

Minutes of the jury meeting in the 2nd stage of the competition “Urban design Trnava – Quarter”

A. Public procurement identification

Announcer: City of Trnava

Order type: architectural and related services

Estimated value at tender:

800 000 € excluding VAT, consisting of:

- total values of prizes and remuneration: € 200 000 excluding VAT,

- Estimated value of the contract for the provision of services awarded under Article 81(h) of the Public Procurement Act: € 600,000 excluding VAT

Procedure: for entering a contract according to the provision Articles 119–125 of Act No. 343/2015 on public procurement and amending and supplementing certain acts as amended (hereinafter referred to as “PPA”), Decree of the Public Procurement Office No. 157/2016 laying down details on the types of design contests in the field of architecture, urban planning and construction engineering, on the contents of competition terms and conditions and on the activity of the jury, as amended, and the Competition Rules of Procedure of the Slovak Chamber of Architects., hereinafter referred to as the "Competition".

Type of competition:

Project-oriented, open, urbanism and landscaping, two-stage – anonymous stage 1 and stage2

Contact point of the Contracting Authority in matters of public procurement:

<https://josephine.proebiz.com/sk/tender/41725/summary>

B. Announcement of the competition:

Slovak Chamber of Architects verified the conditions of the competition by verification No. KA-393/2023.

C. Jury

Full jury members

Independent of the inviting party:

Dipl.- Ing. Dr. in Techn. Nina Svanda

MSc. Land Arch./Arch. Darius Reznek

MSc. Eng.Arch. Monika Konrad, chairwoman of the jury

Ing. Štěpánka Endrle

Dependent on the inviting party:

Ing. arch. Ondrej Horváth

Alternate jury members

Independent of the inviting party:

Ing. arch. Filip Tittl, PhD

MA Arch. ARB Igor Marko

Dependent on the inviting party:

Ing. arch. Mária Dida

Experts:

Mgr. Peter Rozsár, mobility
Ing. Eva Slobodová, landscape ecology
Ing. Tomáš Havlíček, hydrogeológy
IEPD (Inštitút pre pasívne domy): Lubica Šimkovicová, Andrea Borská, sustainable energy concept

Jury's auxiliary bodies:

Secretary:

Ing.arch. Peter Lényi, PhD., 2021 s.r.o.

Verifiers:

Ing.arch. Nikola Chriašteľová, 2021 s.r.o.

Mgr. Marian Szakáll, Trivo s.r.o.

Due to the incapacity of work of the previous secretary of the competition Ing. arch. Lenka Borecka, Ing. arch. Peter Lényi was established.

D. Submission of proposals

All 5 proposals were submitted by the deadline for submission of proposals, i.e. **by 15:00 on 1.3.2024**, from the participants advancing from Stage 1.

E. Evaluation of competition proposals

In accordance with clause 6 of the Competition terms and conditions - Preparing the competition design and recommendations for stage 2:

Graphical part - 6 panels with the dimensions of 700 x 1000 mm in a landscape format, *.pdf
All participants submitted 6 panels of 700 x 1000 mm format.

Completed balance sheet as separate file.

All participants submitted completed balance sheet.

Press kit - shot text explaining the design in *.doc file and visualisations in *.jpeg

All participants submitted a media package with the required content.

F. Jury evaluation session

Date: 25. - 26. 3. 2024

Place: Knižnica Juraja Fándlyho - Záhradná čítareň, Rázusova 1, 918 20 Trnava

Day 1. – 25. 3. 2024

Meeting start: 9:00

End of the meeting: 18:00

Present jury members:

Monika Konrad (chairwoman of the jury), Nina Svanda, Darius Reznek, Štepanka Endrle, Ondrej Horváth

Present alternate jury members:

Filip Tittl, Igor Marko, Mária Dida

Present experts:

MSc. Michal Ďurta (representing Mgr. Peter Rozsár) – mobility, Ing. Eva Slobodová – landscape ecology

Jury's auxiliary bodies:

Peter Lényi (sekretary), Nikola Chriašteľová (verifier), Marian Szakáll (verifier)

5-member jury with voting right:

Monika Konrad, Nina Svanda, Darius Reznek, Štepanka Endrle, Ondrej Horváth

Course of the meeting

Peter Lényi welcomed all participants to the meeting. He summarized the course of the 2nd stage of the competition so far. All participants in Stage 2 submitted their proposals by the deadline for submission of proposals on 1 March 2024, 3:00 p.m. The proposals were provided electronically to the jury on 6.3.2024, so the jury had over 2 weeks to study them in detail. Peter Lényi together with Nikola Chriašteľ presented the results of the verification (Annex P1). The jury took into consideration the evaluation results, and the shortcomings demonstrated by the proposals and decided to evaluate all 5 proposals. The shortcomings demonstrated by the proposals do not constitute serious errors and do not significantly reduce the legibility of the proposals, therefore the jury decided to evaluate all 5 proposals.

