

Prague City Hall
Mariánské náměstí 2, 110 01 Praha 1
Statutory representative: RNDr. Tomáš Hudeček, Ph.D. - Mayor of Prague
Tel./fax: +420 236 002 376
Reg. No.: 000 64 581
Email: info@praha.eu

URBAN ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION FOR DESIGN IDEAS FOR THE SPACE –
MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁMĚSTÍ IN PRAGUE

REPORT ON THE COMPETITION PROCESS

1. Inaugural meeting of the jury

The inaugural jury meeting took place on 30 May 2014. The minutes of the inaugural meeting form Annex 1 hereto.

2. Jury session on inquiries from competitors

A jury session addressing competitor inquiries took place 18 July 2014. The minutes of this meeting form Annex 2 hereto.

3. Receipt of entries

In accordance with the provisions of Article 7 of the Competition Terms and Conditions, receipt of the competing designs took place up until the deadline of 5 September 2014 at 15:00. The location for personal submission or delivery by post was the filing room of the Prague Institute of Planning and Development.

In total 40 entries had been delivered by the designated deadline. One design was delivered 10 September 2014. This entry came from France with a stamp that it had been sent 30 August 2014.

Upon receipt, the entries were marked with a serial number. The serial number, date and time of receipt and the form of delivery were placed in a separate table summary without any identification of the competitor. This summary is part of the competition documentation. Before opening the designs, the entries were renumbered by the examiners of the competing entries. The renumbering is also listed in the aforementioned table, which was not provided to the jury.

4. Examination of the entries

Examination of the competing entries was conducted by Ing. arch. Jitka Barlecová and Ing. arch. Lenka Slívová on 5 September 2014, 8 September 2014 and 9 September 2014. The results of examination were verified by the competition secretary on 9 September 2014 at 13:15.

During examination the entries were opened and all their components were labelled with the renumbered design number.

The examination tracked the formal requirements of the entries, possible violation of anonymity, general assessment that the competition task was followed and a listing of all components of the entry that overstepped the requirements of the Competition Terms and Conditions (hereinafter "CTC") and should therefore not be judged according to Section 10 (6c) of the CCA Competition Code.

The examiners of the competing entries examined a total of 40 entries. The details of examination are listed in the independent tables that are part of the competition documentation and can be viewed at the principal.

The results of examination are as follows:

Entries 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37 and 39 have no deficiencies, formally or in terms of content, are in keeping with the CTC and may be assessed.

Fundamental content or formal deficiencies were found in the following entries:

- a) Entry 11 - text part is missing; in addition the proposal does not follow the prescribed panel template, the drawing plan on Panel 1 has been cropped incorrectly and the frames for writing the entry number are missing;
- a) Entry 13 - text part is on two A4s, clearly exceeding the permitted scope; the scaled-down copies of the panels for the graphic section are not on two separate pages but are printed on several A4 pages featuring the individual plans;
- b) Entry 31 - does not have a CD-ROM in the "Autor" envelope but in a separate closed package (in order to ensure anonymity the competition secretary and examiners enclosed the CD-ROM and Autor envelope into a further envelope).

Partial formal deficiencies were found in the following entries:

- a) Entries 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 22, 23, 28, 29, 3 - only one complete print-out of the text report supplied;
- b) Entries 8, 9, 11, 34 - missing the label MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁMĚSTÍ V PRAZE on the entry cover;
- c) Entries 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 33 - missing the frame for entering the number on the Autor envelope;
- d) Entries 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 23, 29, 34 missing the label MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁMĚSTÍ V PRAZE on the Autor envelope;
- e) Entry 8 - template for the panel with labels and frames not used properly;
- f) Entry 38 - lacking frames for entering numbers on panels;
- g) Entry 40 - paper format is 5 cm smaller; format of background material is correct;

Components of the entry that overstepped the CTC were found in:

- a) Entry 4 – in the report is a scaled-down version of a panel not used in the competition entry - the examiners and secretary covered up the page with the panel;
- b) Entry 29 – a separate folder with print-outs of the individual plans for the graphic part was enclosed - this folder was taken out by the secretary and examiners and was not submitted to the jury.

5. Assessment jury session

The assessment session of the jury took place on 12 – 13 September 2014 in the boardroom of the Prague Institute of Planning and Development.

5.1 Day one

5.1.1 Attendance

The follow jurors were in attendance (in alphabetical order):

Petr Burgr – substitute juror (appointed)
Ing. Jakub Dvořák – regular juror (appointed)
Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček – regular juror (independent)
Ing. arch. Antonín Novák – regular juror (independent)
Ing. Tomáš Novotný – regular juror (independent)
Mgr. Jiří Skalický – regular juror (appointed)
MgA. Marcela Steinbachová – substitute juror (independent)
Ing. akad. arch. Jan Šépka – regular juror (appointed)
Prof. dipl. arch. Miroslav Šik – regular juror (independent)
Prof. PhDr. Rostislav Švácha – regular juror (independent)

The meeting was also attended by:

Ing. Jan Špilar – competition jury expert
Ing. arch. Jitka Brablecová – examiner of competition entries
Ing. arch. Lenka Slívová – examiner of competition entries
RNDr. Milan Svoboda – secretary

Excused:

Ing. Václav Novotný – regular juror (appointed)

Before the session was called to order those present signed a declaration within the meaning of Section 10 (2) of the CCA Competition Code.

5.1.2 Call to order

The meeting began at 9:19.

The meeting was called to order by jury chair Prof. dipl. arch. Miroslav Šik, who proposed a system of assessment. The first item of business is to be assessment of the entries in groups. This will be followed by selection of the entries to be assessed in further phases as needed.

