


ART
IN PUBLIC
SPACES
of Prague



—
2018
—

The quality of the public space is one of the basic preconditions for high-quality urban living.

One of the chief roles of public space as well as art is its cultural and social role. Art creates, cultivates, develops and enriches the cultural dimension of social life for individuals and the whole of society by deepening the sensory and rational perceptions of life and the environment around us. Art in public space establishes a cultural value. Art in public space also improves locations as a whole and facilitates their culturally perceived value by the general public.

The quality of public space is holistic in character, and for that reason it is essential that each constituent element contributing to this notion participates in the quality of the whole. The relationship between a work of art and public space must be reciprocal. Art enhances the quality of the space—and the space reinforces the meaning of the art.

A wise city managed and lived in by wise people should allow, support, initiate, guarantee and actively create such environments.

This is the chief purpose of this publication.

We asked an expert working group composed of professionals active in the field of contemporary art, gallery management, art theory, architecture and urbanism to prepare their professional opinions for the “Art in Public Spaces of Prague” publication (forming a plug-in to the Prague Public Space Design Manual).

The objective was to complement the document’s contents with the valuable expertise of these professionals and obtain commentary on the principles and rules mentioned and any suggestions for additional topics the plug-in could address or suggestions for modifying the document’s structure.

We also asked these professionals to reply to two general questions on the importance of art in public space in our time and how desired quality can be achieved.

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE IMPORTANCE OF ART IN PUBLIC SPACE IN OUR TIMES?

Improving public space increases the quality of their utility functions and also aesthetically cultivates the people who use these spaces.

doc. Dr. et Ing. Jiří Fajt, Ph.D.
(art historian, Director General of the National Gallery)

It is difficult to define the importance of fine art in an urban environment, just as it is almost impossible to generally describe the role of art in society. We may, however, debate the social and political function of art in public space, and consequently, the debate should focus on why today’s society should support placing contemporary fine art in a public space. For example, we may highlight its power to transform the perspectives of city residents and visitors, the power to open and draw attention to and thus assist in resolving contemporary issues as well as offer a point of view beyond the mainstream. Art has the power to transform abstract

discussion into an intelligible opinion. Art is capable of encouraging civic engagement and delivering ironic criticism. These qualities should be employed (for the benefit and in the interest of the general public) in public space, not only brick and mortar galleries patronized by a comparatively limited elite group of visitors.

The contemporary climate of post-truth is undermining democratic principles and damaging the fundamental fibre of social coexistence. One of the underlying conditions of democracy is the public’s commitment to “democratic self-rule,” which requires the ability to pass “sound political judgment.” Professor David Schwartz, an American visual culture theoretician says that this “competence needs to be continuously taught, and the method of teaching it is very similar to teaching how to understand contemporary art. In both cases, citizens need interpretative skills, power of empathy and reflexive imagination.” This, however, does not in any measure exhaust the function of art in public space. There are other aspects related to urbanism and architecture, security, economics, orientation, and of course, art that significantly assist the establishment of a “genius loci.”

Under the expanse of shared urban space, art draws the public’s attention and establishes conditions for perceiving physical public space as places for everyone, as places where we encounter each other. These meeting places then serve, perhaps even with the aid of topical stimuli facilitated by art, as venues where consensus may be reached in addressing social issues, which may then improve society’s effort to better resist its disintegration. Sharing common space more deeply can help the public better resist the current rise in xenophobia, racism, intolerance, polarization and other socio-pathological phenomena now flourishing as a consequence of people meeting each other less and sharing opinions or resentments by voicing them on social networks with little moderation, which merely creates a parody of rational discussion.


MgA. Pavel Karous, Ph.D.
(sculptor, author of the ‘Aliens and Herons’ project)

Art brings beauty, playfulness, humour, emotions, sensuality and substance into the urban environment. These qualities are otherwise present in a pragmatically construed city more by oversight, coincidence or as an element complementing truly high-quality architecture (which is rare).

The importance of art in public space also lies in:

- *testing the potential of art in the complex context of the city,*
- *confronting the public with art in everyday routine settings,*
- *the ability to shape space and thus strengthen our connection to it.*

MgA. Petra Vlachynská
(sculptor, postgraduate at the Faculty of Architecture at the Czech Technical University, thesis topic – Art in Public Space after 1989)



With regard to the fact that the genre of art in public space can be considered historically closed, artists may freely move between its various forms and create a certain genealogy of site-specific art. A traditionally erected statue usually marks a place of historical reminiscence, but a contemporary art piece should point out the future possibilities of the given space.

doc. Mgr. Karel Císař, Ph.D.
(art theoretician and lecturer at the Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design in Prague)

These days, we expect much more of any art in a public space, or more precisely, in public spaces, than the merely static existence of a material and artistically processed object placed on a pedestal. We inquire about the meaning of the art we are passing by, we require a certain type of interaction, a discourse, stimulation, a message or even a mere visual pleasure in daily interaction.

The sculptural “parks” in the midst of housing estates often reflect a topic or libretto dictated by an authoritarian system and belong irretrievably in the past. Public space no longer needs to be overcrowded by permanent installations. A space is cultivated by more than a randomly placed sculpture on a piece of free land; space is cultivated by its interaction with the living organism of the city, by providing meeting places that intersect and nourish collective experiences. When frequent, short-term displays of public art routinely expose passers-by to both Czech and foreign contemporary art in Prague and also other cities, we may begin searching for the forms of new and permanent artistic works for public space with unrivalled deliberation and emphasis on excellence and quality.

Mgr. Marie Foltýnová, Ph.D.
(curator of the public sculpture collection at the Prague City Gallery)

Art gives a location its meaning. It establishes the location through the excellence with which a message is communicated, unless the art in question is a merely formal and hollow aesthetically processed object. It represents a commitment in the information conveyed. This differentiates a work of art from a mere decoration. The artwork and its origin need to possess a certain intrinsic integrity, which in context with the environment creates a “topos” that may be referred to on the plane of the city’s cultural heritage.

doc. Ing. arch. Miroslav Cikán
(architect, lecturer, and one of the co-authors of the UNESCO management plan for Prague currently under preparation)

The plug-in already covers a wide variety of opinion, but I have also prepared my own brief list. Art in public space:

- makes art accessible to the lay public, provides an opportunity to present contemporary art to people who would not otherwise visit galleries or museums,

- communicates cultural values to the population and establishes discourse,
- educates,
- integrates, improves presence in and during transit through the urban environment,
- supports the expression of various communities and interests and strengthens their roles and importance to society,
- has a strong social function, bringing diverse social groups into contact in one place,
- may have contemplative or even therapeutic functions to help “treat” excluded or ruined sites or sites undergoing transformation, etc.,
- underscores the genius loci of a place,
- comments on and critically reflects social issues, laments and provokes, draws attention to problematic places,
- defines meeting places and places of repose,
- nourishes intellectual and spiritual development of people,
- develops an artistic vision and creativity, releases playful and relaxed potential, facilitates rest,
- interacts with its surroundings,
- has an aesthetic function,
- wipes away the boundary between the public and private, evoking a sense of community and intimacy, outer and inner space,
- tells a story of a certain time and space,
- tells about a conflict in the space,
- creates a relationship to a place,
- may act as an instrument to facilitate contact with the qualities and uniqueness of a given place, providing opportunities to influence and change its future,
- re-defines the past,
- may have a strong correcting (ecological, moral, enlightening and other) or self-correcting and creative potential,
- supports the nascency of civic activities, cultural events, community projects, develops civic society,
- may have an economic impact at individual locations,
- rejuvenates public institutions.

MgA. Denisa Václavová, Ph.D.
(playwright, curator and producer of cultural projects in public space)

**WHAT IS THE FUNDAMENTAL PREREQUISITE (INSTRUMENT)
FOR A WORK OF ART TO FULLY ACCOMPLISH ITS POTENTIAL/
SIGNIFICANCE IN PUBLIC SPACE?**

In the present day, I see it is as crucial that this document passes approval in unchanged form, as it is very instructive and addresses not only the quality of the project but also the processes foregoing its implementation. It rightly places great responsibility on experts and less on politicians, which is the only way of ensuring truly competent decision-making. A good example of a similarly superbly functioning project concerning art in public space is Copenhagen, which addresses this issue with equal erudition according to the city's urbanistic and development plans. The results, of course, are obviously apparent...

doc. Dr. et Ing. Jiří Fajt, Ph.D.
(art historian, Director General of the National Gallery)

So that an officially mounted piece of art fulfils its potential, it is necessary to select a temporary work of art for a public space using a curator's professional concept, for example, in the form of a festival, exhibition or public display. Artwork located permanently in an urban area or as a part of an architectural concept of a public building must be selected through a transparent, public competition adjudicated by a professional commission that is independent of the current political interest. No commission may be appointed by political representation. This almost always leads to corruption, political marketing or efforts to gain publicity, or even worse, for misuse as propaganda by the governing garniture, similar to what happened in the 1950s in Czechoslovakia or to what is currently happening in Hungary, Ukraine and the Russian Federation. In an ideal case, the artistic commission should be appointed by the community of artists. In the West, this is facilitated by various foundations, unions, "houses" or professional organizations that represent the interests of the artistic public. In this country, we unfortunately abolished these institutions in 1991. For this reason, I propose, in accordance with the ideas presented in this document, that all members of professional or expert committees are nominated by professional institutions and chambers and that nominations are endorsed by the artistic community. The community needs to be involved in the selection process to dispose of the well-established feelings that decisions are taken "about us, without us" and to correct, through its preferences, any clearly political preferences and pressures on delegates from municipal and state institutions.



Last but not least, any successful impact of visual art in public space rests on involving the broadest possible section of the general public. This may be achieved in a number of ways, such as by medialization, public discussion or commented exhibitions, and educational activities that could be combined with their free-time activities. Education in this domain should also already be taking place in primary and secondary schools, not only in those that have an art-focused curriculum. The experience gained during the "Aliens and Herons" project,

specifically in connection with commented tours directly in the urban environment, clearly showed that the general public, however uneducated it may be in a specific field, is better able to build a healthy relationship with high-quality and non-obsequious art in public space if they have been sufficiently informed about its author and their work.

MgA. Pavel Karous, Ph.D.
(sculptor, author of the 'Aliens and Herons' project)

It is the support provided to artists who produce exceptional and high-quality projects and who must use their own resources and great effort to bring them alive. It is also good communication between all the involved players and sensitivity to local conditions and needs.

MgA. Petra Vlachynská
(sculptor, postgraduate at the Faculty of Architecture at the Czech Technical University, thesis topic – Art in Public Space after 1989)

I will provide a specific and important example of what I consider constitutes good practice. The unorthodox form of the Max van der Stoel monument corresponds to the unconventionality of its brief. It is not a mere memorial to this Dutch politician and diplomat, but primarily to the event when this former Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs met with Jan Patočka, a Czech philosopher and speaker of Charta 77. The monument, which commemorates this event, became an event itself. It took the form of a concrete imprint of a tree shadow in a park, which is named after the Dutch politician.

Dominik Lang, who is author of this work of art, precisely captured the character of the commemorated event and significantly contributed to the current discussion on the nature of a monument in contemporary art. From the distance, barely visible, yet up close, a monumental memorial facilitates an entirely new form of relationship between spectators, who cannot passively stand “before” it, nor the art, which they need to approach to find their own way to appreciate. As any exceptional memorial, the Max van der Stoel monument does not simply represent a reminiscence of things past but also provides an opportunity to think about our future.

doc. Mgr. Karel Císař, Ph.D.
(art theoretician and lecturer at Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design in Prague)

Artwork cannot simply be “erected” somewhere. One must consider the links to the surrounding environment and architecture and the urbanistic, historical and social aspects of its location. We also no longer need cling to old-fashioned “sculptures” made from physical matter in fixed and invariable forms. We need to open our perception to different forms and expressions of contemporary visual art, to forget the doctrine of descriptiveness and the eternal life of a monument. We need to free art in public space from passing political gestures. In recent years, I have been most impressed by the Max van der Stoel memorial by Dominik Lang in Prague 6, which brilliantly

confronts the traditional, deeply rooted notion of a monument with new perspectives.

Mgr. Marie Foltýnová, Ph.D.
(curator of the public sculpture collection at the Prague City Gallery)

Bearing in mind the cultural potential of Prague's historical city centre, which is a UNESCO world heritage site, in Prague this represents a commitment to universal quality that can stand the test of cultural traditions of generations past and generations living in a diverse commonwealth of diverse cultures, not only one nation with one single identity.

It is a timeless opportunity for cultural and critical reflection by the current generations of artists and a challenge to select what is the most valuable and most permanent that a free creative society can pass on to a permanent city under a shared sky not just in the framework of the historical centre.

doc. Ing. arch. Miroslav Cikán
(architect, lecturer, and co-author of the UNESCO management plan for Prague currently under preparation)

Such instruments may take the form of art festivals in public spaces to present the general public with trends and contemporary ideas in visual arts. These are important catalysts for social reflection on art, being received well and having great influence due to their non-recurring, temporary programme. Such festivals are subject to great attention and can afford to present more controversial topics, progressive theatre and take risks. Their advantages lie in their temporary and unique qualities.

Festivals also offer rich educational programmes. Commented tours can introduce contemporary art, debates and lectures to various age groups—children, youth, seniors. This fosters natural intergenerational exchange, mixes various target groups, involves local residents and visitors alike. Festivals can focus on specific issues and needs and address the problematic, even painful, places in urban space. They can initiate the creation of new artistic works and offer the general public a wide variety of accompanying events.

The fundamental prerequisites for this are transparent support programmes, professional committees and well-formulated cultural policy for the city. In addition, the expertise of all individual actors involved in these processes must be clearly defined. Last, but not least, there must be continuity in the support provided and transparency in the conditions that allow temporary and one-off projects to be implemented (permits, fees, permitting process length, etc.).

MgA. Denisa Václavová, Ph.D.
(playwright, curator and producer of cultural projects in public space)

<u>A Introduction</u>	
A.1 The city's approach to achieving high-quality art in public space	11
A.2 The role of art in public space	12
<u>B Purpose of the document</u>	
B.1 Fundamental objectives	17
B.2 Character of the document	17
B.3 Thematic scope of the document	18
B.4 Birth of the document	18
B.5 Links to the city's methodological and strategic documents	20
B.5.1 Prague Strategic Plan	20
B.5.2 Prague Cultural Policy Concept 2017–2021	20
B.5.3 “2% for Art” in Public Space in Prague	21
B.5.4 The Act on a percentage reserved for the arts	21
B.5.5 UNESCO documents and conventions	21
B.6 For whom the document is intended	22
B.6.1 Individual actors, their roles and relationship to the document	22
B.7 How to use this document	25
<u>C Typology</u>	
C.1 Typology of works of art for the purposes of this plug-in	29
C.2 Categories according to the planned length of display	29
C.2.1 Permanent art (art of a permanent nature)	29
C.2.2 Temporary artistic interventions	34
C.3 Categories according to designation	39
C.3.1 Art with a commemorative function	39
C.3.2 Art without a commemorative function	43
C.4 Categories according to the origin	43
<u>D Quality</u>	
D.1 Basic prerequisites for achieving high-quality art in public space	47
D.2 Basic quality criteria for works of art in public space	48
D.2.1 Artistic quality	48
D.2.2 Quality of content	49
D.2.3 Spatial quality and location of art in relation to public space	50
D.3 Other specific quality criteria	56


E Processes	61
E.1 Processes relating to art in public space	61
E.2 New roles and entities in institutionalised processes	61
E.2.1 The role of a professional arbitrator, expert committee or cultural council	61
E.2.2 City curator for public art	62
E.2.3 The role of independent curators as expert consultants and process mediators	63
E.2.4 The role of project manager	64
E.3 Implementing art of permanent nature	65
E.3.1 Methodological preparation	66
E.3.2 Production of a work of art through a public tender	68
E.3.3 Acquisition of an existing artwork for a specific site	71
E.3.4 Subsequent existence of the art at a site	73
E.4 Implementation of temporary artistic interventions	78
E.5 Educating, informing and involving the general public	80
E.5.1 Methods of informing and educating the general public	81
E.5.2 Involving the general public in the art acquisition process	82
E.6 Systematic financial support	85
E.7 Model process scenarios	85
E.7.1 Scheme of the implementation process for an art-architectural design competition	86
E.7.2 Acquisition of a completed work of art or licence for the creation of an artwork	87
E.7.3 Scheme of the process for a repeated placement of a work of art	88
E.7.4 Scheme of the implementation process for a temporary artistic intervention	89
 Annex – Context for establishing a framework to support art in public spaces	
P.1 Artistic and social background of support for art in the Euro-American context in the 19th and 20th century	93
P.2 Principles establishing support in the form of a “percentfor the arts”	96
P.2.1 History of application of the “percentage for the arts” principles abroad	96
P.2.2 Act on mandatory percentage allocated to the arts in Czechoslovakia	98
P.2.3 Other instruments of support and sources of finance	99
P.3 Foreign experience	100
P.3.1 Vienna, Austria	101
P.3.2 Berlin, Germany	102
P.3.3 Helsinki, Finland	103
P.3.4 Den Haag, The Netherlands	104
P.3.5 Chicago, USA	105
P.3.6 New York City, USA	106
P.3.7 Philadelphia, USA	107

A Introduction	9
A.1 The city's approach to achieving high-quality art in public space	11
A.2 The role of art in public space	12
B Purpose of the document	15
C Typology	27
D Quality	45
E Processes	59
Annex – Context for establishing a framework to support public art	91

A

INTRODUCTION

Encounters with art and anything “unusual”
in well-known settings and practical daily routines
educate, cultivate and draw us into the realm
of public affairs.



A.1 The city's approach to achieving high-quality art in public space

SUPPORTING HIGH- QUALITY ART IN PRAGUE'S PUBLIC SPACE

One of the chief strategic objectives of the Capital City of Prague is creating high quality public space.^[A.01] Support provided for creating high-quality art for display in public spaces represents an integral part of these efforts. The city rests on the need to create conditions that foster high-quality artistic works by practising a methodological and systematic approach in this area:

- defining the rules governing the process of placing artistic works in public space,
- enforcing these rules at the city's various departments and stipulating that these rules be observed by other entities within the framework of their planned developments,
- defining fundamental principles and quality criteria,
- passing decisions on whether to install these artistic works and providing the city's financial support according to these quality criteria,
- financing the maintenance of existing art and the new installations.

CONCEPTUAL APPROACH IN PREPARING INVESTMENT AS A PREREQUISITE TO ACHIEVING QUALITY

The fundamental prerequisite in achieving quality in any newly created or modified public space is a conceptual approach to the entire process of its creation, from planning and preparing the project to its implementation, management and use. A conceptual approach guarantees the holistic quality of the place/site, not merely its partial elements or values.

A conceptual and systematic approach is also a prerequisite for the artwork's quality itself and the effect on the overall quality of the site in any public space.

This document is a specific thematic extension (plug-in) of the Prague Public Space Design Manual. Its objective is to define methodological and systematic approaches to installing art in public space. It concerns itself with the entire creation process—formulating the plan, organizing competitions, preparing the project, implementation stage, administration and maintenance—and briefly outlines the various supporting stages of this process, such as providing financing or education. It therefore touches on not only on regulatory issues but also initiation and creative issues. The document thus represents the first comprehensive methodological concept and set of rules for implementing artistic work in Prague public space.

[A.01] ↗ *Prague Strategic Plan, updated 2016*. Prague: IPR Prague, 2016. (Strategic objective 1. 3. C.1 – Strengthening and improving public spaces in the city).

Available online at:
<http://strategie.iprpraha.cz/>

A.2 The role of art in public space

Art in public space primarily imprints the same values on individual people and society as any art in general. The overview below describes some of the specific roles of art situated specifically in public space for access to anyone. It outlines the means by which such art enriches and cultivates society and improves the city environment and its public space.

— **AESTHETIC ROLE**

Art in public space constitutes and enriches the aesthetic value of the environment, which is an essential part of overall residential quality.

— **URBAN ROLE – CREATING A PLACE AND STRENGTHENING ITS IDENTITY**

Works of art in public space elevate the importance and quality of locations and any related wholes. By completing an area physically (visually) and through content (symbolically, scenically, etc.), it influences its own perception and use as well as overall attractiveness while strengthening residents’ identification with the location. The presence of art brings a human dimension into the space as well as detail and other sensory and cognitive impulses that stand above the standard framework of a built-up environment.

Art can increase the stimulating nature of a space. Art can culturally and physically activate and socialize many neglected areas. It makes a space unique, reflecting and strengthening the identity of a given space. It provides an opportunity for the birth of intangible ideas, such as “genius loci”, and lets visitors halt their steps in a space to experience some form of profound experience or moment of contemplation.

— **SUPPORTING ENVIROMENTAL DIVERSITY**

Support provided for the variety and diversity of artistic expressions in public space helps stabilize and develop the city’s cultural diversity and thus contribute to the public’s tolerance towards the new, unknown and different. The existence of art in public space is an important prerequisite for a creative and stimulating environment that further stimulates creativity and motivates artists to create and communicate.

— **CULTURAL ROLE**

Art in public space has an integral cultural role in public space. It cultivates, develops and enriches the cultural dimensions of life and the individual in society and the city, both in the more narrowly defined artistic and creative notion of culture and in its broader social definition. One of the essential prerequisites of a cultural role is the work of art’s content, i.e. the idea it embodies and the significance it generates in collaboration with its context.

The presence of high-quality contemporary works of art in public space increases awareness in the general public of current artistic developments at local and international levels. In the context of contemporary trends in the creation of progressive urban environments, it also strengthens the city’s cultural profile internationally.

— **SOCIAL ROLE**

Works of art in public space are accessible to anyone passing by. Any such installation can therefore impart an artistic experience to the broadest general public. A work of art may respond to a specific social context at the site. It may become an interactive element in space, drawing the attention of the local population and visitors alike, or it may represent the common interest of a specific community and its relationship to the place and thus cement a specific collective in the neighbourhood or society as a whole.

Some approaches involve the general public (the future users of any such site) directly in the creation of the artwork. Besides imprinting the public’s own aesthetic demands on the nascent art, participation may, as a result, accentuate the art’s social acceptance and experience generated by the creative process; see also the *Community (participation) art projects* → [E.5.2/p. 82].

Art in public space communicates to people, directly or subliminally, and instigates interaction. Art may carry and express irony or criticism or represent shared values by appealing to and referencing their existence. Art depicts (materialises) abstract topics in concrete terms that stimulate informal or even formal civic debate.

— EDUCATION ROLE

Encounters with art and „anything unusual” in well-known setting and practical daily routines educate, cultivate and draw us into the realm of public affairs. These encounters represent opportunities to confront the art’s aesthetic value and various artistic approaches. They acquaint viewers with unusual forms of expression in contemporary visual art beyond a confined gallery space and support visual and associative literacy, critical reflection and deliberation. They create associative opportunities, offer mental freedom and nourish intellectual refreshment.

— COMMEMORATIVE ROLE

Art bears specific information which it communicates to the general public through public space. It tells the stories of generations past and sets the stage for the tales of the future. Art in public space may express homage, commemorate an important personage, act, event or idea, and contribute to the effort to halt or prevent fall into obscurity, or alternatively, achieve eternity. Commemorative art in public space → [C.3.1/p. 39], which represents an important vessel for social memory and the memory of places, permits society to express values it can agree on and seek to interpret its history through.

— REPRESENTATIVE AND SYMBOLIC ROLE

The content and form of a work of art, either directly or indirectly through its materialized subject, represent the integrity of its initiator and the opinions and stances of its author. The role of art in public space in a democratic society, however, is not limited to representing the commissioning body but also reflects even ambivalent, contradictory or conflicting topics, including social criticism.

Artistic intervention also represents and interprets the importance of a place where it is located. It consolidates the space and its orientation within a broader context. It creates a sense of direction in relation to and from the place. It generates “iconic” perception and visual composition of the given environment. It may have the capacity to lend a place a specific name or designation that enters general use.


— ECONOMIC AND MARKETING ROLE

High-quality art positively influences the attractiveness of a public space and the city’s image as a whole (image). This may translate to the specific location’s or city’s increased economic potential. Art in public space attracts the attention of residents, tourists and investors.

A Introduction	9
B Purpose of the document	15
B.1 Fundamental objectives	17
B.2 Character of the document	17
B.3 Thematic scope of the document	18
B.4 Birth of the document	18
B.5 Links to the city's methodological and strategic documents	20
B.5.1 Prague Strategic Plan	20
B.5.2 Prague Cultural Policy Concept 2017–2021	20
B.5.3 2% for Art in Public Space in Prague	21
B.5.4 Act on the percentage reserved for the arts	21
B.5.5 UNESCO documents and conventions	21
B.6 For whom the document is intended	22
B.6.1 Individual actors, their roles and relationship to the document	22
B.7 How to use this document	25
C Typology	27
D Quality	45
E Processes	59
Annex – Context for establishing a framework to support public art	91

B

PURPOSE
OF THE DOCUMENT



This plug-in is a thematic extension of the Prague Public Space Design Manual.

It may serve as a guide for anyone participating in the related processes of initiating, commissioning, creating, implementing, administrating and maintaining works of art in public space.

B.1 Fundamental objectives

— DEFINITION OF RULES (METHODOLOGY)

This document defines the basic criteria for the quality of artistic works in public space and the rules for their acquisition, management, maintenance and related activities. It provides methodological support for the professional and the general public for initiation, implementation and decision-making processes in specific projects, cases and issues concerning the city and its districts. It also sets transparent conditions for initiators acquiring artwork for public spaces.

— INITIATION OF A CONCEPTUAL APPROACH

This document describes ideas for systematic changes. It proposes specific tools the city may progressively apply in order to continuously support, expand and promote a variety of high-quality, publicly available art, thereby increasing the cultural capital of the city and quality of its public space.

— INCREASING AWARENESS (EDUCATION)

This document explains the meaning of high-quality art existing in the city's public space and describes the course, benefits and obstacles in the process of its implementation. It explains some of the relationship patterns between artistic objects and the city's environment. It presents high-quality examples, foreign models of approach to the topic, motivations and inspirations.

B.2 Character of the document

A PLUG-IN TO THE PRAGUE PUBLIC SPACE DESIGN MANUAL

The Prague Public Space Design Manual ^[B.01] (hereinafter referred to as the "Manual"), approved by the Prague City Council Resolution No. 1495 of June 24, 2014, is a methodological document intended primarily for the city and its organizations, districts and boroughs as well as private investors. Following the example of other advanced European capitals, the Manual serves as the basis for a methodological approach to public spaces in Prague. It defines the target quality of public space and the tools needed to achieve it. It contains the general principles, rules, recommendations and criteria for creating high-quality public spaces.

This document is a plug-in (thematic expansion) of the Manual. It examines in greater detail the implementation of artistic works in public spaces that were described in the Manual only generally in chapter *D. 9 Art in public spaces*. This plug-in is an integral part of the Manual and cannot be used without it. It does not repeat the Manual's general rules for all structures and artistic objects in public spaces.

BINDING FORM AND DESIGNATION OF THE DOCUMENT

As a part of the Manual, this plug-in forms a binding basis for the decision-making processes of the municipal authorities of the Capital City of Prague (individual departments of the City of Prague), municipal contributory organizations and any organization that draws investment from the budget of the City of Prague. See also → *Individual actors, their roles and relationship to the document* [B.6.1/p. 22].

Like the Manual, the plug-in is also an initiating material which summarises the principles and recommendations leading to good practice in response to current situations. It is not an implementing technical regulation. However, some of the rules listed here may become binding after their direct incorporation or reference to the source — the plug-in to the Manual — in related legislative documents.

The rules and principles formulated in this document cannot be adopted and applied mechanically. It is always necessary to evaluate the specific situation individually. This document will be regularly updated based on user feedback, experience from its practical application and also in response to changing legislation, new trends and trends in the field of contemporary art, etc.

[B_01] → *Prague Public Space Design Manual*. IPR Prague, 2014.

Available online at:
<http://manual.iprpraha.cz>

The document primarily focuses on art in connection with Prague’s public, but some principles are so general that they are beyond the context of the capital city and may therefore be applicable to other cities and municipalities.

B.3 Thematic scope of the document

ART IN PUBLIC SPACES

In this document, the usual and generally applied term *public art*^[B.02] is used only in its general meaning when the topic is described in its broadest terms. Here, it is mostly replaced with a narrower term of *art in public space*, as this document specifically focuses on art located in the Prague’s *public spaces*^[B.03], i.e. in the publicly accessible exteriors of the capital city with the knowledge that public art, i.e. in the interiors of public buildings, also remains an important topic.