Vote to accept all 5 proposals for consideration:

FOR: 5 votes out of a total of 5 votes

AGAINST: 0 votes out of a total of 5 votes

ABSTAIN: 0 votes out of a total of 5 votes

The motion was carried.

Before the actual evaluation of the proposals Ondrej Horváth, at the request of the jury, summarized what are the goals of this competition for the city of Trnava.

The experts present, Michal Ďurta and Eva Slobodová, presented their comments on the proposals. Peter Lényi presented the opinions of Ing. Tomáš Havlíček and IEPD (Annexes P2 - P5). All reports were also available in printed form.

Before lunch, the Jury discussed all the proposals.

Lunch break: 12:30 - 14:00

After further discussion of the proposals, the jury proceeded to the evaluation.

The criterion for the evaluation of the proposals set out in the competition conditions was the quality of the solution in relation to the brief. The brief was Annex 1 to the competition terms and conditions with detailed requirements for the solution.

Method of applying the criterion: The jury shall, by majority vote on the basis of the discussion, assign a ranking to each proposal according to the evaluation of the proposal in relation to the criterion referred to in point 1. The higher ranking shall always go to the proposal which more closely meets the requirements of the criterion for evaluating proposals. The winning proposal of the competition shall be the proposal which is ranked first (highest) in the order of evaluation of the proposals.

Vote on the 5th place for proposal No 15:

FOR: 5 votes out of a total of 5 votes

AGAINST: 0 votes out of a total of 5

ABSTAIN: 0 votes out of a total of 5

The proposal was accepted.

Vote on the 4th place for proposal No 23:

FOR: 5 votes out of a total of 5 votes

AGAINST: 0 votes out of a total of 5

ABSTAIN: 0 votes out of a total of 5

The proposal was accepted.

Vote on 3rd place for proposal No 26:

FOR: 5 votes out of a total of 5 votes

AGAINST: 0 votes out of a total of 5

ABSTAIN: 0 votes out of a total of 5

The proposal was accepted.

Vote that Proposals 8 and 22 appear to be the ones that most closely meet the evaluation criterion:

FOR: 5 votes out of a total of 5 votes

AGAINST: 0 votes out of a total of 5

ABSTAIN: 0 votes out of a total of 5

The proposal was accepted.

At 16:00, after extensive discussion, the jury decided to vote on the winning design.

Vote on 2nd place for proposal No 8:

FOR: 5 votes out of a total of 5 votes

AGAINST: 0 votes out of a total of 5

ABSTAIN: 0 votes out of a total of 5

The proposal was accepted.

Vote on the winning proposal (1st place) for proposal 22:

FOR: 5 votes out of a total of 5 votes

AGAINST: 0 votes out of a total of 5 votes

ABSTAIN: 0 votes out of a total of 5

The proposal was carried.

Overall ranking of stage 2 proposals including prizes and remuneration awarded by the jury:

Overall ranking	Proposal number	Participant	Prizes / remuneration
1 st place	22	Mandaworks AB	1. prize: 60 000 €
2 nd place	8	gogolák + grasse s.r.o.	2. prize: 48 000 €
3 rd place	26	ateliér tečka s.r.o.	3. prize: 36 000 €
4 th place	23	VITKO ARCHITEKTI s.r.o.	remuneration 28 000 €
5 th place	15	Studio Perspektiv, s.r.o.	remuneration 28 000 €

By the end of the meeting, the jury had taken the time to write down comments on each of the proposals.

Deň 2. – 26. 3. 2024

Meeting start: 9:00

End of the meeting: 12:30

Present jury members:

Monika Konrad (chairwoman of the jury), Nina Svanda, Darius Reznek, Štěpánka Endrle, Ondrej Horváth

Present alternate jury members:

Filip Tittl, Igor Marko, Mária Dida

Jury's auxiliary bodies:

Peter Lényi (sekretary), Nikola Chriašteľová (verifier)

On the second day of the meeting, the jury structured the comments and formulated recommendations for the winning proposal.

