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1. Introduction

Auszeichnung für gute Bauten der Stadt Zürich is an architectural prize first established by the Zurich municipal authority together with local architects in 1945. The City of Zurich is positively focused on its own urban development and this prize has afforded an excellent opportunity to address local urban character and policies. The intent of this paper is to extract features of the jury organization and classify building type and other characteristics of award-winning works. It will be part of a broader study clarifying the idea and the methods of architectural evaluation by the Zurich Municipal Authority since World War II.

As far as the authors know, there has been no precedent for such architectural evaluation pursued for more than sixty years under the strong control of a single local government anywhere in the world. From an urban design standpoint two comparable longtime architectural assessment procedures are the Civic Trust Awards and the activities of CABE (Commission for Architecture and Built Environment) in the United Kingdom. The Civic Trust Awards were established in 1959 as one of the first built environment awards schemes anywhere in Europe by a non-profit organization. CABE, on the other hand, was established in 1999 by as successor to the RFAC (Royal Fine Art Commission, founded in 1924). It is the government’s advisor on architecture, urban design and public space, and seeks to create consensus and inspire partnership among both public and private entities. CABE provides free information and non-binding design reviews to local authorities and the public. Both these organizations play an important role—but at a national level.

In the authors’ opinion, therefore, the architectural prize conferred by the City of Zurich offers a unique and unparalleled case to be studied in detail alongside overall urban development since World War II. In order to clarify the idea and methods of architectural evaluation, the prize should be examined from such aspects as jury organization, objects and assessment standards, means of decision-making, promotion methods and so on. As an initial step toward a study of the architectural policies of the City of Zurich, this paper aims to investigate the background of the prize’s founding (chapter 2) to establish data related to jury organization (chapter 3), building type, and other characteristics of award-winning works, as well as the expanding publicity surrounding the award scheme (chapter 4). and, by
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way of conclusion, to illustrate the general features of the prize by classifying it's history into periods (chapter 5). Certain articles and essays have been published from time to time about this competition, such as Auszeichnungen für gute Bauten in der Stadt Zürich 1945-1980 and 50 Jahre Auszeichnungen für Gute Bauten in der Stadt Zürich. Although certain essays in these two publications deal with the relationship between the path of urban development in Zurich and certain award-winning works regarded as typical, no one, to the authors' knowledge, has undertaken a comprehensive piece of academic research or attempted to offer an analysis reviewing the entire sixty years of its history. Reference materials include pertinent publications (monographic or serial, including local newspapers), records held in the city archive (such as the minutes of Zurich City Council’s meetings, and the list of city employees'), interviews with city authorities, and our own recent field surveys for all of the 182 award-winning buildings.

2. Foundation of the Prize

According to Daniel Kurz, by the end of the nineteenth century Zurich had become a cosmopolitan city. In the last decade of that century an Opera House, a Hall of Music, and other major cultural facilities were erected in the city center, while the city's population had increased by an increment of between 5,000 to 10,000 each year. As successor to an urban planning method consisting until about 1900 of dense urban blocks, in the twentieth century the city area began to expand and develop in accordance with the new Garden City concept. After certain schemes for land use and other development devised by Hermann Herter (1877-1945), who served as Municipal Architect (Stadtbaumeister, and head of the Building Section [Hochbaumamt]) from 1919 to 1942, and again in the era during which Albert Heinrich Steiner (1905-1996) served as Municipal Architect from 1943 to 1957, the City of Zurich pushed forward with the development of its suburbs by way of a joint policy of land acquisition and subsidies. New Building and Zoning Regulations (Bau-und Zonenordnung, BZO) was also enacted in 1947. This is the same year, the juried competition for the Zurich architectural prize was held for the first time. The newly established architectural prize seems to have attempted to provide an opportunity to consider the meaning of architectural design in what was now a fully urbanized landscape.