The boundary between these two terms may often be vague, and therefore this document may refer to places/locations that are somewhere at the edge of those two categories (for example, the vestibule of a metro station, a pedestrian underpass, etc.).

WORKS OF ART POSSESSING A MATERIAL CHARACTER

Today’s public art includes a wide variety of diverse forms of expression and media.^[B.04] This document focuses on art possessing a material character and does not address immaterial forms of artistic expressions in public realm, i.e. live art, events and activities such as concerts, theatre productions, performances, celebrations, etc. The topic of cultural and social activities overlaps with other domains and would require a more complex perspective. It should therefore be addressed separately in other methodological documents. This document also focuses on official works of art, i.e. art paid for from public budgets or art produced by private initiatives, which are subject to permission from the city, or art acquired by the city into its administration and management.

B.4 Birth of the document

Prague is a no exception, and it must be acknowledged that the location/placement of an article of fine art into public realm poses a long-term problem. On the one hand, valuable art frequently does not receive enough opportunity. On the other hand, public realm is often thoughtlessly lent out to poor-quality art. One of the causes for these all too frequent and poor-quality implementations may be found in the process of the original plan and proposal for placement.

Due to its culturally historical and architectonic legacy, Prague is a globally important representative of the narrow connection between municipal public space and fine art. In recent times, this connection has been broadened for a number of reasons, some of which are described in the document below. It is therefore necessary, and not merely with respect to the specific Prague environment, to again strengthen the relationship between art and architecture while reflecting the contemporary possibilities and needs for artistic expression and role of public art.

The professional commentaries received in connection with the preparation of the Manual clarified that the Manual’s final chapter, titled “Art in Public Spaces”, deserved more detailed treatment in a separate document. It is apparent that the city and its various bodies and departments lack any guidelines in this field to base their decisions on. Forming a forerunner to the present plug-in, one of the first responses to this issue were professional texts in 2016 from architects working in the Public Space Office, Pavla Melková and Jakub Hendrych. These texts were later published in the anthology titled *Manual of the Monument*.^[B.05] When this document was prepared, examples of similar foreign documents on this topic were used, i.e. *guidelines* from other developed cities with well-functioning systems of support for art in public spaces.

[B.02] ↗ Please see more on page 93 - Annex.

This term denotes any work of art that is publicly accessible and serves the public, i.e. sculptures, monuments, memorial plaques, architectural works of art, artistic decorations in churches, etc. The narrower meaning of the terms is based on the trends of modern and contemporary art which appeared in the 1960s. It is principally based on the effort to facilitate contact between art and the general public via public realm, making art “click into place” in that public realm, beautify the space, highlight a public problem or similar.

[B.03] The term *public space* is explained here:

↗ Act No. 131/2000 Coll., on the Capital City of Prague

↗ *Prague Public Space Design Manual*. Prague. IPR Prague, 2014. (Chapter A. 1. 2 The terms public space and public realm).

Available online at:
<http://manual.iprpraha.cz>

[B.04] ↗ FIŠER, Marcel and ORTMEIER, Martin. *Outdoors/ Art in Public Space in the South-West Bohemia and Lower Bavaria 1990–2010*. Horažďovice: Galerie Klatovy, 2010. ISBN 978-80-87013-30-4.

[B.05] ↗ BARTLOVÁ Anežka (ed.) *Monument Manual*. Prague: Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design in Prague, 2016

This document was developed by a professional team of authors representing key institutions in the field of fine art and architecture — galleries and universities, independent curators, theoreticians, artists, architects and other related professions. Their mission focused on defining the fundamental topics and issues that could not be absent from this document and commenting on the content and structure of the document.

SUMMARY OF THE MAIN PROBLEMS THIS DOCUMENT RESPONDS TO

- Very few high-quality and innovative works of art and site-specific interventions in public space are being created. On the contrary, public spaces are being congested with poor quality or questionable works of art (especially in the central part of Prague).
- New permanent works of art have a weak and poorly considered relationship to the character of the public space where they are located.
- The overall quality of public spaces (affected by this poor-quality art) degrades.
- Prague's image lags behind other European cultural metropolises. The city's administration does not assume the role of an active creator of high-quality public space programming.
- Public art is often understood in very narrow and conservative terms. After 1990, there was a break in continuity of usual practice, and contemporary art ceased being installed in public space. The general public has had no or very little opportunity to be confronted with developments in art and its contemporary expression for around 25 years.
- The official public discourse typically works with conventional notions and concepts. A number of high-quality contemporary artistic interventions or works of art in public spaces have been placed or mounted by artists and other initiatives at their own expense, in exceptional cases by district authorities.
- Prague lack works of art created by eminent Czech artists from the end of the 20th century and beginning of the 21st century as well as any artworks created by foreign artists. This sad deficit cannot be entirely counterbalanced.

THE ROOT CAUSES OF THESE PROBLEMS MAY BE DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS

- Until recently, the value of cultural capital as an important component of Prague's development and competitiveness has not been properly recognized.
- Until recently, the city's interest has been low and has lacked the expertise to press for a methodological vision to develop public space.
- Absence of any concept for permanent or temporary public art at the state or municipal level. Non-existent systemic support.
- Insufficient funds from Prague's budget to create and implement art or administrate existing public art.
- Lack of coordination between the capital city and its institutions, state institutions, city districts and private initiatives to create new artworks in public spaces.
- Lack of transparency in the processes leading to or led to in the past to poor-quality artwork installations.

- Conservative public opinion, which influenced attitudes in municipal administration in the 1990s and early 2000s.
- Absence of an active educational effort that could enlighten the general public. Non-existent promotion of contemporary art and its recent developments.
- Commercial interests outweighing quality criteria with respect to works of art and its impact on the surrounding environment.
- Discontinued support for the creation of new works of art under state-driven construction development, caused by abolishing the instrument dedicating 4% of financing to art and the institutions in charge of integrating art into architecture and public space after 1990 and the absence of any new such instruments^[B.06], etc.

B.5 Links to the city’s methodological and strategic documents

B.5.1 Prague Strategic Plan

The Prague Strategic Plan (Updated 2016)^[B.07], approved by the Board of Representatives of the Capital City of Prague No. 21/7 dated 24 November 2016, stipulates a number of objectives and measures which focus on the development of the quality of life in public space through culture and art. Similarly, it specifies the measures for identifying insufficient conditions for the implementation of cultural and artistic interventions in public space. It also highlights that Prague has been slow to build its brand in innovative cultural activities and slow to recognize the potential in maintaining a dialogue between cultural heritage and the current artistic community.

RELATED OBJECTIVES IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	IMPACT ON	MEASURES
Objective 1.3 Life in the City	1.3-B Cultural heritage	1.3-B1 Actively protect and develop architectural heritage
	1.3-C Public space in the city	1.3-C1 Strengthen and improve public space in the city
	1.3-D Quality of life in the city	1.3-D1 Reclaim and revive the central part of the city
		1.3-D2 Increase and balance quality of life in the city centre and the outskirts of the city
		1.3-D3 Increase the attractiveness of the modernist city
Objective 2.1 An Important region	1.2-A International centre	2.1-A1 Develop efforts to promote Prague abroad
Objective 2.3 Cultural Brand	2.3-A Creative metropolis	2.3-A1 Include Prague among European cultural capitals
	2.3-D Culture in public space	2.3-D1 Ensure the conceptual use of public space for cultural activities and the arts
	2.3-E Cultural tourism	2.3-E1 Optimise (maximise) the amount of time that tourists spend in Prague through vibrant cultural offerings
	2.3-F Financing of culture	2.3-F1 Offer new tools for promoting culture in the city that is comparable to other European cultural cities
	2.3-G Care for historic buildings	2.3-G2 Interconnect Prague’s monuments with contemporary living culture

[B.06] After 1990, when the Cultural Commission of the Prague National Committee was abolished as redundant, the city failed to create a replacement authority that would prepare, monitor and evaluate the plans for creating and installing new ‘permanent character’ works of art in the territory of Prague.

[B.07] ↗ Available online at: <http://strategie.iprpraha.cz/>

B.5.2 Prague Cultural Policy Concept 2017–2021

The Prague Cultural Policy Concept 2017–2021^[B.08] approved by Prague City Council through Resolution No. 28/104 of 15 June 2017 addresses the fundamental objectives, conditions and instruments which should assist in transforming Prague into a cultural and creative Central European metropolis in the third millennium. The selected objectives of this Cultural Policy include:

- 4. 2. 1. Top-quality art and cultural offer
- 4. 2. 3. High-quality public space

B.5.3 “2% for Art” in Public Space in Prague

This plug-in expands on the guidelines for processes under the “2% for Art” programme.^[B.09] The programme involves providing financial support to acquire works of art for public space. Funding will be generated from the city’s investments in previous periods. The arts acquisition fund will receive 2% from capital invested each calendar year.

B.5.4 The Act on a percentage reserved for the arts

This plug-in may also act as a guideline for acquiring works of art within the framework of public building construction, provided that the amendment to *Act No. 203/2006 Coll., on Certain Types of Support of Culture and Amendments to Certain Related Laws, as amended by Act No. 227/2009 Coll.*,^[B.10] which is currently being prepared, is eventually passed, or provided that Prague becomes subject to any similar law or regulatory instrument whose objective is to apply principles of support in the form of a percentage dedicated to the arts.^[B.11]

Introducing the obligation to invest a defined part of the budget for constructing public buildings into visual arts forms a part of the strategic *State Cultural Policy for 2015–2020*. It is also outlined in the *Concept for Supporting Art in the Czech Republic 2015–2020*^[B.12] prepared by the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic. The objective of the proposed draft lies in the obligation of any authority commissioning an above-limit public tender for construction work to acquire/create a work of art, whether fine or applied art, in connection with the tender.

B.5.5 UNESCO documents and conventions

This plug-in is also in line with the theoretical approach to the urban landscape as defined in the *Recommendations concerning historical urban landscapes (2011)*,^[B.13] which approaches the historical urban landscape with the aim of “preserving the quality of the human environment, improving the productive and sustainable use of urban spaces while simultaneously recognizing their dynamic character and supporting social and functional diversity. This concept combines objectives relating to the protection of urban heritage with social and economic development objectives. It rests on the balance and sustainable relationship between urban and natural environments and between the needs of the current and future generations and the legacies of the past.”

The recommendations are further elaborated in the draft of the *UNESCO Management Plan – management plan for the protection of the world’s cultural heritage in the historical centre of Prague*.^[B.14] This document defines the rules how the city should manage the future protection and development of cultural heritage in the historical centre of Prague, which is a UNESCO heritage site, with the objective of strengthening its extraordinary universal values. At the same time, it is a guiding document which attempts to encourage the as yet unused potential of the city as a cultural whole. The Management plan sets out these rules with the aim of coordinating planning and administration in line with Prague’s unique historical character and panoramic

[B.08] ↗ Available online at:
http://kultura.praha.eu/public/6e/a7/f1/2485343_790106_Koncepce_kulturni_politiky_HMP_2017_2021.pdf

[B.09] The “2% for Art” programme for public space was approved by the City Hall Council Resolution No. 1483 dated 12 June 2018 with a proposal to verify its function in a pilot regime.

↗ Available online at:
<http://zastupitelstvo.praha.eu/inao/tedusndetail.aspx?par=033071130138133094084071148138133094081071145138133094081071142138133094081&id=516832>

[B.10] As of the date of this translated version of this publication, the program was approved and functions under the new name “Art for the city”.

[B.11] General information about the “percent for art” instrument ↗ ANNEX – Principles establishing support in the form of a „percent for art”.

[B.12] ↗ Available online at:
<https://www.mkr.cz/koncepce-podpory-umeni-v-ceske-republice-na-leta-2015-az-2020-1279.html>

[B.13] ↗ Available online at:
<https://www.mkr.cz/doporuceni-k-historicke-krajine-1380.html>

[B.14] ↗ The Management plan for the protection of the world’s cultural heritage in the historical centre of Prague – PART 001 Available online at:
http://www.praha.eu/public/cb/a5/7f/1922979_539495_141020_MGP_KPL_centra_cast_i_Benes_IS_16_10Tisk_OPRAVENO.pdf
(as of the date of this publication, the document is under preparation)

value, which is replete with the immaterial culture of a modern city beneath a living horizon and cultural heritage bequeathed to future generations.

The plug-in also respects and elaborates on the ideas embodied in various UNESCO conventions ratified by the Czech Republic. This is primarily *the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (2010).^[B,15]

B.6 For whom the document is intended

This document is a general guideline for anyone involved in the process of initiating, commissioning, creating, implementing, administrating or maintaining artistic objects in public spaces. It should also function, as its parent Manual, as a basis for debate during the consultation and review of specific projects, approval processes and in communication with other entities and organizations.

Its role also lies in inspiring and initiating systemic changes at all levels of city administration. This will reinforce a methodological approach to these issues. In this particular direction, the plug-in is a guide for self-governing institutions, state authorities and municipal organizations.

An important target group of this document are actors directly involved in preparing and implementing works of art in public spaces from the position of the city administration. These actors include administrators of all constituent parts of public spaces, such as the employees and officers of the corresponding City Hall departments and individual districts, who have decision-making competences in this particular area.

The document also serves artists, designers, architects, cultural organizations and other related actors as orientation in the basic principles and recommendations applicable to Prague in acquiring or designing art in public spaces.

B.6.1 Individual actors, their roles and relationship to the document

This document is binding to anyone intending to place art in public spaces under public ownership.

A. PRAGUE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT AND MUNICIPAL DISTRICTS

- owners of most of the public spaces in the Capital City of Prague
- [have the] chief initiation and decision-making roles in fulfilling the vision for city-wide or local strategies and planning
- decision-making functions on the strategic, implementation, administration, management, maintenance and financing levels—assigning budgets for financing the implementation or administration of works of art in public spaces.

This document forms a basis for defining the requirements for supporting high-quality works of art in public spaces and a guide for preparing, evaluating and approving plans to place/mount/install art in public spaces.

[B,15] ➤ Available online at:
<https://en.unesco.org/creativity/convention>

B. STATE ADMINISTRATION IN THE CAPITAL CITY AND ITS DISTRICTS

- approve (permit) plans at the level of planning, implementation, administration, management and maintenance

This document serves as a basis for discussion during the process of preparing, evaluating and approving plans related to creating and placing new or already completed works of art.

The capital city recommends that state administration authorities use this document as an instrument to pursue the uniform quality of public spaces. State administration authorities may declare this document as binding for its departments and other constituent units.

C. STATE/CITY CONTRIBUTORY ORGANISATIONS AND ORGANISATIONS SUPPORTED BY PRAGUE'S BUDGET, ACTING AS THE EXECUTIVE BODIES OF THE CAPITAL CITY

- executive and professional function at the level of methodological and technical preparation, implementation, administration, management and maintenance

This document is a binding basis for state and city-funded institutions and organizations according to the budget for Prague.

Prague City Gallery (GHMP)

The Prague City Gallery collects, protects and scientifically processes, exhibits and publicly presents Czech art of the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries. It is also tasked with managing and ensuring care for public monuments and sculptures, memorial plaques and fountains in Prague's public space, including renovations and mounting new works of art.

Gallery is one of the co-authors of this document and the chief administrator of art in public spaces. From this position, it is also one of the chief vehicles for ensuring active application of this document in practice.

The Prague Institute of Planning and Development (IPR Prague)

IPR Prague is the chief conceptual institution in the Capital City of Prague for architecture, urbanism, development and the creation and administration of the city and is tasked with preparing strategic, urbanistic and territorial/zoning documentation. It obtains, administers and updates important data for the city's development as a whole and consults with other professionals, architects, investors and the general public. It also represents Prague in territorial planning/zoning proceedings.

IPR Prague is the author of this document. The document offers a platform for professional debate in matters where consultation is required on individual plans for placing works of art in Prague's public space. The document is also a foundation for its consulting activities and the creation of additional guidelines. IPR Prague is responsible for updating, reviewing, evaluating and promoting this document.

The Prague Institute of Planning and Development should be invited to participate in all proceedings and processes seeking to place or mount works of art in public spaces as the guarantor of the correct application of this "*Art in Public Spaces of Prague*" plug-in.

D. OTHER ADMINISTRATORS, OPERATORS AND TENANTS OF PUBLIC SPACE

- executive role for the administration, operation, maintenance, and use of public space.

Other administrators, operators and tenants of premises in the ownership of the Capital City of Prague should also consider this document binding. Its binding effect must be addressed within the framework of specific contractual relationships.

E. PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANISED PUBLIC BODIES

- professional, creative, participative and critical role in the process of methodological and technical preparation, implementation, administration and maintenance of works of art in public spaces and related activities.

This document is informative in character for professional public. It declares the city’s objectives on the topic of art in public space and defines transparent rules for acquiring and implementing works of art. It provides a platform for debate in the professional evaluation of quality and a foundation for monitoring and critiquing the practices of the city’s executive and self-governing units. The degree of binding effect depends on the specific relationship between the plan and the self-governing units and state authorities.

Artistic and architectural community

The designers and authors of works of art will benefit from this document, as it provides clear guidelines for the creative process and discussion during the consultation and approval of planned artworks. The document also defines clear quality criteria, aiding individual authors in preparing and implementing their planned artwork while simultaneously setting out comprehensive requirements for art in public space. It also sets out transparent rules for the art acquisition processes—it may assist in selecting authors and artwork proposals in competitions, which helps protect the interests of both communities. Architects and artists appointed to commissions or professional juries in competitions may use this document as a benchmark for evaluating the quality of motivations, designs and planned artwork.

Cultural and educational institutions

Schools, universities, galleries and other institutions should be the chief, independent expert arbitrators of quality, being active in the public domain and forming public opinion. Representatives of these institutions appointed to commissions and professional juries in competitions may use this document as a benchmark for evaluating the quality of motivations, designs and planned artwork. Institutions initiating artistic projects in public areas may use it as a platform for discussion in promoting their plans and as a guide to facilitate high-quality plans. Educational institutions may also apply some of the principles specified in this document in practice during instruction.

F. GENERAL PUBLIC (ACTIVE – AS INITIATORS, OR PASSIVE - AS RECIPIENTS)

- initiating and participative function at the strategic, planning, implementation, administrative, care and maintenance levels

For the general public, this document is primarily an informative and educational material. It may also serve as a manual for initiators of artistic projects from the ranks of the general public and as support for involvement in the creative process and use of art in public space. The binding effect varies according to the legal and property-related circumstances and relationship between the proposed plan and the municipalities or state authorities.

G. DEVELOPERS AND PRIVATE INVESTORS PLANNING TO PLACE ARTWORK IN PUBLIC SPACES

- initiating and decision-making function at the level of planning private investment. Administration and maintenance of private plots constituting public space.

For private natural and legal persons, the document represents an informative and inspirational material that can assist in harmonizing private plans with the visions and strategies of the city with regard to the quality of public areas. It is also a guide for ensuring quality in all processes — preparation of the plan, commissioning and implementation and subsequent administration/maintenance of the work of art. The degree of the binding effect depends on the legal and property-related circumstances and relationship between the proposed plan and the municipalities or state authorities. If a work of art is installed in public space which is under public ownership, this document is fully binding.

B.7 How to use this document

DOCUMENT STRUCTURE

This plug-in is divided into five main chapters and an annex:

- A Introduction declares the need for a methodology in the placement/installation of works of art in public spaces and describes the general benefits of high-quality art in the city.
- B Purpose of the document explains the importance and context of this plug-in and provides a guide on how to use it.
- C Typology differentiates and describes the various forms which art in public space may take and thereby creates the basic terminology used throughout the document. Individual forms and categories of artistic works are illustrated with examples of good practice.
- D Quality describes the principles and quality criteria for works of art in public spaces, illustrated with accounts of bad practice.
- E Processes forms the largest chapter of the document. It deals with the quality of partial activities related to implementing and administrating works of art. It defines the rules for these processes and outlines suggestions for systemic changes.
- Annex: Context for establishing a framework to support public art is an independent section complementing this plug-in with an excursion into history and providing inspiration by highlighting expertise in examples of public art abroad.

LINKS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Chapters C, D and E complement each other greatly. The texts therefore reference related or additional information that may appear in other chapters with the following nomenclature:

→ [“Chapter ID”/ page number]

References and links to independent and separate documents, publications, etc. are given in the footnotes:

... [“Chapter ID”_Footnote in the given chapter]

VISUALS

Visuals are given as informative examples of good practice (Chapter C – Typology) or poor practice (Chapter D – Quality). Photographs illustrate the possibilities of interaction between works of art the living environment of the city (Chapter E – Processes). The texts contain direct references to photographs as follows:

→ [EXAMPLE: **example number**/page number]

! All of the examples of poor practice (marked with a cross) published in this document do not assess the artistic (visual) elements of the depicted object themselves. They provide commentary exclusively in relation to related processes or their relationship with the space where they are located. All examples are from Prague and have been selected to illustrate the general problems. The document’s aim is never to harm the authors of the sculptures used for illustration or any other authors. Each photograph is accompanied by a description and explanation of aspects the reader should take into account and examine.


A Introduction	9
B Purpose of the document	15
C Typology	27
C.1 Typology of works of art for the purposes of this plug-in	29
C.2 Categories according to the planned length of display	29
C.2.1 Permanent art (art of a permanent nature)	29
C.2.2 Temporary artistic interventions	34
C.3 Categories according to designation	39
C.3.1 Art with a commemorative function	39
C.3.2 Art without a commemorative function	43
C.4 Categories according to the origin	43
D Quality	45
E Processes	59
Annex – Context for establishing a framework to support public art	91

C

TYPOLGY

If a work of art in public space represents the values of contemporary society, it should not fear to speak the language of the present.

We need to open ourselves to perceiving diverse forms and expressions of contemporary visual art.



C.1 Typology of works of art for the purposes of this plug-in

The objective of the overview below is to establish the basic terminology and structure as an auxiliary foundation for applying the defined principles and rules of placing works of art in public space. This is not an attempt to formulate an exhaustive theoretical taxonomy for the typology of material art. The differentiation between auxiliary typological categories promotes better understanding of existing art and facilitates the definition of meaning and purpose an initiator of a new work of art may desire to pursue. Individual categories have been defined according to various perspectives and criteria. For this reason, they may overlap or complement each other, and a work of art may therefore be included in several categories.

The intent of this chapter, especially in the section with photographs as visual examples, is to illustrate the full extent of topics or themes, locations and forms that can be applied to present art in public space.

C.2 Categories according to the planned length of display

C.2.1 Permanent art (art of a permanent nature)

Art of permanent nature is present at a site for the long term and represents a permanent constituent part of the environment, premises or real estate. For this particular reason, it must, in contrast with temporary installations, satisfy much higher demands on its physical durability, the need to reflect the context of its location, and sustainability of the idea that the work of art represents. It is assumed that a permanent work of art will be given corresponding care by society and repaired and renovated when necessary to extend its life span to the maximum. Given the importance of installing a permanent work of art in a public space, placement should always be preceded by expert assessment of the intended plan, qualified appraisal of the quality of the art and in agreement with all involved actors (for example, in a *design competition* → [E.3.2/p. 68]).

In this document, the following types of permanent art in public areas are differentiated with respect to the character of their form.^[C.01] The list is not exhaustive list; it is a list of its chief exponents:

- **SCULPTURES, STATUES, INSTALLATIONS AND OTHER THREE-DIMENSIONAL (3D) OBJECTS**
→[examples: 009, 010, 011]
 - figural sculptures and statues
 - non-figural objects
 - interactive sculptures, statues and other three-dimensional objects which simultaneously and intentionally create opportunities for stay or play
- **PAINTINGS, RELIEFS, MOSAICS AND OTHER TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D) OBJECTS**
→[examples: 006]
- **ARTISTICALLY RENDERED ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE, INFRASTRUCTURE, URBAN DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE**
→[examples: 001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 007, 008]
 - benches, water elements, fountains, lighting elements, etc.
- **MULTIMEDIA AND INTER-MEDIA INSTALLATIONS USING STATE-OF-THE-ART TECHNOLOGIES**

[C_01] Note: Such forms may also be used in *temporary installations* → [C.2.2/p. 34]

[EXAMPLES: PERMANENT ARTWORKS]



001 Supporting walls by the Nusle Bridge

Stanislav Kolíbal (1968)
[Prague 4, Vyšehrad]

The monumental geometry of sculpted terrace walls visually asserts itself in the adjacent park from bridge views and views from a distance. This artistic intervention forms an integral part of the architecture of the entire project – the Nusle Bridge – Vyšehrad Metro station – terraces of the Palace of Culture (today, the Prague Congress Centre) and provides an example of honest dialogue between architecture and art. The rendering of the metro station and related construction modifications are the work of Kolíbal and architect Stanislav Hubička. Today, this element is unfortunately partially obscured by trees.



002 Relief fencing of the Emauzy Monastery

Miloslav Chlupáč (1972)
[Prague 2, Vyšehradská St.]

Monumental stelae (slabs) made of concrete and Zbuzany limestone create a fence and frame the entry into the Emauzy Monastery and former offices of Prague Studios Association (today IPR Prague and CAMP). The brutal aesthetics of this abstract detail appropriately complements the architecture of the Karel Prager's cubes elevated on high pedestals above the natural environment of the complex. The sculpted slabs were later complemented by an iron fence, which is unfortunately currently only partially open and will eventually be rectified.



003 Gahura prospect

Jiří Valoch, ellement architects (2013)
[Zlín, T. G. Masaryk Square]

The design of the cultivated green foreground of the Congress and University Centre was selected in an architectural competition. Selection of the artist was the fruit of cooperation between the architects and curator Lucie Šmardová. Minimalistic architectural design conforms to the conceptual solution of the integrated artistic element. The work of art embodies the short message “different words every time,” which is open to many interpretations.



004 Bollards in front of the Lichtenstein Palace

Karel Nepřaš (1993)
[Prague 1, Malostranské Square]

27 blue cast-iron bollards with stylized heads on the pavement in front of the palace recall the execution of the 27 Czech noblemen and leaders of the Estates uprising punished by Carl von Lichtenstein. The bollards were put in place during the palace renovations by architect Pavel Kupka, who had cooperated with Nepřaš previously on many occasions. This is an exemplary demonstration of a site-specific link between art and urban design.

[EXAMPLES: PERMANENT ARTWORKS]

005 Ventilation chimneys for the Letná tunnel

Zdeněk Sýkora, arch. Josef Kales (1969)
[Prague 7, Letná Parks]

The glass-tile lining of the four ventilation chimneys is another good example of a high-quality bond between fine art and architecture. This work of art has been a cultural monument since 2003. The geometrical abstract structures generated with a computer were initially considered a radical intervention but were later again used to produce other linings or for pavements at other locations. In the 1960s and working with architect Kales, Sýkora also created the ceramic lining of the passage from the metro station exit at Jindřišská St., which was later removed from this public space (it is now in private hands as part of a nearby bar interior).



006 Retro-reflection

Epos 257 (2016)
[Prague 5, Stroupežnického St.]

The mural mosaic put together from navigation panels reflects the artist's relationship to urban landscape aesthetics. This artwork initiated directly by the artist stands on the boundary of street art and official art and is appropriately located on the blind side wall of the Smíchov clinic—it projects itself into the space of the neighbouring crossroad and bus station, complementing the banal street scene and presenting utilitarian visual or ordinary traffic elements in a new context.



007 Skácel's fountain

arch. Tomáš Pilař, Ladislav Kuba (2006)
[Brno, Svobody Square]

The traditional water element at this square is simultaneously conceived as an artistic element. The circular bronze grate surrounding the fountain is designed to be walked on and decorated with extracts from the verses of Jan Skácel, a native of Brno and an important Czech poet. Even though the fountain stirs controversy between some of the locals, who complain that the verses of such a luminary are being tread upon, it represents an imaginative example of the bond between urban design and a memorial to a local personage, strengthening the importance of the location and providing a contemporary artistic mark in the historical centre's environment.



[EXAMPLES: PERMANENT ARTWORKS]



008 Sculpted children's playgrounds

Artistically interpreted interactive and play elements as well as entire playgrounds stimulate children's fantasies, develop their creativity, create micro-worlds and foundations for games and children's adventures.^[C.02] Children thus have an opportunity from very young age to interact with art in a very natural manner.