The jury members voting are: Burgr, Dvořák, Hlaváček, Novák, Novotný T., Skalický, Šépka, Šik, Švácha.

5.1.3 Discussion of the results of examination of the entries

At 9:30 the jury discussed the report on examination of the entries (see Chapter 4 hereof).

The jury took under advisement the fact that Entry 41 was delivered after the deadline (10 September 2014) and must be disqualified.

The jury voted on Entries 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37 and 39, for which no formal deficiencies were found. By a vote of

For: 9	Against: 0	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury passed the motion that Entries 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37 and 39 will be duly assessed.

The jury then discussed the **violations of the CTC** and assessed whether to consider the deficiencies found as solely formal deviations that do not reduce the intelligibility of the entries, do not endanger their anonymity and do not grant them any advantages, in accordance with Section 10 (6b) of the Competition Code.

The jury discussed the violation of the CTC by **Entry 11**, which lacked the text part and which did not fully observe the requirements for the panel graphics. The jury stated that the text is located on the panel and thus it can assess the entry. The jury voted on the chair's motion that the missing text part and shortcomings in the layout of the panels do not comprise a reduction in the intelligibility of the entry, a danger to anonymity or an advantage for the entry and thus that the entry not be disqualified from assessment. By a vote of

For: 9	Against: 0	Abstained: 2
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that Entry 11 shall not be disqualified from assessment.

The jury discussed the violation of the CTC by **Entry 13**, in which the text part is on two A4 sheets (the requirements stated 1), clearly exceeding the permitted scope, and which does not contain the scaled-down panels, which are replaced with copies of the individual drawings. The jury studied the submitted text part. The jury chair moved that the extended text part and missing scaled-down panels do not comprise a reduction in the intelligibility of the entry, a danger to anonymity or an advantage for the entry and thus that the entry not be disqualified from assessment.

By a vote of

For: 8	Against: 0	Abstained: 1
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that Entry 13 shall not be disqualified from assessment.

The jury discussed the violation of the CTC by **Entry 31**, which did not have the CD-ROM enclosed in the Autor envelope but rather in a separate package (in order to ensure anonymity the competition secretary and examiners enclosed the CD-ROM and Autor envelope into a further envelope). At the chair's motion the jury decided by a vote of

For: 9	Against: 0	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

that no violation of anonymity had taken place and Entry 31 will remain in competition.

The jury collectively discussed the **minor formal violations** of the CTC:

- by Entries 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 22, 23, 28, 29 and 31, which included only a single complete print-out of the text report;
- by Entries 8, 9, 11 and 34, which lacked the label MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁMĚSTÍ V PRAZE on the entry cover;
- by Entries 1, 2, 7, 8, 9 and 33, which lacked the frame for entering the number on the Autor envelope;
- by Entries 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 23, 29 and 34, which lacked the label MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁMĚSTÍ V PRAZE on the Autor envelope;
- by Entry 8, where the template for the panel with labels and frames is not used properly, the plan format cut on Panel 1 is cropped incorrectly and the frames for entering the entry number are missing;
- by Entry 38, which lacks the frames for entering numbers on the panels;
- by Entry 40, where the paper format for panel 2 is 5 cm smaller than requested, though the format of the background material corresponds to the guidelines.

The jury chair tabled a resolution that the above formal deficiencies are entirely marginal, are not in any way consequential for assessment of the entries, that they do not reduce their intelligibility and do not endanger anonymity. By a vote of

For: 9	Against: 0	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that that Entries 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 38 and 40

shall not be disqualified from due assessment.

The jury took under advisement the fact that it will not assess the **part of the entry that overstepped the framework laid down by the CTC** in:

- a) Entry 4 – scaled-down panel not used in the competition design in the report (pasted over);
- b) Entry 29 – separated folder with print-outs of the individual drawings of the graphic part (not submitted to the jury).

By a final vote of

For: 9	Against: 0	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury agreed that all entries delivered by the proper deadline, i.e. Entries 1 – 40, are to be assessed.

5.2.2 Assessment of entries

At 10:15 discussion of the entries began. At the motion of the chair the jury, including the further attendees at the assessment session, were divided up into three groups, each of which was assigned a portion of the entries:

1. Group led by prof. Šik (Švácha, Šépka, Brablecová) – Entries 1 – 13
2. Group led by arch. Hlaváček (Steinbachová, Skalický, Dvořák, Slívová) – Entries 14 – 27
3. Group led by ing. T. Novotný (Novák, Burgr) – Entries 28 – 40

As the attending expert, Ing. Špilar was at the disposal of all groups.

The groups discussed the individual entries and the fulfilment of the competition task in these entries. Group assessment was completed at 11:25. This was followed by a collective discussion by all jurors on all the entries. A base opinion on each entry was presented by the relevant group leader.

Discussion was suspended at 12:35 when the lunch break began.

The afternoon part of the session began at 14:15.

During the lunch break ing. Dvořák left.

The jury members voting are Burgr, Hlaváček, Novák, Novotný T., Skalický, Steinbachová, Šépka, Šik, Švácha.

Discussion of the individual entries was completed at 14:45.

The jury then decided on which entries would progress to the second phase. The jury agreed that for the second phase it would not recommend the entries that do not properly apprehend the context of Malostranské náměstí and its transportation and urban relations. The jury proposed that Entries 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 36, 39 and 40 progress to the second round. By a vote of

For: 9	Against: 0	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that Entries 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 36, 39 and 40 are to be assessed in the second phase.

