

## LAHTI VIISKULMA ART COMPETITION

### Judging committee

#### Minutes of the competition meetings

Date	7 September 2020, 1–4 pm; preceding working meetings held in person on 25 August, 2 September and 3 September
Place	remote meeting; in-person working meetings at BW-Tower and Malski
Present	Päivi Airas, Planning Architect, City of Lahti, Urban Planning, <i>chairperson</i> Elisa Lindell, Regional Art Museum Researcher, Lahti City Museum Paula Korte, Curator, Lahti City Museum Elina Ojala, Environmental Director, City of Lahti, Environmental Development, Tanja Keskitalo, Producer, Malski, Kinos Property Investment Oy Merja Puustinen, visual artist (appointed to the judging committee by the Artists' Association of Finland) Anni Laakso, sculptor (appointed to the judging committee by the Artists' Association of Finland) Anu Miettinen, Art Coordinator, City of Lahti, Urban Environment service area, <i>secretary</i>

1. The Chairperson opened the meeting at 1:00 pm.
2. The judging committee noted that a total of 60 proposals had been received for the competition.
3. The judging committee noted that the proposal *Ikuinen kevät* had not been submitted by the deadline stated in the competition rules.
4. The judging committee unanimously agreed to remove the proposal *Ikuinen kevät* from the competition due to its late arrival, as late submission is against the competition rules.
5. The judging committee noted that the proposal *Veleta* was marked as having been submitted twice, as the first submission lacked a pseudonym envelope. The two submissions were otherwise identical.
6. The judging committee was therefore left with a total of 58 proposals to judge.
7. The judging committee examined each proposal individually and divided the proposals into three categories.

A total of 28 proposals were placed in **Category C**. These proposals were either sketches or otherwise unsuitable for the purpose in question.

19 proposals were placed in **Category B**. These proposals were successful in many respects, but were sketches or did not strongly meet the criteria. Works whose feasibility was questionable in terms of practicality, functionality, safety or placement were also put into Category B.

All of the 11 proposals placed in **Category A** were considered both meritorious and feasible. The judging committee was delighted by the inventive ways in which the proposals sought to command Viiskulma as a space. The works in Category A met the competition's criteria in many respects, particularly in terms of providing both guidance and an artistic experience. The judging committee

wanted to include all of the feasible or particularly artistically distinguished works in Category A as an indication of the high standard of the competition.

Attached is a list of all the competition proposals by category in alphabetical order.

Table for Category B

<b>Category B</b>	
Aalto Sample	
History varieting itself	
Jalusta	
Johtolanka	
Jäljen jättäjä	
Jäljet	
Kaide (Mutkalla)	
Karyatidi	
Kohtaamme kuin laivat yössä	
LADrillo	
Liidokki	
Maan	
Mahla	
Malskin portti	
Notko	
Taidevahdit	
Terävin kynä	
Wind	
Voita leivälle	

Table for Category A

<b>Category A</b>	
Aurinko piirtää vuorten ääriiviivat	
HX3: DROP I IN	
Ketosysteemipalvelu	

Kultainen leikkaus	
<b>Kylän portti</b>	<b>First place</b>
<b>Löytöretki</b>	<b>Joint second place</b>
Nappi naulaan	
<b>Natura Pentagon</b>	<b>Honourable mention</b>
<b>Silmu</b>	<b>Joint second place</b>
Sävy, kirkkaus ja kylläisyys	
Yhteen kuulumisen kaipuu	

8. The judging committee unanimously decided on the order of the top three proposals.

The winning proposal was *Kylän portti*.

*Löytöretki* and *Silmu* (in alphabetical order) came in joint second place.

The judging committee also decided to give an honourable mention to *Natura Pentagon*.

The ranking and judging committee's comments for these four proposals are as follows:

#### **First prize: Kylän portti**

The judging committee unanimously agreed to award first prize to *Kylän portti*. In spite of this work's monumental size, its artistic content is both subtle and humanistic. This work makes us pause to consider our relationship with the built environment, and ask why we don't feel completely at home either in the city or in nature. The location and implementation of the work are likewise impressive. This work will give Viiskulma Square a completely new identity. It will also act as a dividing element between Vesijärvenkatu and Päijänteenkatu, and help to guide people towards the museum and Malski. *Kylän portti* was also praised for its nod to local culture, by alluding to the idiom of local artist Olavi Lanu.

The judging committee had an in-depth and critical discussion of the choice of concrete as a material. The judging committee recognises that the use of concrete presents a number of ecological challenges. However, the judging committee also wants to stress that environmental perspectives must be understood in a broad-ranging manner in this context, including an assessment of the sense of place created by the artwork, the space itself, the durability of the material, and the work's artistic quality. The judging committee concluded by recommending that the potential for using recycled or eco-concrete should be investigated.