Architects cooperating with artists may produce very high-quality and original spaces for children to spend their time in. Contemporary examples of creative children's playgrounds are few and seldom due to strict standards and large selection of standardized elements on the market. Some sculpted playgrounds from the second half of the 20th century are currently being renovated, while some of the artworks of this type have been lost to public space forever.

008a Children's playground "Kaštánek" in Stromovka Park

Eva Kmentová, Olbřam Zoubek (1961, renovated in 2017)
[Prague 7, Nad Královskou oborou St.]

The sculpted elements were renovated in cooperation with the original author and made accessible again to the general public in 2017.



008b Mini landscape at the Fifejdy housing estate

Kurt Gebauer (1980–1985)
[Ostrava, Fifejdy Housing Estate]

This playful mini landscape has sculpted elements and landscaping modifications which take up an area of approximately 1.5 ha of the housing estate's environment. It is fully functional and in use to this day.



008c Playful elements on the Loučná embankment

Pavla Sceranková and Dušan Zahoranský in cooperation with Rusina Frei architects (2017)
[Litomyšl, Vodní valy Embankment]

The design for the revitalized embankment was selected in an architectural competition. The design of the children's playground in the park references musical themes, specifically Bedřich Smetana, who was a native of Litomyšl. This is the fruit of cooperation between architects and two sculptors, who formed a team for the competition.

[C.02] ➤ More on children's playgrounds can be found in *Prague Public Space Design Manual, Chapter C. 2. 7 Playgrounds*

[EXAMPLES: PERMANENT ARTWORKS]

009 Chair

Magdalena Jetelová (1981)
[Litomyšl, Convent Gardens, since 2004]

A travelling artefact refers to the cultural revolt of artists during the communist regime and resistance against adverse circumstances, ideologically transcending the local context of this specific site. This reference and the simple and clear form of this autonomous artwork allows relative freedom for its presentation, and respectively, location. The specific local situation and integration of artworks into public spaces must, of course, be well considered. The installation in Litomyšl fully meets these demands.



010 Home (Doma)

Dušan Zahoranský (2012)
[Slovakia, Košice]


This permanent site-specific intervention poignantly works with the typical aesthetics of a standardized housing estate. By modifying a standard steel rug cleaner frame, the author created a sculpture which projects several inscriptions of “home” in various languages — Slovak, Roma, Hungarian and Hebrew. Individual inscriptions can be read from different angles and under specific lighting conditions. For example, by shining a light through the sculpture, the inscription may be projected onto the side of the adjacent house. This artwork provocatively refers to the multi-cultural society of pre-war Slovakia.



011 Gate of time

Marián Karel and A69 architects (2010)
[Cheb, mouth of the pedestrian zone at Svobody St. into Krále Jiřího z Poděbrad Square]

The complex architectural proposal for renovating Cheb’s pedestrian zone included a plan to create a sculpture which would enhance the significance of the site and provided additional compositional elements in symbolic form. The site selected by the architects was subsequently subject to a competition. The prize-winning work of art visually closed the aperture of the street and followed the main compositional element of the renovated street — a timeline embedded into the pavement (a historical chronology). The kinetic sculpture rotates along its axis during the day and changes its effect on the surrounding space. It is located at the site of a demolished building which obstructed the connection between the city centre and a new train station, thus referencing the opening of the mediaeval city to the industrial era.



The process of obtaining a permit to implement a permanent artwork in a public space is similar to obtaining a permit to construct a small building. A structure in legal terms is defined by the Civil Code and in the Building Act. A structure (or the process of construction) according to the Building Act^[C.03] means *“any construction work arising in relation to construction or assembly technology, irrespective of their design, products, materials and methods used for construction, and irrespective of their purpose of use and duration”*. If the work involves a construction or is a structure, i.e. it has foundations, a power connection for lighting, etc., it is necessary prior to the installation or erection of an artwork to prepare project documentation in the extent necessary to obtain the appropriate building permit.

The new Civil Code^[C.04] defines immovable property (real estate) as follows: *“Any part of a land plot in the space above or below the surface of the plot, including constructions [structures] erected on the plot and other installations (hereafter “structures”) and anything embedded in the land or fastened to walls, except for temporary structures.”* For these reasons, delivering a permanent work of art firmly attached to the ground [someone’s else administrative responsibility] means that the plot of land beneath must also be handed over. This is an administrative step that must be expected by the investor in any project.

C.2.2 Temporary artistic interventions

Artwork does not need to be permanently placed in a public space. Intentional temporary interventions are characteristic for their limited period of display in a public space and include artworks displayed short term or artworks whose temporal character stems from their very content, form and materials.^[C.05] These can be conceptual and topical curatorship projects, site-specific installations, street exhibitions or art shows not subject to permits or physical durability as permanent artworks, though their contribution to the city, residents and visitors may be significant. The period of time or term which these temporary interventions remain in public space should always defined in advance. The usual term is considered one year. The cost of installation, maintenance and removal, including returning the site into its original condition, are borne by the initiator of the event, and the work of art remains the property of the author or initiator. Supporting these temporary site-specific artistic interventions represents a contemporary trend. Most of the art funds for public space in advanced cities focus on this form.^[C.06] Support provided for temporary interventions brings many benefits:

- greater freedom of expression stemming from the nature of temporary interventions may bring novel ideas into public realm and allow certain degree of controversy to stir public discussion about current topics.
- the more often the public can encounter high-quality contemporary art, the better it can learn to accept permanent progressive works of art in public space.
- temporary installations are ideal vehicles to allow young artists to participate in creating the cultural content of the city or artists who would otherwise find it hard to claim room for their art to show to the general public and have little chance to work in real conditions (work with the context of the space, discussion with the public, etc.). This may include shows by art schools, etc.
- the opportunity to reflect current affairs and test specific spaces and audiences from different perspectives.
- quick implementation process, lower durability requirement, etc.
- greater attractiveness lent to the space associated with its rejuvenation—change in the spatial dynamics, which may motivate residents or tourists to repeatedly visit the place.

[C_03] ↗ Act No. 183/2006 Coll., the Building Code.

Whether an artwork is a ‘structure’ under the Building Code is decided on a case-by-case basis and subject to assessment by the locally competent building department.

[C_04] ↗ Act No. 89/2012 Coll., Civil Code

[C_05] Note: Objects may exist which may be treated as permanent artworks but may also, due to their material transience, hover on the boundary between temporary and permanent. Such art may have a limited life span and defined half-life. This fact/property may be intentionally bequeathed on the object by its author. This aspect must be considered during any potential acquisition process. Typical examples might be wooden structures or sculptures whose renovation would represent an irretrievable interference with the artwork’s integrity.

[C_06] See also ↗ ANNEX – Foreign Experience

It useful to define the following sub-categories of temporary works of art:

- **STREET SHOWS, EXHIBITIONS AND ART FESTIVALS**
→ [examples: 016, 017, 018]
 - whose intent is to bring art into public spaces and temporarily rejuvenate and modify the context of a location and offer the general public an opportunity to familiarise themselves with current topics in the art scene
- **DIFFERENT EXHIBITION PLATFORMS AND FORMATS UNDER THE OPEN SKY**
→ [examples: 014, 015]
 - for regular, site-specific artistic expositions which constitute artistic interventions on their own with varied content
- **INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS, AND SITE-SPECIFIC INSTALLATIONS AND INTERVENTIONS**
→ [examples: 012, 013, 019, 020, 021]
 - artistic and architectural objects or interventions, including immaterial multi-media and inter-media interventions (for example sound installations), accompanying outdoor installation programmes for brick and mortar galleries, etc.

Short-term installations of fine art objects in the streets and squares (or similar) of Prague constitutes a special use of public space and is subject to obtaining a permit for special use of space for cultural “occupancy”. These permits are processed and approved with the consent of the location’s owner and the local road administration office upon application. In Prague, the specific office to request a permit from would be the transport department of each district authority, and in exceptional cases, the transport department at the city hall. If the space is located in a park, the application should be filed with the department in charge of municipal parks and vegetation management. When the “occupancy” ends, the space must be returned to its original condition, unless agreed otherwise.

In the process of issuing a permit, the office will evaluate whether the event constitutes a cultural or commercial event and address the placement of the object regarding traffic and public transport. In certain cases, consent from the subterranean utility network administrators may be required or a structural analysis must be performed, for example, for objects with great weight. For installations located in the Prague Heritage Reservation and certain other protected areas within the capital for a period exceeding 30 days, the event organizer will also need to obtain an opinion from the heritage preservation department.

Organizing a cultural event in a public space is subject to a fee, except for events organized by the owner of the land and public street art performance known as busking.^[C.07] The local fee for the special use of a road, street or square, etc. for a cultural event is determined according to the “occupied” area of public space.^[C.08] In Prague, the fee is CZK 4 per square meter (m²). Each district, however, has specific terms and conditions, which are specified in a decree^[C.09]. Some districts exempt fees for all cultural events or events drawing financial support from the district. Besides local special use fees, the public space must be rented from the road administration office, usually the TSK (Technical Road Administration Plc), and an administrative fee for the application and proceedings paid. These are always paid.

[C.07] ➤ According to the binding decree – Prague City Hall. Decree 1/2016, binding decree on limiting measures ensuring safety and security and public order in connection with the performance of public street artistic productions in public space.

[C.08] ➤ Act No. 565/1990 Coll., on local fees.

[C.09] ➤ Prague City Hall. Decree 5/2011 Coll. of the Capital City of Prague, a binding decree on the local fee for the use of public areas

For more details about the *implementation of temporary artistic projects*, please see → [E.4/p. 78]

[EXAMPLES: TEMPORARY ARTISTIC INTERVENTIONS]



o12 Victoria Pragensis
1. 7.–3. 8. 2017
arch. Juráš Lasovský & Haenke Botanical Lab
[Prague 1, Václav Havel Square – piazzetta at the front of the The New Stage of the National Theatre]

A photogenic site-specific installation which works with the architecture of the entire space, transforming it into a geometrical garden, a labyrinth created by thousands of plants. This intervention aimed to increase awareness of wild medicinal herbs and the importance of vegetation in an urban environment. Václav Havel Square is already a traditional space where various artistic installations, cultural events and activities are held (under the supervision of The New Stage productions).



o13 Processual installation
30. 1. 2017–26. 2. 2017
Artur Magrot, Martin Chlanda and Jakub Rajnoch – students of the Studio of Intermedia Work of D. Zahoranský and P. Sceranková at AVU Prague, curator: Jitka Hlaváčková (Prague City Gallery)
[Prague 1, Malostranské Square]

The objective of this installation was to reflect the current discussion on the importance and position of art in public space and the specific climate of Malostranské Square. The ice sculpture embodied the transience of the monument and its variability over time. It also responded to historical context of the area, where society itself and use of the square keeps changing.



o14 Galerie ProLuka (2012)
run by: START Vršovice, Čtyři Dny Koncept, curator: Denisa Václavová, Křištof Kintera
[Prague 10, a vacant site between Krymská and Moskevská St.]
One day I will grow up – Robert Bárta (2015)

An undeveloped vacant lot at the site of a demolished block of houses inspired project initiators to create an open-air public gallery in the form of a local spot for temporary artistic installations and a natural space for social interaction. The intent was to present a diverse spectrum of artistic approaches in the local context and off local residents an opportunity to experience a new, original look in their neighbourhood.



o15 Artwall gallery (2011)
organized under the auspices of: c2c – a circle of curators and critics o. s.
Curator: Zuzana Štefková, Lenka Kukurová
[Prague 7, Kpt. Jaroš Embankment and E. Beneš Embankment]
Dialogue with Carmen – Lidija Mirković (2017)

Alcoves in the supporting wall of the Letná slope were originally used to promote the communist regime. The wall's owner is Prague, and the gallery operates under a loan specifically for art displays. Artwork is meant especially for public transport drivers and passengers. The importance of this gallery lies in the content of its exhibitions, which often addresses the urgent questions of today's society, thus stimulating lively discussions.

[EXAMPLES: TEMPORARY ARTISTIC INTERVENTIONS]

016 m³/ Art in space – theme: “On the Edge”

6 June 2017–1 October 2017, 1st year) Curator: Radek Wohlmuth, Daniela Kramerová, event organizer: artistic studio BUBEC with the support of Prague City Gallery, IPR Prague, Prague 8 City District and KPMG Czech Republic
[Prague 8, Karlín]

According to the authors, the purpose of the festival is “to make the inner space of the metropolis special using interventions by selected artists, to offer city residents and visitors contact with current art, confront them and actively create new territorial contexts.” A showcase of contemporary art in public space represented by well-known names and young authors. The locations of individual installations were in most cases properly selected, or artworks were even created directly for the site.



016a DO NOT BE AFRAID

Timo [tunnel under Vitkov]

A simple intervention in the form of an encouraging sign above the entrance to a pedestrian tunnel humorously comments on the situation, changes the context and refers to the author's street art roots.

016b A Marching Nest

Jakub Geltner

[Kaizel Gardens]

The group of satellite antennas resembles a combat unit with shields and stabbing weapons and thus refers to the original purpose of 'Invalidovna' [veterans' hospital and home] as a refuge for war veterans.



017 Brno Art Open / Statues in the streets motto “Poem and Truth”

(7 June – 27 August 2017, 6th year)

Curator: Tomáš Knořlíček, Libor Novotný, event organizer: House of Art, City of Brno, in cooperation with the City of Brno, under the auspices of the Mayor
[Brno, at different locations in the city centre]

By 2017, this has already become a traditional biennial of contemporary Czech and foreign art in public space with high-quality curatorial and thematic concepts. The 6th year contemplated “the question of so-called artistic truth and highlighted its possible external connection with the current phenomenon of post-truth.” A total of 13 works, site-specific installations and performance interventions revives the city for three months.



017a Emitter

Pavel Karous

[Moravské Square]

A square whose history was gradually shaped by all of the major ideologies of the 20th century. With its silhouette and symbolism, the work responded to the extinct statue “Communists” by Miloš Axman from 1973.

017b A swelling

Martin Kochan

[Římské Square]

Direct intervention in the form of a standard element of public space, an organic wave in the pavement's terrain disrupts the common perception of urban space.



[EXAMPLES: TEMPORARY ARTISTIC INTERVENTIONS]



018 Intersection of Jungles
trevisan atelier+: Jitka Trevisan, Klára Tricátníková, Zuzana Grečnárová, Xavier Nicolau Sansó (2018)
[Prague 3, Vítkov]

A belt/path of grubbed earth accentuated by grass carpet and hanging flowers makes the city's "wilderness" accessible, offers new views on the surroundings, connects. A conceptual as well as inconspicuous artistic act on the border of landscape architecture and land art is an example of fine work with space. The installation was part of the Landscape Festival 2018, whose main idea was to raise awareness of the meaning of landscape architecture in relation to contemporary public space.



019 Shopping is my hobby
Alena Kotzmannová (1997–98)
[Prague, public transport stops]

A photographic project in public space using the illuminated area of public transport shelters usually used for advertising posters. A series of nine photos placed at tram stops aimed to tear visitors and residents of the metropolis away from ordinary (visual) consumption of the city and accentuate the thin line between advertising and art. The project was organized by the The Foundation and Center for Contemporary Art - Prague.



020 Trail of courage
Matěj Al-Ali, Petr Dub a Tomáš Moravec (2012)
[Psáry – Dolní Jirčany]

Under the CULBURB project and in cooperation with the Centre for Central European Architecture (CCEA), this "permanent installation" was created to artistically depict Prague's periphery. A journey with twelve stops worked with the form of classic information boards and directly addressed viewers through the medium they were accustomed to in public space. Using quotes from selected texts on the theory of urban planning or from situational analyses, the project critically reflected the development of suburbanization in the Czech Republic after 1989.



021 Week in self
Mjölkk architekti (2012)
[České Budějovice, Přemysl Otakar II Square]

A spatial installation presenting a house/high seat on tall legs "floating" over the landscape of the city was an accompanying project to the exhibition by architectural studio Mjölkk architects at the House of Art. This is an example of interaction between a "brick & stone" gallery and neighbouring public space. For a few months, a tiny room of 6.25 m2 offered a new experience to perceive city space and live in a minimal area on the square in the centre of České Budějovice.

C.3 Categories according to designation

“Designation” within the meaning of the fundamental intent of art is the idea with which it is initiated, the idea which fills it with meaning and content and defines the degree of creative freedom.

C.3.1 Art with a commemorative function

Memorials, monuments and memorial plaques are commemorative artworks whose primary function is to commemorate or honour the memory of certain persons, social groups or events and to transmit this memory or thought to future generations. In Prague and other Czech cities, monuments still form a significant part of the contemporary production of artistic works for public space as well as themes of the most recent art competitions. Given their ideological importance and generally permanent physical form, *“they are a serious and socially responsible element in shaping public space”* [C.10]. Symbolism and memory often have a greater role than the quality of the art itself in the contexts of evaluating, placing, and returning and removing an artwork from a space. *Artistic quality* → [D.2.1/p. 48], however, is a key component in a monument's complexity and must not be neglected in the discussion of its significance nor its ability to speak to current but also future generations in a language they will be able to understand. In terms of placement, the motif and meaning should hold equal importance in its architectural and artistic aspects → [D.2.3/p. 50].

For commemorative art of a permanent nature, the following properties are essential:

- usually long-term installation at a site
- close connection with the site and the referenced ideological meaning (person, specific event, etc.)
- timelessness of form and general long-term comprehensibility
- physical resistance and durability of the materials used (stone, concrete, bronze etc.) and processing.

Monuments whose motive reflects a more general theme should also not be forgotten. The greater the degree of abstraction in the theme naturally allows a freer form, and placing these monuments is less dependent on a specific place → [D.2.3/p. 51]. Temporary interventions are also legitimate, for example, those commemorating a person or event.

Commemorative artworks in public space include commemorative plaques mounted to walls, reliefs, busts, etc., which, like memorials, commemorate important personalities, institutions or historical events → [example: 027]. They are mounted directly to the facades of buildings which the people or events had a direct relationship to → [D.3/p. 56].

[EXAMPLES: COMMEMORATIVE ARTWORKS]



022 Bike to Heaven
Křištof Kintera (2013)
[Prague 7, Kpt. Jaroš Embankment/Dukelských hrdinů St.]

A monument dedicated to Jan Bouchal, who promoted city cycling and died at this crossroads in a road accident, and to all other cyclists who have died in Prague in a similar manner. It consists of a streetlamp with a bicycle heading skyward. It is a kinetic sculpture that symbolically works with the “artefacts” of sad events. This monument cost over 1 million crowns and was created without financial contribution from the city or state, only public collection. The proposal came from a competition organized by a citizens’ initiative.



023 The House of a Suicide and The House of the Mother of the Suicide
John Hejduk, MCA atelier (2016)
[Prague 1, Jan Palach Square/Alšovo Embankment]

The pale structure symbolizes the son, the “torch-bearer”, and the darker structure is his mother suffering from terror. The work is complemented by a plate bearing a poem by David Shapiro called “The Funeral of Jan Palach.” This high-quality work of art by a world-class author rests in an important city space and is licensed to execute the artwork according to Hejduk’s design, which the city acquired after long negotiations. The condition for granting the licence was the professional supervision of Prof. Williamson over installation. The authors of the site modifications, including the implementation and integration of the statues, were Pavla Melková and Miroslav Cikán, both architects.



024 Monument to the Anthropoid Operation
sculptor David Moješčík and Michal Šmeral and arch. Jiří Gulbis and Miroslava Tůmová (2009)
[Prague 8, V Holešovičkách St.]

A good example of a monument created under a public art and architectural competition organized by Prague 8 City District. This contemporary figurative monument commemorates Czechoslovak pilots and anti-Nazi resistance and reflects the ideological and spatial relationship to the site of historical events. The site is currently significantly impacted by the presence of automobile transport infrastructure.



025 The Max van der Stoel Monument
Dominik Lang and arch. Jakub Červenka (2017)
[Prague 6, Max van der Stoel Park]

At first sight, an inconspicuous work which embodies a significant moment of the meeting between the then Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs with Charter 77 spokesperson Professor Jan Patočka. The concrete imprint of the tree’s shadow symbolically refers to the day of the meeting that took place on March 1, 1977. It is an original rendition which works with the semantic and spatial context of the location and creates a completely new form of relationship with spectators who “rather than passively stop by must actively find their way to it” ^[C.11].

[C.11] ↗Press release published on the occasion of the unveiling of the memorial, 2017 (cit. 1. 3. 2018).

Available online at: <https://stavbaweb.dumabyt.cz/dominik-lang-pamatnik-maxe-van-der-stoela-16256/clanek.html>

[EXAMPLES: COMMEMORATIVE ARTWORKS]

026 Monument to the victims of communism
SPORADICAL – Petr Janda, Josef Kocián, Aleš Kubalík, Jakub Našinec, Veronika Sávová (2006)
[Liberec, park next to Jablonecká St.]

An abstract monument with the theme of (self) reflection, originating from a public architectural and art competition (2003). According to its authors, it is “an attempt to redefine its typological type.” The monument is the dominant form in the park located at its centre of attraction, at the crossroads of the pedestrian paths. The benches and approach from the adjacent space are a part of the installation so that the huge mirror and its immediate surroundings form an indivisible compositional unit.



027 Plaque commemorating the victims of aerial bombardment
Petr Císařovský (2015)
[Prague 2, Karlovo náměstí 37]

The building of the General University Hospital houses a plaque made of hammered bomb splinters and steel plates symbolically engraved with 701 crosses to commemorate the 701 victims of the Prague aerial bombings in 1944–45. The commemorative idea is conceptually materialized as a material treatise on a grim event. All parts of the plaque, including the typography and hook to hang a wreath, form a single, cultivated whole.



028 Bastion XXXI “U Božích muk”
arch. Pavla Melková, Miroslav Cikán (2011)
[Prague 2, Horská St.]

A work of art in the nicely restored chapel niche in the Baroque bastion returns an ideological connection to the site which bore the original name of the place (Bastion at Calvary), thereby elevating it meaningfully. The abstract sculpture uses a contemporary means of expression to complement the original purpose of the wayside shrine—to stop for a moment and remember the suffering of Christ. This is a commemorative work of art in the sense of commemorating the memory of a place.



[EXAMPLES: COMMEMORATIVE ARTWORKS]



029 Memento mori – By one’s own decision
Krištof Kintera (2011)
[Prague 2, Folimanka park]

The idea of raising a “memorial” to suicides and the concept of rendition came directly from the artist. A small modification of the standard element of street furniture turns and shines towards the Nusle Bridge and the sky is a sensitive yet stronger intervention in open space on the edge of perceptibility. The author adds nothing to the space, simply changes its context and thus shows one of the possible ways of inserting art into public space. Installing this thematically controversial monument aroused a contradictory response from the public.



030 Gate of no return
Aleš Veselý (2015)
[Prague 7, Bubny Train Station]

A memorial built from erect train tracks reminiscent of Jacob’s ladder leading to heaven is an initiating installation that accentuates the gloomy history of the Bubny Train Station, from where tens of thousands of Prague Jews were transported to death. This work is the forerunner of the future memorial centre of the Memorial of Silence, which will be built here when the train station building is renovated. The broader Holešovice/Letná area lacks further artistic reflection commemorating the Holocaust victims tied to the tragic past of this site.

C.3.2 Art without a commemorative function

This category includes most artistic objects that do not originate primarily for the purpose of honouring a memory. Their purpose is to increase the quality of the space where they are located through high-quality content and aesthetic effects. Due to the lack of ideological meaning, this category represents the broadest opportunity for creating contemporary works of art.

This category also includes interactive art and art with residential functions based on direct interactions with viewers or the environment. These deepen the experience of a space with direct personal experience by either responding to the movement or behaviour of people passing by, directly drawing the viewer into play, or expounding on the traditional ways of using space. These can be artistically rendered benches, play elements, fountains, etc., but also abstract objects that are expected to be used (since they intentionally encourage such behaviour) sat on, climbed, etc. They should therefore meet basic user safety → [D.2.1/p. 49].

C.4 Categories according to origin

Especially in works of art of a permanent nature, it is necessary to differentiate the terms which depend on the degree of the artwork's authenticity. This document establishes four basic categories, each which may have different qualitative characteristics and significance. It is therefore important to correctly evaluate and define an artwork's character according to its origin before placing a particular object in a public area and communicate openly about objects in this category.

— ORIGINAL

An original is the unique creation of an author. Any imitation of the original that (unlike a copy or a replica) deliberately impersonates the original is a fake.

— MODEL

A model is a mock-up of a work of art which examines the scale and proportional effects of an object. In practice, models may be often confused with the original since they can visually give that impression. However, due to the temporary nature of the material used, these should not be permanently used outdoors or placed in public areas.

— COPIES AND REPRODUCTIONS

A copy is a non-original imitation of the original or another copy made according to the model. A copy may be made by someone other than the author. A mechanically produced copy is a reproduction.

Less valuable artefacts, copies or reproductions should be placed in public areas in minimum numbers. The use of a copy or reproduction of a work of art must always be sufficiently justified. The right to reproduce an artwork is regulated under copyright law, see also → [E.3.4/p. 73].

— A REPLICA (AUTHOR'S COPY)

A replica is a variation of an original work of art completed by the original artist.


A Introduction	9
B Purpose of the document	15
C Typology	27
D Quality	45
D.1 Basic prerequisites for achieving high-quality art in public space	47
D.2 Basic quality criteria for art art in public space	48
D.2.1 Artistic quality	48
D.2.2 Quality of content	49
D.2.3 Spatial quality and location of art in relation to public space	50
D.3 Specific quality criteria	56
E Processes	59
Annex – Context for establishing a framework to support public art	91

D

QUALITY

Selecting a site must be undertaken in consideration of the meaning, content and theme of the work of art and should precede designing the artwork itself.

Ideally, a work of art should be designed for a specific space.



D.1 Basic prerequisites for achieving high-quality art in public space

Through its presence, art in public space directly affects the overall quality of the site where it is located as well as the tastes and thinking of broader society. For this reason, it is important that the city initiates and supports the emergence of high-quality artistic achievements, authentic concepts and strong messages in a dialogue with the place where they are situated.

TRANSPARENT PROCESS, QUALITY ARBITRATOR AND SPONSOR

The prerequisite for achieving a satisfactory result is a high-quality and transparent process → [E.1/p. 61] preceding the placement of the artwork itself. A high-quality, well-placed work will be created only through a methodologically guided process involving the *commissioning body and experts* in respective roles → [E.2/p. 61].

CONCEPTUAL PLAN

The city currently lacks a more sophisticated conceptual plan that would complement this methodological plug-in with a specific support plan for art in public space. This conceptual plan should serve as supporting documentation for preparing and deciding on individual investment plans undertaken by the city in connection with art in public space so that individual steps make sense within the whole and are comprehensible by the general public → [E.5/p. 80]. In particular, any such conceptual plan should determine where to invest in public art, which locations and topics should be prioritized, what type of investment plans should be associated with creating artistic works and how emerging artists, etc. should be involved.

The development of such a conceptual plan requires expert consideration, and therefore independent experts and representatives of public institutions involved in art for public space should assist in creating it. The basis to create it is mapping the current circumstances → [E.3.4/p. 76]. Developing a conceptual plan would closely relate to the idea of understanding art in public space as a collection owned by the city as a whole under the care of a single administrator – *city curator* → [E.2.2/p. 62].

PROMOTING DIVERSITY OF FORMS

The city should overall promote and present a culture of diverse character. For art in public spaces, this means traditional, well-established forms as well as conceptual and experimental art.

QUANTITY DOES NOT OUTWEIGH QUALITY

Quantity must not outweigh quality. The present is prone to the super-saturation of public space with visual content, therefore all efforts to support the emergence of new art should be accompanied by a certain degree of humility and moderation. It is better to have fewer high-quality works of art in the city than a lot of poor-quality works. Similarly, the most expensive and spectacular is not necessarily always the best quality.

REDUCING THE RISK OF POPULISM AND „MINIMUM RISK ART“

The term *minimum risk art* ^[D.01] describes non-conflicting artistic expressions that do not disturb or offend anyone yet fail to bring anything new or enrich, being unstimulating visually or in content. Such works are conceived when art is perceived superficially or used formally and technocratically as a tool for some form of “automatic improvement” which attempts to address the social problems of a location. The process itself is also beset by a high level of bureaucracy and (political) fear of public displeasure.