At 15:00 the jury began discussion on the entries that progressed to the second round of assessment. On the basis of discussion the jury selected the designs that are contextual, deal well with the transportation relationships or which have a strong concept in the architectural elements to progress to the third phase. The jury moved that Entries 2, 3, 5, 12, 15, 16, 20, 24 and 25 progress to **the third phase of assessment**. By a vote of:

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstained: 0

the jury decided that Entries 2, 3, 5, 12, 15, 16, 20, 24 and 25 are to be assessed in the third phase.

At 15:30 the jury began the third phase of assessment. First of all the entries were once again studied and compared. Then the jury expert, ing. Špilar, provided an exposition on the transportation and traffic aspects. Following this the jury discussed the positive aspects and benefits of the entries.

The first day's discussions were adjourned at 17:15.

5.2 Day two

5.2.1 Attendance

The following jurors were in attendance (in alphabetical order):

Petr Burgr – substitute juror (appointed)

Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček – regular juror (independent)

Ing. arch. Antonín Novák – regular juror (independent)

Ing. Tomáš Novotný – regular juror (independent)

Mgr. Jiří Skalický – regular juror (appointed)

MgA. Marcela Steinbachová – substitute juror (independent)

Ing. akad. arch. Jan Šépka – regular juror (appointed)

Prof. dipl. arch. Miroslav Šik – regular juror (independent)

Prof. PhDr. Rostislav Švácha – regular juror (independent)

The meeting was also attended by:

Ing. Jan Špilar – competition jury expert

Ing. arch. Lenka Slívová – examiner of competition entries

RNDr. Milan Svoboda – secretary

Excused

Ing. Václav Novotný – regular juror (appointed)

Ing. Jakub Dvořák – regular juror (appointed)

Ing. arch. Jitka Brablecová – examiner of competition entries

The jury members voting are: Burgr, Hlaváček, Novák, Novotný T., Skalický, Steinbachová, Šépka, Šik, Švácha.

The meeting began at 9:10. It was called to order by the jury chair. The meeting began with a discussion on the space of Malostranské náměstí and its broader context, in particular in terms of transportation (it is not clear what will happen after the Blanka Tunnel is opened). Also discussed was the issue of the presence of a plane tree planted after 1990.

One highly sensitive issue is that of parking. All the designs reduce the number of parking spots to a varying degree.

The jury took a fresh look again at all the projects delivered for the competition and discussed them.

The jury moved to revise the resolution on the entries that progress to the third phase, adding in Entries 30 and 40. By a vote of

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstained: 0

the jury decided that Entries 2, 3, 5, 12, 15, 16, 20, 24, 25, 30 and 40 shall progress to the third phase.

At 12:10 a lunch break was declared.

The afternoon part of the session began at 12:50.

After discussion the jury agreed that it will award a first, second and third prize.

At 14:05 the jury began voting on the placement of the entries.

On the basis of the preceding discussion the jury chair proposed Entry 5 for first place. By a vote of

For: 5	Against: 3	Abstained: 1
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that **Entry 5 shall place first.**

On the basis of the preceding discussion the jury chair proposed Entry 25 for second place.

By a vote of

For: 7	Against: 1	Abstained: 1
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that **Entry 25 shall place second.**

On the basis of the preceding discussion the jury chair proposed Entry 16 for third place. By a vote of

For: 9	Against: 0	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that **Entry 16 shall place third.**

The jury agreed that the amount of the prizes will not be changed.

The jury proceeding to vote on the awarding of remuneration.

The jury chair proposed an award of CZK 40 000 for Entry 2. By a vote of

For: 8	Against: 1	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that **Entry 2 shall receive an award of CZK 40 000.**

The jury chair proposed an award of CZK 10 000 for Entry 10. By a vote of

For: 5	Against: 4	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that **Entry 10 shall receive an award of CZK 10 000.**

The jury chair proposed an award of CZK 10 000 for Entry 12. By a vote of

For: 8	Against: 1	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that **Entry 12 shall receive an award of CZK 10 000.**

The jury chair proposed an award of CZK 10 000 for Entry 23. By a vote of

For: 5	Against: 4	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that **Entry 23 shall receive an award of CZK 10 000.**

The jury chair proposed an award of CZK 10 000 for Entry 24. By a vote of

For: 8	Against: 1	Abstained: 0
--------	------------	--------------

the jury decided that **Entry 24 shall receive an award of CZK 10 000.**

5.3 Position of the competition jury on the competition and assessment of entries

5.3.1 Position of the jury on the competition

The jury is convinced that the competition for the modification of Malostranské náměstí will become an important stimulus for further competitions and projects for public spaces in Prague which today are not in a state worthy of their historical and societal significance.

Most of the competing projects reacted to the current situation of the square and only a minority understood the competition as an opportunity for extravagance. The comparable quality of many of the competing designs forced the jury to make a highly detailed study of all the aspects thereof, including opinions on transportation, materials used and the functional use of the space of Malostranské náměstí.

The jury was persuaded by projects that dealt with the upper and lower section of the square as a monolithic urban space enriched by local motifs. The jury worked with the assumption that some reduction of transportation and parking spaces will be necessary for a pleasant urban space to be created. What should become an essential quality of this space is civility and respect for tradition and the history of its use. Certain forms of both tram and automobile traffic must realistically be included in the square's design, but the emphasis should be placed on pedestrian visitors to the square. In this sense the results of the competition fulfilled the jury's expectations.

The jury trusts that the awarded projects will lead to revitalisation of the square as a public space that both represents the city and is pleasant to spend time in.

The awarded entries have the potential to meet the conservation requirements following revision.