G. Jury's comments on the proposals:

Proposal no. 15 (5th prize)

This proposal presents a remarkable overall approach with most of the site dominated by greenery. The jury saw immense potential in this proposal to develop into a landscape-centred neighbourhood of the future with ecology and biodiversity at the heart of the city. However, where the initial concept was extremely convincing and strong, the development leaves you wanting more. Due to the relatively underdeveloped character of the central green corridor the impression is that of a green barrier rather than connector. The resulting neighbourhoods are segregated and the positioning of the sports infrastructure on the border between green infrastructure and neighbourhoods makes this barrier effect even worse. The jury felt that the project was not developed to a specific enough level and thus raises many questions in terms of identity and character of public spaces, relatively high and generic urbanity of the blocks and overall legibility of the plan. However, the jury would like to stress the importance of putting nature first highlighted by this proposal.

Proposal no. 23. (4th prize)

The proposal has a very strong spatial framework with a good central park, well connected to the surroundings. It reaches into the landscape with a generous green arm and connects convincingly to local landmarks such as the water tower. The plan is very legible with very clear compositional qualities. The jury was very positive about the potential of this proposal however where the plan is lacking is in terms of vision for the future of living. This is limited to urban composition and spatial characteristics but lacks in terms of resilient planning, diversity of green characters and climate proofing as well as diversity in terms of living conditions and characters. Nonetheless the jury would like to commend the proposal for its clear and robust framework and stress the importance of legible structures in the planning of large urban quarters.

Proposal no. 26. (3rd prize)

This proposal puts a generous park as the heart of the neighbourhood which the jury was very positive about. The park is strong and robust and has a huge potential in combating issues such as urban heat island effect. The commendable choice of the central park has, however its drawbacks in terms of distribution of the urban tissue. The size and proportions of the central green space risk acting as a barrier rather than connector and push the urbanity onto the fringes in relatively narrow strips (especially in the eastern part). The potential of these areas to really become human-centred neighbourhoods is questionable. The ambition to connect to the surroundings is commendable as it has the potential of really connecting not only in terms of infrastructure but also in terms of urban grain. However, the task of bridging the heavy traffic infrastructure on the border

of the site proves to be difficult to solve and was not convincing enough resulting in public plazas on the fringe of neighbourhood.

Still, the jury feels the need to highlight the importance of well dimensioned and generous green spaces in ensuring the comfortable microclimates in our cities and commend this proposal for doing just that.

Proposal no. 8 (2nd prize)

This proposal puts forth a crystal-clear spatial framework, well balanced and extremely well anchored in the spatial context of the city. Its pedestrian and bike connections to the city of Trnava are some of the best and the authors even go so far as to speculate of future potentials of an additional train-station, all of which are extremely appreciated by the jury. The plan shows the universal potential and qualities of the grid structure and showcases a playful layout of each block that holds the promise of a vibrant mix of architectural typologies as well as diverse green spaces. Overall, an extremely professional and well thought through urban planning proposal that was highly commended by the jury.

Where the jury felt the proposal fell short is in its extreme density and overly ambitious urbanity. This overshoot results in an awkward split between residential and non-residential (with an enormous number of square meters dedicated to commercial and cultural programming) but most importantly it pushes the project into an urbanity that is completely disconnected from the context of Trnava. This is visible in the highly urban blocks but even more fundamental in the public spaces. Their metropolitan character and proportions competing with the city centre are thus critically viewed by the jury. Urban spaces such as plazas become over-dimensioned while green spaces are compact and formal resulting in an overall character that does not entirely fit to the lush, natural, and biodiverse character that the competition brief aimed for.

Overall, a very skilled urban planning proposal that manages to solve complex urban spaces in a very high density, and while that is commendable it is also the cause of its shortcomings in terms of identity and a Trnava specific scale. The jury wants to show its appreciation for the careful integration and connections to the surroundings and highlight the importance of spatial and visual connections in anchoring new neighbourhoods into their context, an aspect that this proposal so clearly demonstrates.

Proposal no. 22 (1st prize)

A holistic project that captures the essence of future city planning where landscape forms the base of the design and where aspects such as climate proofing, resilience and ecology are fundamentally embedded in the DNA of the plan. The resulted framework is not only forward looking but surprisingly well anchored in the scale and character of the city of Trnava. Parklife manages to skillfully reinvent the idea of the central park into a robust network of green spaces that have the necessary scale to make an ecological impact but are not over-dimensioned to form barriers. This new blue-green infrastructure will not only serve as climate infrastructure but also instil character and identity into different neighbourhoods. The diversity in scale and character ensures a sense of community and belonging on different scales of the quarter, from a group of houses centred around a green informal plaza to a neighbourhood revolving around a green finger to spaces for the entire city of Trnava.