Art itself cannot cure all ills, and poor-quality art degrades the space and society it is in. It is important that the city takes great care in acquiring high quality, sophisticated works of art and respecting independent experts in order to avoid this negative contemporary phenomenon.

[D.01] ➔ The author of the term *minimum risk art* is the art critic Patricia C. Philips, who coined the expression in her article *Out of Order: The Public Art Machine*. In: *Artforum*, Vol. 27, No.4, 1988

D.2 Basic quality criteria for art in public space

The quality of art entering a public space needs to be evaluated comprehensively – especially in relation to the space where it is situated. Quality criteria for art and artistic interventions in public spaces can be summarized with respect to three equally important areas:

- artistic quality
- quality of content
- spatial quality and the location of art in relation to the public space.

The following subchapters outline the substantial qualitative aspects for these three areas but cannot be understood as exhaustive, especially with respect to specific situations which require additional criteria to be taken into account.

D.2.1 Artistic quality

Establishing universal artistic quality is very difficult. Its guarantee lies in a transparent process that strives for the best possible solution for a given theme and situation based on a qualified assessment of the artistic and aesthetic quality in the given context (i.e. based on specialized education, orientation in the field and experience).

QUALITY OF THE AUTHOR

The quality of the artwork's author represents the basic prerequisite for a satisfactory result. The most suitable author for a particular task should be always selected using an open selection method, which is a public artistic and architectural *design competition* → [E.3.2/p. 68] whose main evaluation criterion is the holistic quality of the design. In exceptions, an author may be also selected according to expert evaluation of the quality of his or her work to date. In this case, the long-term quality and integrity of the author's work to date, provable experience with similar work and sensitivity to the topic should be decisive factors.

CONTEMPORARY EXPRESSION

If a work of art in public space represents the values of contemporary society, it should not fear to speak the language of the present. A work of art's deliberate allusion to the values of the past may also reflect present values. In our circumstances, due to the absence of a methodology and systematic support for creating public space artworks and due to the lay public's (this clearly includes political representation) lack of experience with modern forms of expression, we often incline to conservative, realistic and historicist forms. This is especially true of *monuments and memorials* → [C.3.1/p. 39], where we must not forget that where historical architecture and fine art are primarily used only as narrative symbols, modern times can use an abstract form as a fully developed instrument.

Permanent works of art → [C.2.1/p. 29], i.e. mainly *commemorative works of art* → [C.3.1/ p. 39] are intended, by their very nature, mainly for the coming generation to remind of an event or personality they did not experience. A work of art should therefore speak a contemporary visual language and not turn to a language no longer in use, i.e. in terms of efficiency, a language no longer comprehensible. The superficial and conservative attitudes expressed through some of the currently emerging monuments, which easily take the form of sentimental kitsch, are unsuitable and counterproductive to the purpose of commemorative artworks. It is therefore important, especially in the case of memorials dedicated to personalities, to define the assignment in the planning stage more freely and thus enable and encourage the use of broader means of expression beyond realistic (figural) forms. Instead of descriptive representations or personifications of a person's qualities or merits, a personality can be expressed, for example, by interpreting the legacy of ideas or the subject of the person's character through abstract forms and new media.

QUALITY OF EXECUTION

The quality of execution, i.e. the work's durability, resistance and suitability for maintenance is especially important for art of a permanent nature. These qualities include:

- resistance to weather, including sufficient drainage solutions
- resistance and stability of the work's structural design, its anchoring system and treatment of subtle details, joints etc.
- resistance to vandalism and theft
- quality of craft in details, resistance of subtle details, fragile joints
- material quality (e.g. for objects made of multiple types of materials, it is important that they do not compromise the integrity of the work due to the different physical properties and varying material transformations over time),
- careful and well considered technical solution, including connections to required energy networks (e.g. the lighting for a work, connection to electricity grid, etc.).

For objects in public spaces, it is necessary to ensure solid structural stability and other shape-related, construction and material properties in order to prevent general safety risks, especially in in “*residential*” and *interactive objects* → [C.3.2/p. 43], which may encourage sitting, climbing and other forms of physical interaction, even where it is not primarily intended, but the object's nature would allow nevertheless.

ECONOMIC ADEQUACY OF THE FORM

The cost of acquiring a work of art (which should always include all architectural or landscaping modifications to the site)—its size, materials used, type of construction, landscaping requirements, etc., should be proportional to the importance of the work and the place it is intended for. A realistic calculation of economic cost should already be established in the planning stages of an arts project so that it is very clear from the outset what the price of implementation will be.

All operational and financial costs to maintain the work, including future repairs, also need to be considered in the context of the specific site. A truly comprehensive design for a work of art should therefore also include a maintenance manual created or approved by the work's author, including a description of anticipated repairs that may be needed to ensure target quality and durability → *Administration and maintenance* [E.3.4/p. 75].

D.2.2 Quality of content

Given art's role in society, the ambition to support art from public budgets should be greater than the simple placement of a sculpture in a public space → *Role of art in public space* [A.2/p. 12]. It is also important in this context that the work has can represent it referenced ideas and content and speak to viewers. This does not mean offering trivial clarity, but a complexity in the presented art that communicates and leaves room for one's own interpretation and engagement of the imagination. This is what the form of the works themselves and the context of their position in the area should correspond to. On the other hand, there are recognized trends in contemporary art which are not based on content and openly claim that their significance is primarily “decorative”. A purely aesthetic intention, of course, is legitimate if it falls into a coherent relationship with its surroundings.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONTENT AND THE FORMS OF WORKS OF ART

The importance or nobility of content cannot justify an artwork's poor execution and resulting poor quality, nor the poor quality of its location within a specific environment. Poor-quality art forms and placement lacking context within the given space degrade the quality of the content the work of art attempts to represent.

ETHICAL QUALITY

A part of art’s quality lies in the extent which its contents reflect fundamental, shared social values and in the adequacy of representing the idea itself to society as a whole at a specific site. The realization of a work of art, especially of a lasting nature, must not deliberately discriminate, undermine or violate the fundamental rights and freedoms of any group or individual.

COOPERATION WITH A CURATOR

In special cases (but not strictly limited to these) where a number of artistic works by different authors are implemented in a single place or specific location (e.g. in connection with larger investments, such as the construction of a new metro line, etc.), it is very important to *cooperate with architects*→ [D.2.3/p. 51], who plan the layout of the space, and curators, who provide the essential curatorial concepts→ [E.2.3/p. 63] which address the overall ideas, content and relationships between individual artistic works.

D.2.3 Spatial quality and location of art in relation to public space

The key criterion of quality in a work of art is its relationship to the site where it is located. A work of art cannot simply be a random element in space but must, for its integral part, help shape (elevate) the character and composition of the entire public space. Art cannot be perceived and thought of as a separate element added to a space without any further links. It is therefore desirable to combine any artistic installation with a planned renovation of that space^[D.02] when a plan or study revises the space as a whole → *Methodological preparation* [E.3.1/p. 66].

THOUGHTFUL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A WORK OF ART AND SPACE

The choice of a site for a permanent work of art should never be made solely with regard to the needs of the artwork itself, but always with respect to the work’s impact on the quality of the whole area. Selecting a specific site for a work of art should be done hand in hand with the overall concept, i.e. consider the meaning and content of the work of art, and should precede designing the art.

Ideally, a work of art should be designed for a specific space while evaluating a site-specific situation according to architectural, urban, cultural, social, political, historical, property, environmental and other circumstances. Only in this way can the work genuinely reflect the character of the place and respond well to its limits and potential, such as architectural or technical/operational points of view. A holistic approach is not only a guarantee that introducing an art object into a space will increase the value of the place, it will also enhance the quality of the work of art itself and increase its resilience in the place. A place itself may elevate or suppress an idea and the quality of the art. The art can have the same effect on the place.

With regard to the overall image of the city and the site, and also with regard to the desired methodological approach in collecting art for public space, the selected site should respond to the *conceptual plan of the city*→ [D.1/p. 47]. In the absence of a comprehensive conceptual plan, it is at least recommended that the choice of a site be confronted with the records (maps) of *works of art in public space* in the territory of Prague → [E.3.4/p. 76] which describes the real situation of the number and character of artworks in a given site. Where a public space remains unfinished and the plan for its completion does not yet exist, a work of art should be placed on a temporary basis, or with the agreement that if the space is redesigned in the future, placement of the work of art may be re-evaluated according to the change in the site’s context and new spatial organization → [example: O34, O44], → [E.3.4/p. 73].

It is equally important to protect the artwork’s role within the framework of the whole when future partial interventions/modifications of the surrounding public space are considered. These modifications should not compromise the integrity of the artwork and its *effect in the space*. → [D.2.3/p. 50].

Another important consideration is that placing a work of art in a neglected space does not represent a solution to the problem that needs to be solved at its foundation. Art intervention

[D.02] Note: Combining public investment in public buildings, open space and infrastructure with art intervention projects is also the essence of the “Percentage on Art” principle – see also ↗ ANNEX – P.2 Principles establishing support in the form of a „percent for art“.

must not be misused as an instrument for rapid revitalization of sites neglected by age or inadequate care instead of repairing and maintaining the site's physical substance. The same applies to sites that are problematic due to improper layout instead of engaging in its physical rearrangement (e.g. pedestrian underpasses, etc.). For example, a simply formal application of a coat of paint does not respect the tectonics and architectonic structure and does not increase the quality of the space. On the contrary, it increases its degradation → [example: O38].

IDEOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMEMORATIVE ART AND ITS SPACE

It is especially important for *monuments and memorials* → [C.3.1/p. 39] that these works are not taken out of the context of their place and time. On the contrary, they must resonate with their particular location. It is inappropriate to design and produce a monument without knowing its future location, which would result in a work of art that is entirely unconvincing at its location and in its spatial relationship and artistic representation → [example: O35]. Site selection must be a thoroughly reasoned decision coordinated with a reflection on the monument's concept. The selected site should relate to the monument's theme, whether commemorating an event or personality → [example: O36].

Certain exceptions can be made with respect to monuments dedicated to general themes with a broader social significance and do not need to relate to a particular location. These monuments can be located according to the results of a wider debate → *Conceptual preparation* [E.3.1/p.66] for municipal public spaces and symbolically and architecturally complete them.

COOPERATION WITH ARCHITECTS

Given that the implementation of a work of art in a public space is not a purely artistic discipline but also has broader architectural and urban planning connotations, the participation of an architect in the process is crucial, and best from its planning stage. This is true even where the primary objective is not to modify the surroundings but to “merely” locate/place a work of art, because any placement will always significantly affect the appearance of the wider space. The architect's role is to evaluate the broader spatial and ideological context of the site and view the site as a whole with the work of art constituting an essential part.

Cooperation between the artist and the architect is therefore desirable both at the methodological level of an initial plan or study and during subsequent project stages. If the future work of art or its part constitutes a “*structure*” according to the *Building Act* → [C.2.1/p. 34], the role of an authorized architect is to provide the required project documentation, which is the prerequisite for obtaining appropriate permits, and architects should subsequently supervise the author's implementation of the structure.

INCORPORATING WORKS OF ART INTO PUBLIC SPACE

Every plan or design for a work of art must consider the local situation's overall spatial composition, especially:

- orientation of the work with respect to the main perspectives and viewing axes (the connecting space and broader viewing aspects)
- scale and expressive intensity of the work relative to the size of space
- application of the work in the semantic, compositional and operational hierarchy of the space
- application of the work in the broader urban relationship with the location or city
- readiness of the space, i.e. the need for related architectural modifications at the site.

It is also necessary to consider whether the work should be a dominant feature in the given space, or whether the space is rather intimate and the work should interpret and illustrate its

atmosphere, proceed sensitively with respect to the historical environment → [D.2.3/p. 53]
or redefine the space with its artistic input.

When designing an art object, it is necessary to consider the character of the background, vertical backdrop and layout of the public space. The object may resonate differently when placed in grass or on a pavement (e.g. in the tone of the shadow it casts, etc.). Works of art located in parks and surrounded by vegetation should reflect and respond to the changing nature of the natural environment over time, including seasons. Therefore, when planning art for sites with urban vegetation, cooperating with landscape architects and other specialists (dendrologist, arborist) is recommended.

The space for an artistic intervention should not be over-saturated with a multitude of visual stimuli and spatial disturbances (visual pollution in the form of traffic signs, infrastructure poles, information boards, etc.) unless it intends to reflect the nature of the environment or implementation also architecturally modifies the space to adjust and visually calm the site. It is also necessary to consider obstacles, which at first sight may not be perceived since they are a regular part of urban space, but can potentially prevent good visibility of the work or compete with it visually, suppressing its importance and influence.

For spatially distinctive works or ambiguous compositional locations and situations with difficult perspective and scale, verifying the effect in the space with a 1:1 scale model at the site is recommended.

CONSIDERATION OF OPERATIONAL LINKS

The location of a work of art should reflect the existing pedestrian, operational and technical links and traffic at the site and the site's overall use. The work should not create an obstacle, and conversely, the character and operational aspects at the site should not degrade the work of art. The location of underground infrastructure must be thoroughly verified since their presence beneath the surface may not be immediately obvious and may significantly affect the possibility of erecting an object.

When an already completed work of art created without a direct link to the site is installed or sculptures are returned to their original site and the immediate context of the site has changed over time, it is important to resolve any physical modifications of the space in order to integrate the object into its environment; see also *repositioning artworks*. → [E.3.4/p. 76].

PRESENCE OF OTHER WORKS OF ART IN THE SAME SPACE

When permanent artworks are installed into an existing environment, it is necessary to respect the artworks that may already be there. Newly erected art should not compromise their integrity, and individual artworks should not compete with each other in their meaning or overall composition → [example: O32]. An exception is a temporary installation, which may intentionally change the overall context of the site and involvement of permanent objects for a limited period—but this always depends on the individual assessment of the specific installation.

Although one may well say that each space is potentially open to some form of artistic input, an expert assessment of a situation may conclude that a specific space is unsuitable for yet another artistic object, that the space at the given time has completed its development in this respect. This may occur especially in squares or open park areas.

METHODS AND DETAILS OF MOUNTING ART

The method of anchoring and fitting the object in the given space must be considered from its initial creation in the overall design solution. A three-dimensional sculpture should not be subsequently placed on a pedestal that was created independently without the link to the work itself. Similarly, the immediate surroundings of the artwork must not be underestimated during the design stage, in the project documentation or during implementation of the object. Every detail of the installation, especially the needs and character of the pedestal, the contact of the

statue or the pedestal with the pavement, etc. must be considered, as they affect the overall tone of the object and the space it is located in.

SELECTION OF MATERIALS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SITE

The materials used in an art object should be based on the character and materials at the site where it will be located, according to the visual impact on its backdrop, how the space is used and the expected level of interaction between the statue and its audience.

ACCESSIBILITY

Any object not intended for viewing at a distance but require a close viewing or haptic experience, or, for example, monuments that invite a greater degree of general interaction (e.g. laying wreaths, etc.) must be sufficiently accessible. Often, objects are erected in grass or among flowerbeds, sometimes with the motivation of providing natural protection against vandalism. However, this particular safety-related criterion should certainly not outweigh good access and the overall effect of the object within the space. It is inappropriate to fit safety or protective elements such as chains or fencing at later stages etc. → [example: 032]. A sculpture intended for public exteriors should be sufficiently safe and durable → *Quality of execution* [D.2.1/p. 49] to avoid similar issues and measures.

DESCRIPTION AND INFORMATION

If the work will have accompanying information or an explanatory sign, then the design of the sign (e.g. a descriptive plaque or similar typographic element with information) should be incorporated into the comprehensive design of the object and the space. Elements displaying information should not compete visually with the work nor be retrofitted without consulting the author; see also *author's maintenance manual* → [E.3.4/p. 75].

LIGHTING

An object's design should always consider its night-time effect in the given space. Working with a lighting specialist during the design process is recommended. Lighting is a part of a work of art as a whole. It is therefore not possible to change lighting elements (e.g. within the framework of routine maintenance of the space assuming that the lighting is a separate urban infrastructure element) without consulting the author, as any change may result in a fatal change in the overall tone and quality of the object.

SOCIAL CONTEXT – RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ART AND SPACE WITH RESPECT TO USERS

The quality of work in the social context of a place means how the planned and implemented work of art responds to the character of the space's function and use. Placing the object/ artefact into a space without any relationship to the character of use and social context of the place is insufficient. It is always necessary to consider the users of the public space and their involvement in the dialogue and interaction with the space and work of art.

When formulating a plan or commissioning or designing the work, it is important to consider who the main users of the site will be and how the project reflects their social composition (demographic, cultural, etc.), the importance of the space's use within the city structure (local, citywide, etc.), how it will support or complement existing activities at the location, how the work may encourage people to interact, and how local actors can be involved in creating, using and managing the work → *Educating, informing and involving the general public* [E.5/p. 80].

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE SITE – RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ART AND SPACE FROM A HERITAGE PROTECTION PERSPECTIVE

The historical context and heritage protection issues at a site also represent a significant aspect in the evaluation process of a work of art's location. This concerns not only the physical substance of the space but also its ideological content and the relationship between the two. Any plan to install a work of art within the Prague Heritage Conservation Area or other protected areas of the city must be consulted with the competent local authority of the state (department) of the City of Prague for heritage protection.^[D.03] Inviting conservation experts to consult ahead of and during the project's preparation is recommended.

[D.03] → Act No. 20/1987 Coll., on national heritage preservation.

[EXAMPLES: QUALITY] [D_04]



031 A monument to New York City Firefighters and First Responders
[Prague 1, Kampa Park beneath the Charles Bridge]

The monument was created through a fund-raising campaign organized by volunteer firefighters from Prague 1 to permanently commemorate the heroism of New York City’s firefighters and the efforts of local firefighters in their battle against the destruction brought by devastating floods years ago. Unfortunately, it is improperly surrounded by a chain that prevents access to the monument during normal operation (which also makes the reading of the descriptive tablet difficult). In busy places, it is important that the object has adequate durability and does not need additional protection. Alternatively, a different location must be chosen.



032 Sculpture vs. graffiti
sculpture: Václav Zajíc, Jan Fišera (1983)
graffiti: Udo Kraft, later Jan Kaláb (2008)
[Prague 7, Vltavská Metro Station]

The glass relief/stained glass with Vltava River motif forms part of the wall in the metro vestibule, which was inappropriately designated a legal graffiti area intended for “beautification”. The contract for street art artists did not mention that the existing work must be respected, nor did they approach it themselves with any humility. On the contrary, in recent years, the art on the relief is regularly repainted. A private citizens’ initiative (initially unofficially) voluntarily pursued the purification and restoration of original artwork.



033 Cloak of conscience
Anna Chromy (2000)
[Prague 1, Ovocný trh]

The work donated by the author is found in several copies in other European cities around the world (Athens, Salzburg and others). This is not an example of a work of art created for a specific space, but instead private interest in exhibiting the object—a “brand” in attractive spaces. The statue visually evokes a tourist attraction more than an object of art. The fragile public spaces within the very valuable historical centre of Prague should be dedicated only to the finest art objects.



034 A monument to WWII soldiers
Jiří Plieštík, architekti Tomáš Novotný a Jiří Opočenský (2004)
[Prague 6, Vítězné Square]

The currently ongoing urbanistic competition triggered a debate whether it is possible to change the shape and location of the monument (which includes the adjacent paved area and an info panel) within a new layout of the public space. When renovating a space where the work is located (albeit a good-quality work), the requirement to keep it all intact with reference to the copyright is often raised. If the overall context of a site changes, it is legitimate to undertake a comprehensive review of the extent and location of the existing work of art and formulate a proposal for its modified inclusion in the new whole.

[D_04] Note: The illustrated artworks are not considered negative as a whole. We do not evaluate the quality of the project or artistic quality of the works themselves. The argument is that some aspect of their acquisition and existence in the territory, especially in terms of interaction with the surrounding context, is not ideal and highlights a general failure of principle. Reading the photograph’s text which describes the deficiency is important.

[EXAMPLES: QUALITY] [D_04]

035 Monument to Czechoslovak pilots

Colin Spofforth (2014)
[Prague 1, Klárov]

The bronze sculpture of a winged lion on a concrete plinth is a gift from the British community living in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. From the beginning, the monument received strong media coverage due to negative commentary on its artistic quality and disputes between the initiator, the British embassy, the city district and municipality. This particular art object is an example of non-methodological implementation of a significant monument with high symbolic and ethical value. It was not preceded by a qualified choice of site or artist, resulting in a work of ambiguous artistic value.



036 A monument to Taras Shevchenko

Valentin Znoba (2009)
[Prague 5, Kinských Square]

The raising of a monument to a Ukrainian poet could be considered an individual political act without reflecting the wider social context of the place. It is a monument to a personality embedded in a space to which it has no relation. The installation was not preceded by sufficient professional consultation over its meaning or the overall concept of the area, and it therefore does not fit into the square, which has not been qualitatively completed. Moreover, the figurative form of the statue conservatively mimics the realism of the 19th century.



037 Sculpture line

(1 June 2017 - 30 September 2017, 3rd year)
Curator: Josef Záruba-Pfeffermann
Event organizer: SCULPTURE LINE s. r. o.
[Prague, various locations throughout the city]

This annual show of attractive art works in public spaces deserves a deeper thematic and urbanistic concept that would justify the choices and locations for the individual objects, to give them greater meaning and comprehensibility. Some of these high-quality artworks by international artists are not given adequate space, and their effect is lost. They appear misplaced and inadvertently become a part of the visual pollution in the city.



038 Artistic approach to a bus terminal roof

Artwise (2015)
[Prague 5, Smíchov Train Station]

In the attempted revival of the train station with street art (under contract), artists were invited to modify surfaces of the building. No reflection was given to the fact that the terminal building is not just an empty canvas without context, but an architectural object with a certain composition. Although this is only a temporary intervention, it is better to carefully prepare a site-specific project/assignment that has a broader social impact and to approach an expert who can recommend a suitable procedure and eventually a specific artist. The application of a multi-coloured coat of paint to a neglected space does not guarantee an improvement in the quality of the space.



D.3 Specific quality criteria

QUALITY CRITERIA FOR COMMEMORATIVE PLAQUES

Commemorative plaques are not merely signs with information but artistic objects which are subject to all of the quality criteria described in the previous chapters. They must also be suitably incorporated into the structure’s facade in a manner that does not disrupt compositional bonds or produce undesirable disproportions in material, durability or colour. At the same time, with respect to some plaques, it is necessary to properly approach the desire to place wreaths, i.e. elegantly treat and incorporate a hanging element (hook) into the design that does not disturb the overall tone or create a barrier in the space and will not interfere with the object’s maintenance.

QUALITY CRITERIA OF ARTISTIC WATER ELEMENTS

Fountains, drinking fountains and other similar and artistically rendered water features bring desired refreshment to the city. Their utility function, however, makes them more susceptible to wear and tear. The key criterion in this context is economy of design, not just with respect to purchase price but complexity of operation and maintenance. However, the cost aspect must always be assessed on an equal footing with other quality criteria.

In designing these objects, it is important to specify how they will be used in order not to compromise general safety. This relates to defining the sanitary requirements for drinking water quality and verifying the methods of connecting these objects to a water source. Examining the possibilities of using rainwater (environmental concern) is recommended. The design should minimize build-up of dirt and sediments. When the maintenance requirements are defined, it is necessary to specify the expected method of cleaning and repairs of individual parts. Cleaning should not be complicated in order to maintain the art object in its targeted quality. Considering how these objects will be used and operated during winter is also recommended.

QUALITY CRITERIA FOR TEMPORARY INTERVENTIONS

Temporary interventions may be subject to looser requirements on their materials and durability due to their limited time of exposure in public spaces and allow room for experimentation. When the quality of the work is evaluated, the emphasis should primarily be on the idea and coherence of the intervention’s concept and the physical and ideological relationship between the intervention and selected sites. The provision/assignment of a site and financial support should be decided according to conditions that would deter events primarily motivated by private commercial interest. A prerequisite for a high-quality temporary intervention lies in quality of the process → [E.4/p. 78].
Parades, festivals and temporary exhibitions of art in public space require guidance from a curator. The placement of artworks in a space must not be random (unless this is the legitimate and intended concept) but well considered. The theme of the show is important in determining the conscious relationship between the form and content of artworks and the space they were created for or where they are located. The objective of these events should not simply be to display works in the street without any relation to the location, it is important to respect all of the principles that apply to permanent works. As in a gallery, allocating a suitable spot in public space creates a harmonious relationship between the work and the space and allows the work to stand out and enhance the context of the place, otherwise the artwork may vanish into the space or appear inappropriate → [example: O37]. Location/sites for artworks should always be consulted with their authors and ideally also with the architect and the city curator of art in public space → [E.2.2/p. 62], [E.4/p. 78]. Often another event may take place in the city in parallel and disrupt the original intention of artworks at their sites (or vice versa).

The maxim that “less is more” also applies to street art shows and festivals. Although some variation in the quality levels of individual works may be anticipated, organizers must make sure that below average installations never prevail. A variety of approaches and concepts hand in hand with carefully selected locations represents a much more valuable approach than presenting a large number of objects in recurring situations. The challenge for the organizers and curators of these festivals is to strike a balance between clarity, visibility (attractiveness to

a domestic and international audience) and the artistic quality of the concept of the entire event and individual installations.


A Introduction	9
B Purpose of the document	15
C Typology	27
D Quality	45
E Processes	59
E.1 Processes relating to art in public space	61
E.2 New roles and entities in institutionalised processes	61
E.2.1 The role of an expert arbitrator, committee or cultural council	61
E.2.2 City curator for public art	62
E.2.3 The role of independent curators as expert consultants and process mediators	63
E.2.4 The role of project manager	64
E.3 Implementing art of permanent nature	65
E.3.1 Methodological preparation	66
E.3.2 Production of a work of art through a public tender	68
E.3.3 Acquisition of an existing artwork for a specific site	71
E.3.4 Subsequent existence of the art at a site	73
E.4 Implementation of temporary artistic interventions	78
E.5 Educating, informing and involving the general public	80
E.5.1 Methods of informing and educating the general public	81
E.5.2 Involving the general public in the art acquisition process	82
E.6 Systematic financial support	85
E.7 Model process scenarios	85
E.7.1 Scheme of the implementation process for an art-architectural design competition	86
E.7.2 Acquisition of a completed work of art or licence for the creation of an artwork	87
E.7.3 Scheme of the process for a repeated placement of a work of art	88
E.7.4 Scheme of the implementation process for a temporary artistic intervention	89
Annex – Context for establishing a framework to support public art	91

E

PROCESSES

For committees and juries to be effective, it is essential to emphasize the relevance of its members' expert opinions and transparency in the selection process.

Impartiality, expertise and credibility in the eyes of the professional and general public are essential in jury members.



E.1 Processes relating to art in public space

If high-quality art is to be created and exist in Prague, the processes related to implementation and subsequent existence of art in space must also be of high-quality. Support provided during the implementation of high-quality art in public space requires a clear and functioning institutional background based on the clear division of competences and effective communication between various city departments as well as external bodies. The first section of this chapter therefore proposes new subjects (actors) and new roles for existing actors whose existence and activities could lead to better processes and fulfilment of the city's methodological approach to art in public spaces.

The chapter also describes the processes related to implementing and placing artistic works in public space, with an emphasis on the activities and partial steps which are currently underestimated and need to be rehabilitated or newly described. The ideal courses of selected processes are described at the end of this chapter in the form of model scenarios (diagrams).

E.2 New roles and entities in institutionalised processes

E.2.1 The role of an expert arbitrator, committee or cultural council

There is currently no professional guarantor for public art. The proposed designs for works of art are only subject to comprehensive qualitative evaluations in cases of isolated design competitions in which winners are selected by individually assembled juries → [E.3.2/p. 69]. If, however, a work is acquired in a manner other than through a design competition or if other activities determine the theme of art for public space, no arbitrator or independent advisory body that would assume professional patronage of the decision-making processes and provide an expert opinion is currently available at the city's highest levels.

This role may be formally executed, for example, by an expert commission attached to the Council of the Capital City of Prague or a cultural council^[E.01] attached to a professional institution (for example Prague City Gallery). For this body to function effectively, it is essential to emphasize the relevance of the body's expert opinion directly with the city government. It is essential to highlight the impartiality and expertise of members and their credibility in the eyes of the professional and the general public. For this reason, the process of appointing members to this board or commission must be transparent. Any fears of the cultural public with respect to expert art commissions still lingering as a symbol of regulation and constraint need to be gradually eliminated through the openness of these boards or commissions and through the will of the city and interested public to collaborate → [E.5.2/p. 82].