Evaluation from the perspective of transportation solutions (Ing. Špilar)

The competing designs for the regeneration of Malostranské náměstí were drawn up in accordance with the assigned task and their concepts were based on a strategy of reducing the negative influences of automobile traffic, whether transit or stationary, in the delineated area of the Prague Heritage Conservation Area. The basic transportation premise for the entry designs was to significantly reduce or completely eliminate parked vehicles from the area around the important historical building in the central part of both squares and transit of motorised vehicles and use the freed-up space to emphasise the residential function of the public space with a wide range of services and to favour pedestrian traffic. Respect for the current quality of public space in the tight quarters of the historic buildings, which severely limits the possibility of altering the organisation of transportation on the current road network, preordained a considerable level of acceptance of the current state of both individual and public transport.

The parking of passenger vehicles respects the needs of the Czech Parliament, residents, delivery vehicles, taxis and the presence of institutions of higher learning. With a single exception the competing works do not propose mass underground parking garages, which in the current traffic situation would increase the traffic burden circling around the north part of the square.

The competition entries reflect a varying degree of traffic calming on the square:

- maintaining the current traffic set-up with a marked reduction in vehicle parking and stopping;
- a reduction in transit traffic volume associated with the opening of the Blanka Tunnel Complex;
- regulatory measures restricting short-term paid parking and delineating an emission zone.

Reduction of the current traffic load values is planned by having automobile traffic on the square run either in close quarters with trams using Vienna-style tram stops, or in shared space. Such measures help substantially increase the residential and pedestrian area as well as the possibilities for the use thereof.

5.3.2 Assessment of entries

Entry 5 – 1st place

For this entry the jury appreciated how it respected the historical environment and unified the whole space, while at the same time reacting sensitively to the square's local problems. The simple paving forms a clear spatial figure without architecturally dominating the surrounding buildings, churches and palaces. The square is locally bordered with sidewalks made of traditional Prague paving stones, thereby effortlessly emphasising the individual buildings. The base material is grey granite – the traditional material for surfaces in Malá Strana. The square, sidewalks and traffic zones are distinguished purely by the structure and size of the granite blocks and the granite kerbs that border them. The spatial design is complemented by diverse high-quality street furniture using civil shapes. The primary lighting works with historicist lamps complemented by street light poles to which the tram lines are attached.

The quality of the project lies in the clarity and effectiveness of the proposed space, which reacts to the varied social activities. The jury also appreciates the humility of forms in the urban and architectural design.

Traffic assessment

The transportation design is based on the assumption of a gradual reduction in traffic on the streetscape of Malá Strana in the context of the imminent changes to the city's road network. The area of the whole square is designed as a single shared space of pedestrian and essential destination traffic. In the first stage the capacity of parking space in both parts of the square is reduced. In the second stage a change of the traffic system in the lower part of Malostranské náměstí is proposed. Automobile traffic is conducted in both directions in a shared area parallel to the tram tracks. The position of the tram stop is retained but modified to the Vienna type. Transit through Nerudova ulice and the upper square is considerably restricted with the essential parking spaces for resident and Chamber of Deputies vehicles circumscribed. A total of 77 of the total projected number of 86 spots are proposed for these functions; their placement will need to be considered carefully with regard for the location of the most important historical structures. The proposed design improves the traffic intersection on the south side of the square where Karmelitská ulice leads into the intense pedestrian traffic along the route of the Royal Way.

The depicted crossings on the square are superfluous.

Recommendations of the jury

The jury strongly urges the author to deal with the area at the Špaliček corner at the narrowing of the tram and car lanes in any potential elaboration on the design. The jury also recommends:

- reducing the scope of kerbs and dividing elements in the shared area;
- placing the underground containers for recycling in a different, less conspicuous position;
- considering the necessity and appropriateness of placing a tree in the southwest tip of the square;
- not placing a shelter at the tram stop;
- rethinking the placement and form of the benches.

The jury also recommends reconsidering the placement of the monument to Field Marshall Radetzky.

Entry 25 – 2nd prize

The goal of the design is to achieve a visual likeness of the square at the end of the 18th century. The square is connected as a whole and both upper and lower part create a space for routine and social use. A uniform carpet of paving stones covers the square without the segregation of differing elevations from one house to the next. The buildings thus take on the form we know from period paintings and lithographs with the addition of vehicles riding on the square. The space of the square thereby becomes liveable, with the pedestrian becoming the primary user. The proposed design refers to history not only in the likeness of the square itself, but also in the design of the details. The paving is to be made from quartzite, which has a characteristic "honey colour"; returning to the arcade are tiles made of "Slívenec ivory". A disadvantage of this design is that the paving ceases at the crossings to the surrounding streets. In the case of the lighting the design is also influenced by a romantic perspective, with the circumference of the square lit by hanging lanterns. As a result the central part of the square is insufficiently lit. The placement and especially the form of the fountain in the upper part of the square is questionable, being situated directly on the axis of the Church of St Nicholas. The design does not address the attachment of the tram lines or street furniture.

Traffic assessment

The transportation design is based on the assumption of thorough reduction of traffic and overall traffic calming in both parts of the square. The elimination of personal vehicle parking on the square is marked.

Tram traffic along with the unavoidable quotient of motor vehicles are conducted along a common route as they are on certain segments of Karmelitská and Letenská. The freed-up space is used to emphasise the wholeness and residential and representative function of the public space and the range of shops, restaurants and cafes. The barrier-free set-up of the shared space of the whole square accents the high quality of conditions for pedestrian traffic without any height barriers.

The parking lay-out documents the projected state that fulfils the parking needs for the vehicles of residents while relocating the parking capacities of the Chamber of Deputies. The placement of taxi parking spots is balanced in both parts of the square. In implementing this design it would be necessary to assess the plan of using historical quartzite paving to such a large extent considering the lower degree of comfort this surface provides for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Evident in the design is the intention of a minimum functional distinction between the surfaces with the goal of a shared public space. In the details it is necessary to address the safety of pedestrian and vehicle movement in the tram zone.