According to the minutes of the Zurich City Council meeting on October 12, 1945, immediately after the Second World War, the various Zurich city authorities (its mayor [Stadtpräsident], its Finance Department [Finanzamt], Construction Departments I and II [Bauamt I, II] and Building Section [Hochbauamt, a division of Bauamt II, headed by Stadtbaumeister]) and the Zurich chapter of the Federation of Swiss Architects (Ortsguppe Zürich des Bund Schweizer Architekten, BSA) agreed to establish a new architectural prize for outstanding buildings in Zurich, the Auszeichnung für gute Bauten der Stadt Zürich. While Zurich was changing rapidly at this time, there was no system to evaluate architecture in the urban landscape, even though there were already several prizes for literature, music, painting, and sculpture. The City Council minutes lastly address basic questions pertaining to convictions about building (Baugesinnung) in general, with especial respect to urban landscape in Zurich (das Stadtbild Zürichs). Details of the prize agreement may be highlighted as follows:

1) A juried competition to be held every two years. 2) Prizes to be awarded to clients, not architects. 3) No monetary awards, but instead conferral of honorary certificates and memorial plaques. 4) Awards to be made to 10-12 commissioned buildings at each competition. 5) Jury comprising three representatives from the City of Zurich, one representative from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (E.T.H.), and three independent architects. The term of the jurors is four years (i.e. for two competitions). 6) Initial awards to be given in 1946. The minutes in 1945 also go on to set forth briefly the background and reasons for establishing such a prize. As for the competition, there have been some modifications over sixty-plus years with respect to the composition of the jury, however guidelines have remained largely similar to those established under the original 1945 agreement (i.e., in the minutes of October 12, 1945 still referred up to now)

A pair of remarkable points is that the prize gives special attention to urban landscape in Zurich, on the one hand, and that it is a prize for clients, on the other. For the foundation of its new prize the City of Zurich seemed strongly motivated: (1) to emphasize architecture suited to its urban development policy and (2) to enlighten the public rather than merely to assess architectural professionals. Although the Zurich chapter of BSA played an important role in founding the prize, no prescribed relation to the jury occurs in the minutes. Management of the prize seemed thus to have been entrusted to the city authorities from the beginning.

3. Jury Organization

This chapter focuses on the jury organization and investigates the features of all fifteen juries (Table 2). Zurich municipal authority representatives and independent architects/professors are dealt with separately.

3.1. Jurors Belonging to Zurich Municipal Authority

The first jury (in 1947 for the years 1945-1947) comprised seven jurors: the Mayor (Stadtpräsident) as a chair of jurors, a member of City Council (Stadtrat), who headed the Construction Department II (Bauamt II), Municipal Architect (Stadtbaumeister), a representative of E.T.H. and three independent architects. At the second jury (in 1950 for the years 1947-1950) the Mayor changed from Adolf Lüchinger to Emil Landolt, who continued to serve as a chair of the jurors until the sixth jury. For the third jury (in 1954 for the years 1950-1954) all
1980 BZO) was also enacted in 1947

11. Bauschule (the so-called "Art School") was created in 1926 by the Zurich Municipal Authority (Zentralbuchhaltung) and the Zurich chapter of the Federation of Architects (Bundesverbands Architekten).

2. Foundation of the Prize

- The juried competition for the Zurich architectural prize was held for the first time in 1947, as recorded in the minutes of the Zurich City Council meeting on October 12, 1945.
- The prize was established to commemorate the contributions of Swiss architects to the city's architectural development.

3. Jury Organization

- The jury comprised representatives from various stakeholders, including architects, planners, and city officials.
- The term of the jurors is four years, with two competitions held every two years.

4. Details of the prize agreement may be highlighted as follows:

1. A juried competition to be held every two years.
2. Prizes to be awarded to clients, not architects.
3. No monetary awards, but instead conferral of honorary certificates and memorial plaques.
4. Awards to be made to 10-12 commissioned buildings at each competition.
5. The minutes in 1945 also go on to set forth briefly the background and reasons for establishing such a prize. As for the competition, there was little information about the criteria for selecting the winners.

5. The first jury (in 1947 for the years 1945-1947) comprised seven jurors: the Mayor, the Vice Mayor, the Finance Department, three representatives of the City of Zurich, and three independent architects.