Experts should be nominated to this commission or board by respected public and independent professional institutions, entities with long-term moral and professional integrity active in the field of fine art and architecture, and also by representatives of the artistic community. The expert's role in the commission is to defend the quality of the resulting works and transparency of the processes, not the interests of the institution. A guideline for nominating specific experts is preference in the following professions: artist, curator, theoretician, architect, urbanist, historian, conservationist, sociologist, publicist, educator, etc., and taking into account the proportional representation of all forms of expertise in the commission.

An important criterion for the final selection of members should be their demonstrated knowledge of and orientation with examples of contemporary fine art, urbanism or architecture in domestic and foreign scenes, or the necessary knowledge of historical, sociological and other fields related to the creation of cities and respect of the professional public. Commission members should be regularly replaced in order to maintain continuity in the body's activities.

When the commission is set up and its scope of activities specified, the city can draw inspiration from similar examples abroad or by working models of other domestic institutions. The commission should have sufficient time to assess and evaluate projects and be able to meet

[E.01] ↗ For example, the cultural council according to the example of Austria, where they have the so-called cultural senate enshrined in the law on the promotion of culture of 1996 (NÖ Kulturförderungs-gesetz 1996)

project initiators and authors of art in personal interviews, etc. Members should be sufficiently remunerated. Given that this would be a formal professional platform for discussion and formulation of expert opinion, it is necessary to create a base, including administrative support, which prepares documentation for meetings, etc.

This is a brief summary of the activities of the commission for art in public space:

- independent expert opinion for the city government.
- professional and formal guarantee for a citywide concept and vision.
- professional guarantee of methodological preparation of plans for the acquisition of works of art when it is purchased or financed by the capital city.
- assessment of major plans and recommendations for the placement of art in public space, etc.

E.2.2 City curator for public art

At present, there is no representative for or comprehensive overview of existing works of art in public spaces; see also *Record-keeping and documentation* → [E.3.4/p. 76]. The concept of art in public space being a type of collection is similarly absent. It is therefore difficult to guarantee that any newly acquired work would be conceptually consistent with this concept of a collection: a work is acquired after careful consideration and possesses apparent justification for the city (or specific site) with respect to its theme, form and location.

Today, the Prague City Gallery (GHMP), which is a professional institution in the field of visual art established by the capital city, is the administrator of public sculptures. GHMP is also the administrator of all monuments, memorials, commemorative plaques and fountains in Prague’s public space. In addition to custodianship and classifying artistic works and artefacts, the role of the municipal administrator of public sculptures can also be more comprehensive, provided it has sufficient capacity. It could act as the city curator of public art in order to build a collection as a meaningful whole. This would place it in the position of one of the main co-creators of a *citywide concept*→ [D.1/p. 47] in relation to art in public space and a natural professional authority.

The role of the city curator would also be to provide consulting services to the city (city districts and other actors) and use its knowledge and expertise to coordinate individual plans. The curator should also maintain communication with the city, educate other city departments (e.g. district officials), communicate with the public, be involved in promotional and educational activities → Educating, informing and involving the general public [E.5/p. 80]. Similarly, a city curator’s representative may also act as a project manager for selected events initiated by the city → The role of a project manager [E.2.4/p. 64].

Summary of a municipal curator’s activities:

- administration, maintenance and formulation of a curator’s concept for collecting works of art in public space owned by the capital city.
- involvement in the creation of a citywide conceptual plan for art in public spaces.
- consultation on and coordination of plans proposed by third parties, etc.
- initiation and co-creation of plans for the acquisition of new works, preparation of plans for evaluation by an expert committee or cultural council.

- preparation and implementation of public procurement tenders, competitions, open calls, etc.
- information, promotion and education of the general public.
- communication with other departments of the city, artists, independent curators, etc.

039 Fountain with sculpture

Lydie Hladíková, Děviana Mírová, Marie Rychlíková (1976)
[Prague 8, Invalidovna housing estate]



Although the entire abstract sculpture is in a neglected state (originally it was a composition with a water element), it still completes the identity of the common area of the housing estate. It illustrates the memory of the space yet captivates the attention of younger generations. It develops children's imaginations and interacts with them, creating a natural background for their games.

E.2.3 The role of independent curators as expert consultants and process mediators

An independent curator acting as a methodological creator and professional consultant for art projects in public space is a profession associated in our country with short-term public art festivals. However, their role can make a significant contribution to achieving high quality in permanent art for public space. They would informally complement the role of expert arbitrator → [E.2.1/p. 61] at the highest level of city's decision-making processes, which, by definition do not have the capacity to solve partial projects in detail or provide long-term education for the professional and lay public through mutual dialogue.

Demand for these services may increase over time, especially as financial support for art at national or local levels is applied. The existence of this profession, however, depends on the support for developing capacity and long-term development of comprehensive training for future curators.

The purpose of this specialization is primarily to behave as an "interpreter" to convey artistic values and interpret the hidden meanings and context of art for the general public.^[E.02]

[E.02] → See also
PACHMANOVÁ, Martina. *Who are curators? On the interpreters of art and their dialogue with the public*. In: A2. 2007, č. 39 [cit. 30. 5. 2018].

Available online at: <https://www.advojka.cz/archiv/2007/39/kdo-jeto-kuratora>

The curator may also act as a “process guide” and provide expert assistance services to initiators in preparing and communicating plans to implement works of art in public space. Through its expertise, the curator’s role is to ensure the quality of content in the project preparation process. This role is beyond purely artistic or architectural knowledge and represents the ability to discover relationships and interpret the connections between artistic, historical, social and political contexts. For example, the curator can raise the architects’ awareness with regard to selecting artists for a given task, or directly propose and showcase the work of artists that could be invited as collaborators, etc.

Curators should be engaged at a designated workplace in the city (e.g. *city curator for public art* → [E.2.2/p. 62]) to collaborate on the preparation of projects, organize competitions, etc. Curators could also assume the roles of project managers and consultants or mediate communication between different actors in various processes/projects, educate the public, etc.

Summary of an independent curator’s activities:

- consultation, methodological support for the preparation of plans to place/locate art in public space,
- facilitating dialogue between the artistic and non-artistic worlds, interpreting artistic values in the area of public relations, general public education,
- cooperation with architects,
- production, management of art projects, etc.

E.2.4 The role of a project manager

The implementation of a permanent work of art in public space should, in principle, be seen as a socially responsible project. It has certain formal requirements and a clear objective formulated in advance and requires coordination between different actors at different stages.

It is important, especially in the framework of significant investments initiated by the city, that a project manager is appointed immediately at the beginning of the process (a specific institution or responsible authority) to guarantee the acquisition of artwork, as a part of a larger project, or eventually to guarantee the project as a whole. If this responsibility is not clearly defined, then there is a risk that the project may disintegrate “along the way” or depart from its original concept, or that the implementation does not successfully finish or that it does not turn out as expected.

A project manager will be involved with the project from the start to finish—from its initial formulation to its completion. He/she should have the power to represent and act on behalf of the investor under the entire process. A project manager must be responsible for setting up the project, its active fulfilment and outcome. The project manager’s task is to maintain the integrity and original concept of the project and facilitate communication between individual actors involved in its process (and prevent fragmentation of competencies).

Summary of the project manager’s activities:

- coordinating individual professions involved in the preparation of the project, overseeing the preparation of tenders and contractual documents,
- facilitating communication between individual actors, representing the contracting authority in negotiations with the relevant state administrative authorities and other actors,

- control of deadlines and quality throughout the preparation and implementation process in accordance with the original concept and the quality requirements defined by the contracting authority and applicable legislation and standards,
- ensuring post-realization guarantees and service, defining the conditions and scope of post-realization service and artwork maintenance,
- commissioning and takeover of the work of art.

040 Monument to Jan Palach (The House of a Suicide and The House of the Mother of the Suicide),
John Hejduk, arch. Pavla Melková, Miroslav Cikán (2016)
[Prague 1, Jan Palach Square/Alšovo Embankment]



On 18 January 2012, the city approved the plan to build a monument to Jan Palach. The ceremonial handover of the monument took place on January 16, 2016, with foreign guests and political representatives in attendance, on the anniversary of Palach's self-immolation—exactly four years after the plan to realize the work of John Hejduk in Prague was approved.

E.3 Implementing art of a permanent nature

Acquiring a permanent work of art for a public space is a process that involves several stages, which, as with building a house, cannot be skipped. For this reason, it is necessary to methodologically prepare the project, devise a suitable method to select the author and the work of art, and produce corresponding project documentation to obtain the appropriate permits.

A work of permanent nature can be acquired for a public space in various ways, for example:

- realization of the work for a specific site by an artist selected in a public tender, e.g. an architectural/art competition,
- purchase of an existing artwork for a specific location directly from an artist, gallery or other entity,
- accepting donation of a particular artwork to the city, directly by the artist, galleries, foundations, private or civic initiatives,

- a collective process as a result of community participation on a site-specific project, workshop,
- returning an original artwork, or in exceptional cases, a copy of an artwork to the original site.

E.3.1 Methodological preparation

Careful pre-project preparation is the basis of a methodological approach to the overall quality of public spaces. In many cases, and not only in relation to art in public space, underestimating this stage of the project may lead to problems later.

All major urban investments into significant public spaces or buildings should always include a professional evaluation whether a permanent work of art should form a part of this investment (especially if an instrument of systematic financial support exists → [E.6/p. 85]). This requirement should be defined in the commissioning documentation for individual projects or architectural competitions which, through their character, satisfy the opportunity to install an artistic work in the subject public space, e.g. selecting a specific site to subsequently place art or elements suitable for artistic representation so that the work can reflect the social, architectural-urbanistic and ideological context of the site.

PREPARATION OF PLANS

The outcome of the initial project stage should be a coherent and well-reasoned plan, containing all the relevant information so that it can be qualitatively assessed and developed into a project for public procurement, for example, a design competition → [E.3.2/p. 68] etc.

First, it is essential that the client deliberates on the basic questions of the essence and meaning of the planned work of art and its location in the city and also the question of the relationship of the artwork's content to the selected site, see also *Spatial quality and location of art in relation to public spaces* → [D.2.3/p. 50]. At the same time, it is important to address the actors involved, including expert representatives and public organizations → [E.5.2/p. 82], and initiate open discussion so that these actors can promptly formulate their attitudes towards and interests in the location and artwork's concept.

At this stage, it is also necessary to select a suitable method for acquiring the artwork and selecting the author of the architectural and artistic component to ensure prompt consultation with IPR Prague as the main conceptual workplace for architecture, urban planning and city development and with the owner of the land (often the capital city of Prague or one of its districts), etc.

The spatial conditions and future plans affecting the site must also be thoroughly explored. A coherent project should contain:

- a concept of the plan and its artistic and historical justification,
- a defined and anticipated location (including justification for the choice), essential location information (landowners, etc.),
- a list of stakeholders and preliminary consent from all major organizations and entities involved (e.g. district administration, etc.),
- a proposal of the method of acquisition of the artwork (including justification) → [E.3/p. 65],
- an indicative calculation, preliminary project schedule, specification of the project guarantor, etc.

TENDER PREPARATION

The outcome of this stage should be a high-quality definition of the project and detailed specification of the plan in a form ready for commissioning, and respectively, specification of the subject of the public contract; see also *Subject of the competition and competition terms* → [E.3.2/p. 69]. In this context, it is essential to determine the project costs and schedule promptly as well as the corresponding schedule for each activity (e.g. sufficient time for design proposals, time required to produce the artwork, etc.) and steps to implement the plan (e.g. administrative procedures, tenders, etc.) in sufficient quality and a coordinated manner.

High-quality commissioning documentation, i.e. a thoroughly considered formulation of the requirements for the character of the artwork in the context of its intended site and its spatial potential, forms a necessary prerequisite for good results. Participation of key actors in the proposal/commissioning documentation process can prevent rejection of the artwork at later stages. It is important to find the right level of creative freedom—overly specific definitions limit creativity, however, unclear assignments may create complications later. The commissioning proposal should also include specifications for accessibility and the required degree of “residential” function of the object (i.e. whether it is intended for sitting, etc.). These specifications must accommodate the requirements for the *safety and resistance of artworks* → [D.2.1/p. 49].

It is also necessary for the client to gather all necessary documentation, including digital surveys of the terrain and locations of technical infrastructure networks. Local administrators and competent authorities must also determine the limits for the intended plan, including assessment of environmental protection limits or infrastructure protection zones at the given location.

041 Panelka (visualization)

Čestmír Suška a arch. Eva Wagnerová

(a 2017 proposal submitted in connection with the General Landscape plan of Císařský ostrov and its broader surroundings)

[Prague 6, Císařský Island]



The architectural team designing the landscaping and pedestrian accessibility on the island invited an artist to participate in the design. The team of authors proposed preserving the original panel path and supplementing it with minor interventions at the boundary of architecture and art. These interventions brought interactive “residential” elements into the space while reflecting the character of the island, where an extensive, important infrastructure intersects with valuable nature.

E.3.2 Production of a work of art through a public tender

ARCHITECTURAL AND ART DESIGN COMPETITIONS

A *design competition* represents an open and transparent method of selecting works of art, especially monuments, memorials and commemorative artworks of high importance, and their authors.^[E.03] In cases of major investment in public spaces, this method—competition— should always take precedence over other methods of acquiring art. The reasons are as follows^[E.04] :

- A design competition is an acceptable and transparent method of selecting a contractor for a public contract and eliminates speculation about bias and clientelism. Permanent artworks for public space are acquired by open or invitation-only competitions in developed cities abroad.
- It is a common practice that the surrounding area, in addition to the object/sculpture itself, forms a part of the competition task and is later realised together with the object. The sculpture therefore does not have to be “retrofitted” into place but is organically integrated into its intended environment, thereby preventing discussion whether “the work fits there”.
- The contracting authority obtains a number of artistic proposals designed specifically for the given location. It may select the best and most suitable proposal according to a range of criteria, including quality, originality and best match to the assignment.
- The announcement of the competition contributes to the positive publicity of the city. A competition for design proposals is a highly professional process used to promote the correct manner of administering and managing public affairs. International competitions (for the more important spaces) may attract foreign artists and raise awareness of Prague in the cultural and general public beyond the borders of the country.
- The work of a qualified expert jury during the competition guarantees the quality of the result. The jurors’ activities are regulated by detailed law such that that their decision-making is transparent, impartial and without bias. A jury also provides organizers with the highest possible professional service. The jury becomes guarantor of the quality of the assignment, identifies itself with it and can thus best assess the suitability of candidates. After the competition ends, the jury may also assist in communicating the work towards the general public—the result is thus easier to justify.
- All key players can be involved in the preparation of the assignment and the competition process, thus reducing or eliminating later conflicts and complications.
- The openness of the city and systematic, transparent processes of acquiring artworks create a healthy competitive environment. The attractiveness of competitions for artists and architects lies in the fact that it offers equal opportunities to all participants, bringing innovative and original solutions.
- Public contracts are not only democratic tools for the cultural enrichment of the whole of society, they are also an opportunity for the undiscovered local art community and art school graduates without a public or private contract.

For consultation, expert assistance in organizing competitions and patronage of the entire process, contacting the Czech Chamber of Architects (ČKA) is recommended. The Czech Chamber of Architects has a working group for competitions with suitable expertise and experience in art competitions held in other Czech cities. At the same time, given the more

[E_03] Other methods of public procurement and selection of authors and artworks are not sufficiently verified in our context, so in this version they are not elaborated in detail.

[E_04] Some theses are taken from the website of the Czech Chamber of Architects: <https://www.cka.cz/cs/souteze/proc-je-architektonicka-soutez-vyhodna>

complex preparation of the competition process itself, the contracting authority may outsource administration and organization of the competition to an external contractor.

SUBJECT OF THE COMPETITION AND COMPETITION TERMS

From the point of view of the desired overall success of the competition, it is important to define the competition's terms in a manner that primarily supports and encourages artistic quality, and provides a fair and motivating environment:

- the commissioning documentation/assignment must define the conditions that focus on delivering artistic quality without limiting the creative potential and the artist's original contribution,
- optimal rewards and sufficient time for high-quality processing of the design proposal must be provided,
- the quality of the independent, i.e. professional part of the jury, must be ensured in order to guarantee the quality of the work and communication of the competition results to the public.

Any competition must always be preceded by a *professional and methodological preparation of the commissioning documentation/assignment* → [E.3.1/p. 66]. Contracting authorities should start working from the outset the commissioning process with artists and theoreticians to provide the best value from an artistic point of view. They should also work with architects, urban planners and landscape designers to address the spatial context and other specialists or academics to include other aspects. Cooperation with experts on the one hand and the interested public → [E.5.2/p. 82], on the other is a proven way of clearly defining what is expected of a future work of art and the related space. Funds are thus not wasted. If local residents identify with the work and consider it an organic part of their environment, then it is more likely that the work will not disappear. However, limiting the process to satisfying private interests or changing the interests of political representation leads to the rapid destruction of projects.

The assignment for the competition must seek/emphasize an overall solution for the whole space and the integration of the work of art into that environment → [D.2.3/p. 50]. For this reason, it is important that the competition terms stipulate that competing teams should include an authorized architect → [D.2.3/p. 51].

It is crucial that all actors involved in the process, especially the responsible representatives of local government, respect the results of the competition, follow the opinion of the expert jury and are able to accept the result of the competition and work with it. Frequently, the local administration refuses to support and implement the winning proposal due to fears of displeasure in the general public and resulting loss of popularity, and instead decides to act hastily in a manner that negates the very essence of the competition; see also *Reducing the risk of "minimum risk art"* → [D.1/p. 47].

COMPETITION JURY

Juries are assembled individually by competition organizers for each specific competition. The jury adjudicates proposals submitted to the competition and decides on the result. The composition of the jury should comply with the *Competition Rules of the Czech Chamber of Architects*^[E.05].

If a competition is called by the city and its entities or districts, the dependent members of the jury are the contracting authority's representatives, i.e. of the city or city districts. Depending on the context of the competition, experts for the dependent section of the jury may be selected from representatives of professional institutions of the city or city district, the Prague City Gallery, IPR Prague, the specific city investor, etc. In separate art competitions for artworks where the surrounding space is not the subject of the proposal, it is important that the

[E.05] ↗ Available online
at: <https://www.cka.cz/cs/media/prilohy/soutezni-rad.pdf>

dependent part of the jury includes the author of the architectural design of the public space in question.

The independent part of the jury is represented by independent experts. At least one of them must be an architect and another an expert in contemporary art. In addition to the members of the jury, the contracting authority may also invite external expert(s) without voting rights, e.g. experts on heritage preservation, representative of local public organizations → [E.5.2/p. 82], etc.

THE TABLE BELOW RECOMMENDS THE COMPOSITION OF THE JURY FOR ARTISTIC AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY		INDEPENDENT MEMBERS
Elected representative of the city	Others**	Experts***
Elected representative of the city	Representative of the city 1 Representative of the city 2	Expert 1 – expert on contemporary art Expert 2 – architect
	Representative of the city 3	Expert 3 Expert 4 Expert 5
1	3	5
4		
9		

** Other dependent members of the jury can be, based on the nature of the competition, selected from the following organizations: City Council’s Committees, city district, IPR Prague, city investor, etc. In case of the artistic competition for an artwork, the internal part should also include the author of the architectural design of the public space in question.

*** At least one of the independent experts must be an architect, and another one must specialize in contemporary art.

Note: The jury can invite an external expert without the right to vote, just for discussion (e.g. on heritage care)

COMBINED DESIGN COMPETITION (INCL. BY INVITATION)

While public (open) design competitions offer the possibility of finding new and surprising solutions from a wide range of architects and artists, the alternative is a narrower invitation-only competition, where the contracting authority has the right to directly address selected participants. Combined competitions are those where the contracting authorities invite experienced authors to participate while also allowing other artists. Both methods allow the commissioning body to invite renowned artists who they believe will address the competition’s subject well since their competence has already been verified on similar tasks. It provides a certainty quality for the city and greater motivation for experienced authors to participate (less competition, more prestige and possibility of reimbursement of expenses).

This type of competition is justified especially for significant or specific contracts where specific knowledge or experience is required. The process of addressing invited participants only requires expert preparation. The selection of invited artists and architects must be supported by clear criteria for assessing the quality of their previous experience and work.

TEAMWORK OF ARTISTS AND ARCHITECTS

Another opportunity/option to implement works of art arises in connection with the construction or renovation of a public space under which the plans are formulated in close collaboration between the artist and architect during the architectural competition → [D.2.3/p. 51]. If an architect selects an artist (as a contractor) as a part of the team, it achieves the desired intensive dialogue between the two professions as well as consistency of the architectural design and work of art while ensuring a high quality, functioning link between the artwork and the space. The disadvantage of this method may lie in the somewhat reduced transparency of the selection process of the author of the work of art, which may, however, to some extent be eliminated by guaranteeing the professional assessment of the work of art within the framework of the architectural competition for the entire project. Another option would be an informal invitation-only competition organized by the architect with the assistance of an *independent curator* → [E.2.3/p. 63].

For architectural competitions, the architect or designer prepares the project documentation, including all professional parts, and subsequently selects the contractor, who completes the work according to this documentation. The architect supervises the construction part at this stage. With artistic objects, the situation is often different in that the object is usually a direct work of art by its author and a similar delivery procedure is not possible. Therefore, it is necessary to establish, within the framework of each tender, a legitimate method of ensuring supply of the work of art by its author, including its material and design certification, if the work is in direct contact with the environment and the public and if it is to continually resist weather conditions. The topic of participation of the author/artist in the implementation stage of the work of art would deserve deeper consideration and mapping and a proposal for a systematic solution.

042 Rubato (free flow)

Eva Hild (2015)

[Sweden, Malmö, in front of Malmö Live – a concert and congress hall]



The six-metre aluminium sculpture was made by a local sculptor, who won the invitation-only competition for the design of an artistic landmark for the surroundings of the new concert hall. The organic shape and “movement” of the object refers to the soft rhythm of music and deliberately contrasts with the strict facade of the buildings in the background. The holes in the statue naturally encourage children to sit and play. The structure/statue thus enriches the space not only visually, but also increases its livability.

E.3.3 Acquisition of an existing artwork for a specific site

Acquisition of an existing artwork for permanent display in a public space or purchasing a licence to produce an already designed artwork should represent only an exceptional means of acquiring a permanent artwork for the city. It should be utilized only to enhance the diversity of art in public space by adding a missing type of artwork to the existing collection and to methodically and systematically map contemporary Czech and international monumental and visual artistic creations → [E.2.2/p. 62].

The proposal to acquire an existing artwork and to put it on permanent display in a public space must be sufficiently justified and approved by an expert commission or cultural council → [E.2.1/p. 61]. Careful methodological preparation and consideration of where and how the work will be permanently displayed must always form a part of the preparations to purchase art. No purchase can be made without this preparation/consideration. Legal and property matters concerning future administration must also be resolved. Agreements with counterparties must be reached for adequate terms of purchase or obtaining a licence for production. At the same time, it is essential that the investor acquires a high-quality architectural study on incorporating the art into its intended space. The study will form the basis for the subsequent project documentation to acquire the building permit.

DONATING A SPECIFIC ARTWORK TO THE CITY

Often, situations may arise when the city or city district is offered an existing artwork by a private individual or directly by the author. The aim is noble, and the work itself may seek to refer to the moral and cultural qualities of society, but donations are a very problematic and unmethodological means of acquiring artworks for public space since no transparent mechanism for assessing the quality of donated artworks currently exists. Donations represent one of the easiest ways for an author or donator to appear in a public space but are unfortunately also an easy way to display poor-quality artworks in Prague’s public space.

Although the initiator’s/donor’s initial concept and artwork’s content may be very positive, the form may often be unacceptable in artistic quality and quality of craftsmanship. The author was not selected according to quality criteria. The artist-author is the one who would like to donate work, or the author was selected by the initiator. Personal preferences thus often prevail over objective design quality. Similarly, the space where the particular work is displayed is often only selected afterwards, carrying a high risk of low ideological and spatial interconnection of the existing environment and the donated artwork. A work in a public space is also very difficult to remove afterwards, or its removal is difficult to enforce unless its temporary nature has been clearly declared.

The recipient, the city or city district, is therefore in a precarious position, often failing to find enough objective arguments to support the refusal of the artwork. This is especially true of art whose idea is non-conflicting. Installation of the work is currently subject “only” to the necessity of obtaining a building permit if the work meets the requirements of the Building Act. If it is located in a protected heritage area, installation is also subject to the affirmative and binding opinion of the locally competent authority overseeing heritage/conservation protection in Prague (Department Heritage Protection of the City of Prague).

The main argument for rejecting artworks which have not passed competitive selection is that the value of the public space is many times greater than the value of the donated artwork, which also applies to the potential cost of acquiring the artwork without a proper competition. The city providing a public space without critical consideration acts for the benefit of the person who donates the work and thus inadvertently becomes a donor of its most valuable asset. Accepting a donated work of art without competition also reduces confidence in the quality of the artworks and the artist, who is unable to defend his work in a competition with other potential artists.

The city should therefore reject donations that do not meet quality criteria → [D.2/p. 48] and the curator’s concept of a city collection → [E.2.2/p. 62].

The prerequisite for improving the quality of donated works is awareness of the general public. The city should set up an information portal, a place where a project initiator can access all the necessary information and contacts for consultation already during the preparation of his/her plan → *Educating, informing and involving the general public* [E.5/p. 80]. A suitable alternative to the donation of existing artworks whose quality is questionable because they were not implemented under a competition may be provided in the form of accepting applications for institutional or financial support. Any such application should be a *coherent project* → [E.3.1/p. 66] which can be professionally evaluated and should contain:

- a photo of the artwork or its model, and the author’s description, including technical specifications,
- a drawing of the artwork onto a photograph of the anticipated site (in variants),
- the artwork’s specification according to its origin: a *model or the original* → [C.4/p. 40] (to assess whether the object is suitable for outdoor installation).

E.3.4 Subsequent existence of the art at a site

AUTHORSHIP, OWNERSHIP AND USE OF ARTWORKS

A work of fine art (a painting, graphic or sculpture), applied art, audio-visual work, architectural work, including urban planning work, i.e. artwork which is a unique result of the author's creative activity, is subject to copyright and protected under the Copyright Act. ^[E.06] Copyright arises when the author's work is created, i.e. when it is expressed in an objectively perceived form. From this moment, the work is protected by copyright laws. An author's work is already constituted in its developmental stages, such as first-hand drawings or sketches. Creation of the work is not subject to publication or registration. The exclusive copyright holder is always the author, the natural person who created the work. The author does not transfer rights to others but grants rights for others to use the work, i.e. the right to use the work under licence.

Copyright and the proper use of works of art include dual rights: personality and property rights.

The author's personal rights include the important right to personalize authorship, i.e. the right to be referred to as the author of the work and to choose how or whether he/she wants to be referred to as the author at all. The author's name must therefore not be published if the author does not wish to publish it (anonymous work). Other personality rights include the right to choose to publish one's work and the right of inviolability of the work. Inviolability means the author's right to authorize and supervise any change or other interference with the artwork or to prohibit the use of the work in a way that diminishes its value. The author may supervise directly or designate a person on his/her behalf.

The author's personal rights cannot be waived, are tied to his/her person alone and expire only upon death. However, it is important to note that even after the author's death, the work remains protected (post-mortem protection), and no-one else may claim authorship or use the work in a manner that diminishes its value. Post-mortem protection has no statute of limitations and may only be claimed by a close person (not only relatives) or a collective administrator.

In addition to personality rights, the author holds property rights, i.e. the author has the right to use the work and the right to let the work be used by others by granting a licence. These rights are important to the author economically since the author is entitled to remuneration for granting the licence. The Copyright Act deals with individual property rights in detail. Briefly, these are rights governing the reproduction of the artwork through print, photographic or three-dimensional media, the right to distribute, lease, lend, or exhibit the artwork in its tangible form, and the right to communicate the artwork to the general public in intangible form, such as via the internet.

The copyright and the ownership rights to the work of art are two different matters. The city acquires the copyrighted work into its ownership typically by concluding a contract for work or through purchase or donation, depending the acquisition method. The owner of the work of art does not automatically acquire the copyright to the work with its acquisition (copyright remains with the author or his/her heirs). The owner of the artwork, i.e. of the tangible object through which the copyrighted work is expressed, is the owner in accordance with the meaning in the Civil Code, not the copyright holder ^[E.07]. Under a licence agreement, however, the owner may also acquire property rights to the work.