Entry 16 – 3rd prize

The jury appreciated the project's great emphasis on unifying the space of the square while retaining a certain distinction between the two parts. The unification is achieved by the uniform paving extended to all the surrounding facades with the exception of the arcade. Single-format paving is laid at a single level without emphasising the carriageway with the exception of the tram tracks, where the paving stones are rotated. QR codes inserted in the paving provide historical memory. The modern style of the proposed sandstone street furniture contrasts nicely with the historical environment.

Despite the valued concept of the shared space, the jury criticises the design's inappropriate or even naive placement of the street furniture, considers the complete rejection of traffic in the upper part of the square based on the assumed traffic closure on both banks of the

Vltava to be unrealistic at this phase and finds the fulfilment of the demand for parking and stopping spaces to be inadequate.

Entry 2 – awarded

This vigorous, distinct and even conceptual design for a single dark residential expanse unifies the space into a compact whole involving the adjacent courtyards and streets. All the elements (lighting, street furniture...) are integrated into the overall design and subordinated to the whole. The design's strong creative drive is however infeasible in the context of the place and in the material aspect.

Entry 10 – awarded

This design is based on the romantic idea of the square as the carpet of a living room. The jury positively views this creative principle as one of the atypical designs. The jury did not however find further qualities in the other layers of the project, such as the traffic design and architectural detail.

Entry 12 – awarded

This design numbers among the projects that conceive of the whole square as a single unit. All it does is break off a corridor for trams and cars to pass through and separates the residential area with a row of bollards. The jury however considers the motif of the bollards to be stereotypical and mechanically applied.

Entry 23 – awarded

The jury appreciates the artistically humorous element of the design, which treated one of the main topics of the competition – "the square as a living space for people" – with a bearable lightness of being. The design did not however carry this idea over into a detailed design.

Entry 24 – awarded

This design respects the atmosphere of the place and maintains the compact historical topography and organisation. It is nice how it works with the most concise means, uniting the whole square with one type of paving with a decent if uncommon colour scheme. The proposed objects are limited to a water element in the lower part of the square, the scale and placement of which is sensitive and maintains the overall quality of the design, which is valuable in its reservedness and sensitivity. What is problematic is the connection of the paving to the connecting streets and a certain simplification of the traffic design.

5.4 Opening of the envelopes

At 16:50 the jury chair received the Autor envelopes from the secretary and opened them. The jury secretary checked to make sure the envelopes contained all the requirements. The names of the individual entries were then read out.

Entry	Participant / Author/ Authors
1	Till Rehwaldt
2	Loffice coworking, Esterházy Marcell
3	Riegler Riewe Architekci Sp. z.o.o., Prof. Florian Riegler, Prof. Roger Riewe

4	MOBA studio s.r.o., Ing. arch. Igor Kovačević Ph.D, MArch. Ing. arch. Yvette Vašourková, Ing. arch. Karin Grohmannová, Arch. Marco Marinelli, David Seidler
5	Ing. arch. Martin Hájek, Ing. arch. Václav Hájek, Ing. arch. Petr Horský
6	Alberto Collet, Lucas Torres Agüero, Cristopher Micallef
7	Idea Ogrod Studio Architektury Krajobrazu, Arkadiusz R. Janczak, Rafal Burczyński, Patrycja Ćwiek, Katarzyna Abramowicz
8	Ordre des Architectes d'Île de France, Nada Ghanem
9	Daniela Grazia Rossi, collaborators: Carlo Romanazzi, Lucia Polakovicova
10	Frank Gorge Dipl. -Ing. Architekt
11	Roz Barr Architects Ltd, Roz Bar
12	Echorost architekti s.r.o., Ing. arch. M. Arch. Jiří Pavlíček, Ing. arch. Jaroslav Hulín
13	Pirvu A. Achim-Radu, Pirvu Achim-Radu
14	Ing. arch. Vlastimil Hrouda, Ing. arch. Jaroslav Minařík, Ing. arch. Jiří Kočí
15	Joint Venture Simon Mahringer Dipl. Arch. ETH Dipl. Ing. Lukas Veltruský
16	Ing. arch. Ivan Retter, co-authors: Ing. arch. Zuzana Retterová, Ing. arch. Lukáš Taller, Bořek Němec
17	MgA. Barbora Rossi, MgA. Jan Mrázek, MgA. Jarin Krouz
18	Ting s.r.o., MgA. Štěpán Toman, Ing. arch. Juraj Biroš, Ing. arch. Andrea Houštická, Mgr. Tereza Vlasáková
19	Ing. arch. Petr Kouřimský, collaborators: Ing. arch. Nikol Kouřimská, Ing. arch. Jan Kačer
20	Triglyph Architektonická kancelář s.r.o., Ing. arch. Josef Dastych, external consultants: Ing. arch. Jan E. Bárta, Ing. arch. Martin Krise, Ing. arch. Vojtěch Dvořák
21	Ing. arch. Drahoslava Bednárová, co-author: B. Arch. Peter Bednár
22	Architekt Bartłomiej Bulawa Burio Projektów, Bartłomiej Bulawa, Maria Barton, Erdi Karaman, Gokhan Cakir
23	Vlasta Koupal, Vladimír Lavřík, collaborator: Aleš Mach
24	Ing. arch. Ondřej Beneš, Ph.D., Ing. arch. Marcel Šípka
25	Atelier M1 architekti s.r.o., Ing. arch. Jakub Havlas, Ing. arch. Jan Hájek, Mgr. akad. arch. Pavel Joba
26	Studio AEIOU, Ing. arch. Jan Vojtíšek, Ing. Jakub Staník, Zdeněk Modlitba
27	Ing. arch. Ondřej Bartůšek, Ing. arch. Ondřej Fabián, M. arch. Verónica Gallego Sotelo, collaborator: Olivia Eliash Délano
28	Adam Vukmanov, Mag. Arch, Shota Tsikoliya, MgA, Ondřej Tichy, Ing. arch.
29	Central, Pierre Burquel, Paul Mouchet, Radim Louda, Valentin Piret
30	Archilab s.r.o., Ing. arch. Martin Řežábek, Ing. arch. Pavel Táborský, Bc. Klára Filaunová, Bc. Pavla Enochová
31	MgA. Ondřej Císler PhD, Ing. Václav Malina, Bc. Vojtěch Ružbatský, Bc. Richard Pozdníček, Bc. Josef Choc
32	Vítězslav Danda, Richard Kokeš, Marta Chaloupková
33	Petr Gučfa, Tomáš Pavlík
34	Ing. arch. Pavla Kordovská, Ing. arch. Petr Kordovský, co-authors: Bc. Táňa Hložková, Jakub Dvořák, Iva Keselicová
35	Ing. arch. Zuzana Boháčová, Ing. arch. Barbora Simajchlová, co-author: Ing. Jakub Pleiner
36	Robust architects, Ing. arch. Ondřej Busta, Ing. arch. Robert Damec, Ing. arch. Helena Busta
37	Ing. Akad. arch. Václav Králíček, co-author: Ing. arch. Tomáš Šantavý
38	Tomáš Vích, Peter Balhar
39	Atelier Kruton, Ing. arch. Tomáš Pecina, Ondřej Machaň, Ing. arch. Klára Veselá

