take sustainable action. Thus, for example, in KII the north facade was replaced but the south facade was merely fitted with interior insulation at the splayed, since the original aluminium windows were still in quite good condition. Together with the clients and the users, we developed a minimal and efficient rehabilitation strategy in which the existing built substance could be retained to a great extent. Where interventions were necessary, we oriented ourselves on the original design principles.
By contrast, the buildings that already exist there can be used without difficulty, in the spring and fall almost everything, and in the winter, you need to settle for a smaller area. In the remaining area, you need to wear a thick sweaters. Incidentally, we stay within the legal requirements, we simply construe them differently: we don’t upgrade the building; instead we reduce the area in winter, defining different heat and use zones.

FH: What do you do with the space that you don’t need?
AB: We don’t know that yet. That’s precisely what’s so fascinating – the excess space opens up new questions about use and accessibility. By retaining the existing, a “plus” emerges, one that otherwise would never have been considered for financial reasons. Suddenly, an indeterminate generosity emerges: we have too much space. Who wants to use it? For what? It’s a byproduct that has arisen only from retaining and working with the existing space as a resource, and it costs nothing.

FH: A “luxury of the void.” That suits Brandenburg very well.
AB: Ordinarily something like this doesn’t happen with architecture as it never produces “too much,” everything is precisely calculated. In this case, however, we came upon a completely different economic model: the added value doesn’t emerge by creating something new, but as a result of doing less.

MP: That sounds as if the two ugly buildings are something else. Of course it’s necessary to carefully examine what can still be done with the existing building. That’s an interesting reversal of the question established notions of standards. You don’t do a complete demolition and then work in new ways; we call into question building standards that are rarely challenged. A building like Antivilla, with asbestos. That raises certain questions in relation to adaptive reuse.

FH: Sounds like good reasons for demolition. So what are you doing?
AB: The roof is being disposed of and we’re replacing it with a slightly sloped concrete slab that has several functions: we’re using waterproof concrete, so it functions as a roof membrane without any additional roofing. Beyond that it’s suitable for walking on, so it serves as additional space. In addition, as the slab independently spans between the exterior walls, the load-bearing interior walls are supporting it and an open floor plan is possible. We also no longer need all of the exterior and structural support, so we’re able to remove two of them. We get jackhammers and invite friends to a demolition party. Where do we want holes in the walls? Where do we want to look out to? To the roofs or the lake? Clear it out! The rough holes that result will be sealed afterward from the inside in sanded plaster. And voila—the Antivilla is finished. One single move—the new roof slab—makes it all possible.

MP: Why are you retaining these ugly buildings?
AB: First of all, it’s simply cheaper to use what is already there than to build something new. The anticipated demolition costs for both buildings would have actually already been deducted from the price of the real estate. Conserving them as is, we laid off for a threshold: we saved the costs of demolition, the property was nevertheless cheaper, and we no longer had the necessity to erect a new building.

Secondly, and to us this was at least as important, there was a chance here to have significantly more usable floor area, since the area of the two existing buildings is much greater than what we would have needed to be permitted to rebuild after demolishing them. The building code would have permitted three small new buildings with a total of only 250 square meters. By contrast, the buildings that already exist there are 500 square meters per floor. So by retaining them we came upon a completely different economic model: the added value doesn’t emerge by creating something new, but as a result of doing less.

MP: Why should everything always be replaced or missing windows, load-bearing interior walls, a corrugated fiber cement roof contaminated with asbestos. That raises certain questions in relation to adaptive reuse.

FH: Sounds like good reasons for demolition. So what are you doing?
AB: The roof is being disposed of and we’re replacing it with a slightly sloped concrete slab that has several functions: we’re using waterproof concrete, so it functions as a roof membrane without any additional roofing. Beyond that it’s suitable for walking on, so it serves as additional space. In addition, as the slab independently spans between the exterior walls, the load-bearing interior walls are supporting it and an open floor plan is possible. We also no longer need all of the exterior and structural support, so we’re able to remove two of them. We get jackhammers and invite friends to a demolition party. Where do we want holes in the walls? Where do we want to look out to? To the roofs or the lake? Clear it out! The rough holes that result will be sealed afterward from the inside in sanded plaster. And voila—the Antivilla is finished. One single move—the new roof slab—makes it all possible.

MP: What are your reasons for demolishing these buildings?
AB: In Krampnitz we have a building with tiny windows that were built; they’re all the same size, but made with different techniques: lintel, arch, and so on. It was the trainees who did the building.

FH: Let’s talk about the follow-up costs, especially for insulation and fire protection.
AB: That sounds as if the two ugly buildings are something else. Of course it’s necessary to carefully examine what can still be done with the existing building. That’s an interesting reversal of the question established notions of standards. You don’t do a complete demolition and then work in new ways; we call into question building standards that are rarely challenged. A building like Antivilla, with asbestos. That raises certain questions in relation to adaptive reuse.

FH: Sounds like good reasons for demolition. So what are you doing?
AB: The roof is being disposed of and we’re replacing it with a slightly sloped concrete slab that has several functions: we’re using waterproof concrete, so it functions as a roof membrane without any additional roofing. Beyond that it’s suitable for walking on, so it serves as additional space. In addition, as the slab independently spans between the exterior walls, the load-bearing interior walls are supporting it and an open floor plan is possible. We also no longer need all of the exterior and structural support, so we’re able to remove two of them. We get jackhammers and invite friends to a demolition party. Where do we want holes in the walls? Where do we want to look out to? To the roofs or the lake? Clear it out! The rough holes that result will be sealed afterward from the inside in sanded plaster. And voila—the Antivilla is finished. One single move—the new roof slab—makes it all possible.

MP: What are your reasons for demolishing these buildings?
AB: In Krampnitz we have a building with tiny windows that were built; they’re all the same size, but made with different techniques: lintel, arch, and so on. It was the trainees who did the building.
Florian Helmeyer: What was your very first impression of the Europarei housing development? 

AK: It already touched upon the most complex element of the residential blocks was shocking. The buildings all seemed at first to be completely without character—the endless exterior corridors with their ugly metal railings; the typical, closed-in ground floor with all those storage rooms; the faceless entrances lobster clamps and drainage pipes; the elevator shafts that look like they were tucked on... It was clear that architecture had played only a very small role in the planning in these recent years. But it turned out that the apartments were very spacious and nice, and that the surroundings were also convincing—in particular the design of the landscape: the trees are large and verdant, just like all those classic modernist drawings one sees. Just like Le Corbusier had promised; so to speak.

FH: It was especially important to retain the qualities of the apartments and the open spaces? 

AK: Exactly. For the buildings themselves we came up with the motto “a second chance for modernism.” The somewhat naive idea was that everything that had been precluded to economize on the buildings in their day would now be amended. You could say that we wanted to make architecture out of the buildings. The goal was to make them accessible in scale and lend them dignity and a monumental quality within their context.

Mick Petzet: What were the biggest problems you encountered? 

 AK: One of our first findings was that the buildings were examined for structural soundness. It quickly became clear that it had been constructed back then to the absolute minimum. It simply wasn’t sturdy enough not only for the walls and floor slabs, but also for the foundations. In the end, the economic crisis meant that no concrete steps were taken. MP: Large-scale housing developments have been criticized for a long time now. Their planning approach is considered a failure and the existing housing developments are often seen as problem zones. There is public debate in general in the

OT: The discussions about razing parts of the complex came up again and again throughout the process. The city was already a “rehabilitation machine”—which was well-oiled and working smoothly by then—had even stopped after the sixth of nine buildings was completed in 2010. It was suddenly decided that the three buildings that had not yet been refurbished should be torn down, because they had sold the project and determined—after nine years— that the whole operation was too expensive. The cooperative was considering building tenanted houses instead. In the end, the economic crisis meant that no concrete steps were taken. MP: Large-scale housing developments have been criticized for a long time now. Their planning approach is considered a failure and the existing housing developments are often seen as problem zones. There is public debate in general in the

You could say that the size of the Europarei ensured its continued existence. It simply wasn’t logistically possible to tear it down.

Netherlands about tearing them down, or have comparable housing developments already been torn down? 

OT: Of course, the Netherlands is actually the present country which comes to demolition and new construction. The Europarei is an exception, simply because it wasn’t logistically possible to tear it down. You could say that its size ensured its continued existence. But many similar housing developments are systematically razed or “re-coded”—Osdorp and Bijlmermeer in Amsterdam, Morewijk in The Hague, Hoftenbroek in Zwolle, and many others. In many of those places we’ve put up new construction. That often means following the logic of the old sites and erecting new buildings that are principally similar to the old ones, because it’s not easy to change the layout of the streets. The biggest change affordability of the new buildings is the area devoted to living. The new housing developments generally have fewer apartments with twice as much space in each, which, in turn, means that on average the number of residents is cut in half.