The proposed built structure is extremely rich and diverse comprising of a playful mix between urban and rural typologies. It is in this vibrant combination between urbanity and countryside that Parklife manages to present a highly specific scale and character that is both true to the heritage of Trnava as well as forward looking. The jury recommends investigating this mix further and ensure it is even sharper in character and even more diverse in mix across all phases of the project.

While the project impresses in many aspects it also leaves room for improvement. The jury recommends careful review of several public functions such as the football field placed central in the park. The mobility concept will need to be aligned with the vision of the municipality with consideration for avoiding through traffic. The jury also stresses the importance of a careful development and detailing of the green spaces to ensure that they stay true to the promise of the competition proposal. All in all, Parklife understands the

importance of providing a robust and flexible framework that can withstand change and can be further investigated in more detailed scale. The jury is positive about the capacity of this proposal to incorporate further input in the planning process as it forms an excellent base for further development.

One aspect that specifically drew praise from all jury members was the project's visionary approach that is embedded in all scales of the project, from an ambitious mobility plan to a resilient green blue network to diverse typologies. The jury stresses the importance to stay true to this promise in further development and continue to improve and sharpen these crucial aspects of city building.

H. List of competition participants and authors of competition proposals

Ranking	Proposal number	Participant	Authors
19. – 39.	1	I.A.M.-projekt Ing.arch. Ivan Matys	Ing.arch. Ivan Matys
8. – 18.	2	Bauchplan).(Tobias Baldauf Anna Mokropova Fernando Nebot Gómez Kay Strasser
19. – 39.	3	Atelier - 3A	Ľ. Kružel, Ing. Arch. Ľ. Kružel ml., Ing. Arch I. Kružel, Ing. Arch. R. Tupý, Ing. Arch.
19. – 39.	4	Arch. Guido Maurizio Urbani – Urban Horizon	Arch. Guido Maurizio Urbani
19. – 39.	5	SLLA s.r.o.	Michal Sulo Miriam Lišková Jana Nagyová
19. – 39.	6	Narcís Font Juan	Narcís Font Juan Juan José Vargas Castillo
8. – 18.	7	Oppopp as	Audun Hellemo Kristin Hilde
2.	8	gogolák + grasse s.r.o.	Ing.arch. Ivan Gogolák, Ph.D. Ing.arch. Lukáš Grasse Ing. Arch. Katarína Fejo, PhD. Bc. Ing. Arch. Tomáš Hanáček, PhD.
8. – 18.	9	MAAUS s.r.o.	Miroslava Zdražilová Jakub Czapek Karolína Wojtek Tereza Bezděková spolupráca: Ľubomír Písařík Martin Všetěčka Martin Novák Markéta Bartoňková
19. – 39.	10	TH & İDİL Mimarlık Şehircilik Mühendislik Müşavirlik İnşaat	Hasan Özbay, M.Arch/ City Planner A. Tamer Başbuğ, M.Arch Aslı Özbay, M.Arch/ Restoration Expert Su Sarihan Güven, M. Arch

			Büşra Öncül, M. Arch
8. – 18.	11	ofschem architekti s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Luboš Františák, Ph.D. Ing. arch. Matěj Ondruch Ing. arch. Viktor Schwab
7.	12	EDDEA ARQUITECTURA y URBANISMO S.L.P	Jose Maria de Cárdenas Dominguez-Adame Anja Ehrenfried Eva Garcia Pascual Eduardo Mayoral Gonzalez Jose Maria Sanchez Rey
19. – 39.	13	ARDIELLI FORNASE ASSOCIATI	Marco Ardielli Paola Fornasa Sarah Cowles
8. – 18.	14	2M ateliér architektúry s.r.o.	Ing.arch.Tomáš Pozdech Ing.arch.Filip Hečko Ing.arch.Miroslav Michalica
5.	15	Studio Perspektiv, s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Ján Antal Ing. arch. Kristýna Stará, Ph. D. Ing. Barbora Kuciaková Ing. arch. Libuša Rybanská Ing. Josef Filip, Ph. D. David Hora, DiS
8. – 18.	16	BY architects	Markéta Zdebská Marek Žáček Alexandra A. Bajan Tomáš Vojtíšek Max Mohl
19. – 39.	17	PT ASA Adiguna	Yugo Sinta Isfandiary Ainsyah Amanda Meilia Saputri Oktoda Susanto Angela Grisnawati
8. – 18.	18	Cityförster + atelier gram s.r.o	Piotr Kalbarczyk Ivan Shkurko Petre Şimonescu Marina Kounavi Jan Kudlička
19. – 39.	19	young.s architekti s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Jozef Bátor, PhD. Ing. arch. Tomáš Medlen Ing. arch. Michaela Perejdová Frederika Jankovičová
19. – 39.	20	Lucky architects s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Marián Lucký
8. – 18.	21	FIVE by FIVE s.r.o.	Mgr.art. Ladislav Bartko Ing.arch. Katarína Jägrová spolupráca: Ing.arch. Michaela Sara Srbecká Bc. Michal Budinský Vladimír Vančo
1.	22	Mandaworks AB	Martin Arfalk Patrick Verhoeven Cyril Pavlu