The rights to use the artwork for a pre-agreed purpose (licence) may be acquired by the city under an appropriate licence agreement. The agreement should be a part of the contract between the author and the city as the client (or the recipient or buyer). It is the responsibility of the parties involved to decide on the form of the licence. The licence may be granted as an exclusive licence, i.e. in the fullest extent, which allows the work to be used in all manner of use. By granting an exclusive licence, the author loses the right to use the work because he/she no longer possess the property rights. Similarly, the author may grant a non-exclusive licence, i.e. a limited licence agreement which specifies the individual uses of the work.

[E.06] ➤ Act No. 121/2000
Coll., on Copyright

[E.07] ➤ Act No. 89/2012
Coll., Civil Code

The best method of acquiring a work of art for display in a public space is to create it under contract or in the form of a public competition. If the client does not conclude a licence agreement with the author, the legal assumption is that the client is entitled to a licence according to the extent of the purpose of the contract for work (Section 61 of the Copyright Act). This means that the purpose of the contract is important and must be carefully formulated, i.e. the contract must clearly specify for which purpose a particular work is made.

In order to avoid complications during the subsequent use of a public space, the licence agreement and specification of the author's work must clearly state the exact extent of the author's work and whether it is only the object as such or includes the location and any solutions for related issues. In a public space, the artwork is only one of the elements that forms the area's whole. If a total renovation of the area is planned, the city needs to ensure that copyright-related rights do not prevent the comprehensive solution/modification of the entire space. The city should have the right to review the location of artworks in the event of complete refurbishment. The author should be aware of this right in advance, and this agreement should be the subject of a contractual relationship between the author and the city as the client. → *Removing or repositioning artworks* [E.3.4/p. 76], → [D.2.3/p. 50].

Specifying in advance which interventions the city as the owner and manager of the work of art and the adjacent area can perform under routine maintenance is also recommended. This means that the "author's manual" should specify which maintenance operations with the artwork are essential to maintain its target quality and which can be implemented without the author's consent and vice versa → *Administration and maintenance* → [E.3.4/p. 75].

A work of art may also be used legally outside the concluded licence agreement in cases clearly defined by the law and includes a free-use and statutory licence. A public domain work is work whose property protection rights have already expired. This protection lasts for the life of the author and 70 years beyond his/her death. After the author's death, the heirs may continue as holders of the rights. After expiration of the statutory term, the work may be used freely, but the post-mortem protection (prohibition of personalizing the copyright, prohibition of using the work in a way that diminishes its value) still applies. A statutory licence, or lawful use without the author's permission, includes personal use or citation for criticism or scientific work.

For works permanently placed in a public space (both conditions must be met), a special legal licence for so-called freedom of panorama applies according to Section 33 of the Copyright Act: *"Copyright is not infringed by anybody who records or expresses through drawing, painting, graphic art, photography or film a work permanently located in a square, street, park, on a public route or in any other public place; copyright shall likewise not be infringed by anybody who further uses a work so expressed, rendered or recorded."* Freedom of panorama does not apply to building interiors, exhibition halls, libraries, etc., and does not apply to three-dimensional reproductions! For instance, it is possible to print and sell postcards depicting the Dancing House, but it is not possible to sell small models of the same building.

043 Metronom

Vratislav Novák (1991)

[Prague 7, Letná Parks]



A kinetic object on the pedestal of the former Stalin monument was created as a temporary structure on the occasion of the centenary of the Czechoslovak Industrial Exhibition. However, it stood the test of time and became permanent, bearing high social significance. It symbolizes the passage of time and the post-revolutionary celebration of freedom; it transformed the historical context and overcame the totalitarian symbolism of the site. In 2016, at the initiative of its owner, it was painted in a corporate green colour. However, in protest against this act, the members of the BOLT 958 artistic group intervening in public space restored its original red colour.

ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE

The successfully completed placement of a work of art does not halt the city's responsibility for the quality of the work in a public space. The condition of existing works of art in public space reflects the status of the city, and without sufficient financial support for maintenance, it makes no sense to achieve new artworks. Ensuring quality maintenance of works of art in public space by maintaining their target quality and location should be a prerequisite for their implementation. It is essential in this respect to clarify in advance the legal and proprietary relationships — the ownership and management of the work itself, ownership and management of the land on which it is located and of land or structures directly related. This not only determines responsibility for maintenance of the art but also its sustainability in the quality of the whole, where the ultimate responsibility for the public space lies mainly with the city administration, even when it is contractually transferred to other entities.

It is therefore essential to determine at the beginning of the acquisition process who will be the work's future administrator, i.e. specify which entity will maintain the work and public space in its immediate vicinity. For installations connected to energy and utility supply networks (electricity, water, gas), it is important to maintain the appropriate connection with operators and corresponding contracts for supply. The warranty and post-warranty services should also be defined in advance. Delivery of the work should be taken together with the author's manual for operation and maintenance and specification of the warranty and post-warranty conditions for artwork restoration → *Economic adequacy of the form* [D.2.1/p. 49]. A prerequisite for adequate care, including cleaning, regular minor repairs and more extensive renovations, is that the city allocates corresponding funding to the budgets of city organizations who maintain the artworks.

REMOVING OR RELOCATING ARTWORKS

In the artwork's life cycle, situations and circumstances may arise that raise questions about moving the work, sometimes even permanently (storing it in a depository, museum). As with the placement of new works of art, removing a statue from a public space represents a significant act of interference with the environment and may be met with a strong social response. In all cases, any removal or relocations of artworks should therefore be preceded by broader expert debate, and where appropriate, with the advice of the *expert committee or cultural council*. → [E.2.1/p. 61].

The need to move an existing work may arise in connection with the restoration of a public space aiming to improve its overall quality, form and function. This may represent a fundamental change in the artwork's context. In this case, it is necessary to reconsider the role of the work in this new whole. It is important to consider moving the work somewhere else in the same location or away from it, ideally with the participation of the work's author. The autonomous interest of the work itself enforced through the individual interest of authorship should not be superior to the needs of the whole. These property and legal relationships should also be addressed and regulated from the start of the placement process → *Authorship, ownership and use of artworks* [E.3.4/p. 73], → [D.2.3/p. 50].

Another legitimate opportunity may arise when the symbolism of the statue becomes entirely contrary to the current ethical values of society, or the work, by its condition, significantly endangers public safety, prevents full use of the site and restoration to an adequate physical state would require a very costly or disproportionate intervention that would impair its aesthetic value.

REPOSITIONING ARTWORKS

Returning artefacts, whether in the form of restored, reconstructed, original or durable *copy or replica* → [C.4/p. 43] to their original sites represents a frequent method of acquiring works for public spaces. Repositioning also impacts the spatial and ideological plane. If the work returns to its site for ideological reasons or because of its artistic/craft value, it is important to evaluate its role in the site's current spatial and ideological context → [D.2.3/p. 50].

When a monument that was previously placed in a public space is restored, there is often an attempt to return the monument to its original location, which may now have a completely different function or character. Unfortunately, much of the effort is often spent on simply returning the work without considering sufficient preparation. The work may thus find itself in a place that no longer has any relationship to it, and the content of the surrounding space no longer supports the relationship of residents and visitors to the work. It is therefore necessary to consider new relationships and stimuli. The site may have changed over the years so much that the insertion of the original artwork would be inappropriate in terms of current use and spatial constraints. In these cases, the solution may be to make the installation of work contingent on the overall architectural re-design of the space that would ensure adequate re-incorporation of the work, or to discuss alternative sites for the work.

The restoration (return) of a monument whose ideological content and meaning may now be questionable can cause controversy or even insult a certain part of society. This is all the more difficult. Therefore, in these cases, a broad professional discussion would be required, including a discussion about the historical and social context of the times when the work originated and when it ceased to exist.

RECORD-KEEPING AND DOCUMENTATION

A comprehensive overview of which artworks exist in Prague, how many and where represents a basis for a methodological approach; see also → *City curator for public art* [E.2.2/p. 62]. With respect to some of the existing works of art in public space, there are no records as to who the owner is, resulting in a lack of clarity in the administration and maintenance of the work and its surroundings.

For this reason, the city needs to begin mapping the current circumstances in order to record artistic works in public space in the territory of the city of Prague and subsequently process this map into a comprehensive database — a catalogue containing information about administration and ownership for each registered work. Based on this evidence, it will be possible to start solving specific cases where the artwork's owner or administrator is unknown.

The catalogue and its spatial projection or a map showing art in public space also form an important basis for decision-making in relation to the acquisition of new works. The catalogue and map will complement the plug-in, which has a generally valid character, with a topographic plane. The catalogue can help in deciphering various questions: whether it is appropriate to commission another artistic work for a given location due to the presence of existing sculptures, whose locations are underestimated in terms of art in public space, or, for example, whose themes have already been expressed in Prague many times and no other monument is therefore needed.

The electronic version of the catalogue and map should be freely available to the general public so that the initiators of certain artworks may use it as a basis for their site selection processes. It will also serve as a popularization tool for *marketing and educational purposes* → [E.5/p. 80]. The map of art in public space may also form a part of the Land-use Analytical Documentation (ÚAP) of the City of Prague, which is regularly updated. ÚAP characterizes the significant value of the city and the limits and possibilities of its further development. It also serves as a basis for planning the development of the territory, including preparation of city zoning plans and other documentation. Knowledge of the territory in terms of existing works can also prevent later inappropriate handling and removal of sculptures during public space renovations.

Updated data are crucial. The catalogue should therefore have one administrator responsible for its content and updates, although there may be several administrators of art for public spaces and data sources that need to be assembled for the purpose of the overall database. The mapping and registration of works of art in public space should also include an updated overview of intended plans.

The following information should be provided for each work listed in the catalogue:

- name of the work, theme (personality, event, etc.),
- author,
- creation/implementation date,
- copyright owner (heir),
- owner, administrator of the work,
- general information (description, materials and techniques used, plus other properties and information about its origin/creation),
- registration in the list of national cultural monuments – yes/no,
- location (address), including GPS coordinates, map projection,
- photo documentation,

More detailed documentation may be provided in connection with new acquisitions, for example:

- 3D scans and technical documentation,
- author's documentation of the origin of the work, sketches, plans,

- documentation of the competition,
- text prepared by an art historian or curator, with links to other resources and quotes, where available,
- specification of contractual relationships,
- price evaluation, etc.

044 Woman with her Shopping

Jan Lukáš (2012)

[Jablonec nad Nisou, in front of the “Jabloň” [Appletree] shopping mall (today the “Central” shopping mall)]



The photo shows the original location of an abstract sculpture with the folk nickname “Woman with her shopping”, created by a local sculptor and designed specifically for this site. When the shopping centre was rebuilt, the work was saved under the initiative of the local civic association “PLAC” and remained in approximately the same position. However, the context of the site has since changed significantly and is filled with barriers due to the shopping centre’s renovations and the transformation of its surroundings. The appearance of the object is quite different today.

E.4 Implementing temporary artistic interventions

Temporary projects and installations of artistic objects for a definite period are generally solved by the process of permitting special use of local communication (roads, squares, etc.), and respectively by the “occupancy” of public space for a cultural event → [C.2.2/p. 34]. Although it is a temporary use of public space, obtaining a temporary occupancy permit is currently a complicated administrative procedure. Initiators of these events should therefore allow sufficient time in advance to deal with and obtain all the necessary approvals from authorities and actors involved, especially in the case of festivals or shows where several permits for different locations may need to be individually obtained.

If the city wishes to promote high-quality art in its public spaces, it should be aware of the importance of the art’s cultural aspects and impact on the quality of life of the population> It should initiate and support the emergence of high-quality projects at different levels and create space for art and define favourable conditions.

First of all, it is important to publicize in one place clear information about the conditions and prerequisites for the process of obtaining a temporary occupancy permit for installations in

Prague's public space (e.g. on a website) so that project initiators may familiarise themselves with the system → [E.5.1/p. 81]. This information can take the form of a brief manual or FAQ explaining which documents are required for the application, which authorities to contact, which authorities will need to be approached for partial authorizations. Contact information can be provided, as well as advice where more information can be obtained. The whole process could be made more efficient by optimizing the system and allowing electronic applications.

The second step is unifying local occupancy permit fees for cultural events across Prague. At present, the conditions are different for each city district.^[E.08] Sporting events, which the capital or the city district supports with funding, are already exempted from the local fee for the use of public space in the city. Similarly, cultural events and temporary art projects could be exempted if they met the *quality criteria* → [D.3/p.56].

Reasonable processing times for applications represent a necessary prerequisite for an effective and functioning system—most authorities and bodies require up to 30 days to process an application, but some institutions have longer deadlines, which is disproportionate to the nature and duration of temporary projects. These deadlines could be shorter. For site-specific projects, which are very organic and react to a particular site, site selection is often the result of a process, event or workshop.

The locations for art objects in temporary projects, festivals and shows must be consulted with the *City curator for public art* → [E.2.2/p. 62] in advance for operational, architectural and artistic concerns and also with a view to coordinating with other events. The curator should have an overview of all similar activities in the city and be able to inform the initiators and potentially provide further assistance. For the purposes of expert consultations, the authors or initiators (applicants) should prepare a comprehensive plan during the methodological preparations for temporary interventions which describe:

- the concept of the project and its scope, ideas and goals, information about the authors, exhibited works and artists, curators, drawings and photographs, situation plans,
- the spatial framework, i.e. location(s) selected for the installations, including justifications for the selection (this is an essential role of the architect, who should participate in the location selection process and on-site solutions,
- the financial framework,
- a description of the influence of the art object or event on the environment and guarantees of safety, i.e. methods of installation, anchoring, structural design, etc,
- the expected date of installation and deinstallation, and the implementation schedule.

At the same time, from the city's point of view, it is essential to actively support temporary interventions by strengthening *financial support* → [E.6/p. 85] and organizing open calls to artists to express a specific theme or animate a particular location. One method of achieving this would be themed challenges prepared by experts planned three years in advance. The municipal programme of calls, representing one of the sub-activities of financial support, must have a defined budget, management structure, manager, experienced curator and clear and transparent rules for declaring calls and criteria for selecting projects for implementation.

If the city decides to leave the object in public space permanently, i.e. for more than one year, then the placement process will be subject to further quality criteria → [D.2/p. 48] and similar to donating or purchasing existing artworks → [E.3.3/p. 71].

[E_08] → Decree No. 5/2011
Coll. hl. m. Prague, a binding
ordinance on local fees due for the
use of a public space.

E.5 Educating, informing and involving the general public

The effort to raise awareness of the general public should form an integral part of the long-term methodological approach to public art and be a necessary accompanying activity for acquiring and managing works of art – this includes informing the broad, organized and professional general public and preparing the lay public for the entry of a contemporary work of art into public space.

The basic prerequisite for engaging the general public in the process of planning and acquiring artistic works for public space is raising awareness and open communication by the city. Allowing discussion and focusing on the transparency of processes are the key aspects in building dialogue and trust between the city and its residents and users.

The long-term lack of contact between the professional and the general public, lack of explanation of the meaning of high-quality art in public space and low level of engagement of the general public with the cultural-aesthetic dimension and the current trends in contemporary art have resulted in the public not being continuously educated. The city’s population, in their role of art recipients, but also the public administration in the role of the contracting authority, are often confined to the idea of a figural sculpture in its classic concept.

The situation may be improved primarily by the existence of high-quality contemporary works in public space and by the fact that people will naturally encounter these works. The basis of continuous education lies in the existence of high-quality installations and temporary interventions, shows, festivals with accompanying programmes and discussions about public space. On the other hand, installations of poor-quality art can result in the exact opposite.

045 “Culture is where people live”
Mjůlk (2012)
[Prague 11, Opatov – Jižní město housing estates]



An example of revitalizing and promoting the identity of a neglected place on the outskirts of the city in the form of emphasizing the iconic element of the staircase. The architectural element of the so-called “snail” with the motto “Culture is where people live” as a part of the Street for Art 2012 festival became its persistent symbol.

E.5.1 Methods of informing and educating the general public

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC

In cooperation with experts and entities who can execute this agenda, at least in Prague, it will be necessary to develop the city's basic communication strategy on the topic of art in public space as well as a concept for the education and involvement of the general public. In this respect, it is important to have sufficient numbers of competent staff to communicate with the public, which is contingent on the existence of training programmes. Emphasis should also be placed on educating artists and designers themselves at universities so that they can put into practice the ability to interpret and communicate and be prepared to defend their concepts in the face of the general public.

The main axis of any educational programme and informing the general public about news, communication and participation in the context of art in public space should be concentrated in the city under one guarantor. Abroad, this guarantor is often the institution that administers the municipal collection of art in public space. By analogy, this role in Prague could be assumed by the Prague City Gallery (GHMP), which would act as its *city curator* → [E.2.2/p. 62]:

- support for the public educational programmes of galleries and other artistic institutions, acquainting the general public with the art world,
- media coverage, guided walks and public discussions on current topics, etc.

WEB PORTAL WITH INFORMATION ABOUT ART IN PUBLIC SPACE IN THE CAPITAL CITY OF PRAGUE

In connection with educational programmes, the city should consider building an attractive and user-friendly web portal^[E.09] with information about art in Prague's public spaces, perhaps under the auspices of an institution focusing on art in public space at the city level, i.e. GHMP. The site should feature:

- an accessible and visually and content-aware map of artistic works in public spaces^[E.10] → *Record-keeping and Documentation* [E.3.4/p. 76], including the ability to query or add artworks or information to the map,
- publication of current calls for artists, ongoing and upcoming projects and design proposal competitions,
- publication of results of architectural and art competitions,
- consulting – publication of all contact information and guides for private initiatives (including a link to relevant contact points for consultation of plans or submission of initiatives),
- open register of artists (or artisans and craftsmen) – for searches for potential authors, competition jurors, etc.,
- cultural service – a programme of current cultural events, discussions, guided tours, etc.

EDUCATION OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN PRESCHOOL AND SCHOOL AGE

- strengthening aesthetic education as a key part of art education in primary and secondary schools.

[E.09] Inspiration may be drawn, for example, from the HAM (Helsinki Art Museum) information portal, available online at: <https://www.hamhelsinki.fi/en/>; see also ↗ ANNEX – Foreign Experience

[E.10] Inspiration may be drawn, for example, from the database and map of Sculptures in Ostrava website.

Available online at: <http://ostravskesochoy.cz/>

CULTURAL ADVERTISING ACTIVATION OF PUBLIC SPACES OF CULTURAL

From the position of the city, it is important to enable and support the activation of public spaces adjacent to cultural institutions. These have the potential to disseminate their content into their surroundings and act as an “umbrella”.^[E.11] This can create synergies between the institutional culture of public buildings and the vibrant non-institutional culture of public spaces.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

At present, there is no comprehensive analysis of the relationship of the general public in Prague with works of art in public space. Arguments used by experts and the general public alike very often rely on unconfirmed assumptions. It would therefore be advisable to use different methods of identifying feedback on existing, but new installations by the general public in order to provide more accurate feedback on the resources spent. For example, this may take form of questionnaire surveys during guided walks, one-time research projects, or the continuous collection of data about the popularity of certain sculpture, conducted interactively, e.g. by collecting the stories and experiences of people related to specific works.

E.5.2 Involving the general public in the art acquisition process

Participation of the general public in city planning is one of the basic prerequisites for democratic self-government and has a direct impact on the quality of life.^[E.12] The active participation of citizens contributes to their greater sense of belonging to the place where they live and to a sense of greater responsibility for its further development. The public should be a discussion partner not only within the framework of urban and architectural projects but also in connection with artistic interventions in the city.

However, participation itself cannot replace any of the other essential parts of the process, in particular, the author’s responsibility or the responsibility of the commissioning body for the concept. Although the involvement of the general public represents an indisputable benefit, it is often a very complicated and demanding process whose preparation and implementation requires sufficient knowledge and communication skills.

It is therefore always necessary at the beginning to answer the key question whether the general public’s involvement makes sense. Based on the expert assessment of a situation, it is then important to consider what the procedure and entire process will entail, including the choice of scope and suitable methods of participation. The degree of community involvement in the art acquisition process is individual and depends on the type and importance of the project. It is important that participants in the participation process are clearly informed of the limits of their participation at the outset, i.e. what is up for discussion and what is not.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN THE FORMULATION OF INTENT AND CREATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

In cases where the public would be involved in a project, the public’s participation should be intensive, especially in the initial stage, namely during the methodological *preparation of the project* → [E.3.1/p. 66]. First and foremost, it is essential to analyse the environment/site concerned by the project and to map the potential actors that should be involved. Different actors will be involved in the installation of a National Monument and a minor intervention in a local park. A moderated discussion between a local expert and the interested general public should aim to:

- gather local experience and needs related to the use of the selected site for the installation of the work from the perspective of the general public and interest groups,
- collect suggestions from the local specialist public and information about the site and theme,

[E_11] See also ↗ Prague Public Space Design Manual (B. 2. 5 Public space of Public Buildings), IPR Prague. 2014

Available online at: <http://manual.iprpraha.cz>

[E_12] ↗ More detailed information about the topic of involving the general public in city planning and city creation processes may be found at: Prague Participation Manual. Prague: IPR Prague, 2016.

Available online at: https://www.iprpraha.cz/uploads/assets/dokumenty/obecne/manual_participace_tisk_2017.pdf

- explore the possibilities of supporting and involving key local cultural institutions in the next stages of the artwork's procurement process,
- consider closer involvement of representatives of local professionals or general public organizations in the project's team or as experts without voting rights in the competition jury, etc.

PARTICIPATION OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC IN THE DESIGN STAGE

A more difficult but no less important stage is the presentation of the proposal (study). The aim is to get feedback for authors of the proposed design. The presentation of the proposal must not take the form of a public vote—a work of art must always be evaluated and selected by experts(!). The debate with the general public should always focus on defining the problems and qualities of the site, never on the quality of the work itself.

The initiator, the commission body and the author must focus on dialogue and comprehensible interpretation of the author's ideas, of the quality and meaning of the work. In this regard, one can very well lean on the expert opinion of the jury, and therefore it is important to select, in the case of *design competition* → [E.3.2/p. 68] a high-quality jury and to respect the outcome of the competition. A representative of the local community may be one of the invited experts to the jury, without voting rights. This method has not yet been tested much in our circumstances since it requires organization on the part of the local public and consensus that the selected representative has the right to speak on everyone's behalf.

COMMUNITY (PARTICIPATORY) ART PROJECTS

A specific way of creating artworks are projects whose primary goal is to strengthen the relationship between the community and the location through a creative process based on collaboration between the artist and spectators, deliberately abolishing the traditional author-work-recipient model. Rather than the aesthetic demands of the work, such projects accentuate its impact and effect on the site and local community. By actively contributing to the work and fostering cooperation between the site's users through teamwork, the social ties strengthen directly between local actors, i.e. residents, and between residents and professionals, residents and the town hall, etc.

It should be the role of architects and city planners to recognize which projects or situations have the potential for participatory art projects. The end products of community projects are mostly temporary artworks, given the freer and wider range of formal approaches, but this is not the key requirement. It is not so much the result—the artefact itself—as the whole creative process and its impact on the community. A positive outcome of a community artistic project is strengthened local identity and the identification of local people with artistic interventions and a new or “animated” place they accept. Projects of this type are also a communication tool which can refresh and facilitate interdisciplinary cooperation.

The key aspect of community projects is the site-specific concept, in which the artworks reflect the character and identity of the particular site they seek to develop and strengthen. Participatory projects are therefore justified, for example, for neglected locations or for revitalizing residential projects, where the main group of users are local residents for whom the specific public space directly relates to their home, by expanding their home to the exterior, and thus forming a logical and close relationship. Involvement in the creation process can strengthen their positive attitude to the location and restore confidence in the authority of the city. These activities may also be of use in places where a sense of belonging is absent, where indifference to the environment increases the risk of crime and vandalism, and where participation may arouse interest in the environment.

The results of creative workshops, joint activities or installations with an artistic undertone under the direction of an artist or curator can thus, for example, create a new element of residential street furniture, a playground, a new functional and aesthetic element of public space, landscaping and vegetation.

Participation by artists or curators is important in this process in order to ensure the integrity and artistic quality of the outcome; however, the role of the artist-author transforms into the role of artist-curator that guides others through the process. For this reason, it is necessary to emphasize the involvement of a suitable type of person who is open to collaboration, communication and sharing of ideas and who can combine an authentic artistic approach with the ability to motivate people to creativity, a person willing to give up their creative freedom for the quality of common work. At the same time, it is important that all actors involved in the project from the outset are clearly informed by the initiator (city) of the goals and individual roles, so that the expectations of individual groups are not improper or unrealistic. An important part of the project is (ongoing) evaluation of the project’s benefits using indicators focused on social impact.

046 Superheroes at Luník IX housing estate

Oto Hudec and children’s collective attending the local community centre (proposal 2018)
[Košice, Luník IX]



A collaboration between an artist and local children, this sculpture of children’s superheroes was built on a stylized block of flats. The 3.6-meter-high statue will be cast from concrete and decorate the local park. It symbolically refers to the complex role of skilful children in a marginalized location. It is part of the project “Building Hope on Luník IX”, one of the activities of the non-profit organization ETP Slovakia.

E.6 Systematic financial support

A sophisticated and transparent funding system based on a high-quality institutional background with sufficient professional, organizational and executive capacities forms the necessary prerequisite for implementing high-quality artistic works in public space. Systematic support should not only be directed to installations of new works but also viewed as an investment in education and communication in addition to ensuring adequate resources in the city's budget for the maintenance of existing and newly installed sculptures → *Administration and maintenance* [E.3.4/p. 75].

There are many instruments of support, including various funding arrangements, the most popular method being the use of the “percent for art” principle.^[E.13] At the national level, the application of the so-called “1% Act” is currently under preparation^[E.14] → [B.5.4/p. 21].

The City of Prague has approved its own “2% for art” program – procurement of works of art for the public space of the City of Prague.^[E.15] For this purpose, funds will be generated from investment projects that have been previously implemented. The fund for the acquisition of artistic works (hereinafter referred to as the “Fund”) will receive 2% of capital expenditure invested by city per calendar year → [B.5.3/p. 21].

A prerequisite for effective functioning of this support programme is a strategy that defines the objectives of the programme, a sophisticated structure in its institutional background and the creation of a procedural methodology for the programme, including defining transparent conditions for obtaining financial support. The programme will be the first tested in a pilot regime to determine what must be fine-tuned or resolved for effective functioning and then adapted according to the evaluation.

E.7 Model process scenarios


The model process scenarios below schematically illustrate the sequences of sub-activities in the framework of individual processes related to the acquisition of artworks described in the previous chapters. These are general diagrams that can serve as an idea of the basic milestones in processes, and as a basis for designing a specific project/ activity. Procedures may, of course, vary depending on the individual specifics and conditions of each situation.

[E.13] In general, about the
“Percent for Art” instrument
→ ANNEX – P.2 Principles
establishing support in the form of
a “percent for art.”

[E.14] → by amendment of Act
No. 203/2006 Coll., on Certain
Types of Support of Culture and
Amendments to Certain Related
Laws, which is currently being
drafted.

[E.15] As of the date of
the translated version of this
publication, the program is
ongoing under a new name, the
“Art for the City” programme. All
updated information about the
programme can be found online at
<https://umenipromesto.eu/>


E.7.1 Scheme of the implementation process for an art-architectural design competition



[E_16] Note: including:
- Discussions with stakeholders and representatives of the general public
- Determining the available financial means
- Setting the basic requirements for the work in terms of limits in the area, usability, hygiene, durability, safety, etc.


[E_17] In general: The work is first taken over under warranty mode after repair complaints are discovered before the warranty expires, the work is taken over under warranty and maintenance mode.

E.7.2 Acquisition of completed work of art or licence for the creation of an artwork




[E.18] The scenarios may vary for different forms of the artistic components (i.e. whether it is the placement of an original, model, copy, replica) and according to the individual circumstances of the situation. In some cases, the author or heirs may be required to supervise the production of the copy and subsequently confirm with the author on the quality of the copy (or otherwise refuse authorship). It then also determines the price of artistic artworks and its implementation.