MP: Both of you grew up in East Germany, where industrially manufactured, large-scale housing developments are often seen as problem zones. In many of those places we’ve put up new construction. That often means following the logic of the old sites and erecting new buildings that are principally similar to the old ones, because it’s not easy to change the layout of the streets. The biggest change affordability of the new buildings is the area devoted to living. The new housing developments generally have fewer apartments with twice as much space in each, which, in turn, means that on average the number of residents is cut in half.
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MP: Both of you grew up in East Germany, where industrially manufactured large-scale housing developments are often seen as problem zones. In many of those places we’ve put up new construction. That often means following the logic of the old sites and erecting new buildings that are principally similar to the old ones, because it’s not easy to change the layout of the streets. The biggest change affordability of the new buildings is the area devoted to living. The new housing developments generally have fewer apartments with twice as much space in each, which, in turn, means that on average the number of residents is cut in half.
Florian Hollmeyer: You describe the site for the Galerie Giti Nourbakhsch as “very charming with its three existing buildings.” Could you talk a bit more about that?

Nils Buschmann: It’s a gap in a row of Gründerzeit buildings, closed off from the street by brick wall and a large industrial gate. The site opens onto a surprisingly idyllic scene with quintessential architectural buildings: a garage shed, a commercial building dating back to the 1930s, and a metal box from the 1970s. A courtyard with a balanced mix of buildings and green space, an arrangement of equally important interior and exterior spaces, surrounded by the blank brick walls, typical seen throughout Berlin. The heterogeneity of this accumulation makes the place rich and interesting. That’s what we meant by “charming.”

FH: How was the decision to retain the buildings reached?

NB: We were in agreement with our client, Giti Nourbakhsch, about the most important point: this was not about representation, but about creating versatile and robust gallery spaces. Spaces of opportunity for the artists. And it was precisely that which was lying dormant in the diversity of the three buildings and the exterior spaces.

Tom Friedrich: That gave us the opportunity to programmatically and typologically adapt the found to the new requirements: we decided not to demolish or rebuild anything, but expose the existing potential and think in terms of continuity. We believe in a diverse and heterogenous city with identifiable and characteristic typologies, similar to the Green Archipelago envisioned by Oswald Mathias Ungers, Hans Holthof, and others there. So it must remain recognizable, readable.

TF: In this case, it was already recognizable: the built fabric from the nineteenth century, and within it, a gap of an entirely different character. The other sites were of the rules. Precisely in places like this, it is important to not conceal anything and to not fear anything down too hastily.

FH: And? Is it possible?

NB: We’re trying to do that now with a current project: the residential development Am Lokpod. It lies directly adjacent to a large, densest track field that had been used by the railroad for decades. A classic peripheral inner-city site, of the kind that is still to be found very often in Berlin. It’s easy to imagine industrial architecture here, but there isn’t any. Although it wouldn’t surprise me if there were: the cultural references to this place would self-evident. So we are reinventing industrial architecture, or more precisely: a typology that establishes a cultural reference to industrial architecture, but which represents a residential typology for today that is capable of being personalized. Yet we are not copying it in a historicizing way, but rather developing it further. We are making the qualities of industrial architecture usable for housing. A Loft—the classic example of conversion—but newly built. A clearly new architecture that builds on the genius loci, that reinvents a story with a reference to the past. We’re not concerned here about producing a collage, but about assembling the various fragments, in all their complexity, to form a new whole.

FH: Your treatment of everyday existing structures seems almost overly cautious, as if you feared removing too much. Is that because you belong to the generation of architects whose careers began in 1990s Berlin—where, more for ideological than for rational reasons, too much was demolished; too much was vanished?

NB: We are convinced by the diversity and heterogeneity of a city that has evolved over time. So yes, that means not lightly throwing anything overboard. We’re not working on a blank page of paper, but in the cultural context of Europe. Not a tabula rasa. It’s simply wrong to believe that the old must be destroyed in order to create the new. The new can also emerge from the existing, through adaptive reuse and by developing ideas further. Yet that requires great precision and attention.

TF: Our perception of the city is of course deeply influenced by our experiences of urban development in Berlin architecture in Berlin during the 1990s. A city of appropriation, where existing structures belong to the generation of architects whose careers began in 1990s Berlin—where, more for ideological than for rational reasons, too much was demolished; too much was vanished.
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NB: We’re trying to do that now with a current project: the residential development Am Lokpod. It lies directly adjacent to a large, densest track field that had been used by the railroad for decades. A classic peripheral inner-city site, of the kind that is still to be found very often in Berlin. It’s easy to imagine industrial architecture here, but there isn’t any. Although it wouldn’t surprise me if there were: the cultural references to this place would self-evident. So we are reinventing industrial architecture, or more precisely: a typology that establishes a cultural reference to industrial architecture, but which represents a residential typology for today that is capable of being personalized. Yet we are not copying it in a historicizing way, but rather developing it further. We are making the qualities of industrial architecture usable for housing. A Loft—the classic example of conversion—but newly built. A clearly new architecture that builds on the genius loci, that reinvents a story with a reference to the past. We’re not concerned here about producing a collage, but about assembling the various fragments, in all their complexity, to form a new whole.

FH: Do you thus consider these ideas to be something completely new, or isn’t there more that you are linking back again to very old, pre-modern architectural traditions?

NB: That’s correct in terms of establishing a link. But we must remember: linking back to an existing point. What really interests us is what comes next. What new architectural opportunities can arise as a result? In this sense, your motto “Reduce / Reuse / Recycle” clearly needs another term: “Reinvent.”

What’s interesting to us is whether these strategies for conversions or additions can also be transferred to new buildings. We talk about hybrid combinations. Typologies that can still be designed by the users.

FH: Does sustainability play a role in that?

NB: It does not. As an example we mention the Berlin Weekend Club, you have also worked with rather ‘formerly’ existing buildings. Do you see a connection between these projects?

FH: So, is there a connection to how you want to work about your work on the Giti Nourbakhsch gallery?

NB: Yes.

FH: Does the aesthetic quality play a role in that?

NB: Yes.

FH: That’s why you drew in a German “WIV” 70’ energy standard, but in terms of robust spaces that is difficult. The functional factor is more than just a single function. A sustainable building structure in terms of spaces that remain usable over the long term. In other words, more asked of cultural sustainability.

NB: An “architecture—architecture”-architecture that develops from an evolutionary understanding of architectural history, similar to the way Helmut Lang made “fashion—fashion” with a cultural context instead of a concept. It’s not about the spectacular and brightly colored M.&M.s. It’s more important to us that architecture allows qualities to emerge in every city, for every city in a different way.

FH: How was the decision to retain the buildings reached?

NB: We were in agreement with our client, Giti Nourbakhsch, about the most important point: this was not about representation, but about creating versatile and robust gallery spaces. Spaces of opportunity for the artists. And it was precisely that which was lying dormant in the diversity of the three buildings and the exterior spaces.

Tom Friedrich: That gave us the opportunity to programmatically and typologically adapt the found to the new requirements: we decided not to demolish or rebuild anything, but expose the existing potential and think in terms of continuity. We believe in a diverse and heterogenous city with identifiable and characteristic typologies, similar to the Green Archipelago envisioned by Oswald Mathias Ungers, Hans Holthof, and others there. So it must remain recognizable, readable.

TF: In this case, it was already recognizable: the built fabric from the nineteenth century, and within it, a gap of an entirely different character. The other sites were of the rules. Precisely in places like this, it is important to not conceal anything and to not fear anything down too hastily.

FH: How was the decision to retain the buildings reached?

NB: We were in agreement with our client, Giti Nourbakhsch, about the most important point: this was not about representation, but about creating versatile and robust gallery spaces. Spaces of opportunity for the artists. And it was precisely that which was lying dormant in the diversity of the three buildings and the exterior spaces.
Giulia Andi / Recycle and Transform  

Conversion

Florian Heilmeyer: What was the condition of the building when you saw it for the first time?  
Giulia Andi: The bunker is a memorial. It’s a visible manifestation of violence and a determinant for the city’s morphology. Its dimensions and shape make the submarine base a place with a strong and very emotional impact. It simultaneously depicts protection and repulsion. It’s a real phenomenon in the landscape, like a second nature—both material and immaterial.