6. The City Council minutes lastly address basic questions pertaining to convictions about building (das Stadtbild Zürichs).

7. “Auszeichnung für gute Bauten der Stadt Zürich” (see Table 1). While Zurich was changing rapidly at this time, there was no system to evaluate architecture in the urban landscape, even though there were already several prizes for literature, music, painting, and sculpture. The City Council minutes also address basic questions pertaining to convictions about building (das Stadtbild Zürichs).

8. According to Daniel Kurz, by the end of the nineteenth century Zurich had become a cosmopolitan city. In the last decade of that century three major cultural facilities were erected in the city center, while the city’s population had increased by an increment of between 5,000 to 10,000 each year. As successor to an urban planning method consisting until about 1900 of an Opera House, a Hall of Music, and other major cultural facilities were erected in the city center, while the city’s population had increased by an increment of between 5,000 to 10,000 each year.

9. According to the minutes of the Zurich City Council meeting on October 12, 1945, the juried competition for the Zurich architectural prize was held for the first time in 1947, as recorded in the minutes of the Zurich City Council meeting on October 12, 1945. The newly established architectural prize seems to have attempted to provide an opportunity to consider the meaning of architectural design in what was now a fully urbanized landscape.

10. The jury comprised seven jurors: the Mayor, the Vice Mayor, the Finance Department, three representatives of the City of Zurich, and three independent architects.
jurers except the Mayor and Municipal Architect were replaced. Until the third jury Zurich's Municipal Architect was A. H. Steiner who, as already mentioned, promoted the development of new residential areas still guided by the notion of the Garden City. Then for the third jury Adolf Wasserfallen (1920−2000), who later served as Municipal Architect and activated the development of large scale residential areas by relaxing density restrictions and providing financial support\(^9\), became a supplementary juror (Adjunkt) for the first time. He participated in his later capacity as Municipal Architect from the fourth jury (in 1957 for the years 1954-1957) and continued to serve in this role until the eleventh jury in 1984. At the seventh jury (in 1968 for the years 1965-1968) the Mayor, and acting chair of the jurors, was changed from E. Landolt to Sigmund Widmer, who had already served the previous juries as a head of Construction Departments II from the third to the sixth jury. Also the seventh jury was the first occasion upon which a second-in-command of Construction Department II participated as a juror. Accordingly the number of representatives of the city became four among eight jurors. All four jurors from the City of Zurich at the seventh jury served until the tenth jury. For the eleventh jury (in 1985 for the years 1980-1984) the Mayor and the head of Construction Department II were replaced only once. The twelfth jury (in 1991 for the years 1985-1990) saw a major change. Ms. Ursula Koch (1941- ), a member of City Council, took over as a head of Construction Department II in 1986 and Hans-Rudolf Rüegg as Municipal Architect. The Mayor and the second-in-command of Construction Department II were excluded from the jury and the head of Construction Department II, U. Koch, assumed the position of chair of the jurors. For the first time three government officials in charge of Table 2 List of Jurors
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conservation of monuments, building permissions and legal matters, participated as advisers (Beratende Stimme). In this capacity they were able to express their opinions but had no voting right. In this way U. Koch and H.-R. Ruegg had greater influence exclusively in the twelfth and thirteenth juries than before. U. Koch declared Zurich to be already fully built ("Zürich ist gebaut") and thus expressed a new policy attaching greater importance to renovation of the city. In March 1997 the Building Department (Hochbaudepartement, formerly the Construction Department II [Bauamt II]) was reorganized. The old Municipal Architect System was abolished and at the same time a new section in charge of urbanism, Bureau for Architecture in an Urban Context (Amt für Siedlungsplanung und Städtebau, now known, since 1999, as Amt für Städtebau) was established. It should be noted that, while the former Municipal Architect had taken responsibility for both the policy to promote public construction commissions and the assessment of architecture in an urban landscape, those duties were henceforth separated: the aforementioned Bureau for Architecture in an Urban Context was founded in order to assume the latter role. As a consequence of this full-scale reorganization in the Building Department, changes in the fourteenth jury (in 2001 for the years 1995-2001) were dramatic. While all the jurors were replaced and the Mayor became a juror again, the head of the Building Department still served as chair of the jurors. The systematic participation of the director and advisers of the Bureau for Architecture in an Urban Context (Amt für Städtebau) served to strengthen the urbanistic emphasis. Moreover, at the fifteenth jury a professional adviser of the Bureau for Architecture in an Urban Context served as an additional juror. In the most recent fifteenth jury (in 2005 for the years 2002-2005) the city jurors and advisers remained practically unchanged, while all architect members were replaced. Clearly, the Bureau for Architecture in an Urban Context appears to have assumed a major and systematic role in this architectural prize.