E.7.3 Scheme of the process for a repeated placement of a work of art



E.7.4 Scheme of the implementation process for a temporary artistic intervention



[E_19] In this case, the work should meet the same quality criteria as a permanent work, i.e. safety and security, etc. It is therefore necessary to draw up a plan, discuss and specify the conditions under which the work may remain (e.g. to ensure stability, the need for architectural modifications to the surroundings, etc.). It is essential to obtain appropriate permits, resolve proprietary relationships and formally hand over the work.

A Introduction	9
B Purpose of the document	15
C Typology	27
D Quality	45
E Processes	59
Annex – Context for establishing a framework to support public art	91
P.1 Artistic and social background of support for art in the Euro-American context in the 19th and 20th century	93
P.2 Principles establishing support in the form of a “percent for art”	96
P.2.1 History of application of the “percentage for the arts” principles abroad	96
P.2.2 Act on mandatory percentage allocated to the arts in Czechoslovakia	98
P.2.3 Other instruments of support and sources of finance	99
P.3 Foreign experience	100
P.3.1 Vienna, Austria	101
P.3.2 Berlin, Germany	102
P.3.3 Helsinki, Finland	103
P.3.4 Den Haag, The Netherlands	104
P.3.5 Chicago, USA	105
P.3.6 New York, USA	106
P.3.7 Philadelphia, USA	107

ANNEX

Context for establishing a framework to support public art

[author: MgA. Petra Vlachynská]

High-quality financial support programmes must be created in order to establish high-quality works of art in public space.

Funding and sufficient professional, organizational and executive capacities are the necessary prerequisites.



P.1 Artistic and social background of support for art in the Euro-American context of the 19th and 20th centuries

Works of art referred to *public art* can be characterized as being part of the public space of the city as well as fulfilling the roles related to the urban, architectural and social importance of public space.

Support provided to art in the form that is recognized by contemporary society emerged in the context of the perception of public space as an expression of democracy,^[P.01] which began to take shape in the Euro-American context during the 19th century. The recipient or audience of art in public space is the general public, i.e. the community of people in the broadest sense of the word, and its funding and care are provided through public funds.

Cameron Cartiere defines four conditions in her book “*The Practice of Public Art*”,^[P.02] stating that at least one must be met in order to speak about public art:

- Art is in a place accessible or visible to the public (*in public*)
- Art expresses the interest of the community or a group of individuals (*public interest*),
- Art is maintained and used by a community or group of individuals (*public place*),
- Art is financed from public sources (*public funded*).

[P_01] ➔ BARTLOVÁ, Milena.
In Margine (Not just about the monuments). In: Artalk [online].
Artalk, 2014 [cit. 26. 9. 2017].
Available online at: <https://artalk.cz/2014/03/01/in-margine-nejen-o-pomnicich/>

[P_02] ➔ CARTIERE, Cameron and WILLIS, Shelly, (ed.), *The Practice of Public Art*. New York: Routledge, 2008, p. 15

[P_03] ➔ SENIE, Harriet and WEBSTER, Sally. *Critical issues in Public Art*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1992

[P_04] ➔ BACH, Balkin Penny. *New Land Marks: Public Art, Community and the Meaning of Place*. Washington: Greyson Publishing, 2000, p. 13

[P_05] ➔ KUTHANOVÁ, Kateřina (ed.). *Metamorphose of politics*. Prague: Prague City Archive, 2013, p. 11

Public art should be seen as a complex phenomenon where, besides the form and meaning of artworks and their relation to the surrounding space, importance also lies in the process of its origin, i.e. the emergence of an idea, formulation of intention, commissioning, implementation, installation and subsequent acceptance of the work of art by the public.^[P.03] By including a reflection on this process, the expectations and objectives associated with public art and the role it can play in the urban environment can be better defined.

The purpose of the following overview is to briefly outline the development of artistic forms in relation to the gradual transformation of the basic requirements imposed on art in the context of Western Europe and the USA, with an emphasis on the situations that created the background of support that is provided to public art. The overview is complemented by an outline of events in the former Czechoslovakia and, respectively, the Czech Republic.

In the Euro-American context, one of the most important moments marking the beginning of systematic support for public art was the establishment of the civic association called the “*Fairmount Park Association*” in Philadelphia, USA in 1872 → [P.3.7/p. 106]. This organization was the first to systematically promote the creation and installations of sculptures, first in Fairmount Park, and later in the city of Philadelphia. The main objective was (and remains) to “convey” art to the broader population and contribute to the cultivation and aesthetic quality of the city, which underwent rapid industrialization in the 19th century.^[P.04]

With respect to Bohemia and Moravia (the “Czech Lands”), the strengthening and consolidation of the idea of the Czech nation in the second half of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century, has been greatly supported by the installation of a series of monuments. Their importance and form aptly reflected the need for a narrative meaning and communication of political ideas^[P.05] more than for the then valid artistic requirements.

The waning powers of the monarchy also allowed the free establishment of “beautification associations” in the 1860s in order to preserve cultural and historical heritage. Due to their activities, sculptures and statues of a mostly decorative character begin to appear in parks and cities.^[P.06]

Avant-garde art, which succeeded in promoting and defending independence from any purpose or external requirements, remained in galleries until World War II. Public space remains the domain of traditionally conceived figural statues and monuments.

The beginning of the second half of the 20th century was marked by the rebuilding of cities damaged during the Second World War. In the 1960s, interest in public art massively expanded in the US and Western Europe. The already established modernist sculpture was often funded through special programmes set up by municipal authorities or through the adoption of “a percent for art” programmes. Along with the increase in state support and the interest of individuals and private organizations dedicated to the promotion of cultural life, the goals relating to the existence of art in cities also expanded. Strategic municipal documents from the 1970s and 1980s often included the expectation that the impact of public art would strengthen the sense of belonging for communities as well as the senses of uniqueness and identity of a place. It was assumed that the presence of art would help in alleviating some of the negative side effects of socially excluded areas (vandalism, unemployment, lack of interest in shared space, etc.) that occurred in the new neighbourhoods of fast-growing cities.^[P.07]

In the 1950s, Czechoslovakia supported the construction of often monumental memorials and works of art in architecture subordinated to the ideology of the Communist Party and the cult of their leaders. The ideological and costly projects were only stopped by a review of the consequences of applying the cult of the personality of J. V. Stalin and by the partial liberalization of society. 1958 can be described as the turning point, this being the year when Czechoslovakia was represented with a great success at the Brussels World Fair (Expo 1958), which foreshadowed further development. In the 1960s, cooperation between artists and architects, which the state actively supported, developed considerably under somewhat relaxed conditions, including the adoption of the 1966 *Percentage for the Arts Act*—the so-called “four percent laws” → [P.2.2/p. 98]. In the 1970s, the role of the state was transformed into a guarantor of quality-built environments, i.e. also guaranteeing the aesthetic satisfaction of its citizens. However, sculptures and statues were often placed in new urbanized areas without considering additional spatial relationships and functional connections. On the one hand, art commissions ensured that no kitsch was created and that the artistic quality of works in public space remained high. On the other hand, they also considered design proposals from an ideological and formal point of view, thus influencing the character of period production towards mediocrity. In the 1970s and 1980s, hundreds of sculptures, statues and other art objects spread in the Czech and Slovak cities under the “percentage for the arts” Act, which soon earned the popular designation of “aliens and herons” or the art of “real socialism”.^[P.08]

In the 1980s, chiefly in the US and Western Europe, criticism began to emerge, triggered by a large number of new works in public space and by reflections on the unfulfilled goals declared by the advocates of public art in strategic documents of urban and cultural institutions. Abstract modernist sculpture, which grew up due to the consistently advocated notion of the autonomy of a work of art, was often installed without any relationship to the place and architecture.^[P.09]

Art seeks the justification of its presence in a city in two ways. The first option involves participation in the design of parts of the architecture or in the adoption of a functionalist paradigm. Artworks compositionally complement architecture, and it is often not clear where architecture ends and art begins, which reduces the art to a decorative element. Art can also integrate the function of street furniture. Often in collaboration with architects, minimalist artists with an eye for refined form and composition design benches, tables, gates, bollards and other functional objects in the urban environment.^[P.10]

The second option rests on looking for the means and options how to respond to the context of a place or situation. Artists process the stimuli generated by a specific environment, which they

[P_06] ↗ ZOJACOVÁ, Dana. *Cultural and Historical Heritage in the Care of Local Communities*. In: *Cultural and Historical Heritage around us* [online]. 2009–2012 [cit. 26. 9. 2017]. Available online at: <http://elearning.historickeddictvi.com/zobraz/materialy/odborne-texty/humanitni-environmentalistika>

[P_07] ↗ HALL, Tim and ROBERTSON, Ian. *Public Art and Urban Regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debates*. In: *Landscape Research*, 2001. 26/1. p. 5–26

[P_08] ↗ KAROUS, Pavel (ed.). *Aliens and Herons*. Prague: Arbor Vitae, 2013, p. 452–455

[P_09], [P_10] ↗ KWON, Miwon. *One place after another*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2004, p. 65

then further interpret, critically examine and enrich with additional layers. A site-specific art is thus produced, responding to historical, cultural, political and social conditions and accentuating the importance of art in everyday life. Artists soon realized that traditional static sculpture represented an inadequate means of expressing the increasing complexity of expanding cities and dynamically changing societies. Some of the critics see art in cities as manifestations of the power and influence of various interest groups and as the gradual privatization of public space. There is a trend of moving away from institutionalized art and partly also from permanent installations of artistic objects in favour of temporary interventions. This marks the emergence of “*a new genre of public art*”^[P.11], which becomes the term for socially engaged art working with the different layers of a place or location that uses new methods and strategies, such as performances, events, interventions, community projects and many others.

With a deeper reflection on these approaches, the subject of the audience—which is the recipient of art and for whom art is created in the city^[P.12]—emerges along with the question “is it still art”? Since the 1990s, support for participatory methods in revitalization projects and the development of new public spaces has been increasing. Artists are often mediators and catalysts of processes whose goal is not to implement physical artworks but to interconnect the community and deepen social ties.

In Czechoslovakia, and later in the Czech Republic, 1989 marks the beginning of the abolishment of institutions that were directly involved in the support and implementation of art in public space. The *law on the mandatory “percentage for the arts”* was likewise abolished → [P.2.2/p. 98]. The arts were left to grapple with the possibilities of the emerging free market, the particular interests of individual initiators and the entrepreneurship of artists themselves. Over the course of more than a quarter of a century, the lack of systematic support has resulted in a high concentration of works of differing quality in the historical core of Prague, mostly conservative, and in rarely installed art during the revitalization of housing estates or in urban areas of rural character and in the periphery of the city.

In general, it can be said that new forms of art are first tested in galleries, after which artists use it to activate public space. After a time, it is integrated into the city’s strategic programmes. Permanent works of art that tend to concentrate in the historical city centre are characterized by lagging behind the vital stream of current artistic movements. The tendency to prefer conservative art can only be overcome in cities which actively perceive current trends resonating in the world of art and see public art as a valuable and curated collection. Such a clear vision can only be supported through open and transparent support programmes that stimulate a varied cultural environment. As a result, their city shifts onto an international cultural map, irrespective of the city’s size.

[P.11] ↗ LACY, Suzan.
Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art. Washington: Bay Press, 1995

[P.12] The question of the public, which is associated with the issue of evaluating art in public space, has been the subject of discussion to a greater extent in recent years. Research on this topic has been published in a book by urban geographer Martin ZEBRACKI. ↗ ZEBRACKI, Martin.
Public Artopia. Amsterdam: Pallas Publications, 2012.
The issue is also addressed in: ↗ SENIE, Harriet. *Responsible Criticism: Evaluating Public Art*. In *Sculpture*, December 2003, XX, 10.

047 Sculpture / Vzlet II. [Take-Off II.]
Stanislav Hubička, Valerián Karoušek, Jiří Novák (1972)
[Prague 6, Ruzyně Airport]



P.2 Principles establishing support in the form of a “percent for art”

“Percent for art” represents one of the best known and most popular financial mechanisms for supporting art and architecture in public space. However, the experience in Czechoslovakia and other countries clearly shows that it was just a tool for securing funding that did not in itself guarantee the emergence of high-quality art.

“Percent for art” is a financial instrument of support under which the state and city receive funding to implement art in public space. It determines the percentage of the amount or how to arrive at it according to the project parameters and conditions that the project must meet. The corresponding amount is subsequently earmarked from the total investment intended for the construction of buildings and other objects and for the revitalization of public space and used for the realization of works of art, their maintenance and for publicity.

The “percent for art” principle can be adopted in the framework of national legislation or in regulations pertaining to regions and cities, or to the investment policies of ministries or other authorities. It may take the form of an enforceable law or guideline. It may be applied in different ways, the following two being the most common:

— “PERCENT FOR ART” IN THE FRAMEWORK OF A SPECIFIC INVESTMENT

In general, the “*Percent for Art*” system in Western countries is always tied to a particular building project, such as a motorway construction project or a new concert hall, i.e. the artwork must be placed on schedule as part of the overall investment and at the site of the construction project. This method may face two problems. Since installation relates to a specific project, the art usually forms a part of the building and less of the adjacent public space (unless it is a revitalization project), and it is difficult to apply this approach to stable and compact urban structures where the number of such projects is naturally low. The second problem lies in the disproportion between the requirements of integrating art into various buildings and the cost of construction, i.e. it does not take into account the real need and appropriateness of installing the work of art in a given building, including the fact that some buildings, although formally public, are not really visited by the public, and not even intended to be, their “public” quality consisting in the “general public utility” through their function. This applies especially to technical and infrastructure buildings, etc. In Czechoslovakia, this was solved with a mechanism for determining the percentage for various types of buildings, described below.

— A PERCENTAGE [%] FOR THE ARTS IN THE FORM OF A FUND

The city withdraws an appropriate percentage from the total amount earmarked for next year’s investments and places it in a fund, which it then uses as needed. The resulting amount is thus not tied to a specific investment and may serve, in addition to the installation of new works, for the management, care and protection of the municipal collection of public sculpture/art and for educational programmes and workshops and other activities according to the programme’s defined priorities. Ideally, the money in this fund does not need to be spent within that particular calendar year, etc., but clear rules exist, irrespective of the time of expenditure, on what the money can be spent on, what the process is and under what conditions money can be drawn from the fund. The problem with this system is perhaps that it gives preference to placing artworks in exposed parts of the city centre, this potentially resulting in the further neglect of undervalued sites elsewhere in the city and allowing easier abuse of the system for the purposes of political marketing.

P.2.1 History of application of the “percent for art percent for art” principles abroad

FRANCE

The “percent for art” principle was applied for the first time in France in 1937, and only

to the construction of new educational buildings. Of the total investment budget, 1.5% was used for “decoration”. Implementation of this principle was the result of a long-term effort to apply avant-garde art in urban construction. The declared goal was to enable cooperation between artists and architects in the creation of new buildings and urban areas with an emphasis on creating a pleasant environment. An important moment in the formulation of this regulation was the declared incentive for artistic creations different from the classical figural sculpture cultivated in the conservative environment of the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris. Unfortunately, this regulation was rarely applied in practice, and if it was, architects often preferred to work with traditionally focused artists.^[P.13] After the Second World War, the “percent for art” concept in France evolved dynamically for several decades. Systematic changes took place especially in the 1980s, when the regulation was extended to the activities of all ministries, not only the ministry of education. The 1990s were characterized by the effort to promote application of the programme, which still had the status of a recommendation, especially in smaller towns. In 2002, the programme was extended to all ministries, and since 2006, a uniform application process has been in place.^[P.14]

SCANDINAVIA

The Netherlands and Sweden adopted a percentage programme as early as 1951. In the Netherlands, the percentage ranges between 0.5% and 2% and is intended for state administration buildings, municipal buildings and art in open air. The office of Chief Government Architect is responsible for applying the percentage programme. Each work of art is subject to a decision made by an Office architect, project manager, future user and independent consultant. In recent years, the state has also funded experimental and conceptual artworks.^[P.15]

In Sweden, the responsible state institution is the Public Art Agency Sweden. Since 1997, the law applies not only to buildings, but to public space generally and forms a part of urban planning process. The percentage released from the budget is usually 1%^[P.16], except for the capital city of Stockholm, which prescribes 2% for the construction and renovation of medical facilities.^[P.17]

A structured programme to support art in public spaces has also been gradually built in Norway. In 1977, a state institution called KORO was established under the authority of the Ministry of Culture. Its basic objective is to procure high-quality art in public space nationwide. The institution has four differently targeted programmes. The specifics of individual programmes are reflected in the manner of financing, application processes and the nature of cooperation with involved entities. The first ever programme was created for the construction of new government-funded government buildings. Under this programme, KORO releases anything between 0.5% and 1% toward arts according to the type of construction, importance and other parameters. The second programme focuses on existing state-owned or rented buildings (LES). Here, KORO offers advice but not financial backing for projects. The third programme is for buildings owned by municipalities and districts (KOM), and the fourth programme focuses on art for the open air (URO). In the latter two programmes, the financial participation of KORO and the applicant is usually equal. In addition to the four programmes, KORO looks after all state-owned artworks (approximately 7,000), manages an internet archive of public sculpture and provides expert advice. The committees that decide on applications change regularly and are composed of professionals employed by KORO and external experts. Under these programmes, temporary and permanent artworks are created and installed by Norwegian or foreign artists, including the occasional implementation of a world-famous artist.^[P.18]

USA^[P.19]

As early as 1934, as part of the New Deal consolidation plan of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the “Federal Art Project” imposed an obligation to dedicate 1% of the cost of a public building funded by the federal government to art. The selection, financing,

[P.13], [P.14] ➔ RADISIC, Slavica. *Public Art Policy and Legal and Financial Policy Instruments*. Graduation thesis; University of Arts in Belgrade, University Lyon 2, 2007. [online]. [cit. 04. 11. 2020]. Available at: http://www.culturalmanagement.ac.rs/uploads/research_file_1/56d978be6e6f153e1aa6efa34a98ebb15e5f74e5.pdf

[P.15] ➔ European expert meeting for percent for art scheme, (Percentage) Schemes in participating countries, Public Art Online, 2005, [online]. [cit. 26. 9. 2017]. Available at: http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/resources/reports/percentforart/percent_schemes.php.html

[P.16] ➔ ALEXANDER, Victoria D. a REUSCHEMEYER, Merilyn. *Art and the State*, New York: Palmgrave Macmillan, 2005, s. 123.

[P.17] ➔ *Stockholm Konst*, [online]. [cit. 26. 9. 2017]. Available at: <http://www.stockholmkonst.se>

[P.18] ➔ KORO, *Public Art Norway*, [online]. [cit. 26. 9. 2017]. Available at: <https://publicartnorway.org/arbeidsomrade/>

[P.19] ➔ KAROUS, Pavel. *A brief description of the “percent” system development in the USA* (internal commentary to the plug-in in the process of its preparation 12/2017).

installation and maintenance processes of fine artworks in architecture was managed by the Section of Painting and Sculpture in the Procurement Division of the United States Department of the Treasury. In 1943, due to the cost of war, the regulation was suspended.

In 1949, it was replaced by the “*Art in Architecture Programme*” at the federal level and administered by the Art in Architecture Department under the *General Services Administration (GSA)*. The GSA allocates 0.5% of the estimated cost of constructing each new federal building to an art project. Artworks to be installed are selected through a panel discussion between art experts, representatives of citizens and communities, the project’s leading architect and GSA representatives. This discussion forum produces a number of nominated finalists, and the GSA selects the winner. Artists work with architects and other project team members from the beginning of the project to ensure a meaningful link between the art and architecture in order to prevent the creation of a merely artificial decoration. This system works in the USA to this day.

Since the end of the 1950s, “*percent for art*” legislation has been in force in individual states. Washington and Alaska were among the first, and more than half the US state governments practice it today. This trend was followed by various big cities, which pushed the “*percent for art*” ordinances through individually. The first city to adopt this cultural policy was Philadelphia, since 1959. In 1964, Baltimore drafted its own regulation, San Francisco joined the movement in 1967, and during the 1970s and 80s a “percent for art” strategy was adopted by most of the major North American cities. At present, more than seventy metropolises have it.

Chicago’s cultural strategy, which has become the Mecca of art in architecture and public space, has proved to be the most successful. The Chicago and New York regulations dedicate 1.33% from any public building or public space construction or renovation budget exceeding \$ 500,000 to the acquisition of original artworks or art projects. These art projects are selected via open art competitions. The winning art projects are selected by an expert committee composed of the architect of the constructed building, the building’s future user and three elected visual culture professionals.

GREAT BRITAIN

In British cities damaged by World War II, art was usually a part of new construction and revitalization projects and was financed through grants and the direct integration of art into the projects’ budgets. The United Kingdom did not adopt a “percent for art” regulation until 1978, and then only in the form of a recommendation directive, without specifying the rules of the application process. Despite the voluntary nature of this recommendation, many British cities have applied some form of a “percent for art” programme themselves. An analysis of the consequences of this directive later revealed that 95% of all works of art are produced in large, densely populated agglomerations with developed industry. In the traditionally agricultural areas, the percentage for art is applied rarely. Since 1997, therefore, the regulation has been mandatory for some types of public projects, such as hospitals, schools or municipal buildings.^[P.20]

P.2.2 Act on mandatory percentage allocated to the arts in Czechoslovakia

The previous chapter refutes the widespread myth that the principle or the law of “percent for art” was a tool for spreading the ideology of socialism and communism. As in the US or Western Europe, the adoption of the law in Czechoslovakia was preceded by two decades of state activity in construction and the integration of art into architecture and cities.

[P.20] ➔ RADISIC, Slavica. *Public Art Policy and Legal and Financial Policy Instruments*. Graduate Theses. University of Arts in Belgrade, University Lyon 2, 2007. [online]. [cit. 26. 9. 2017]. Available online at: <http://www.academica.rs/academica/Radisic-Slavica-Art-Public-Art-2007.pdf>

After the 1950s, which were marked by ideologically burdened architecture and the construction of monuments, the 1960s saw investment directed toward smaller works forming a part of architecture and public spaces in urban and in rural areas. In 1965, the government passed “*Resolution of the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on the solution of issues related to the application of art in investment construction projects*”, which provided a legal framework on the cooperation between artists and architects and which determined its principles. In 1966, the implementing guidelines for this resolution were passed, including the art funding mechanism for architecture and new urban complexes. This programme soon took the popular nickname of the “four percent law”. The percentage for art was calculated by multiplying the basic percentage rate (between 0.6% to 4.2%) by two coefficients. The first took into account the importance of the site (0.1% to 2.5%) and the second concerned the type of building (0% to 1.75%). The base rate was based on cost—the percentage decreased with increasing investment.^[P.21]

Several institutions were involved throughout the process. Besides the *State Commission for Investment Projects*, the *Union of Czechoslovak Architects* and the *Union of Czechoslovak*

P.2.3 Other instruments of support and sources of finance^[P.22]

The “percent for art” principle is the most widespread and well-known mechanism of providing funding to art for public space. However, there are more support instruments that states, cities and private organizations may implement and use. The following examples, which are not exhaustive, briefly present these other financing instruments.

— PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

This is applied in grant calls where a private entity can request financial support from a public institution but also make use of their advice and expertise. The financial backing of the projects is often evenly shared.

— RESERVING AN AMOUNT FOR ART IN AN INVESTMENT PROJECT

This is used for designing buildings of national cultural and social importance and in the absence of systematic support programmes.

— ART IN PUBLIC SPACE PROGRAMME WITH A STABLE BUDGET

This is used in cities that for some reason do not have a “percent for art” regulation/system (e.g. Vienna, Houston, Phoenix). This combines various resources, such as taxation of certain services, government lottery programmes and private contributions. The city often transfers this agenda to private organizations or agencies.

— ART IN PUBLIC SPACE AS A BUDGET ITEM

This is used in cases where the cities are too small and unable to generate enough money through any “percent for art” legislation.

— PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

Foundations directly initiate the creation of art in public space or support non-profit organizations and public institutions.

— COOPERATION BETWEEN DEVELOPERS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION BODIES

Under various agreements with the city, developers commit to contributing to the quality of public space by investing in infrastructure and services, and local administrations may direct these resources towards art. In the UK, for instance, this is managed through a legally binding planning contract. Developers sometimes consult institutions or private agencies for advice when implementing artistic works.

[P.21] ↗ KAROUS, Pavel (ed.). *Aliens and Herons*. Prague: Arbor Vitae, 2013, s. 454–455.

[P.22] The overview was inspired by and partially uses information from this source: ↗ Funding Sources for Public Art, Project for Public Spaces, 2009, [online]. [cit. 25. 9. 2017]. Available online at <https://www.pps.org/reference/artfunding/>

— NATIONAL LOTTERY PROGRAMME

This is an important source of art funding in the UK. A fifth of the revenue from the sales of lottery tickets is dedicated to providing funding to culture. Funds are managed at the state level by an Arts Council, which, to some extent, is independent, and works under the auspices of the Department of Culture, Sport and Media, which serves as guarantor of the development of culture and cultural institutions in the UK.^[P.23]

— TAXES

In the USA, some funds are also raised from taxes on tourist accommodation^[P.24] and the sale or rent of apartments and studios to artists.

P.3 Foreign Experience

The long-term experience in the USA and in Western Europe, which has been transcribed into the current form of their institutions and programmes, may act as inspiration to define the strategy, objectives, principles and tools supporting art in public spaces which Prague has the opportunity to create anew.

The following section presents examples of municipal or non-profit organizations abroad applying a comprehensive approach. These programmes demonstrate an awareness of the interdependence of placing artworks in public space with the overall creation of the city and other cultural aspects. They have also been selected to illustrate the variety in programmes and focus, declared goals and the degree of integration into city management.

[P.23] ↗ 2010 to 2015 government policy: arts and culture. 2015, [cit. 25. 9. 2017] Available online at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/2010-to-2015-government-policy-arts-and-culture>

[P.24] The so-called 'TOT' (transient occupancy tax) is a tax on "temporary accommodation," which applies to hotels and motels and other accommodation for less than 30 days.

P.3.1 Vienna, Austria

KÖR – KUNST IM ÖFFENTLICHEN RAUM WIEN
www.koer.or.at
FORM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Private organization – GmbH (equivalent of a Czech s.r.o. – a limited liability company).
INSTITUTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Established in 2004 by the city (at the initiative of the Committee on Culture and the Committee on Planning, City Development and Housing).In 2008, it was transformed into a private organization.
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">A five-member expert committee that decides on financial support for selected projects.Independent members change every three years, with the exception of the permanent member – MUSA Director (City Museum, managing the City’s Contemporary Art Collection), who is also the Head of the City of Vienna Cultural Affairs Office.
FINANCING METHODS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">KÖR administers a fund obtained from the public funds of the city, which is distributed between selected projects according to the findings of an expert commission.Amount of support per project achieves a max. € 150,000.
VISION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">KÖR aims to “breathe new life into public space through permanent or temporary art projects”.KÖR’s efforts aim to strengthen the identity of each neighbourhood and revive public space in the sense of an “agora”, i.e. places of socio-political and cultural discourse.
OBJECTIVES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Assist in art’s active role in the creation of the city, provide people with new perspectives, experiences.Assist in shaping public space through temporary and permanent artistic projects, breathe life into these spaces and strengthen their social quality.Develop the understanding of art as not just a decoration but an independent contemporary contribution to relevant socio-political themes in the urban environment.Present art in public space as an important aspect of cultural life and thus anchor Vienna more internationally and strengthen the city’s cultural profile in the field of contemporary visual art.Improve quality, support and document art in public space.Support young artists by implementing temporary projects.Develop key cultural activities and social interests of the city and pursue them from an arts perspective.Discover areas for future city development as opportunities for artistic activities and participate in the creation of public space from the start.
CHIEF ACTIVITIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Manage artistic projects, organize open and invitation-only art competitions, public procurement.Allocate grants to artists and partner organizations.Publishing, organize symposia, create educational programmes, archiving and documenting projects.
SUPPORTED ARTISTIC FORMS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Permanent and temporary.
OPTIONS FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF ARTISTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Participation in open and invitation-only art competitions.Direct procurement from artists.

For the first three years, KÖR was run as a municipal institution. Due to the project’s success, its status was changed to an independent private organization. Through the staff’s connection to MUSA, the organization is directly linked to other cultural activities in the city. The objectives and values of the programme are defined with regard to the complexity and topicality of art issues. Culture is meant to be a key factor in shaping the urban environment, and KÖR wants to be an active player in this process. KÖR’s visions are defined with balance in order to cover a wide range of methods of involving art in everyday life, and vice versa, enable people to change their way of perceiving art and develop critical thinking. In recent years, there has been a trend towards temporary projects.