FH: How did you approach the design of the building? What were the first steps?  
GA: This project basically started long before we joined in. Beginning in the 1990s, an attempt had been started to develop a new scheme for the harbor, to open it up and connect it back to the city. That was the first step in transforming the bunker into a cultural and social reality. In 1995, the artist Yann Kersale created a choreographic work of light and shadow titled Nuit des Docks, and in 1994 the symbolic Ville Port project was launched, marking the first reactivation of the bunker. The Spanish architect Manuel de Solà-Morales set a catwalk on the first reactivation of the bunker. The Spanish architect Manuel de Solà-Morales set a catwalk on the roof and opened four of the fourteen alveolos, the bunker’s chambers, thus breaking the barrier between the city and the harbor. Our intervention began in 2003 with the transformation of Alveole 14 into a cultural space.

FH: Were there any positive strengths to the existing facilities, certain qualities or characteristics that you could build upon? How can such a building—symbol of brute violence, war, and destruction—be considered separately from its history? Can the site once again become a positive part of the city?

GS: A radical transformation was necessary to reintegrate the site into the city’s day-to-day reality. The question was how to deal with this extreme situation. We were interested in developing a different approach than Solà-Morales: adding new elements to the bunker and opening it up to the city, using the bunker’s energy and brutality with minimal intervention in order to maintain its double nature. We were asked to provide a methodological answer to the program. The first objective was to work with the morphology of the site, activating its intrinsic qualities—the enigmatic and raw atmosphere of the bunker cells—without opening up the bunker. We wanted it to stay massive and dark. The second objective was to develop an intervention to add a different characteristic—one that is reversible and heterogeneous.

The main programs (LIFE and VIP) and their coexistence were the biggest challenge. VIP already existed and was something of an institution in Saint-Nazaire. LIFE was a completely new concept. We wanted their spaces to be designed differently. VIP is a black-box venue for contemporary music concerts with perfect sound control, a catwalk stage, recording studios, and a bar overlooking the double-height space. In contrast, LIFE is a place for emerging art that requires great spatial flexibility.

FH: The bunker was built by the Todt Organization for the German U-boat fleet in World War II, making it an important strategic objective for Allied bombers during the war. So it bears a debt to the city that was heavily damaged due to its presence. Was there a moment when you said, we do not want to—or cannot—do this?

GA: The submarine base was an alien object imposed on the city, built in 1942 in only sixteen months. The Allies destroyed 85 percent of Saint-Nazaire but left the bunker intact. It’s a manifestation of the violence from the past and has decisively influenced the morphology of the city. Paul Virilio wrote in his book Bunker Archaeology, “Striking examples of blindness of an era, these works announce a new primitive architecture based on proportions but not on the mental faculty.” “If we look at these buildings with a different eye, they look almost beautiful. It seems as if they establish a new relationship with the surrounding environment.”

FH: So what does that mean for your transformation?

GA: You only can describe the bunker through its double nature: it expresses power and fragility. It’s an indestructible mass with the fragility of a living creature. It’s the result of iron and cement coming into contact—there’s a great deal of dripping water—so it’s intended to decompose naturally. The difficult goal was to simultaneously reinvent the space to make it people-friendly, yet not deny the original condition of the “alveolos.” A vertical link has been created to bring natural light inside and provide access to the roof. The public space—a former railroad track—is defined by a suspended light carpet made of LEDs and metal bars.

FH: How did you get the idea of taking the radar dome from Tempelhofer Airport in Berlin, another building of the Third Reich, and recycling it as a think-tank area by transplanting it on top of the bunker in Saint-Nazaire?

GA: We wanted to colonize the bunker with a defined program and a light approach. An exploration of light and of temporary and recyclable elements. Our reuse of the dome, built in 1934 by Ernst Sagefeld, recycles the modular structure as an icon and symbol of a new transformation shared between France and Germany—the memory of change.
Ansgar and Benedikt Schulz

Love at Second Sight

Infill

Florian Helmsmayr: What were your first impressions of the university building in Erlangen?  
Ansgar Schulz: We’re familiar with this kind of architecture from our childhood in the Ruhr district. We’ve seen it there in thousands of times, at the Ruhr University in Bochum, the TU Technical University Dortmund, and elsewhere. But we didn’t want to go to college. Not until we had continually grappled with the act of building did our appraisals of 1970s architecture change. So the task of “continuation” in Erlangen was all the more interesting.

Benedikt Schulz: It certainly wasn’t “love at first sight.” To begin with, the building simply didn’t fit the objective at all. Whether the building could even be “saved” was an open question.

Muck Petzet: Was demolition discussed?

BS: No, it was always about expanding the existing structures as effectively as possible and also an aesthetic argument that can be decisive when it comes to retaining or demolishing buildings. In Chemnitz, the building previously used by the Volkspolizei had a massive image problem due to its appearance, which is why many people supported tearing it down. Only by precisely “liberating” this building’s strategically important position—due solely to its location at the intersection of the ring road and the main access road—were we ultimately able to retain the site and its volumetric form as a lasting icon for the public.

MP: Do you see a general change of thought in newer architecture in Germany that seems to deal more circumspectly than before with what already exists, even that which is beyond consideration as “worthy of preservation”?

BS: I do think there has been a shift in dealing with existing architecture. There’s not necessarily an attempt to form contracts and to differentiate each new layer from the existing as distinctly as possible. What exists is now taken up and continued much more often.

AS: In continuing what already exists, the individual architect takes more of a back seat; architectural achievements increasingly become part of a greater whole. There is a greater need for communication, however, and it carries more weight with this praxis of refurbishment, in order to also make the work of an individual perceptible to those who aren’t experts in the field. It also opens up the opportunity for the wider public to fall in “love at second sight.”

In continuing what already exists, the individual architect takes more of a back seat; architectural achievements become part of a greater whole.
Arno Brändlhuber / Bonds

Infill

There's nothing wrong with a tabula rasa. But: it doesn't exist. Everywhere there's something already there. There, we actually have too many. From an overall economic perspective, it's completely senseless to build new buildings. Of course there are situations that are not suitable for reuse, ones that really have no positive qualities whatsoever. The solution should not be forgotten. But it can be sensible to evaluate certain buildings or typologies to determine whether they are generally useful as models for certain forms of reuse. What could this be like? What about gas stations? The result could be a very inspiring guideline.

AB: Today's architects cannot, in any case, simply present ingenious sketches that are meant to resolve everything, whether it's with a thick pencil or an automated computer process. They have to deal with much more complex existing situations. Architecture can then also be a partial solution or a temporary improvement. It's no longer necessary to develop entire new buildings, especially for competitions and its promises. Has it meanwhile been proven that this format is not a dead end. Because it's simply not capable of factoring in complex bonds—social, cultural, and political ties. Thus it leads only to iconic architecture highly complex in formal terms, but as architecture, ultimately of low complexity because so much is not taken into consideration. In this respect, the finance crisis comes at just the right moment for architecture, since it forces us to deal with our resources more economically.

AB: That brings us to the profession's self-image, which sees itself as a master builder and less as a master rebuilder.

AB: Muck Petzet: What fascinates you about such projects?

AB: That's right. We must have the courage to approach the architect to rectify deficiencies.

AB: MP: That's the topic simply isn't sexy.

AB: FH: By and large, architects are still trained in college to build something new. Shouldn't we also start there and give much more decisions to this concept of continuing building?

AB: You say it helps when you have constraints. But: it doesn't exist. Everywhere there's something already there. How much will that cost with burnished concrete floors? How much with parquet flooring? How much with pencil or an automated computer process. They have to deal with much more complex existing situations. Architecture can then also be a partial solution or a temporary improvement. It's no longer necessary to develop entire new buildings, especially for competitions and its promises. Has it meanwhile been proven that this format is not a dead end. Because it's simply not capable of factoring in complex bonds—social, cultural, and political ties. Thus it leads only to iconic architecture highly complex in formal terms, but as architecture, ultimately of low complexity because so much is not taken into consideration. In this respect, the finance crisis comes at just the right moment for architecture, since it forces us to deal with our resources more economically.

AB: Florian Hellemeyer: On Brunnenstrasse you operated in an area that's not consistent with the "state of the art." Such experiments can lead to dramatic additional costs ...
Muck-Pätzl: Aside from its size, what makes the high-rise student housing in Munich relevant? To what extent do you see something special in it?

Thomas Knerer: Günther Eckert’s design was radical. He wanted to establish a counterpoint to Werner Wirsing’s neighboring low-scale housing, the so-called Bungalow Village, where each student inhabits their own house. With Eckert’s design, however, 801 students were meant to live together in a single building. The radical nature of this approach was translated with utmost consistency in the design and its construction.

Eva Lang: It is one of the most expressive buildings in the entire Olympic Park, and we believe that to this day it remains a particularly compelling architectural document of its time.