3.2. A Representative of E.T.H. and Independent Architect Jurors

Although the jurors belonging to Zurich municipal authority have not changed so frequently, a representative of E.T.H. and independent architect jurors changed in each two juries in most cases. For the first jury Hans Hofmann (1897-1957) from E.T.H., Werner Max Moser (1896-1970) and several other architects from Zurich served as jurors. After the first jury W. M. Moser expressed concerns to the head of the Construction Department II in 1949. He criticized the selected housing units as not displaying "architecturally fruitful achievement" and suggested that architectural criteria should be clearly demonstrated by the City of Zurich. He also advised that selection be made by anonymous jurors invited from outside Zurich. From the third jury architects were invited not from Zurich any more but from other Swiss cities, namely Luzern, Basel, Bern, and Geneva among others. Thereafter, the Zurich chapter of BSA withdrew from the program. Overall, architects were replaced in every two (or at least in each third competition) until the twelfth jury. For the twelfth jury a non-Swiss professional (and a professor), Karl Josef Schattner from Germany, was invited as a jury member for the first time. After the thirteenth jury independent architect/professor jurors included non-Swiss architects were replaced in every successive period. For instance, we find the names of such architects as a German architect/professor Hans Kollhof from E.T.H. and Peter Zumthor from Chur, Switzerland, serving on the thirteenth jury and Wiel Aretz from Maastricht in the Netherlands on the fourteenth jury.

In short, these different procedures for jury organization correspond to four major periods for the prize. The first period was the dawn of the prize guided by Municipal Architect A. H. Steiner and the architects belonging to the Zurich chapter of BSA (the first and second juries). The second period was the era in which Municipal Architect A. Wassefallen and the city authorities took the initiative of inviting architects from outside Zurich as jurors (from the third to the eleventh juries). The third period evolved under the auspices of U. Koch, a member of City Council, who raised the banner of city renovation (the twelfth and thirteenth juries). The city also started appointing international architects as jurors at this time. In the fourth period, after the reorganization of the city government in 1997, the city itself took a stronger systematic role in the administration of the competition (the fourteenth and fifteenth juries).

4. Building Type and Other Characteristics of Award-Winning Works and Expanding Publicity Surrounding the Prize

The aim of this chapter is to describe the general features of award-winning works under each jury and to search for turning points that focus on building type and other characteristics of award-winning works, as well as to explore the role of expanding publicity. Table 3 shows a composite classification of the 182 awards by building type and other relevant data. Housing, on account of its importance, has been separated from all other building types.

