

The *Model Styria*

was created by the Province of Styria in 1972. A building contract and financial support were linked to architectural competitions. This meant that young architects with less experience could also gain contracts. They carried out imaginative, brave projects. Later inhabitants could have a say in how their home should be designed. The policy hoped for ambitious architecture at a low cost. Whether this goal was achieved, is still being discussed today. In the 1990s, the *Model Styria* was abandoned.

For examples on this matter, you might take a look at:
Bernhard Hafner: *Rettenbachersiedlung*, 1986-1988
Günther Domenig: *Wohnanlage Neufeldweg*, 1984-1988
Manfred Wolff-Plottegg: *Wohnbebauung Heidenreichstraße, Seiersberg*, as early as 1987-1991

Does anyone else have something to say about this?

It is a high ideal for people to be able to decide for themselves how they would like to live. The idea that the future inhabitants of a house can have a say in the planning is still not a given: the more people are involved, the longer a project lasts and the greater the work for the architects.

For examples on this matter, you might take a look at:
Szyszkowitz + Kowalski: *Wohnanlage Alte Poststraße*, 1981-1984
Eilfried Huth: *Wohnmodell Gerlitzgründe, Wohnbau Graz-Puntigam*, 1976-1984
Eilfried Huth: *Eschensiedlung Deutschlandsberg*, 1972-1992

Times change

Nowadays we want different things from architecture than people wanted in the past. Old buildings are often renovated or added to. But does the new suit the old at all—and vice versa? How can the new be appropriately implemented without destroying the old? Many architects treat the building's features respectfully and allow them to be incorporated in the modern design.

For examples on this matter, you might take a look at:
Szyszkowitz + Kowalski: *Schloss Großlobming*, 1979-1981/1994-1996
Volker Giencke: *Abtei Seckau*, 1988-2000
Bernhard Hafner: *Montanuniversität Leoben, Laborhalle - Zubau*, 1989-1992

Universalmuseum
Joanneum

Graz Architecture

Rationalists, Aesthetes, Gut Instinct Architects, Democrats, Mediacrats

23.09.2017-28.01.2018
Space02



Quick tour

Open for everything?

We humans are constantly changing, so why should our architecture always remain the same? Could it not adapt to our needs and to its own surroundings? How can we design parts of a town or a residential area so that they are easily accessible and can be changed again when required? Many architects dream of architecture that can be endlessly extended. A fundamental 'framework' remains the same, but is always completed or expanded in a different way. In this way architecture can acquire new ways of working and change its meaning. It is then no longer rigid but can change over the course of time.

For examples on this matter, you might take a look at:
Bernhard Hafner: *Raumstadt / City in Space*, 1966
Bernhard Hafner: *Lineare Stadt / Linear City*, 1966
Bernhard Hafner: *Schichtenstadt / Layered City*, 1974

Graz Architecture - with works by Günther Domenig, Konrad Frey, Julia Gaisbacher, Volker Giencke, Bernhard Hafner, Oliver Hangl, Eilfried Huth, Anna Meyer, Szyszkowitz-Kowalski, Manfred Wolff-Plottegg and Arthur Zalewski.

Texts about all of the works on show here can be found in the publication on the exhibition, available for purchase at the exhibition or in our shop.

Architecture can be many things:
practical, beautiful, ostentatious, simple,
fixed or changeable.

This exhibition shows many different ideas
of what architecture can or should be.

You will see the works of seven architects
who are based in Graz.

All of them have
a professional or personal relationship
with Peter Cook and Colin Fournier,
architects of the Kunsthaus Graz.

The exhibition also shows artworks
that deal with some of the buildings that are shown.
Amongst other things, they pose the question:
are past ideas about construction
still relevant today?

Who was it?

Who sets the tone, when a building is constructed?
The architect can try
to express his/her personality in a building.
But instead of this, he/she can also allow
as many people as possible to participate in the planning
and to co-ordinate their requirements.
Perhaps the architect does not plan a building
on his/her own at all.
He/She could leave the planning to computer programmes—
or even entirely to chance.
How a building ultimately looks
can then no longer be foreseen.

For examples on this matter, you might take a look at:
Günther Domenig: *Das Steinhaus*, 1986–2008
Günther Domenig: *Zentralsparkasse Favoriten*, 1974–1979
Manfred Wolff-Plottegg: *Das Binäre Haus*, as early as 1988

Everything has a price

Building a house is an expensive business.
Many architects therefore think about
how to keep costs low.
Can low-cost materials
create ambitious architecture at all?
Does the desire to save money
perhaps even allow for particularly inspired ideas?
With a clever use of resources
a great deal can also be achieved with very little.

For examples on this matter, you might take a look at:
Konrad Frey: *Sundome – Schalentragsystem für Hallen*,
1970–1971
Konrad Frey: *Wellpappehaus*, 1973

For the whole family

A family home is still
a lifetime dream for many people.
When a family home is planned,
one question is decisive:
What does this family need, to feel comfortable?
If the concept of the family changes,
the idea of the typical house
can change at the same time.
People who share a living space themselves
have a strong voice in the planning stage.
In order to ensure a feeling of security,
it needs places where individual inhabitants can retreat to
as well as places for the community, too.
Moreover, a family house should be
as affordable and as environmentally friendly as possible.

For examples on this matter, you might take a look at:
Szyszkowitz + Kowalski: *Haus Zusertal*, 1979–1981
Konrad Frey: *Haus Zankel*, 1978–1985

Needing and consuming

The way in which we build and live
influences not only ourselves
but also our environment.
If we put too much strain on it,
a future worth living is endangered.
We consume energy, when we live.
But where do we get this energy from?
And how much do we actually need
in order to meet our needs?
Many architects believe strongly that
nature and architecture are not in conflict
but go hand in hand together.

For examples on this matter, you might take a look at:
Konrad Frey: *Low Budget Loft House*, from 2005
Szyszkowitz + Kowalski: *Wohnbebauung Küppersbusch IBA
Emscher Park*, 1989–1997
Szyszkowitz + Kowalski: *Haus über Graz*, 1972–1974

Oh, that's beautiful!

Does architecture have to be beautiful?
As we know, we can argue about what beauty is.
Yet an architect can try
to create harmonious structures.
Whether beautiful or not,
what we see can bring us a new awareness.
We can, moreover, learn to observe in a more aware way.
The things we usually do not notice
perhaps then catch our eye for the first time.

For examples on this matter, you might take a look at:
Volker Giencke: *Odörfer*, 1989–1992
Volker Giencke: *Kirche in Aigen*, 1985–1992