Florian Heilmeyer: Can you describe this expressiveness more precisely?

EL: The individual apartments were depicted on the exterior by fair-faced concrete frames stacked one above the other. Together with the engineering firm SSP, Günther Eckert developed a building system with a high degree of prefabrication.

TK: The resulting “stacked walls” formed the east and west façades of the building and were connected by concrete beams spanning across its depth. The building’s interior remained column-free, and the student apartments were added using prefabricated modules. Whether the architect chose this means of construction in order to enable subsequent conversion is something we can only speculate on.

EL: In any case, the resulting overall form appears to be almost accidental but is flexible. From a distance, the silhouette is — intentionally or not — reminiscent of an Alpine panorama.

MP: What was the condition of the building when you saw it for the first time?

TK: It was clear that the entire exterior supporting structure, including the loggias, needed to be packed in a thermally insulated enclosure in order to meet the requirements of current energy-saving regulations. That meant the building’s rehabilitation also called for a radical approach: we hang a new structure of lightweight precast concrete in front of the existing. This provides a degree of plasticity that comes very close to that of the earlier building. The new windows and the metal panels with which we have now clad all the spandrels create a strong reference to the materiality of the original building and its façade articulation, but without copying it. Instead of the very tightly dimensioned apartments, we’ve inserted compact, small apartments with various, spatially differentiated functional areas.

MP: You refer to the project as a rehabilitation measure, but the changes to the external appearance make it much more than that, don’t they?

TK: To be sure, our alteration can be read in the many new details, but a connection with the building’s origins still remains — sometimes more and sometimes less subtle. Changes were necessary, but we didn’t want to destroy the special charm of the 1970s. It was especially important to preserve the building’s character when seen from a distance. After being refurbished, the building will invisibly continue to assert its prominent place in the Olympic Village ensemble.

FH: All these considerations and subtleties — and in the end, one almost can hardly distinguish the intervention from the prevailing condition. Can this “invisibility” be satisfying at all for you as architects?

EL: We’ve talked a lot about that. Our office is in Dresden, where the subject of history is dealt with very often, very emotionally, and with great controversy. We believe that buildings must be adapted to meet changed circumstances and conditions. Thus our approach for working on the student housing in Munich is not primarily one of historic preservation, but is developed from the various requirements of our mandate. Our design represents an independent solution; it’s not a restoration of the original state. That would not have been technically feasible. We view the work rather like music: as a variation and reinterpretation of a theme with similar instruments.

As natives of Munich, we have always liked and admired the building. That’s why a major change to its configuration was for us absolutely out of the question.

FH: Is there something of a “new cautiousness” to be sensed in your treatment of the existing — a certain desire to discover, retain, and refine existing qualities?

EL: Exactly. It’s hopefully an affectionate approach. We examine the strengths and attempt to elaborate upon them with present-day means. This results in layers of time that deny neither history nor the present. We think that’s a sustainable approach.
Our starting points were really the analysis of the existing building ... and the position relative to the cardinal points.

Volker Staab / Conditions

Redesign

Muck Petzet: What was the condition of the building when you saw it for the first time?

Volker Staab: The first meeting took place in a room on the seventh floor. It was summer and felt like 38°C. That made the building’s main problem immediately palpable. The façade from the 1960s was in very poor condition; the windows couldn't be opened and the exterior sun shading, which had long since ceased to operate, was unusable.

Florian Heilmeyer: So was demolition also discussed?

VS: Demolition was indeed also discussed in the preliminary stages, but a new high-rise on this site would not have been permitted. But, for the Darmstadt University of Applied Sciences, the high-rise was a symbol visible from afar and, as such, if not only acting as an important point of orientation on the campus, but also forming part of the institution’s public identity.

FH: Where did you see spatial or urbanistic advantages or strengths that you could take advantage of as part of your renovation strategy?

VS: We found the organization of the interior to be convincing in its clarity and simplicity. Two spatial areas of different depths, and a middle zone for the ancillary spaces, with nice wide corridors. Hence we tied the extension, which enlarges the building by two additional gridlines, exactly into the existing structure. The organization of the spaces was developed in close coordination with the users, and we also worked together to decide upon the color scheme for the rooms. With the design of the façades, aside from the fact that there was absolutely nothing we could preserve from the existing façades, the exact north-south orientation of the building was of crucial importance.

MP: What deficiencies needed to be eliminated?

VS: Besides the climatic ones, there were also spatial deficiencies, most notably on the ground floor, which we opened up vertically to the floor above, also because of the public use. From a technical standpoint, in addition to the structural design, which had no reserve capacity, fire protection was a big issue.

FH: How did you arrive at the idea of recycling the marble panels of the façade by using them inside?

MP: The new metal façade doesn’t appear new at first glance because the design arouses strong associations with the modular façades of the 1960s. Should it be understood mostly as a gesture with a touch of humor, or were there practical reasons for recycling them?

VS: In the debate about this redesign, weren’t there any misgivings that the building could become too “loud”? After all, it already dominates its surroundings solely due to its height.

FH: In this case, too, the building’s orientation lent itself to our concept. The building presents its calm north façade to the city, and its more expressive south façade faces the campus. That’s well-suited to the client’s valued “symbolic character.”

FH: Why do you call it the south façade?

MP: The side effect that a recollection of that time will be awakened is, however, not entirely unwelcome.

VS: In this case, too, the building’s orientation lent itself to our concept. The building presents its calm north façade to the city, and its more expressive south façade faces the campus. That’s well-suited to the client’s valued “symbolic character.”

FH: How did you arrive at the idea of recycling the marble panels of the façade by using them inside?

MP: In the debate about this redesign, weren’t there any misgivings that the building could become too “loud”? After all, it already dominates its surroundings solely due to its height.

VS: Well, neither. Our starting points were really the analysis of the existing building, especially its inner structure, and the position relative to the cardinal points. Due to the precise north-south orientation, the two longitudinal façades each had completely different requirements. The goal was to develop façade geometries that allowed us to forego any external, operable sun shading, with its susceptibility to mechanical failure. As it turned out, there are naturally many geometries that facilitate shading. But with regard to the structural implications and the brightness inside, there were great differences. Our work was therefore to develop a form that provided an optimal result with respect to the shading, the brightness, and the forces acting on the existing building’s structure. But there was still a certain range to work within, so we opted for varying elements. Instead of employing the same module around the entire building, the façades respond differently to the different conditions of the four cardinal points. The scale of the module is nevertheless entirely different than the one from the 1960s. The side effect that a recollection of that time will be awakened is, however, not entirely unwelcome.

VS: In this case, too, the building’s orientation lent itself to our concept. The building presents its calm north façade to the city, and its more expressive south façade faces the campus. That’s well-suited to the client’s valued “symbolic character.”

FH: How did you arrive at the idea of recycling the marble panels of the façade by using them inside? Should it be understood mostly as a gesture with a touch of humor, or were there practical reasons for recycling them?

VS: It was requested by the university.
Florian Heilmeyer: What was the condition of the building when you saw it for the first time?

Florian Schlüter: At first glance, the Dornbusch Church was rather off-putting. It had practically no open space in front, and the atmosphere inside was rather gray and a bit dismal. The church's interior was enormous and undifferentiated in relation to the size. In the sanctuary there were plastic buckets and bowls because of the leaky roof.

Martin Wendt: Later we learned that in addition to roof repairs, the concrete structure was also in need of refurbishment. The church interior was cold and uncomfortable in the winter; the insulation was bad. The building offered space for approximately five hundred churchgoers, but only about fifty members of the congregation still came on Sundays. So to some extent it was understandable that the church building was not particularly loved by the community, as we learned.

FH: Even though you yourselves attested to the bad condition that the Dornbusch Church was in, your proposal averted complete demolition of the building. What were the advantages of partial demolition?

Claudia Meixner: The material advantage was that the remedial measures for the entire building would have been very expensive, and for a smaller building they could be reduced accordingly. In addition, the smaller church building we created this way is still larger than any new building that could have been built with the same money. Furthermore, for the same amount of money we used to preserve part of the original church, no new building could have been built in the same magnitude.

The intangible advantage was that, in this way, part of the old church was able to survive in the new one.

FS: The previously existing ensemble of church space and community center worked very well. With our reconstruction, it was above all necessary to ensure that the steeple and what remained of the building continued to constitute a unity. At the same time, it was possible for us to enrich the existing ensemble with a new, large churchyard.

FH: What was the biggest challenge with the reconstruction?

MW: One challenge was the meager budget. All the reconstruction and rehabilitation measures had to be carried out for €800,000. There were structural difficulties because the new church façade had to replace the bracing of the nave's side walls even during the reconstruction phase itself.