4.1. Award-Winning Housing

The first jury (1945-1947): Housing obtained 67% of the awards. Clients for housing included both collective housing societies (Genossenschaften) and private estate developers. These were for the most part large- or mid-scale developments of two- or three-stories collective units with traditional gabled roofs (Fig. 1) in suburban settings. The second and third juries (1947-1954): Housing obtained 100% in the second jury and 53% in the third. In the second jury the characteristics of awarded-winning housing are similar to the results of the previous jury, but in the third jury single volume buildings of four- to six-stories appeared in the periphery of the city center. The ratio of low-rise collective units decreased. From the fourth to the sixth juries (1954-1965): For the fourth jury only one housing award was made, then the ratio of housing remained under 27% until the ninth jury. By the time of the sixth jury the traditional gabled roof
had disappeared from amongst award winners; instead, building design shifted to the so-called modern box with four- to five-stories and its characteristic flat roof standing independently. From the seventh to the ninth juries (1965-1976): Though in the previous juries the City of Zurich had received no housing awards whatsoever, the eighth and ninth jury saw fit to premiate municipal housing schemes. Moreover, the resumed housing awards now shifted from small- or mid-size buildings to large-scale, predominately high-rise buildings in the suburbs. The tenth and eleventh juries (1976-84): The tenth and eleventh juries show major change. The ratio of housing increased and all housing awards went to private clients with no municipal housing premiated. This housing was now somewhat smaller in scale, in contrast to the high-rise work of the previous juries. Most was built in a suburban context. The twelfth and thirteenth juries (1985-1994): For the twelfth jury four out of five premiated housing units were renovations or extensions of existing buildings. At the twelfth jury the character of clients, number of floors, and volumetric composition were each similar to the previous jury, but the thirteenth jury presented only a single award for housing. The fourteenth and fifteenth juries (1995-2006): The fourteenth jury once more restored the ratio of housing awards to 36%, whilst the fifteenth jury raised it further to 47%. All were commissioned by private clients and distributed in the various sorts of urban context, such as a part of an urban block dating to the nineteenth century near the city center, others located in the outskirts of the main part of the city, in former industrial areas in the periphery and so forth.

### 4-2. Other Award-Winning Works

The first jury (1945-1947): Three awards were conferred upon office buildings each occupying one part of an entire block within the city center. The second and third juries (1947-1954): Although no prize was presented except for housing by the second jury, four offices within the city center, three churches, and a welfare facility were premiated for the first time at the third jury. Those winners were all private clients. From the fourth to the sixth juries (1954-1965): The fourth and fifth juries made awards to new types of public buildings: schools, detached houses, amusement centers, sports facilities, hospital, a commercial facility, a tram station, an industrial facility and a multiuse complex with housing. Awards continued to be given to office buildings in the city center (3 or 4 instances per jury) and schools (2 to 4 instances per jury), detached houses (1 to 3 instances per jury) and churches (1 per jury) mainly located in the outskirts of areas developed in the previous period. For the first time the fourth jury presented five prizes to the City of Zurich for three schools, a tram station and a sports facility. The prizes were also awarded to the city itself or the Canton of Zurich (Kanton Zürich) as client, four works by the fifth and sixth juries. From the seventh to the ninth juries (1965-1976): The major award-winning building type changed on each occasion. Prizes were awarded to the city itself or the Canton of Zurich as client for three works by the seventh and eighth juries and for five by the ninth jury. The tenth and eleventh juries (1976-84): Various building types still received awards but only for one or two works in each type. The number of prizes given either to the City or to the Canton

### Table 3 Building type and other characteristics of Award-Winning Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Building type</th>
<th>Other characteristics</th>
<th>Publication by the City of Zurich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1947</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-1954</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-1965</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1976</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1984</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1994</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-2006</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 1 No.6 (premiated in 1947)*

*Fig. 2 No.182 (premiated in 2006)*
of Zurich was four, then decreased to one at the eleventh jury. The twelfth and thirteenth juries (1985-1994): Although the twelfth jury showed similar proportion of building types to the eleventh jury, at the thirteenth jury the ratio of prize-winning building types changed. Awards for office buildings climbed from one to four but only three building types were awarded. The fourteenth and fifteenth juries (1995-2006): Office buildings, commercial facilities, schools and public spaces were all judged from a different perspective. Although situated in the city center, in former industrial areas at its periphery, or in suburban areas, most of these were now area re-development schemes (Fig. 2). It should also be noted that prizes awarded to the City of Zurich included three for schools and public spaces by the fourteenth and four for schools and public spaces by the fifteenth jury.