P.3.2 Berlin, Germany

BBK BERLIN – KULTURWERK DES BERUFSVERBAND BILDENDER KÜNSTLER KIÖR – BÜRO FÜR KUNST IM ÖFFENTLICHEN RAUM
www.bbk-kulturwerk.de
FORM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">KiöR – Office for art in public space is a supporting component of the Association of Professional Visual Artists (BBK Berlin), which has approximately 2,000 members.
INSTITUTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Established in 1979. In 1999, it was renamed KiöR.
FINANCING METHODS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The operation of BBK Berlin and KiöR is funded by contributions from registered artists.Financing the acquisition of works of art is based on the building regulations for the implementation of public projects, which stipulate that 1–2% of the construction costs of all buildings constructed from public funds should be used for art.
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Eight-member expert committee (7 artists, 1 invited guest).
VISION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">BBK promotes the rights and interests of artists and advocates the improvement of creative opportunities, represents the artistic community under the city's cultural policies.
OBJECTIVES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide a transparent and fair guarantee of the application of a “percent for art principle from the beginning of the planning process.
ACTIVITIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Expert committee proposes artists for invitation-only competitions or specific contracts and selects representatives of the artistic community as experts for juries of competitions.Registration and administration of portfolios of artists who are active with public space (approximately 500 portfolios).Consultancy for artists and entities involved in public procurement processes.Initiation and transparent organization of art competitions (open and invitation-only).Publishing the magazine “Kunststadt – Stadtkunst” (City of Art – Art of the City)
SUPPORTED ARTISTIC FORMS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Permanent and temporary. The “percent for art” system only supports artworks of a permanent character.
OPTIONS FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF ARTISTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Membership in the organization and registration of portfolios in the Portfolio Archive.Administration and organization of association activities.Participation in open and invitation-only competitions.Use of consulting and other services (coaching, workshops and courses).Implementing works in sculpture workshops managed by the organization.

The benefits of BBK Berlin lie in the services and backing it provides to artists. Combined with the KiöR's role and its responsibility for applying the “percent for art” regulation, it has become a strong stakeholder for representing the interests of the larger Berlin artistic community and an independent curator of art in public space in Berlin.

P.3.3 Helsinki, Finland

HAM – HELSINKI ART MUSEUM
www.hamhelsinki.fi
FORM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Organization established by the city.
INSTITUTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The municipal art collection was established in 1885.The City Art Museum, responsible for the municipal art collection and its presentation to the general public, was established in 1979.In 1998, the Helsinki Art Museum (HAM) became a part of the municipality as an independent organization of the city.
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Director and a Board of Management (9 members).
FINANCING METHODS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Since 1991, the city of Helsinki has applied a “percent for art” programme (1%). This amount is dedicated to financing art in connection with specific investments undertaken by the city—projects in public spaces or in public buildings (new and renovated buildings, hospitals, day-care centres, etc.)HAM is responsible for the entire process of implementation and closely cooperates with other city organizations, acts as an administrator of all works of art acquired under the programme.
VISION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Motto: “Art can make life in Helsinki fun.”The museum and its collections are aimed at all residents and visitors of Helsinki. Art in public space is designed to create unexpected situations in the urban space.The museum wants to be a part of everyday urban life, defining the role of the art museum in the framework of the social life of the metropolis as well as internationally.
OBJECTIVES
<p>HAM aims to follow the following values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Courage – Have an opinion and do things innovatively.Joy – meaningful creation, openness and mediation of meetings.Presence – the museum is here for the public, listening to its visitors and wanting to be a part of their daily lives.
ACTIVITIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Exhibition activities, acquisitions (to the collection of contemporary Finnish art and the collection of art in public space).Record-keeping, documentation and care of the existing art collection.Research, popularization and educational activities (workshops, public and private tours).Lending works of art to public institutions.Administration of an on-line archive and maps of art in public space (artworks managed by the city and other entities).
SUPPORTED ARTISTIC FORMS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Chiefly permanent.
OPTIONS FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF ARTISTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Participation in open and invitation-only competitions.Direct procurement of artists.

Helsinki has been actively expanding its art collection and installing sculptures in parks and squares since the late 19th century. In 1954, an art council was established to purchase and implement the works of artists living in Helsinki in order to enrich and revitalize offices and public space. In the 1970s and 1980s, the importance of cultural activities was strengthened by the adoption of significant private collections linked to the need for renovating and constructing new buildings.

HAM presents a clearly and popularly defined vision on its website in a declared effort to reach the broadest possible spectrum of the general public. Once every few years, it revises its direction. The online archive presenting the city's collection of public sculpture includes sculptures in Helsinki and its environs and is linked to a map of services. In addition to providing information about specific works, it is enriched by providing the option to report damage or share memories associated with a statue. These experiences then appear as short comments on the museum's website.

P.3.4 Den Haag, The Netherlands

ART CENTER STROOM DEN HAAG
www.stroom.nl
FORM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private Foundation (art centre).
INSTITUTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Established in 1990.
FINANCING METHODS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Combination of financial support from the City of Hague and private sources, foundations (e.g. Mondriaan Fund, Creative Industries Fund NL and DOEN Foundation).
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board of Trustees (5 members), Grant Committee (8 members), Professional Artists Committee (4 members), employees.
VISION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Foundation is committed to a wide range of activities that relate to the urban environment and include visual art, architecture, urban planning and design.• The centre is open to all stimulating ideas, wants to be a stimulating platform, and in cooperation with other institutions, reflects the development of the contemporary city and the role of visual art in this process.
OBJECTIVES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Promote critical and creative thinking about contemporary cities.• Using a combination of different professional and artistic perspectives, knowledge and methods, it wishes to build a position from which it is possible to reflect the complex issues of the urban environment.
ACTIVITIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Promoting cultural interests in political affairs (conferences, presentations for local governments and authorities).• Support for the local artistic scene.• Building a library, initiating research activities and exchanging experience in the field of art and related disciplines.• Initiation of exhibitions, workshops and lectures for the public, publications.• Implementation of permanent artistic objects in public space in cooperation with the city, facilitating communication between artists and the city.
PROJECT EXAMPLES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Sculpture Gallery – pedestrian zone designed to present works by Dutch sculptors.• Fiets & Stal – a challenge to the artistic community to render hundreds of bike shelters and racks.• Art for schools – in close cooperation with the city and under the application of a “percent for art” programme, involvement in investment in renovation or construction of new school buildings.
SUPPORTED ARTISTIC FORMS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Permanent, temporary, participative.
OPTIONS FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF ARTISTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participation in grant calls and special projects.• Participation in workshops, lectures.• Use of the centre’s services (library, counselling).• Registration in the City of Hague artist database.

The centre’s contribution is especially strong in the initiation of unusual connections. For example, “Play Your City” introduces three-dimensional art objects into the world of children’s games and movement through a specific context of the urban environment outside the “safe” playground environment. The centre reflects the position of art in public space in a broad sense, not only through exhibitions but also seminars, lectures, open studios and other events. The aim is to stimulate critical thinking in relation to contemporary society and current affairs.

P.3.5 Chicago, USA

CHICAGO PUBLIC ART PROGRAM
www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/dca/provdrs/public_art_program.html
FORM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The founder and the administrator of the programme is the Department of Cultural Affairs and Special Events.
INSTITUTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Established in 1978 (programme of support dates back to the 1930s).
FINANCING METHODS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Financing the acquisition of new works on a “percent for art” basis—1.33% of the budget for the construction or renovation of buildings, structures or exterior modifications is intended for the implementation of art as a part of the investment.
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Department employees, Head of Department, Head of Programme Department.
VISION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The department does not declare a vision or value framework for the programme on its website.
OBJECTIVES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Implementation of non-commemorative works of art in public space.
ACTIVITIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Implementation of artistic works by applying the principle of a “percent for art” in the form of a combination of open calls and invitation-only competitions.Administration of a database of artists, who are informed about new projects and opportunities.Documentation, maintenance of works of art, and administration of on-line archives.
SUPPORTED ARTISTIC FORMS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Permanent.
OPTIONS FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF ARTISTS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Registration in a database whereby artists are informed of all the competitions they may enter. The programme’s employees select artists for invitation-only competitions based on their previous work.

The programme pays detailed attention to the process of applying the “percent for art” principle → [P.2.1/p. 88]. It is based on open communication and close cooperation between the city, local government and community, and includes the formulation of intentions, selection of artists and subsequent discussion of proposals in public meetings. Chicago has successfully implemented many contemporary artworks by world-class artists with sensitivity to their location and importance in the given context.

P.3.6 New York City, USA

DOT ART NEW YORK
www.nyc.gov/html/dot/html/pedestrians/dotart.shtml
FORM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">A city organization – part of the transport department, relevant public space, pedestrian transport section (NYC DOT – Department of Transport).
INSTITUTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Established in 2008.
FINANCING METHODS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Public funds drawn from the city's budget (the total annual budget of NYC DOT is \$ 900 million; the project's five-year budget is \$ 10 billion).
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Department staff, Artistic Advisory Board (5 members elected for two years, 4 representatives of public cultural institutions and one independent artist).
VISION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Animate and improve public space in cooperation with artists and local communities and directly connected traffic structures – “squares, fences, barriers, bridges and other elements can serve as a canvas for artistic expression”.
OBJECTIVES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Use temporary artistic projects to transform ordinary streets into exceptional environments.
ACTIVITIES
<p>DOT Art works with local communities and artists under five programmes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Barrier Beautification – regularly organizes open calls/competitions for visual conception of traffic constructions in specific locations.Community Commission – works with local organizations to select an artist/artwork for temporary placement on land managed by NYC DOT. The local community organization works closely to select the artist and later maintains the artworks.Artistic intervention (Arterventions) – collaboration with galleries and local organizations to display certain artworks in public space, usually in line with the gallery or museum programme. Partner organizations are responsible for maintenance and all costs associated with installing and uninstalling artworks, which are installed for three to six months.Art Display Case Exhibits – temporary presentation of the artist/project using portable exterior panels created in cooperation with local organizations and artists on the squares. NYC DOT manages installations and deinstallations.Special Projects – patronage and organization of temporary cultural events on land managed by NYC DOT.
SUPPORTED ARTISTIC FORMS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Permanent, participatory.There are only a few dozen permanent works. Temporary installations of statues and objects are much more frequent (e.g. the Jan Palach memorial by John Heyduk was created as a temporary installation by Cooper Union students and exhibited for two months at Cooper Square).
OPTIONS FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF ARTISTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Participation in DOT Art programmes – financial and material support for installations in public space.

The main goal of the NYC DOT metropolitan organization is to ensure sustainable mobility of the city and quality of traffic structures. The DOT Art programme extends beyond the expected spectrum of services and underlines the fact that the responsibilities of individual city authorities overlap and may complement each other. The programme addresses cultural activities and citizens' needs, works closely with local communities and partners, avoids bureaucratic confusion and facilitates the creation of artistic projects by various actors.

P.3.7 Philadelphia, USA

ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC ART
www.associationforpublicart.org
FORM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private, publicly beneficial organization.
INSTITUTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Established in 1872 as the Fairmount Park Association. Renamed in 2012 to the Association for Public Art.
FINANCING METHODS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Government grants, contributions from private societies, entities and individuals (e.g. Skanska USA Building Inc.).
STRUCTURE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board (7 members), employees, supervisory board, artists advisory committee.
VISION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reflection of the real conditions of life in contemporary society.• Participating in the creation of a cultural heritage of the city and preserving the cultural heritage for future generations.
OBJECTIVES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Implementation of new works, protection and care, support and promotion of art.
ACTIVITIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Directly awards projects to artists.• Administration of on-line archive of the collection of artistic works and interactive maps, including a plan of walks for the public.• Promotion and popularization through the audio application for smartphones. Museum without Walls, brochures, maps, cycling guide, art in the city, etc.• Organization of long-term thematic projects.• Organization of special programmes, educational and publishing activities, annual meeting of friends of the association, artists and students.
SUPPORTED ARTISTIC FORMS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Permanent or participative, leading to lasting creations.
OPTIONS FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF ARTISTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Involvement in projects, educational activities and art promotions.• Networking and participation in annual association meetings of the Association.

This is one of the oldest organizations engaged in the systematic support of public art. At present, it focuses on presenting and bringing existing works of art to the city’s residents. In a variety of creative ways, it encourages interest in the collection of public art and provides information to the general public.

In the past, the Association has implemented long-term projects responding to the current art trends. For example, in 1999, they completed participatory projects under the New Landmarks framework: Public Art, Community, and the Meaning of Place. The selected communities, together with artists, worked for one year to prepare works of art that would reflect the shared values and direction of these communities. These works were subsequently implemented under projects related to public space revitalization, implementation of public construction, etc.

[EXAMPLES: FOREIGN EXPERIENCE—VIENNA]



048 Turnertempel memorial site
Iris Andraschek, Hubert Lobnig + Landscape architects: Maria Auböck + János Kárász (2011)
[Vienna, Turnergasse/Dingelstedtgasse]

A proposal treating a memorial space at the site of an important Viennese Synagogue, burnt down by the Nazis during the Second World War, was based on an invitation-only art competition of teams of artists and landscape architects. The objectives of the competition were to move beyond the standard format of a monument, to reconcile the requirement for the rehabilitation of the site and recall its sad history with the transformation of vague space into a truly public space and local meeting point.



049 Vienna Banquet of Human Rights and its Guardians
Françoise Schein (od 15. 6. 2018)
[Vienna, Platz der Menschenrechte]

“A table set for dinner” – the installation represents the thirty articles listed in the 1948 United Nations Declaration on Human Rights. It creates a space for interaction, reflection and enlightenment, reflection and relaxation. Articles served on hand-painted plates underline the notion that human rights are “food for the soul”.



050 Quantitative Easing (for the street) ^[P.25]
Axel Stockburger, curator: Muntean/ Rosenblum (27. 5.–27. 10. 2014)
[Vienna, Kunstplatz Graben]

In one of the most prominent spaces in the city centre, a place was selected where art projects have been regularly alternating under the direction of KÖR since 2011. Stockburger’s intervention responds to the topic of money and the global economy in contemporary society. It points out that streets are also scenes of “social transactions”, not only in terms of financial wealth but also social, aesthetic and political capital.

[P.25] Note: Quantitative easing (QE) is a form of monetary policy used by central banks to stimulate the economy

SUMMARY

The quality of public space is one of the basic preconditions for high-quality urban living. Public spaces play a cultural and social role. Art creates, develops and enriches the cultural dimension of the life of society and the individual and deepens perception of the environment and life around us. Art in public spaces enriches the area as a whole and enables cultural values to be transferred to the public at large.

The quality of public space is holistic. It is therefore important that each individual part it is composed of contributes to the quality of the whole. The relationship between the work of art and public space should be reciprocal: art enhances the quality of the space—and the space reinforces the meaning of the art. A wise city managed and inhabited by wise people, should allow, support, initiate, guarantee and actively create all of this. This is the purpose behind the publication “Works of Art in Public Spaces” and thematic plug-in for the Prague Public Space Design Manual.

The publication is divided into five interrelated chapters which specify the basic criteria for the quality of artworks located in public spaces and the guidelines for their acquisition, management and maintenance. This provides methodological support for the process of initiating, implementing and deciding on specific projects for the city and the professional and general public. It also establishes transparent conditions for the initiators of public art.

The plug-in also introduces ideas for systemic change. It proposes tools for the city to apply over time, provided its aim is to support, expand and promote high-quality and publicly accessible art, thereby increasing the city's cultural capital and the quality of its public spaces.

It also explains some of the patterns in relationships between works of art and the urban environment, presenting good practice and examples from abroad, and a motivating and inspiring tool.

manual.iprpraha.cz/en

RELATED LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Act No. 131/2000 Coll., on the Capital City of Prague.

Act No. 183/2006 Coll., on Town and Country Planning and Building Code (the Building Code).

Act No. 89/2012 Coll., Civil Code.

Act No. 121/2000 Coll., Copyright Act.

Act No. 565/1990 Coll., on local fees.

Prague City Hall Decree 1/2016 Coll. hl. m. Prague, generally binding ordinance on restrictive measures to secure local public policy issues in connection with the operation of public street art productions in publicly accessible places.

Prague City Hall Decree 5/2011 Coll. hl. m. Prague, generally binding ordinance on the local fee for the use of public space.

RELATED METHODOLOGICAL AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS

Prague Public Space Design Manual. Prague: IPR Prague, 2014. Available at: <http://manual.iprpraha.cz> (approved by Resolution of the Prague City Council No. 1495 dated 24.6.2014)

Prague Participation Manual. Prague: IPR Prague, 2016. Available at: <http://www.iprpraha.cz/manualparticipace> (approved by Resolution of the Prague City Council No. 2908 dated 22. 11. 2016)

Prague Strategic Plan, updated 2016. Prague: IPR Prague, 2016. Available at: <http://strategie.iprpraha.cz/> (approved by Resolution of the Prague City Council No. 21/7 dated 24. 11. 2016)

Prague Cultural Policy Concept 2017–2021. Praha: KUC Prague City Hall, 2017. Available at: http://kultura.praha.eu/public/6e/a7/f1/2485343_790106_Koncepce_kulturni_politiky_HMP_2017_2021.pdf

Concept for the Support of the Arts in the Czech Republic 2015–2020. Prague: Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic, 2015. Available at: <https://www.mkcr.cz/koncepce-podpory-umeni-v-ceske-republice-na-leta-2015-az-2020-1279.html>

UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. Paris: UNESCO, 2011. Available at: https://www.mkcr.cz/doc/cms_library/doporuceni_o_histor_krajine_cz-2056.doc

The 2005 Convention for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Paris: UNESCO, 2005. Available at: <https://www.mkcr.cz/umluva-unesco-o-ochrane-a-podpore-rozmanitosti-kulturnich-projevu-verejna-diskuse-660.html>

Why do competitions pay off? [online]. Available at: <https://www.cka.cz/cs/souteze/proc-je-architektonicka-soutez-vyhodna>

Guidelines for competitions for proposals in the field of architecture, urbanism, landscape architecture, construction and fine or applied art. ČKA, 2018. Available at: <https://www.cka.cz/cs/souteze/jak...soutez/...a...soutezi/140320-metodika-son-final.pdf>

European expert meeting for percent for art scheme, (Percentage) Schemes in participating countries. Public Art Online, 2005, [online]. [quote / accessed: 26. 9. 2017]. Available at: http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/resources/reports/percentforart/percent_schemes.php.html

Stockholm Konst, [online]. [quote / accessed: 26. 9. 2017]. Available at: <http://www.stockholmkonst.se>

KORO, Public Art Norway, [online]. [quote / accessed: 26. 9. 2017]. Available at: <https://publicartnorway.org/arbeidsomrade/>

Funding Sources for Public Art. Project for Public Spaces, 2009, [online]. [quote / accessed: 25.9.2017]. Available at: <https://www.pps.org/reference/artfunding/>

2010 to 2015 government policy: arts and culture. 2015, [quote / accessed: 25.9.2017]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/2010-to-2015-government-policy-arts-and-culture/2010-to-2015-government-policy-arts-and-culture>

RELATED LITERATURE AND REFERENCES

ALEXANDER, Victoria D. a REUSCHEMEYER, Merilyn. *Art and the State*. New York: Palmgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Auto*Mat, z.s. *Manual for the use of public spaces*. Prague: Auto*Mat, 2015. Available at: <http://zazitmestojinak.cz/zazit-mesto-normalne/wp-content/uploads/Manuál-UV-P7-final.pdf>

BACH, Balkin Penny. *New Land Marks: Public Art, Community and the Meaning of Place*. Washington: Greyson Publishing, 2000.

BARTLOVÁ, Anežka (ed.). *The Manual of the Monument*. Prague: Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design in Prague, 2016.

BARTLOVÁ, Anežka, DUB, Petr and LOMOVÁ, Johana (Spolek Skutek). *Art in public space. A Percent for Art. Information brochure about the amendment of Act No. 203/2006 Coll., on Certain Types of Support of Culture and Amendments to Certain Related Laws, and other initiatives supporting placement of art in public space*. Available at: <http://spolekskutek.cz/sites/default/files/SPOLEK-SKUTEK-%25-na-umeni-ve-verejnem-prostoru-2017.pdf>

BARTLOVÁ, Milena. *In Margine (Not just about the monuments)*. In: Artalk [online]. Artalk, 2014 [quote / accessed: 26. 9. 2017]. Available at: <http://artalk.cz/2014/03/01/in-margine-nejen-o-pomnicich/>

CARTIERE, Cameron a WILLIS, Shelly (ed.), *The Practice of Public Art*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

FIŠER, Marcel a ORTMEIER, Martin. *Outdoors / Art in Public Space in the South-West Bohemia and Lower Bavaria 1990–2010*. Horažďovice: Galerie Klatovy, 2010.

HALL, Tim a ROBERTSON, Ian. *Public Art and Urban Regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debates*. In: Landscape Research, 2001.

HENDRYCH, Jakub. *Rules for the Placement of Works of Art in Public Space from the Perspective of their Impact on the Overall Quality of the Site*. In: *The Manual of the Monument*. Prague: Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design in Prague, 2016.

KAROUS, Pavel (ed.). *Aliens and Herons*. Prague: Arbor Vitae, 2013.

KUTHANOVÁ, Kateřina (ed.). *Metamorphoses of politics*. Prague: Archive of the Capital City of Prague, 2013.

KWON, Miwon. *One place after another*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2004.

LACY, Suzan. *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Washington: Bay Press, 1995.

MELKOVÁ, Pavla. *Role of fine artworks in public space*. In: *The Manual of the Monument*. Prague: Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design in Prague, 2016.

PACHMANOVÁ, Martina. *Who is a curator: On the interpreters of art and their dialogue with the public*, in: A2. 2007, č. 39 [quote / accessed: 30. 5. 2018]. Available at: <https://www.advojka.cz/archiv/2007/39/kdo-je-to-kuratorika>

PAVLÍČKOVÁ, Kateřina. *Works of Art in Public Space*. [catalogue of the 4th Annual Exhibition of the Soros Center for Contemporary Art: 2 October 1997–2 November 1997, Veletržní palác, Prague]. Prague: Soros Center for Contemporary Art, 1997.

PHILIPS, Patricia. *Out of order: The public art machine*. In: Artforum, Vol. 27, No.4, 1988.

RADISIC, Slavica. *Public Art Policy and Legal and Financial Policy Instruments. Graduate Thesis*. University of Arts in Belgrade, University Lyon 2, 2007. [online]. [quote / accessed: 26. 9. 2017]. Available at: <http://www.academica.rs/academica/Radistic-Slavica-Art-Public-Art-2007.pdf>

SENIE, Harriet and WEBSTER, Sally. *Critical issues in Public Art*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1992. SENIE, Harriet: Responsible Criticism: Evaluating Public Art. In *Sculpture*, December 2003, XX, 10. [quote / accessed: 2.10. 2015]. Available at: <http://www.sculpture.org/documents/scmag03/dec03/senie/senie.shtml>

ZEBRACKI, Martin. *Public Artopia*. Amsterdam: Pallas Publications, 2012.

ZOJACOVÁ, Dana. *Cultural and Historical Heritage in the Care of Local Communities*. In: Cultural and Historical Heritage around us [online]. 2009-2012 [quote / accessed: 26. 9. 2017].

Art in public space. Bulletin ČKA 03/2016. Available at: <https://www.cka.cz/cs/cka/cinnost-komory/bulletin-CKA/bulletin-3-2016>

AUTHORS OF PHOTOGRAPHS

IPR Praha © Jan Malý: 002, 004, 005, 006, 008a, 013, 015, 023, 025, 029, 030, 032, 033, 036, 043

IPR Praha © Archive of the Public Space Office: 007, 008b, 009, 016a, 016b, 017b, 022, 024, 027, 028, 031, 034, 035, 037, 039, 041, 042, 044

External sources of photographs:

© Ester Havlová: 026

© Oto Hudec: 046

© Pavel Karous: 001, 011, 017a, 038

© David Kašpar: 045

© Jan Nedbal: 012

© Alena Zmeškalová: 003

Prague City Gallery Archive: 040, 047

Galerie Jaroslava Fragnera Archive © Michal Barbuščák: 018

KÖR (Kunst im öffentlichen Raum Vienna) © Iris Ranzinger: 048, 049, 050

Foundation Proměny Karla Komárka © Jana Slavík: 008c

Archive of Denisa Václavová:

© Dušan Zahoranský: 010

© Robert Bárta: 014

© Alena Kotzmannová: 019

© Zdeněk Porcal: 020

© Mjölík: 021

ART IN PUBLIC SPACES OF PRAGUE

PLUG-IN →

Prague Public Space

Design Manual

Prague Institute of Planning and Development,

Public Space Office

Vyšehradská 57, 128 00 Prague 2

manual.iprpraha.cz

AUTHORS:

doc. Ing. arch. Pavla Melková, Ph.D.

Ing. arch. Kateřina Frejlichová, Ing. arch. Jakub Hendrych

CO-AUTHOR: MgA. Petra Vlachynská (Annex: Context for establishing a framework to support art in public spaces)

COOPERATION: IPR Prague – Strategy and Policies Section, the “Creative Prague!” team — MgA. Olga Škořichová, Mgr.

Veronika Marianovská, MgA. Klára Mišunová; IPR Prague – External Relations Section, Office of Participation —
Pavla Pelčíková, MSc.; IPR Prague Legal Dept. – Mgr. Kateřina Rabiňáková; Prague City Hall – Heritage Protection
Department – Mgr. Jiří Skalický, Ing. Ivana Sýbrtová

EXPERT GROUP AND LECTORS: doc. Ing. arch. Miroslav Cikán, doc. Mgr. Karel Císař, Ph.D., doc. Dr. et Ing. Jiří Fajt,
Ph.D., Mgr. Marie Foltýnová, Ph.D., PhDr. Magdalena Juříková, MgA. Pavel Karous, Ph.D., Dr. Petr Nedoma,
MgA. Denisa Václavová, Ph.D., MgA. Petra Vlachynská

ILLUSTRATIONS: MgA. Marek Kundera

GRAPHICS/TYPOGRAPHY: Ing. arch. Jakub Hendrych, Ing. arch. Kateřina Frejlichová, Ing. arch. Kateřina Dolejšová
(concept), Barbora Listíková (supervision)

TRANSLATION: Didacticus s.r.o.

PROOF-READING & SUPERVISION: Viktória Mravčáková

1. edition / 116 pages

© IPR/UDS/POS, PRAGUE,

Original version: 2018, Translated version: 2020

plug-in → Prague Public Space Design Manual, Prague Institute of
Planning and Development.

Separate images, text and parts can (with respect to copyright law)
be distributed, copied and reproduced by any technique. A larger
quotation or higher cost must be agreed with the publisher. It is always
necessary to indicate the source.

ISBN 978-80-88377-11-5

**ART IN PUBLIC SPACE OF PRAGUE,
A PLUG-IN → PRAGUE PUBLIC SPACE DESIGN MANUAL**

A Introduction

- A.1 The city's approach to achieving high-quality art in public space
- A.2 The role of art in public space

B Purpose of the document

- B.1 Fundamental objectives
- B.2 Character of the document
- B.3 Thematic scope of the document
- B.4 Birth of the document
- B.5 Links to the city's methodical and strategic documents
- B.6 For whom the document is intended
- B.7 How to use this document

C Typology

- C.1 Typology of works of art for the purposes of this plug-in
- C.2 Categories according to the planned length of display
- C.3 Categories according to designation
- C.4 Categories according to origin

D Quality

- D.1 Basic prerequisites for achieving high-quality art in public space
- D.2 Basic quality criteria for works of art in public space
- D.3 Specific quality criteria

E Processes

- E.1 Processes relating to art in public space
- E.2 New roles and entities in institutionalised processes
- E.3 Implementing art of a permanent nature
- E.4 Implementing temporary artistic interventions
- E.5 Educating, informing and involving the general public
- E.6 Systematic financial support
- E.7 Model process scenarios

Annex – The context for establishing a framework to support public art

- P.1 Artistic and social background of support for art in the Euro-American context in the 19th and 20th century
- P.2 Principles establishing support in the form of a “percent for the arts”
- P.3 Foreign experience