FH: From the structural requirements and other issues, such as the new entrance, natural lighting, and access to the community center, an overall concept had to be developed that also had to do with the uniqueness of the church and its identity. That was actually the biggest challenge.

FH: What remains of the Dornbusch Church has become a new wall into which individual elements of the old building have been recessed, like imprints of a memory. That sounds quite nostalgic, isn't it? It's awful for the community, constantly to be reminded of the old building and thus, as it were, of its former “greatness”? How do the church members get along with their reduced-scale building?

CM: The congregation really doesn't mourn the larger church. They find the current size appropriate; the churchgoers no longer feel so lost. And we've also received many positive reactions for preserving the room-sized stained-glass window, which now has a much greater presence in the small church.

MW: Meanwhile the number of churchgoers has been rising again. We actually have the impression that the church community doesn't perceive the transformation of the old church and the memory of the deconstruction as a loss, but rather as an awakening in something new — without having lost the past.

FH: And how is the new outdoor space between the building and the tower used?

MW: In the mornings it's virtually an extension to the yard of a neighboring school. In the afternoons, it becomes more a kind of children's playground. The congregation is happy, and uses the space for bazaars, festivals, or in special cases even for outdoor religious services.

FH: What extent would you describe your way of dealing with Dornbusch Church as “exemplary”?

CM: Perhaps it's exemplary because every project should begin without bias. Often, pragmatic use of what exists is a very inexpensive and ecologically sensible option. We always view the use and extension of existing buildings as offering a great opportunity for achieving a process-driven, eclectic result.

FS: Starting with the site and the task we're given, we seek in our projects to develop a new way of seeing the everyday situations that have evolved. We try to discover physical and social qualities in order to develop them further — especially when we encounter existing built elements with some sort of previous history.
Florian Heilmeyer: Sonja and Jan, you know each other from your time studying together at the Academy of Fine Arts in Munich, are you not? Sonja Nagel and Björn Martenson: Of course, but we met when both worked with Arno Brandlhuber and Bernd Koenig in Cologne. But actually, there was a slightly odd passion for collecting that brought you together: the photographic collection ‘Bauten der Zwischenstadt’ [Buildings of the In-Between City].

Jan Theissen: I was graduating from college (work) for a flat-fee former contractor. Back then I was driving all-through the region surrounding Stuttgart. And noticed these quirky commercial villas—strange hybrids—very sturdy and resilient buildings—which had often been altered and expanded several times. I started taking pictures of them; Sonja was enthralled by it, and we spent several weeks in the summer semi-strictly traveling across the countryside. Later, we showed them to Björn, who was as fascinated with them as we were.

Björn Martenson: In 2001 I had a teaching position at the university in Aachen, and we created a design course about this building type.

FH: What kind of course was it?

BM: It was an experiment. We were interested in whether a design strategy could be derived from the analysis of these buildings.

SN: Students were to design a commercial villa.

JT: However, hardly anyone was interested in that type of everyday architecture in 2005.

Sonja Nagel, Björn Martenson and Jan Theissen / Learning from the Inconspicuous - Addition
The only economically significant form of recycling buildings in Germany is the processing of building rubble into gravel materials. The reuse of larger building components is problematic, especially with regard to logistics and transportation. It would be easy to reassemble redundant Plattenbau buildings elsewhere—were it not for the costs of non-destructive disassembly, transport, storage, and reassembly. A few pilot projects—such as in the Cottbus slab housing block district of Saxony-Madlow, where in 2001 the architectural firm Zimmermann + Partner had the parts of a disassembled high-rise apartment building reassembled into new town houses on an adjacent site—point to ways in which, at least locally, large components can be sensibly reused, both economically and in terms of energy. However, this presupposes a need for new homes directly next to the “dismantled” areas, which is more likely the exception in shrinking cities.

On a smaller scale, marketplaces for used building components offer networks and structures for the regional use of “secondary” building materials. However, these exchanges only have a niche existence in the construction industry; they are primarily of interest to budget-conscious “do it yourself-builders” and aficionados of historical elements. In Germany, “professional” components must be certified through extensive testing in order to obtain building regulation approval. For used components this is possible to a very limited extent.

It follows that the status quo of recycling buildings is the use of the smallest fragments—rendering the process completely energy inefficient. According to statistics compiled by Initiative Kreislaufwirtschaft Bau [Society for the Recycling Economy in the Building Sector], between 1995 and 2009 an average of 210 million tons of mineral construction waste was incurred annually. This represents approximately sixty percent of the total waste volume in Germany. Of the construction waste, eighty million tons came from building demolition. Each year, nearly forty million tons of this is processed into recycled building materials.

The bulk of this recycled material is reused in Germany for road construction. The demolished housing estates of East Germany thus serve as important “urban mining grounds” for the country’s new infrastructure as slab buildings are converted into highways. But this is only economically and energetically sensible if the dismantling site, the processing plant, and the road construction site are close together; economic viability ends after about twenty-five kilometers. It is also likely that at least in the eastern part of the country, the supply of recycled materials from demolitions in the near future will far exceed their demand.

For several years, therefore, attempts have been made to use the recycled debris in higher-quality form, such as aggregate for recycling-concrete (“RC-concrete”). In Germany, this is still in the testing phase. In contrast to Switzerland, where RC-concrete is already in use, initial studies on the energy efficiency of RC-concrete versus conventional concrete, however, show only a slight advantage, which is not even gained from the material, but from the shorter transport distance between the crushing facility and the concrete plant. In contrast to gravel pits, both are usually located relatively close to urban centers. This advantage accounts for only a few percentage points in the overall energy balance: the production process comprises eighty to ninety percent of the primary energy used for ready mixed concrete. Cement plants account for the world’s third largest source of annual CO2 emissions, just below power plants and vehicles.

The key to reducing the carbon footprint of our buildings lies in extending their lifecycles—non-destructive disassembly, transport, storage, and reassembly. A few pilot projects—such as in the Cottbus slab housing block district of Saxony-Madlow, where in 2001 the architectural firm Zimmermann + Partner had the parts of a disassembled high-rise apartment building reassembled into new town houses on an adjacent site—point to ways in which, at least locally, large components can be sensibly reused, both economically and in terms of energy. However, this presupposes a need for new homes directly next to the “dismantled” areas, which is more likely the exception in shrinking cities.

On a smaller scale, marketplaces for used building components offer networks and structures for the regional use of “secondary” building materials. However, these exchanges only have a niche existence in the construction industry; they are primarily of interest to budget-conscious “do it yourself-builders” and aficionados of historical elements. In Germany, “professional” components must be certified through extensive testing in order to obtain building regulation approval. For used components this is possible to a very limited extent.

It follows that the status quo of recycling buildings is the use of the smallest fragments—rendering the process completely energy inefficient. According to statistics compiled by Initiative Kreislaufwirtschaft Bau [Society for the Recycling Economy in the Building Sector], between 1995 and 2009 an average of 210 million tons of mineral construction waste was incurred annually. This represents approximately sixty percent of the total waste volume in Germany. Of the construction waste, eighty million tons came from building demolition. Each year, nearly forty million tons of this is processed into recycled building materials.

The bulk of this recycled material is reused in Germany for road construction. The demolished housing estates of East Germany thus serve as important “urban mining grounds” for the country’s new infrastructure as slab buildings are converted into highways. But this is only economically and energetically sensible if the dismantling site, the processing plant, and the road construction site are close together; economic viability ends after about twenty-five kilometers. It is also likely that at least in the eastern part of the country, the supply of recycled materials from demolitions in the near future will far exceed their demand.

For several years, therefore, attempts have been made to use the recycled debris in higher-quality form, such as aggregate for recycling-concrete (“RC-concrete”). In Germany, this is still in the testing phase. In contrast to Switzerland, where RC-concrete is already in use, initial studies on the energy efficiency of RC-concrete versus conventional concrete, however, show only a slight advantage, which is not even gained from the material, but from the shorter transport distance between the crushing facility and the concrete plant. In contrast to gravel pits, both are usually located relatively close to urban centers. This advantage accounts for only a few percentage points in the overall energy balance: the production process comprises eighty to ninety percent of the primary energy used for ready mixed concrete. Cement plants account for the world’s third largest source of annual CO2 emissions, just below power plants and vehicles.