4-3. Renovation and Extension Works

From the seventh to the ninth juries awards went to one renovation or extension scheme per jury. By the seventh jury a cafe in the historical city center was premiated for the first time, then an extension of a cafeteria for the university by the eighth jury and an extension of an art gallery by the ninth jury. For the tenth and eleventh juries no renovation or extension work was worthy of a prize, but the theme of renovation was again addressed by the eleventh jury. Renovation became a major theme for the twelfth jury, with seven out of eleven awards conferred for either renovation or extensions to existing buildings. For the thirteenth jury, and this may be understood in terms of an obvious holdover from the previous period, four out of seven awards were now for renovation or extension projects. Since the fourteenth jury renovation and extension schemes were not judged as a single building but instead as part of larger scale comprehensive re-development projects receiving awards.

4-4. Expanded Publicity for the Competition

In 1957 the winning buildings were introduced for the first time with illustrations on one full-size double spread in the famous Swiss magazine Bauen, Leben, Wohnen (No. 29, 1957). This coincided with the first time that A. Wasserfallen participated in the jury as Municipal Architect. From this time forward the Zurich prize seems to have been widely recognized by the profession. By contrast, the City of Zurich, as far as the present authors have been able to determine, only began internal publication of premiated works in 1981. On the occasion of the tenth jury (1980), held at the end of A. Wasserfallen's era, the Construction Department II published a small booklet, Auszeichnungen für gute Bauten in der Stadt Zürich 1945-1980, a short summary and introduction of the winning designs over the first thirty-five years of the competition. This experience was repeated in the following era under U. Koch. Under her direction the results of the twelfth jury (1990) were published with the title Auszeichnung für gute Bauten und Renovationen 1985-1990. In 1995 on the occasion of the thirteenth jury, 50 Jahre Auszeichnungen für gute Bauten in der Stadt Zürich appeared. This book presented all award-winning works with brief construction data, a distribution map, and extracts of the minutes of each jury as well as commentary by several critics. With the fourteenth jury the city started regular publication of competition results in both book and exhibition form for each occasion . The most recent exhibition was held from 24 March to 7 April 2006. It was promoted widely to the public and 2,500 visitors attended . That is to say, since the twelfth jury held in 1990, the City of Zurich has become more proactive in promoting knowledge about the competition and its results.

In conclusion to this chapter, several turning points may be noted in the history of the fifteen juries. At the third jury the number of awards increased: award-winning private (low-rise) housing was replaced in favor of middle-rise collective units: and some new types of building, such as church and welfare facility, received prizes. At the fourth jury the ratio of award-winning houses decreased dramatically, various types of public buildings started to get prizes, and results were introduced widely in professional magazines. At the seventh jury high-rise housing and renovation work came to the fore in the awards process. At the tenth jury award-winning housing again returned to middle-rise submissions, at a ratio beyond 30%, and publication of awards by the City of Zurich started. The ratio of public building to housing decreased and changed frequently until the thirteenth jury. The twelfth jury focused on renovation and extension works, while publication became more active. Since the fourteenth jury, when re-development schemes became a major issue, both private housing and public buildings have constantly received awards, and publication and exhibition have become ever more active.

5. Features of Jury Organization, Award-Winning Works, and Expanded Publicity for the Competition Classified by Period

Finally, a consideration of jury organization, the array of award-winning works, and expanded publicity suggests an overarching context in which to understand the evolution of the Zurich prize and its recipients. Features of jury organization, award winning works, and expanded publicity can be understood by classifying those fifteen juries into four major periods.

Period 1 (The First and Second Juries, 1945-1950: Garden City Type Low-rise Housing under A.H. Steiner and Other Zurich Architects): Municipal Architect A.H. Steiner, a representative of E.T.H., and independent BSA architects from Zurich presented awards mainly to low-rise private housing developments situated in the suburbs or to office buildings in the city center. Clearly, this seems in large part a consequence of the latter-day Garden City policy initiated by A.H. Steiner at that time. After the Mayor changed from A. Lüchinger to E. Landolt at the time of the second jury, prizes were presented uniquely to such private housing schemes. As the criteria and results were
not satisfactory for the architect jurors belong to Zurich chapter of BSA, they withdrew entirely from the program after the second jury. The City of Zurich took a strong initiative in launching this new system of evaluation and assessment.

