

VERBAL EVALUATION OF THE CONCEPTS

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY:	The Capital City of Prague represented by the Department of Property Management of the Capital City of Prague Prague Public Transit Company, a joint stock company Správa železnic, state organisation
NAME OF PUBLIC CONTRACT:	NEW MAIN STATION DISTRICT

This document is drawn up in the Czech and English language, and in the event of any discrepancies between the individual language versions, the Czech version of the document shall apply.

Chybik + Kristof + Civitas

The Evaluation Committee has not recommended the Concept to proceed to the next phase of the Competitive Dialogue, primarily due to the fact that the long-term sustainability of the basic concept of the main attractor solution is questionable.

Architectural and urban design:

Evaluation: Satisfactory / 20 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and sufficiently defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, but to a lesser extent. Compared to the professional approaches of the other participants, the Contracting Authority evaluated the Concepts of the participants with evaluation good to excellent as more appropriate in this sub-criterion.

Specific evaluation of the Evaluation Committee attached: The Participant responded to the brief in the Concept, working with the multiple layers of the area for different user groups, but is not entirely convincing in terms of long-term sustainability in individual parts of the area. The design predicts a significant need for long-term moderation of the content in a relatively isolated public space. The Evaluation Committee perceives this Concept as difficult to adapt, especially in the terminal hall area.

Landscape design:

Evaluation: Good / 20 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and well defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, to a large extent. Compared to the Concepts of the other participants, the Contracting Authority is convinced of the Contractor's ability to perform the subject of the Public Contract well.

Specific evaluation of the Evaluation Committee attached: The Concept responds quite adequately to the current uniformity of the park and, at the same time, the design includes the required principles of functional content, ecosystem services, less difficult maintenance services and enhanced sustainability of the park. The Concept adds significant logical pedestrian links to the surrounding areas and the terminal hall.

Transport solution:

Evaluation: Satisfactory / 10 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and sufficiently defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, but to a lesser extent. Compared to the professional approaches of the other participants, the Contracting Authority evaluated the Concepts of the participants with evaluation good to excellent as more appropriate in this sub-criterion.

Specific evaluation of the Evaluation Committee attached: The Concept works appropriately with the tram line routes and structuring, including the Opletalova Street design. The design of the system of supplies also raises issues including additional investments. The proposed gradient of the tram line is at its maximum but is nevertheless feasible.

West 8 Urban Design and Landscape Architecture B.V

The Evaluation Committee has not recommended the Concept for the next stage of the Competitive Dialogue, primarily due to the minimum potential for development and transformation of the area.

Architectural and urban design:

Evaluation: Less satisfactory / 10 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is only marginally related to the subject and purpose of the Public Contract. The Contracting Authority's preferences have only been met to a small extent. The response does not convince the Contracting Authority of the suitability of the proposed design compared to the Concepts of the other participants.

Specific evaluation of the Evaluation Committee attached: The overall approach of the Concept directly relates to and only partly modifies the current situation of the park and the terminal hall. Within the overall design of the space, the design does not provide an adequate solution and the principles described are unconvincing with respect to the brief. It is not entirely clear that the design of the interior layout of the hall will comply with the demands of the further increase in the number of passengers. The design does not provide sufficient potential for the connection between the Fanta Building level, the NOH and the remaining part of the area concerned.

Landscape design:

Evaluation: Satisfactory / 10 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and sufficiently defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, but to a lesser extent. Compared to the professional approaches of the other participants, the Contracting Authority evaluated the Concepts of the participants with evaluation good to excellent as more appropriate in this sub-criterion.

Specific evaluation of the Evaluation Committee attached: The Concept attempts to elaborate on the existing condition and structure of the park. The design provides only minimum possibilities regarding the anticipated use of the space. Similarly, the aspect of functional, vegetation and visual hierarchy/differentiation of the space, especially of the soft vegetation areas is not clear. The design addresses solutions on how to protect these areas.

Transport solution:

Evaluation: Less satisfactory / 5 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is only marginally related to the subject and purpose of the Public Contract. The Contracting Authority's preferences have only been met to a small extent. The response does not convince the Contracting Authority of the suitability of the proposed design compared to the Concepts of the other participants.

Specific evaluation of the Evaluation Committee attached: The Concept appropriately incorporates the tram line into the area. The design of the adjacent streets, including the design of transport regimes and relationships, is unconvincing with respect to both pedestrian relationships and other public space designs. The draft design of Opletalova Street does not bring the expected higher quality of both the public space and other crossing links. The new tram line also raises questions of pedestrian permeability and may be seen as a barrier in the area. The dimension of some of the proposed pedestrian routes also remains an issue. The Concept counts on the system of supplies to the terminal hall and the Bolzanova garage that is very difficult to implement.

Henning Larsen Architects A/S

The Contracting Authority has decided not to provide detailed evaluations of the Concepts of the advancing participants at this stage to avoid disclosure of their draft designs.

Architectural and urban design:

Evaluation: Very good / 35 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and very well defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, to a large extent. Compared to the Concepts of the other participants, the Contracting Authority is convinced of the Contractor's ability to perform the subject of the Public Contract very well.

Landscape design:

Evaluation: Excellent / 30 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The proposed design is very comprehensive and excellently defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting

Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, to a large extent, or even exceeds it by appropriate addition. Compared to the Concepts of the other participants, the Contracting Authority places high confidence in the Contractor's ability to perform the subject of the Public Contract in a quality manner.

Transport solution:

Evaluation: Good / 20 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and well defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, to a large extent. Compared to the Concepts of the other participants, the Contracting Authority is convinced of the Contractor's ability to perform the subject of the Public Contract well.

Miralles Tagliabue EMBT S.L.P. + “OCA architects Prague, s.r.o.

The Contracting Authority has decided not to provide detailed evaluations of the Concepts of the advancing participants at this stage to avoid disclosure of their draft designs.

Architectural and urban design:

Evaluation: Satisfactory / 20 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and sufficiently defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, but to a lesser extent. Compared to the professional approaches of the other participants, the Contracting Authority evaluated the Concepts of the participants with evaluation good to excellent as more appropriate in this sub-criterion.

Landscape design:

Evaluation: Good / 20 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and well defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, to a large extent. Compared to the Concepts of the other participants, the Contracting Authority is convinced of the Contractor's ability to perform the subject of the Public Contract well.

Transport solution:

Evaluation: Good / 20 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and well defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, to a large extent. Compared to the Concepts of the other participants, the Contracting Authority is convinced of the Contractor's ability to perform the subject of the Public Contract well.

re:architekti+baukuh+YellowOffice

The Contracting Authority has decided not to provide detailed evaluations of the Concepts of the advancing participants at this stage to avoid disclosure of their draft designs.

Architectural and urban design:

Evaluation: Good / 30 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and very well defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, to a large extent. Compared to the Concepts of the other participants, the Contracting Authority is convinced of the Contractor's ability to perform the subject of the Public Contract well.

Landscape design:

Evaluation: Satisfactory / 10 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and sufficiently defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, but to a lesser extent. Compared to the professional approaches of the other participants, the Contracting Authority evaluated the Concepts of the participants with evaluation good to excellent as more appropriate in this sub-criterion.

Transport solution:

Evaluation: Good / 20 points

General evaluation pursuant to paragraph 9.7.5 of the Tender Documentation: The prepared design is complete and well defended. It responds to the preferences of the Contracting Authority and the Competition Brief, and also fulfils the purpose of the Public Contract, to a large extent. Compared to the Concepts of the other participants, the Contracting Authority is convinced of the Contractor's ability to perform the subject of the Public Contract well.