The assessment session was adjourned at 17:20.

I hereby confirm the accuracy of the report

Petr Burgr

Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček

Ing. arch. Antonín Novák

Ing. Tomáš Novotný

Mgr. Jiří Skalický

MgA. Marcela Steinbachová

Ing. akad. arch. Jan Šépka

Prof. dipl. arch. Miroslav Šik

Prof. PhDr. Rostislav Švácha

Report drawn up by:
RNDr. Milan Svoboda, competition secretary

The original signed version is in Czech language and is stored in the archive of the competition.

Annex 1

MINUTES OF THE INAUGURAL JURY MEETING HELD 30 MAY 2014 IN PRAGUE

In attendance:

Ing. akad. arch. Jan Šépka – juror (appointed), drafter of Competition Terms and Conditions
Prof. dipl. arch. Miroslav Šik – juror (independent)
Prof. PhDr. Rostislav Švácha – juror (independent)
Ing. Tomáš Novotný – juror (independent)
Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček – juror (independent)
Petr Burgr – substitute juror (appointed)
Ing. Jan Špilar – competition jury expert
RNDr. Milan Svoboda – jury secretary
Ing. arch. Jitka Brablecová – examiner of competition entries

Excused:

Ing. Václav Novotný - juror (appointed)
Ing. Jakub Dvořák - juror (appointed)
Mgr. Jiří Skalický - juror (appointed)
Ing. arch. Antonín Novák – juror (independent)
MgA. Marcela Steinbachová – substitute juror (independent)
Ing. arch. Lenka Slívová – examiner of competition entries

The meeting began at 14:30.

The meeting was called to order by the representative of the competition organiser Ing. akad. arch. Jan Šépka, head of the IPD Office of Projects and Competitions. Following the opening statement an order of business was proposed. Those present agreed on the following order of business:

1. Election of a chair
2. Discussion on the Competition Terms and Conditions
3. Agreement on the honorarium for the jurors
4. Further steps and conclusion

1st order of business

The jury nominated Prof. dipl. arch. Miroslav Šik. He agreed to his nomination. By a vote of For: 5, Against: 0, Abstained: 1 the attending jurors elected Prof. dipl. arch. Miroslav Šik as jury chair.

The absent jury members shall express their opinion in writing in accordance with Section 10 (1) of the CCA Competition Code.

2nd order of business

Discussion on the Competition Terms and Conditions (hereinafter "CTC") was led by the jury chair; the drafter of the CTC provided commentary on the individual points.

Discussion took place on the following points of the CTC:

2.2 Main topics of the competition for ideas

The jury discussed the main topics of the competition as described in point 2.2 of the CTC.

The jury agreed to add to the paragraph "commercial space" in the following wording:

"Commercial space

It is also important to consider the placement of summer restaurant patios in connection with pedestrian routes. Likewise it is possible to speculate on the placement of stands for potential organisation of markets."

2.3 Subject of the competition

The jury agreed on a clearer definition of the area to be designed in two perimeters – a first in which interventions are made and a second that is visual, flexible. It will be adjusted in the graphic section, in background material 001 – Design Area.

6.2 Graphic section

The jury discussed the content of the graphic section, in particular the presentation of the paving design and the possibility of placing additional graphic parts in Panel 1. Following discussion the jury agreed to adjust point 6.2.1 in the wording (changes in red):

"Mandatory content of the graphic section:

- a) *The situation containing the whole design area in a scale of 1:250 – expected in particular is the proposed surface design, including the proposed design for the paving detail (which can be placed as a reference in the area for structures). It would be appropriate to address the placement of street furniture and potentially the traffic concept (Panel 1)*

Additions in Panel 1 are not precluded; the area outside the design area can be used for details and more specific information."

11.3 Deadlines

The jury agreed to fill in the deadline under 11.3:

"Responses to inquiries that are to be answered by the organiser shall be made within 10 days of receiving the question and shall be made public in the same manner as the competition background material. The last inquiries concerning organisational issues may thus be sent out 26 August 2014 at the latest."