#### **Joint second prize *Löytöretki* and *Silmu***

The judging committee unanimously decided to award a joint second prize to *Löytöretki* and *Silmu*.

*Löytöretki* was praised for its ambiguity: who is this young girl walking across such a fragile bridge? Is she walking towards an ecological crisis or a brave new future? The judging committee was also charmed by the work's formal elements and, in particular, the ornamental nature of the bridge. However, the judging committee would have liked the work to command the space more clearly.

*Silmu* spoke to the judging committee by virtue of its beautiful and minimal forms. The use of wood as a material also resonated with the judging committee due to its ecological nature. However, the judging committee had reservations about the structural feasibility of the work and would have liked to have seen some deeper artistic meaning alongside the attractive architectural forms.

No third prize was awarded.

### **Honourable mention *Natura Pentagon***

In addition to the prize-winning works, the judging committee also wanted to award an honourable mention to *Natura Pentagon*. In this piece, a gilded fence creates an enclosed forest clearing in Viiskulma – one that we can admire but cannot enter. In the judging committee's opinion, this work discusses the environmental crisis and our relationship with nature with merit and complexity: is our attempt to control nature right? And will we soon find ourselves in a situation in which we can only enjoy nature as a cultivated, laboriously maintained curiosity? Although this work was eventually deemed too challenging in terms of upkeep, the judging committee wanted to draw attention to its conceptual merit and ecological statement.

9. Unlike stated in the competition rules, the judging committee decided to divide the prize money as follows:
  - First place: 6,000.00€
  - Joint second place: 3,000.00€
  - Joint second place: 3,000.00€
  
10. The winners' pseudonym envelopes were opened in order, starting with the winner, and it was noted that the prizes were awarded as follows:
  - First place: Akseli Leinonen
  - Joint second place: Matti Vesanen
  - Joint second place: Atte Mattila
  - Honourable mention: Tuija Asta Järvenpää
  
11. The judging committee recommended that the first-placed artwork should be implemented. If the costs rise significantly (for example, with regard to the foundations), the artist must either simplify the work plan or bear the additional costs themselves. All changes to the work plan and cost estimate must be approved by the client before work begins.
  
12. It was noted that the proposals can be seen in an exhibition at Lahti-Piste, from 13 October to 29 November 2020. The exhibition opening and award ceremony will be held on 13 October 2020 at 6 pm. The exhibition will display the works in Category A, with other proposals being viewable in a folder. All of the proposals can also be seen on the competition website while the exhibition is running.
  
13. The meeting was closed at 4:00 pm.

Appendix: A list of the competition proposals and their classification

## VIISKULMA ART COMPETITION

Proposals received by category in alphabetical order

7 September 2020

A total of 58 approved proposals

Table of all proposals submitted

Pseudonym	Category
<b>Category A</b>	
Aurinko piirtää vuorten ääriiviivat	A
HX3: DROP I IN	A
Ketosysteemipalvelu	A
Kultainen leikkaus	A
<b>Kylän portti</b>	<b>First place</b>
<b>Löytöretki</b>	<b>Joint second place</b>
Nappi naulaan	A
<b>Natura Pentagon</b>	<b>Honourable mention</b>
<b>Silmu</b>	<b>Joint second place</b>
Sävy, kirkkaus ja kylläisyys	A
Yhteen kuulumisen kaipuu	A
<b>Category B</b>	
Aalto Sample	B
History varieting itself	B
Jalusta	B
Johtolanka	B
Jäljen jättäjä	B
Jäljet	B
Kaide (Mutkalla)	B
Karyatidi	B
Kohtaamme kuin laivat yössä	B
LADrillo	B
Liidokki	B
Maan	B
Mahla	B
Malskin portti	B
Notko	B
Taidevahdit	B
Terävin kynä	B
Wind	B
Voita leivälle	B
<b>Category C</b>	
Aistit	C

Gate of the Sun	C
Centaurea cyanus	C
Inspiraatio	C
Kaksi siikaa	C
Kertomataulut	C
Kulma	C
Lahden Sininen	C
Lasimaalaus	C
Lohkare	C
Marraskuun Valo	C
Museon aisti	C
Oculus	C
Omenapuu	C
Onni	C
Pohjantäti	C
Sateenkaariportti	C
Soiva lampi	C
Taidekontti	C
Taipuu	C
Tienviitat	C
Tärkeä piste, tärkeä ruksi	C
Welcome LAD	C
Veleta	C
Veleta	C
Viis kulmista	C
Viiskulma	C
Viiskulman koirat	C
Väinämöisen hauki	C
<b>DISQUALIFIED</b>	
Ikuinen kevät	O