			Emeline Lex Katja Mali Lara Abi Saber
4.	23	VITKO ARCHITEKTI s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Peter Vitko Ing. arch. Kornel Kobák Ing. arch. Tomáš Pokorný Ing. Magdalena Horňáková Bc Gabriela Lapšanská Bc. Miloš Šaradín Prof. ing. arch. Ľubica Vitková, PhD.
19. – 39.	24	Atelier 9.81	Cédric MICHEL Geoffrey GALAND Morgane COUÉ Axelle MINCHIN Estelle BÉZARD Renaud LAUDREL Lylían KUBIAK
19. – 39.	25	Kalus / Kubaská architekti, s.r.o.	Mgr.art. Zuzana Kubaská Kalusová Ing. arch. Juraj Kalus Ľubica Feriancová, prof. Ing. PhD. Ing. Anna Brašeňová RNDr. Radovan Masiar
3.	26	ateliér tečka s.r.o.	Luboš Klabík Tomáš Klapka Anna Kozáková Anna Křížová Eliška Vasko Viktória Mravčáková Kateřina Eklová Till Rehwaldt Richard Labanc Karel Králíček
19. – 39.	27	ARCH LUCA TONON	Luca Tonon Andrea Pacchierotti Ilaria Cazzato Damiano Mesaglio
19. – 39.	28	Ash Sakula Architects	Cany Ash Robert Sakula
6.	29	dddd studios AB	Konstantin Miroshnychenko Eugenia Bezv
19. – 39.	30	Superworld	Thomas Krall Maxime Cunin
8. – 18.	31	Mika Svoboda architekti s.r.o.	Jiří Mika Petr Svoboda Martina Havlová Radek Prokeš
19. – 39.	32	MOA Architects	Chai Yi Yang Hung Sing Ing

19. – 39.	33	Compass, s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Juraj Benetín Ing. arch. Matej Grébert Ing. arch. Miroslava Argalášová Ing. arch. Lenka Oravec Ing. arch. Mária Hvillová Ing. arch. Lucia Barančoková Bc. Dorota Gontkovičová Ing. Michal Marcinov Ing. Barbora Hrmová Ing. arch. Simona Tóthová Christophe Egret David West Duncan Paybody Maysa Phares
8. – 18.	34	SIEBERT TALAŠ s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Matej Siebert PhD. Ing. arch. Roman Talaš Ing. arch. Ivan Kulifaj Ing. arch. Ján Horváth Ing. arch. Diana Szekerová Ing. arch. Tomáš Klásek
19. – 39.	35	nice&wise s.r.o.	Tomáš Žáček Soňa Pohlová Min Ter Lim Qin Chao Zhou Xinyi Liu Ai Chen Yi Hsin Lin
19. – 39.	36	Sadovsky & Architects s.r.o.	Oliver Sadovský Marián Stanislav Viliam Zajíček Elena Šoltéssová Dang The Anh William Mathews Edward Kilkenny-Brown Elle Thompson Joe Randall Artur Borejszo
19. – 39.	37	AA arch – DC Inc.	Marco Bersano Nicole Dal Santo Michele Rossi Eugen Guldán Alexandra Macholová Pavol Čechvala Oskar Mészár
8. – 18.	38	Promim Co. Ltd.	Can Kubin Mehra Geylan Serenay Gürelli Tugba Nur Topaloglu Zeynep Eraydin spolupráca: Aysin Ekin Altinöz Ceylin Hassemercioglu

19. – 39.	39	MI MAR MIMARLIK SANAT HIZMETLERI INSAAT SANAYI VE TICARET LIMITED SIRKETI	Ahmet Yilmaz Ibrahim Hakki Yigit Bekir Sami Esra Gokbel Ahmet Yildirim Elif Senel Belemir Dundar Kubra Cimen Ibrahim Ethem Karakose Mehmet Yonden Bengisu Nisa Mermer Bilal Kanpak Cagla Altunbilek Feyza Nur Yildiz Ibrahim Ozetci Sumeyye Pelister Zehra Mumcu
-----------------	----	---	--

Written by: Ing. arch. Nikola Chriašteľová

Reviewed by: Ing. arch. Peter Lényi, Mgr. Marián Szakáll