The key to reducing the carbon footprint of our buildings thus does not lie in building component recycling, but by extending the life cycles of buildings, for example through the use of existing shells or parts of buildings rather than demolitions and new constructions. In order to achieve a general change in mindset, energy balances must consider a building’s entire life cycle. Here, too, Switzerland is a pioneer, where the energy efficiency rating takes into account the “gray energy” used for the manufacture of the building materials that are used and thus stored in the buildings themselves. A building in which preexisting elements are used has a significantly better energy balance than a new building. Buildings are too valuable to merely reduce them to piles of rubble and road gravel.
Muck Petzet: With your Klosterpark in St. Anna, there's an interesting thing about Manchot Leather. One part of the old monastery had to be demolished because it couldn't be converted for the new function. It was important to you, as you write, to not allow the entire ensemble to degrade into a new and an old part, which would thus obscure the new building's legibility. The courtyard façade in particular makes a strong reference to the existing building: window forms, dormers, tiled roof, and the color and articulation of the facade. The most striking elements, however, are the neo-Romanesque masses that were first introduced into the new building. You're recycling building elements from the previous one:

Andreas Hild: We have never spoken about recycling for a specific building project. MP: —and in this context we want to speak of material recycling, even when it's certainly more of an emotional recycling than one that is justified economically or ecologically. What do you expect from these reuse, from these spolia? Is it primarily about not having to do any design, or is it also about what and what is new? AH: Well, it's certainly more than that. By using spolia, we are seeking to establish a certain iconographic continuity between the old building that was lost and the new building. You take a piece from the whole, preserve it, and use it again; the hope is to be able, so to speak, to transfer some of the magic to the new. In that sense, maybe it's like a fetish. A connection is kept between the old and the new part, and there was a decisive decision against allowing any explicit difference in design to emerge. So we use the spolia for this, or at least: —or architectural fragments for that.

AH: It is a way of making demands for the demands of the dollar.

AH: Let's just say, it also helped us to get everything we wanted. The construction authorities were naturally against demolition, the city council, the local council, then the mayor, then they can only pay half as much because the city council will only pay the equivalent. We were limited to the monument from the monastery if they get less money, they would have to move out completely. Then the rest of the work would have to be funded by us.

As the architects, we suddenly had the role of finding a solution in a situation of being able to interfere in the table. The key to this was actually reassessing and reinterpreting spolia.

Florian Hollemayr: So was it just a design compromise for the project?

AH: It was a way to unite various interests. Like an equalization of potential, without which the project would never have been built. In German, the word “compromise” has a negative connotation. But with alterations, it’s part of the job to find compromises, to make spatial adjustments. “Political” in this case means that a solution is negotiated and the project is realized, then it can’t see the ethnic differences.

FH: Doesn’t the window arch morph into a purely decorative element? AH: No, it is one of the five-meter-high window arches that lead to substantial problems or situations. The arches are much more than a catalyst than ornamentation—if we hadn’t used them, we would have had to design an entirely different idea of such high structures. The reuse of what’s on-hand has this side effect.

MP: Since you reintroduced the existing elements as if they were prefabricated units, it’s possible to speak here of form recycling—or, more likely, material recycling.

AH: As a classically trained architect, the alarm bells immediately go off when the concept of form is raised. We’re not interested in the reuse of the form itself. It merely serves as an instrument for us, in order to convey an atmosphere or a meaning. But in the way we employ these arches, we avert an affinity of the new and an old part, which would thus obscure the new building’s legibility. The courtyard façade in particular makes a strong reference to the existing building: window forms, dormers, tiled roof, and the color and articulation of the facade. The most striking elements, however, are the neo-Romanesque masses that were first introduced into the new building. You’re recycling building elements from the previous one:

The reuse of what’s on-hand has led to more, on many levels.

MP: Is it a way of making amends for the previous one?

FH: It was a way to unite various interests. Like an equalization of potential, without which the project would never have been built. In German, the word “compromise” has a negative connotation. But with alterations, it’s part of the job to find compromises, to make spatial adjustments. “Political” in this case means that a solution is negotiated and the project is realized, then it can’t see the ethnic differences.

FH: Doesn’t the window arch morph into a purely decorative element? AH: No, it is one of the five-meter-high window arches that lead to substantial problems or situations. The arches are much more than a catalyst than ornamentation—if we hadn’t used them, we would have had to design an entirely different idea of such high structures. The reuse of what’s on-hand has this side effect.

MP: Since you reintroduced the existing elements as if they were prefabricated units, it’s possible to speak here of form recycling—or, more likely, material recycling.

AH: As a classically trained architect, the alarm bells immediately go off when the concept of form is raised. We’re not interested in the reuse of the form itself. It merely serves as an instrument for us, in order to convey an atmosphere or a meaning. But in the way we employ these arches, we avert an affinity of the new and an old part, which would thus obscure the new building’s legibility. The courtyard façade in particular makes a strong reference to the existing building: window forms, dormers, tiled roof, and the color and articulation of the facade. The most striking elements, however, are the neo-Romanesque masses that were first introduced into the new building. You’re recycling building elements from the previous one:
Florian Helmeeyer: Your project with the cabin in the Fichtelgebirge came about almost accidentally. You noticed that a small mountain shelter was being put up for sale on the edge of Tellerhäuser (a small village in Sachsen). What were your impressions as you saw the building for the very first time?

Martin Fröhlich: If we’re talking about a collection, it had already happened during childhood: we were often in the region on vacation. In 2004, we saw an advertisement for the sale of the cabin. The cabin was more of a garden shed. In the 1970s in the GDR, you could get one as a present. This one was used by a ski club as a warm-up room and storage shed. A silent servant to the German elites of competitive sports.

SF: You actually bought the shed, even though it was almost completely dilapidated. When you bought it, had you already checked into the possibility of erecting a new building in place of the old one, or did the possibility arise later?

Sven Fröhlich: As already said, we knew the place and the natural landscape. And we thought the history of the sports bungalow was interesting. The cabin was located on an area on the outskirts of the village, where new construction is prohibited—but it enjoyed grandfathering protection; demolition would have resulted in losing the status quo protection, so preservation of the building became a mandatory requirement. It was only a question of how.

Muck Petzet: How did you come up with the idea of using the old walls as “formwork”—as molds for casting the new concrete elements?

SF: We considered a thousand different possibilities. The idea of using the old wall as formwork is something we learned after a process of elimination. Then we started working on it and sketched out how to build it.

FH: Did architecture or art provide you with any models for your approach?

MP: In this case, it’s the theme of copies and the mask, which is an old part of our cultural language. In the classical era, death masks of the deceased were often made to help remember those dear to one’s heart. Their opposite was the dream of eternal life. But as everyone knows, originals don’t last forever. Or as we say the dream of eternal life has a dark side, since it changes our character. A good example of this is the story “Do You Exist, Mr. Jones?” by Stanislaw Lem.

SF: With regard to the bungalow, we decided to make castings because the cabin’s original parts could have only been retained with considerable cost and effort. And then they would not even have been authentic anymore...

FH: You use the cabin as a weekend and vacation house, inviting friends and acquaintances. What reactions do you get?

MP: The aesthetic’s play a secondary role. The use and the reduced convenience are what people usually focus on. We arrive as a group and allocate the work—such as chopping wood, heating, cooking. By the time it gradually starts getting warm and the food and drink are on the table, everyone has had the small luxury of contributing to the warmth and the food. The cabin provides a reason for having to become fully involved in this reduction: prescribed templates for new things, or simply sparring partners for design juggling.

SF: The observation of everyday life is a skill that architects definitely should develop because it helps them to deal more carefully with what already exists—to become more engaged with it?

MP: Yes, absolutely. Training your perception—following trails—is extremely important. Our profession is supported by such an enormous amount of superficial knowledge from so many disciplines that our powers of observation are virtually a fundamental component. When we teach, we place great value on it.
We were interested in a convergence of old and new parts, an overall version that challenges and breaks with traditional viewing habits, and then you find, far from the main entrance, in a kind of maintenance court, in a very quiet place—not at all visible from the street. How can you expect to justify applying so much devotion to detail in such an invisible way?

Roger Diener: That didn’t influence us. It’s also not true that the photo shows everything completely from the public—p—people, for example, are not in the frame. This was not to design a striking public façade but to complete the wing, which had been destroyed in World War II, as part of the overall ensemble—without covering up or regaling the traces of history or the sophisticated form. We were interested in a convergence of old and new parts, an overall version that challenges and breaks with traditional viewing habits here, parts you would expect to see in wood or glass are cast in concrete, producing an almost surrealistic effect. And there are no references to the inside form. Old and new can surprisingly and naturally stand side by side, and suddenly it’s no longer certain if the colorful part is what’s old, because the achromatic part looks almost like an even older layer. The photo of your fascinating, old-new façade of new architecture that does not divide but unites. The convincing version that is almost subtle. There’s no emphasis on the joint. That’s how Helmut Federle and I designed the relief makes reference to the missing neighboring building. That’s why we proceed with the awareness of the ensemble as a whole. We were interested in a convergence of old and new parts, an overall version that challenges and breaks with traditional viewing habits here, parts you would expect to see in wood or glass are cast in concrete, producing an almost surrealistic effect. And there are no references to the inside form. Old and new can surprisingly and naturally stand side by side, and suddenly it’s no longer certain if the colorful part is what’s old, because the achromatic part looks almost like an even older layer. The photo of your fascinating, old-new façade of new architecture that does not divide but unites. The convincing version that is almost subtle. There’s no emphasis on the joint. That’s how Helmut Federle and I designed the relief makes reference to the missing neighboring building. That’s why we proceed with the awareness of the ensemble as a whole.