3rd order of business

Arch. Šépka proposed the amount and conditions for calculating the honorarium for independent jurors.

The honorarium for independent jurors shall be CZK 1000 / hour. The jury secretary shall keep records of attendance and time spent. After the end of the competition the secretary shall hand over a statement of hours to the primary and the independent jurors, on the basis of which the jurors shall invoice the primary for the honorarium for their work on the jury.

4th order of business

The jury secretary shall send the amended draft CTC to the jurors for their information.

The jury secretary shall request that the excused jurors sign the commitment and expression of consent with the Competition Terms and Conditions and election of chair.

The competition organiser shall send the amended CTC to the CCA office for a statement on the fairness of the competition by Friday 6 June 2014.

Ing. Arch. Šépka shall submit the resulting wording of the CTC for approval to the empowered representative of the principal.

The jury and principal shall take all steps for the competition to be duly declared 16 June 2014.

The meeting was adjourned at 17:30.

Minutes taken by: Milan Svoboda in cooperation with Jan Šépka and Jitka Brablecová

Annex 2

MINUTES OF JURY MEETING ON INQUIRIES

In attendance:

Petr Burgr – substitute juror (appointed)

Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček – juror (independent)

Ing. Tomáš Novotný – juror (independent)

Ing. akad. arch. Jan Šépka – juror (appointed), drafter of Competition Terms and Conditions

Prof. dipl. arch. Miroslav Šik – juror (independent), jury chair

Prof. PhDr. Rostislav Švácha – juror (independent)

Ing. Jan Špilar – competition jury expert

Ing. arch. Jitka Brablecová – examiner of competition entries

Bc. Jolana Danková – technical support

Ing. arch. Lenka Slívová – examiner of the competition entries

RNDr. Milan Svoboda – competition secretary

Excused:

Ing. Václav Novotný - juror (appointed)

Ing. Jakub Dvořák - juror (appointed)

Mgr. Jiří Skalický - juror (appointed)

Ing. arch. Antonín Novák – juror (independent)

MgA. Marcela Steinbachová – substitute juror (independent)

Call to order and introductory information

The meeting began at 8:15.

The meeting was called to order and presided over by jury chair Prof. dipl. arch. Miroslav Šik. He moved that the jury go through the individual inquiries received according to the summary that the jurors received in advance and comment on the draft responses prepared by the competition secretary and the primary's team.

Before discussion began the competition secretary stated that in accordance with point 13.1 of the Competition Terms and Conditions ("CTC"), the inquiries had been divided into two types:

Inquiries on organisational issues of the competition, for which the primary is responsible. Competitors may submit such questions up until 26 August 2014. The primary must respond to inquiries on organisational issues within 10 days, which is the reason that the first set of questions and answers (inquiries 1 – 3) were published before the jury meeting.

Inquiries on the subject of the competition, for which the jury is responsible. These questions may be submitted up until 14 July 2014 and the responses to these inquiries are the primary subject of this meeting.

Summary of questions and answers

Following discussion of the various inquiries and draft responses, the jury agreed on the following answers. In the summary the questions were provided in their original wording; for questions in English a translation was included.

Inquiry No. 1 of 2 July 2014

(on organisational matters of the competition)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION:

I have a question on the conditions for participating in the competition: Can authorised engineers in the field of building construction take part in the competition?

a) according to point 4.1.e), only authorised architects can take part.

b) from the information in Annex 3 – "Affidavit of compliance with professional qualifications" it follows however that both authorised architects and authorised engineers in the field of building construction can enter.

Which information is correct? Please provide clarification of this unclear information on the professional requirements for competition participants.

RESPONSE:

The deciding factor for participation in the competition is point 4.1 e) of the Competition Terms and Conditions – authorised architects that meet the requirements of point 4.1 of the Competition Terms and Conditions may take part. Annex 3 has been amended.

Inquiry No. 2 of 3 July 2014

a) on the subject of the competition, b) on organisational matters

WORDING OF THE QUESTION (English original):

As a possible competition candidate i have some questions :

a) Its possible to provide a land survey with altimetric information ? Its seems to me very important due to altimetric variatons in the square.

b) In the 6.7.3 item its not clear to me the information to provide on the exterior envelope
The adress to send the proposal is :

Prague Institute of Planning and Development, contributory organisation, Vyšehradská 57/2077, 128 00, Prague 2, block C, fi ling room ("podatelna")

And the senders, as i am a portuguese architect i should put the: Portuguese chamber of architects ?

Written in english , translated ? or with the portuguese nomination ?

RESPONSE:

Re: a) In the file 003. Situace_Situacion, there is a drawing 003.Situace vrstevnice_Situacion contour lines.dwg. The contour lines are at a frequency of one metre.

Re: b) From Portugal (and other foreign countries) send us the entry to the address of the primary

in English:

Prague Institute of Planning and Development, contributory organisation,
Vyšehradská 57/2077,

CZ 128 00, Prague 2,
block C, filing room ("podatelna")

Czech Republic

or in Czech:

Institut plánování a rozvoje hlavního města Prahy

Vyšehradská 57/2077

Budova C/411 – podatelna

CZ 128 00, Praha 2

Czech Republic

As the sender state the Portuguese Chamber of Architects with the address in English or in Portuguese.

Inquiry No. 3 of 3 July 2014 (on the subject of the competition)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION (English original):

Its possible to provide a traffic route plan with an extended limit?

RESPONSE:

By 31 July 2014 the following background materials will be added: 018. Transportation – data sheet on current state and 019. Transportation – modelling the current load state, for the greater historical territory of Prague.