Period 2 (From the Third to the Eleventh Juries, 1950-1984: High-rise Housing and Various Types of Buildings under A. Wasserfallen)

Period 2-1 (From the Third to the Sixth Juries, 1950-1965: Shift from Low-rise Traditional Housing to Middle-rise Modern Housing): The total number of award-winning works increased, possibly as a reflection of the renewal of jury organization in this new era. At the third jury, although A. H. Steiner still remained as Municipal Architect and there was some holdover influence from the previous period, on account of the participation of the succeeding Municipal Architect A. Wasserfallen and non-Zurich Swiss architects, award-winning housing shifted from collective units of low-rise traditional gabled roof to so-called modern box buildings with four-, five-, or six-story stories. Churches and a welfare facility were also premiated for the first time. At the time of the fourth Jury A. Wasserfallen became Zurich's Municipal Architect. Even though all other jurors had been retained, the award results dramatically changed. The ratio of housing awards decreased while various other types of buildings now received awards. Larger scale traditional housing developments with gabled roofs disappeared, while smaller scale developments composed of modern boxlike buildings were premiated. Meanwhile, detached houses, as well as offices, schools and churches continued to receive awards. Premiated works are now mainly in the outskirts of the areas developed in the previous period. Public buildings sponsored by the city now also regularly won prizes. This reflects the policy of A. Wasserfallen to activate the development of larger scale residential areas.

Period 2-2 (From the Seventh to the Eleventh Juries, 1965-1984: Predominance of Municipal Jurors, High-rise Housing and Its Decline after the Energy Crisis): A. Wasserfallen continued to serve as Municipal Architect, and an additional second-in-command of Construction Department II participated. While by now conventional modern buildings continued to appear in Zurich, other building types remained attractive and increasingly divers types also won awards. From the seventh to the ninth juries six housing awards went to larger scale high-rise buildings mainly associated with city-sponsored projects in suburb. One of the reasons seems to be retirement of the former Mayor E. Landolt, who had opposed high-rise housing. Renovation or extension work was premiated each time from the seventh to the ninth juries. By 1974 the Architectural History Archive (Baugeschichtliches Archiv) was co-opted under the direction of the Municipal Architect, moreover this was the time during which the movement to protect cultural properties (Europäischen Denkmalschutzjahr 1974, for instance) was growing in Europe. Although there was no major change of jurors for the tenth jury, there occurred an obvious change in the award-winning works. Both the number of premiated works and the variety of building types decreased, and no renovation or extension work was premiated, while the number of three- or four-stories private housing schemes increased noticeably. The energy crisis of 1974 may have caused this decline in enthusiasm for prize giving. In fact only about 230 works were nominated for the tenth jury, while about 800 works had been proposed in the previous jury. On the other hand it is worth noting that the City of Zurich published a booklet Auszeichnung für gute Bauten in der Stadt Zürich 1945-1980 to summarize its history, even under such a difficult situation in 1981. At the eleventh jury the Mayor and the head of the Construction Department were both replaced. Independent architect jurors were replaced more frequently hereafter. The ratio of housing awards increased, while other buildings types still won notice but none played any discernibly major role. Housing award winners were relatively small, private, freestanding residences. The city and the cantonal project winners decreased from four at the tenth jury to only one at the eleventh. Corresponding to these post-energy crisis changes the results of the tenth and eleventh juries failed to show distinctive features as before. In retrospect, these periods appear as a transition to the following stage.