MP: Why this distancing effect?

RD: With the construction of the Swiss Embassy in Berlin, history was already accomplished a similar distancing. As with the east wing, the relief in the pale color gathers the accents of all kinds of colors and white photo. Like preserving a memory of something that used to be there, even if you no longer know exactly what it was. An artistic strategy?

RD: Yes, I think that’s the case. But you can’t always say absolutely sure what makes you do things.

MP: At the embassy, however, there’s much stronger separation from the existing building. Here, there’s nothing to bases of history. It isn’t even a constructive part of the building. It’s completely separate. As if we were leaning on the embassy building.

MP: We’ve discussed that both projects are actually a kind of recycling. Not in a technical sense, because indeed no materials are recycled. But certain images and certain motifs are reused—a kind of recycling, if you will.

RD: It’s not about the form in the narrow sense; it’s more about the idea of deposits, of layers. You would have to speak more of gestalt than form: we wanted the history of the ensemble as a whole to be impressed in the new parts. In a very precise reconstruction, there’s always the frustrating experience that the age value is lost. At the natural history museum, I have the feeling that we succeeded in expressing the time in another, compressed form. Old and new can surprisingly and naturally stand side by side, and suddenly it’s no longer certain if the colorful part is what’s old, because the achromatic part looks almost like an even older layer. In the reconstruction of the Alto Pinacothek in Munich right after World War II, Hans Dilgath had already achieved a similar abstract effect with his newly added parts. In their simplification, something emerges that seems like a raw version of the building’s historical elements. There’s no competition between old and new, even though there are two clearly distinguishable layers of time. But they can’t be arranged in a clear order. The conceiving and suggestive power of the building comes about because Dilgath places the new parts like archetype next to the old parts. Where do you see the difference to the Venice Charter?

RD: I believe the Venice Charter has been greatly misunderstood, especially by architects. It’s nearly just half a sentence in the Charter saying that what’s newly added should be configured in such a way that it’s recognizable as new vis-à-vis the existing condition. But it wasn’t the original text in the Charter, then the rest of the paragraph before that half sentence actually says that, as a basic principle, the new may not diminish the effect of the existing. The sentence about distinction doesn’t come until after that. Unfortunately, most people know only this last part but not what is written before that. This has triggered devastating developments, because architects have interpreted it as a license granting them unlimited permission to establish contrasts with respect to what exists.

MP: Just like Karl Josef Schattner and Carlo Scarpa later demanded.

RD: Schattner and Scarpa have decisively influenced this development. My problem with this attitude is that it’s simply not a continued development of the existing condition, but more of a final accounting, it’s a quasi-ahistorical attitude, because they’re looking for a final state. Here the old, the new. How can you build on that? How can you perpetuate that? I think the main difference to our approach is that we proceed with the awareness that, as architects, we work on a project at a certain point in time which won’t be the last, there have been others here before us, and there will be others who will follow us. We’re responsible for ensuring that others can build upon our work, if necessary. But as an architect, you still leave behind visible traces. Of course our work doesn’t come without its traces. These traces may even be very personal aspects pertaining to one’s own interests as the architect responsible. But they must be integrated completely into the basic conditions. By this, we mean first and foremost the social and spatial demand of architecture, making space available in a decisively qualified form. Secondly, the local context, in other words the existing condition. My notion of the city is an experience of the concurrence of older and newer parts. It presents itself with a limitless collection of means to fashion the distance or proximity between old and new. As architects we’ve never had any temptation. We’ve never worried about what our contribution can assert itself when viewed in isolation. Even with freestanding buildings, we expect them to develop a relationship with their surroundings, integrate themselves, and enhance the effect of what already exists rather than reduce it.
ARCH+ features 14: Reduce/Reuse/Recycle
Muck Petzet, Konstantin Grcic, Erica Overmeer, and Florian Heilmeyer in Conversation with Nikolaus Kuhnert and Anh-Linh Ngo
The basic assertion is that the less energy I use to produce the goods and services I require, the more easily and economically I can meet these needs. In this context it's interesting that you make reference to recycling. By transforming what was traditionally considered waste into something valuable, something that was once considered garbage as a valuable resource. The environmental movement's slogan "Reduce/Reuse/Recycle" conceals a fundamental, almost a matter of a reversal of proof. Put another way, what once was considered waste is now considered a valuable resource. This transformation of the architectural discourse begins on the eve of the marginalization of the architectural community. A strategy of the As Found was developed as early as the 1950s by the Smithsons. With that project, the work of Lacaton & Vassal is a good means to examine this. They have developed a concept that is based on the existing. Just as the new thinking in waste management is not only a matter of a reversal of proof, but it is also an interesting approach, architecturally and/or politically, to arrive at new insights and forms. While the new thinking in waste management is not only a matter of a reversal of proof, but it can also lead to legal changes in the broader notion of stored energy— even the issues of typology, or urban morphology, but with regard to the existing fabric of the city.

ARCH+: We also see that as being the decisive aspect. That corresponds to a pragmatic. They start with the qualities of the built environment, which is obviously also now reflected in what factors play a role in a project, and what is meant by "changes"—even the bull substance and only add what's there. Erica has just mentioned the two most striking examples of your concept. An example of Atelier Bow-Wow provides a good means to examine this. They have developed a concept that is based on the existing. Just as the new thinking in waste management is not only a matter of a reversal of proof, but it can also lead to legal changes in the broader notion of stored energy—even the issues of typology, or urban morphology, but with regard to the existing fabric of the city.

MP: For me, the term "as found" is contradictory to the classic approach which is based on a series of issues of terminology, especially with such terms as "as found" [contemporary] and building [contemporary]. The architect, who is mentioned as "as found," but, if you're not only interested in finding something, but also to make something new out of it. For that reason, I think we should take a step back and ask, in what way the engagement with the existing, with the goal of making something new out of it, obviously not become to be in that way a new thing. A new building, that is, that is new from the very beginning yields density and deeper layers, a friction that can be overcome.

ARCH+: Then the difference to the alternative is that the architect partner in the As Found approach is not in the method, but rather in the relation to modernity, because even the As Found principle aims to change our perception in order to arrive at a new perception of the existing fabric. We can imagine that the Architectural Group, who worked in Bethnal Green in London's East End around 1950, was interested in the communities of the Tourn Bois-le-Prêtre. That is to say, the reversal of the view that you just express, but with a lot more freedom. Y ou no longer have to tediously derive your intervention. As you can see, what's there. Erica has just mentioned the two most striking examples of your concept. An example of Atelier Bow-Wow provides a good means to examine this. They have developed a concept that is based on the existing. Just as the new thinking in waste management is not only a matter of a reversal of proof, but it can also lead to legal changes in the broader notion of stored energy—even the issues of typology, or urban morphology, but with regard to the existing fabric of the city.

ARCH+: A strategy of the As Found was developed as early as the 1950s by the Smithsons. They sought to view the existing— the found—in terms of the past, and to introduce as a source of inspiration for the further development of architectural practice in the context of the existing fabric of the T our Bois-le-Prêtre. This residential tower was a discussion between form and function. The social layer also relates to the tradition of so-called street furniture. And in the new thinking in waste management, it is also about dealing with what exists, and not just demolishing it. It is a reusable or new one. In these cases, it's about dealing with what exists, and not just demolishing it. It is a reusable or new one. In these cases, it's not the intention to say that as much as possible must be recycled. It is the idea that there must be a clear and clearly identified and remedied. In the exhibition concept, another aspect of recycling is the idea that there is to be a clear and clearly identified remedied. In the exhibition concept, another aspect of recycling is the idea that there is a need to reflexively think of building something— even the bull substance and only add what's there. Erica has just mentioned the two most striking examples of your concept. An example of Atelier Bow-Wow provides a good means to examine this. They have developed a concept that is based on the existing. Just as the new thinking in waste management is not only a matter of a reversal of proof, but it can also lead to legal changes in the broader notion of stored energy—even the issues of typology, or urban morphology, but with regard to the existing fabric of the city.
Questions of ordinary usage and the observation of everyday life play an important role.