Inquiry No. 4 of 11 July 2014 (on the subject of the competition)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION:

In point 2.2 of the Competition Terms and Conditions, in the section on parking spots, there is a specified number of parking spots for the Chamber of Deputies. What is the occupancy rate of these spaces? Are they occupied every day or only, for example, when the Chamber of Deputies is in session?

RESPONSE:

According to a parking study done by the Technical Administration of Roads in February 2014 on the area of Malostranské náměstí, Deputies use the parking lot in the lower part of the square even when the Chamber is not in session.

According to spot checks conducted by the primary, the reserved spaces (18 spots) along the north side of the square are constantly full on workdays, but are not used on the weekends.

Inquiry No. 5 of 11 July 2014 (on the subject of the competition)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION (English Original):

Its possible to propose increasing the number of parking spaces in the existing underground garage (house of comons) in order to consider Lesser Town Saqure space free of parking (+ 46 blue zone)?

RESPONSE:

It is not possible to increase the number of spaces in the underground garages at their current site; the space beneath the Chamber of Deputies is already full. In addressing the

parking situation the competitors are to take into account the provisions of point 2.3 of the Competition Terms and Conditions.

Inquiry No. 6 of 11 July 2014 (on the subject of the competition)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION (English original):

Its possible to provide the file 003.Situace vrstevnice_Situacion contour lines.dwg file with the buildings information in the same file? Ive tried to overlap the 2 separeted files and they dont match.

RESPONSE:

By 31 July 2014 a new file will be added to the background materials 020. Situace – spojená data.

Inquiry No. 7 of 13 July 2014 (on organisational matters)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION:

Can a student in their last year of architecture enter the competition with an authorised architect merely providing their auspices for the work, or may only an authorised architect be listed as the author? Or is it at least possible to list it as a team so the student who produces the work is at least listed as a co-author, if it's not possible another way?

RESPONSE:

The competition participant must be an authorised person as per point 4.1.e) of the Competition Terms and Conditions. It is possible and common for multiple persons (authors) to be involved in a team (as a single participant), with at least one of them having to be an authorised person (see point 4.2.2). In this specific case the ideal situation is thus that there be two members of the team, i.e. two authors, of which one holds the necessary authorisation.

Inquiry No. 8 of 14 July 2014 (on organisational matters)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION:

In connection with the competition concerning Malostranské náměstí I have a question on Section 4 (1) d of the Competition Terms and Conditions. According to this paragraph, a participant must meet the conditions of Section 3 of Act No. 137/2006 Coll., on Public Procurement. For this reason I would like to know whether the participant must meet the conditions of sub-section 3 of this paragraph and submit the appropriate documents or just a signed declaration on fulfilment of the basic qualification requirements.

RESPONSE:

Fulfilment of the qualification requirements according to point 4 (1) d) is demonstrated by an affidavit (see point 4.2.1 of the Competition Terms and Conditions).

Inquiry No. 9 of 14 July 2014 (on organisational matters)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION:

The accompanying report must be boiled down to a single A4-format page. Could the text part contain, as an independent removable annex, something like an expert assessment with a financial estimate of one of the uncommon urban or technical designs (e.g. parking, etc.)?

RESPONSE:

Expansion of the text part beyond the framework laid down by the Competition Rules and Conditions is not practical. According to point 8.3.3 of the Competition Terms and Conditions, the jury must discard all parts that overstep the requirements and will thus not take them under consideration. This provision, which is based on the Competition Code, provides for equal conditions for all competitors.

Inquiry No. 10 of 15 July 2014 (on organisational matters)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION:

In the required text part for the Malostranské náměstí competition, it is written that:

The text part shall have a maximum volume of 1 A4 (max. 4000 characters including spaces).

Yet one standard page of text allows for 1800 characters on 1 A4. So in order to meet the condition, the normal font size must be reduced about three times? Then 4000 characters could fit on an A4. That means cramming 4000 characters on an A4 in the tiniest possible font? Is that correct?

Note: 1 standard A4 (i.e. approximately 1800 characters including spaces, i.e. 250 words) is not sufficient for the required description of the competition design (i.e. clarifying and justifying the chosen design, describing the architectural, traffic and material design, describing the stages of the design in connection with the parking situation and gradual reduction in the overall number of spots).

My opinion is that 4000 characters is the minimum for the required description (i.e. approx. 2.5 standard pages)

RESPONSE:

The Competition Terms and Conditions do not ask for a standard page of 1800 keystrokes. A report with 4000 keystrokes on one page is realistic and tested.

Question No. 11 of 16 July 2014 (on organisational matters)

WORDING OF THE QUESTION (English original):

I have a doubt about the item 4.1 of the Competition Rules Document.

It is written at „e“:” They are certified architects in the field of architecture or in the field of land use planning or they are certified architects with general competence, or persons settled or visiting under Act No. 360/1992 Coll., on Certified Architects and Certified Engineers and Technicians Active in Construction, as amended, or certified architects under the laws of the relevant member state of the European Economic Area or of the Swiss Confederation, of which they are citizens or in which they have their registered office.“

I would like to clarify if I can submit a design for the Competition. I am not an architect from European Economic Area but I have completed my studies in Architecture and Urban Planning, so I can design for the field of architecture and land planning in my country. I am also registered in the Architecture Council of my country. Can I submit a copy of my ID as an affidavit of my architect certification?

RESPONSE:

For participation in this competition it is necessary to join up with an architect that meets the conditions of point 4.1.e) of the Competition Terms and Conditions.

Further steps

The competition secretary and primary team will prepare files with the current summary of questions and answers in Czech and English and post them on the competition website by 21 July 2014. By 31 July 2014 at the latest all the background materials the jury agreed to add will have been made public.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30.

Minutes taken by: RNDr. Milan Svoboda