Period 3 (The Twelfth and Thirteenth Juries, 1985-1994: Renovation and Extension in Dense Urban Environments under U. Koch): The twelfth jury, with the exception of one independent architect and one representative of E.T.H., comprised a completely new set of members. The Mayor was excluded and a new chair U. Koch, a head of Construction Department II, assumed a major role. A. Wasserfallen had been replaced by H-R. Rüegg and indeed all other members from the municipality were likewise replaced. Under the new dispensation a total of three advisers belonging to the city administration now participated. Both Swiss and non-Swiss architects and professors were invited to serve as jurors. U. Koch made renovation a major theme for the first time, thereby facilitating the possibility of awards for interiors and extensions. The thirteenth jury presented four out of its seven awards to renovation or extension entries. Moreover, predominant building-type ratios differ greatly from those of previous juries. One reason could be that nearly all the architects and/or professors from the previous jury had been replaced. Hereafter, architects and professors participated only for a single jury. Under the direction of U. Koch the City of Zurich tried to take an initiative in evaluation and assessment on the one hand, and to adopt a more professional and objective perspective with the appointment of active independent architects on the other. It should be noted, too, that the twelfth jury marks the moment at which the City of Zurich began to encourage and oversee publication of all prize-winning works.

Period 4 (The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Juries, 1995-2005: from the Moment of Systematic Assessment of New Urban Redevelopment by the Bureau for Architecture in an Urban Context): The external members of the fourteenth jury were once again all new appointees. Municipal jurors and advisers retained their positions in the fourteenth and the fifteenth competitions, all in supplementing their own
role by inviting internationally known architects from both outside and within Switzerland to serve as jurors for one single competition. The total number of award-winning works also increased. Privately sponsored housing once again shows up as the main emphasis, along with city-sponsored schools and public spaces in the city center, in former industrial areas at its periphery, and in suburban areas. The redevelopment of the city seems to be the new theme. Also in this period, publication and exhibitions grew both more sophisticated and more numerous. The city itself undertook a stronger role in administering the competition. The reorganization of the city government in 1997, especially the foundation of the Bureau for Architecture in an Urban Context (Amt für Städtebau) as an exclusive adviser and assessor from the viewpoint of urbanism, provided the opportunity to facilitate such changes.

In this way the features of all fifteen juries may be better understood by classifying their history into four major periods, with the second period subdivided into two intervals. Along with changes in period, the respective roles of the jurors from the Zurich municipal authority and those of independent architect/ professor jurors were successively readjusted. This evaluation system has been guided by the initiative of the city authorities— and the overall trend of urban development and in architecture. Within each period, however, building type and other characteristics of award-winning works reflect various shifts in viewpoint on the part of jurors, including independent architects and professors.

6. Conclusion

In examining the history of the architecture prize Auszeichnung für gute Bauten der Stadt Zürich this paper has sought to throw light on jury organization, as well as building type and other characteristics of the award-winning works, such as publicity surrounding the awards. Details of the jury organization and the prize-winning buildings were dealt with in chapters 3 and 4, and then analyzed for trends in chapter 5. Our investigation has attempted to clarify what is known of the idea and methods of this architectural evaluation and assessment program that has continued for more than sixty years. While the original principle of the 1945 initiative has been respected, and retained as the basis of jury organization, as noted by a contemporary administrator of the Zurich Municipal office, the City of Zurich has nonetheless followed well-defined trends in the political and practical themes of each period. This history indeed reflects the ways in which the City of Zurich and its architects considered how best to assess new architecture, and how at the same time they tried to assume the initiative in creating better architecture and urban landscape at a municipal scale. Moreover, the authors have tried to show that the entire process from Period 1 to Period 4 displays a shift from conventional evaluations based on style to a broader, and more systematic, assessment procedure as organized by the City of Zurich today.
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和文要約

本研究は、スイス・チューリッヒ市主催の建築賞Auszeichnung für gute Bauten der Stadt Zürichをとりあげるものである。本賞は、市当局がよりよい都市景観と都市空間の形成を誘導するために、専業建築家と協力し優れた建築を評価してきたもので、1945年に創設、これまで60余年の間に計15回開催され、計182作品の施主が表彰された。市当局が、独自の建築賞をこれ程長く継続している例は稀である。本稿は、チューリッヒ市による戦後の建築デザイン評価の理念と手法を明らかにする一連の研究の端緒として位置づけられ、本賞の審査体制・受賞作品・広報の内容を分析することによって、これまで計15回の変遷を4期に分け特徴を明らかにした。