It. Reconstruction in the spirit of retro architecture points the way here. When the building is transformed and used for other purposes, it is as if you see something new than I saw nothing wrong in the notions of nostalgia. As a basis for our projects in the Naturkundemuseum [Museum of Natural History] in Berlin and the Glaserbau, we are not interested in historical presentation, but rather in an artistically creative and engaging experience of natural history. In this sense, the exhibition will also manage without lengthy captions. The project labels are sprayed directly on them in this form they are in turn the carrier of museum-like proportions.

ARCH+: Are you using the exhibition to establish new, individualized solutions, materials, and specific strategies.

KG: That’s only one detail, but it demonstrates very well the translation of the idea that I want to use in this new way of working. I have the feeling that our exhibition has in your view?

MF: I can only say that the exhibition in its own content carrier. It is intended to bring the attention of visitors to the project, to keep them in this sense its own content carrier. It is intended to bring the attention of visitors to the project, to keep them in the pavilion, draw them into the theme, and establish vantage points for the various projects. The life-size format of the images that surround us every day. The large photos serve to engage the visitor.

MP: We deal with the pavilion and its own content carrier. It is intended to bring the attention of visitors to the project, to keep them in the pavilion, draw them into the theme, and establish vantage points for the various projects.

MP: That’s only one detail, but it demonstrates very well the translation of the idea that I want to use in this new way of working.

MF: The architecture almost writing to bear. The German pavilion is the largest single work of architecture and is considered an act of historical preservation.

MP: If you look at the nature of our projects, you will see that we use the gangways as furniture for the pavilion, and not as an additional support. The gangways serve the important role of counteracting the tendency toward artification of the exhibition and the large photos serve to engage the visitor.

MP: It’s a noble temple to art, where profane observation of entire historic centers. Here we must not at all want to apply to a newly manufactured product. KG: That is only one detail, but it demonstrates very well the translation of the idea that I want to use in this new way of working.

MP: That’s only one detail, but it demonstrates very well the translation of the idea that I want to use in this new way of working.

MF: The question is what is meant by nostalgia. Is it a word that one can use to describe a particular historical period or era? How can it be defined? This pertains to the present exhibition. The idea is not to apply to a newly manufactured product. KG: That is only one detail, but it demonstrates very well the translation of the idea that I want to use in this new way of working. The appearance of a wine-bottle crate and even a simple cardboard box are examples. They are not displayed on panels, but wallpapered directly onto the walls of the pavilion. This way they lose their objectness. The picture is not an exhibition, it is a view of the exhibition—of the architectural project. The photographer’s perspective determines the view from which exhibition visitors experience the project. The life-size format of the images drawn from the viewer directly into the pictorial space of the photos.

EO: My pictures are intended to give the visitors the feeling of looking into aerial space, and not of standing in front of a picture. The reaction at the press conference was interesting. One journalist asked, obviously horrified, ‘What is that ugly image of Germany you’re depicting with this exhibition?’ That effectively illustrates a certain perception of our approach that doesn’t concern all. Because I don’t show how ugly Germany is; I am trying to open up new ways of looking at this disowned image. These views are certainly perceived very differently; it is not surprising that so many people might not really want to see it all. But from my side there is no argument for excluding even for a second—in as much as there is something ugly, strange, weird, or trivial to do with that is not tolerated, it is just not tolerated. The question is whether there is a strong congruence to Šik is that he has discerned a strong congruence to Šik is that he has the appearance of a wine-bottle crate and even a simple cardboard box are examples. They are not displayed on panels, but wallpapered directly onto the walls of the pavilion. This way they lose their objectness. The picture is not an exhibition, it is a view of the exhibition—of the architectural project. The photographer’s perspective determines the view from which exhibition visitors experience the project. The life-size format of the images drawn from the viewer directly into the pictorial space of the photos.

EO: My pictures are intended to give the visitors the feeling of looking into aerial space, and not of standing in front of a picture. The reaction at the press conference was interesting. One journalist asked, obviously horrified, ‘What is that ugly image of Germany you’re depicting with this exhibition?’ That effectively illustrates a certain perception of our approach that doesn’t concern all. Because I don’t show how ugly Germany is; I am trying to open up new ways of looking at this disowned image. These views are certainly perceived very differently; it is not surprising that so many people might not really want to see it all. But from my side there is no argument for excluding even for a second—in as much as there is something ugly, strange, weird, or trivial to do with that is not tolerated, it is just not tolerated. The question is whether there is a strong congruence to Šik is that he has discerned a strong congruence to Šik is that he has the appearance of a wine-bottle crate and even a simple cardboard box are examples. They are not displayed on panels, but wallpapered directly onto the walls of the pavilion. This way they lose their objectness. The picture is not an exhibition, it is a view of the exhibition—of the architectural project. The photographer’s perspective determines the view from which exhibition visitors experience the project. The life-size format of the images drawn from the viewer directly into the pictorial space of the photos.

EO: My pictures are intended to give the visitors the feeling of looking into aerial space, and not of standing in front of a picture. The reaction at the press conference was interesting. One journalist asked, obviously horrified, ‘What is that ugly image of Germany you’re depicting with this exhibition?’ That effectively illustrates a certain perception of our approach that doesn’t concern all. Because I don’t show how ugly Germany is; I am trying to open up new ways of looking at this disowned image. These views are certainly perceived very differently; it is not surprising that so many people might not really want to see it all. But from my side there is no argument for excluding even for a second—in as much as there is something ugly, strange, weird, or trivial to do with that is not tolerated, it is just not tolerated. The question is whether there is a strong congruence to Šik is that he has discerned a strong congruence to Šik is that he has the appearance of a wine-bottle crate and even a simple cardboard box are examples. They are not displayed on panels, but wallpapered directly onto the walls of the pavilion. This way they lose their objectness. The picture is not an exhibition, it is a view of the exhibition—of the architectural project. The photographer’s perspective determines the view from which exhibition visitors experience the project. The life-size format of the images drawn from the viewer directly into the pictorial space of the photos.

EO: My pictures are intended to give the visitors the feeling of looking into aerial space, and not of standing in front of a picture. The reaction at the press conference was interesting. One journalist asked, obviously horrified, ‘What is that ugly image of Germany you’re depicting with this exhibition?’ That effectively illustrates a certain perception of our approach that doesn’t concern all. Because I don’t show how ugly Germany is; I am trying to open up new ways of looking at this disowned image. These views are certainly perceived very differently; it is not surprising that so many people might not really want to see it all. But from my side there is no argument for excluding even for a second—in as much as there is something ugly, strange, weird, or trivial to do with that is not tolerated, it is just not tolerated. The question is whether there is a strong congruence to Šik is that he has discerned a strong congruence to Šik is that he has the appearance of a wine-bottle crate and even a simple cardboard box are examples. They are not displayed on panels, but wallpapered directly onto the walls of the pavilion. This way they lose their objectness. The picture is not an exhibition, it is a view of the exhibition—of the architectural project. The photographer’s perspective determines the view from which exhibition visitors experience the project. The life-size format of the images drawn from the viewer directly into the pictorial space of the photos.
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EO: My pictures are intended to give the visitors the feeling of looking into aerial space, and not of standing in front of a picture. The reaction at the press conference was interesting. One journalist asked, obviously horrified, ‘What is that ugly image of Germany you’re depicting with this exhibition?’ That effectively illustrates a certain perception of our approach that doesn’t concern all. Because I don’t show how ugly Germany is; I am trying to open up new ways of looking at this disowned image. These views are certainly perceived very differently; it is not surprising that so many people might not really want to see it all. But from my side there is no argument for excluding even for a second—in as much as there is something ugly, strange, weird, or trivial to do with that is not tolerated, it is just not tolerated. The question is whether there is a strong congruence to Šik is that he has discerned a strong congruence to Šik is that he has the appearance of a wine-bottle crate and even a simple cardboard box are examples. They are not displayed on panels, but wallpapered directly onto the walls of the pavilion. This way they lose their objectness. The picture is not an exhibition, it is a view of the exhibition—of the architectural project. The photographer’s perspective determines the view from which exhibition visitors experience the project. The life-size format of the images drawn from the viewer directly into the pictorial space of the photos.
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The graphic design for the 2012 German contribution pays homage to the Venetian graphic designer Giulio Cittato (1936–1986) whose work for the public transport company Acnil (now Actv) in the 1970s added a radical touch of modernism to Venice. More than thirty-five years later, repeatedly altered and updated over time, his original design may soon disappear completely.
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