

PROTOCOL OF THE COMPETITION JURY EVALUATION MEETING

("Protocol")

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY:	Správa železnic, státní organizace Dlážděná 1103/7 110 00 Prague 1
NAME OF THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION:	RS 4 VRT PRAHA-BALABENKA – SJEZD LOVOSICE; ARCHITEKTONICKÁ SOUTĚŽ TERMINÁL ROUDNICE NAD LABEM VRT

On 10 January 2022 at 10:00 a.m., an evaluation meeting of the jury of the architectural-urban design competition entitled "**RS 4 VRT PRAHA-BALABENKA – SJEZD LOVOSICE; ARCHITEKTONICKÁ SOUTĚŽ TERMINÁL ROUDNICE NAD LABEM VRT**" ("**Competition**"), whose Contracting Authority is Správa železnic, státní organizace ("**Contracting Authority**"), was held in the building of the railway station Prague-Dejvice.

The jury evaluation meeting was held in accordance with the applicable legal regulations and in accordance with the Czech Chamber of Architects' Competition Rules of 24 April 1993, as amended ("**Competition Rules**").

A Protocol ("**Protocol**") of the jury evaluation meeting was prepared to summarise the course of the evaluation meeting. This Protocol will form an integral part of the Competition Protocol.

10:00 a.m. – Opening of the jury evaluation meeting

1. On 10 January 2022 at 10:00 a.m. the Competition Secretary, Ing. arch. Miroslav Vodák, opened the competition jury evaluation meeting.
2. At the beginning, individual jury members, representatives of the jury's supporting bodies and invited experts were welcomed. All persons present at the evaluation meeting confirmed their attendance at the jury meeting by signing the attendance list, which constitutes **Annex No. 1** to this Protocol and signed the affidavit, which constitutes **Annex No. 2** to this Protocol.
3. All participants of the meeting introduced themselves to each other, the Director of the HSR Preparation Section, Ing. Martin Švehlík took the floor on behalf of the Contracting Authority.

4. At the evaluation meeting, the jury voted as follows (following the presence of the individual jury members):

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
1. Ing. Pavel Hruška (SŽ)	1. Ing. arch. David Hlouch
2. Ing. arch. Pavel Andršt (SŽ)	2. doc. Ing. arch. Antonín Novák
3. Mgr. Zdenka Vachková	3. Ing. arch. Petr Štefek
	4. Ing. arch. Petr Vagner

5. Other jury members present at the jury evaluation meeting:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
1. Ing. arch. Matyáš Hron	1. Ing. arch. Pavla Pannová
	2. doc. Ing. arch. Karel Hájek, Ph.D.

6. The following persons also participated in the jury evaluation meeting:

Competition Secretary:	Ing. arch. Miroslav Vodák
Reviewer of competition entries:	Ing. Jiří Velebil
Reviewer of competition entries:	Ing. Tom Bareš
Invited expert:	Ing. Jan Janoušek
Invited expert:	Ing. Lenka Žemličková, Ph.D.
Invited expert:	Mgr. Monika Kotasová
Invited expert:	Ing. Elena Galková
Invited expert:	Ing. arch. Lucie Kavánová
Invited expert:	Lucie Radová

Invited representatives of the Contracting Authority:	Mgr. Bc. Jaroslava Havlovicová
	Iveta Petrášková
	Ing. Lenka Janhubová

10:10 A.M. – Report on the progress of the Competition

- Competition Secretary Ing. arch. Vodák briefed the attendees on the progress of the Competition during the competition period. He informed the attendees that the opening of the competition entries (in paper and electronic form) was carried out by the external law firm HAVEL & PARTNERS, which also prepared a protocol on the opening of envelopes and a report on the assessment of compliance with the conditions of participation of individual participants in the Competition.

As the participants of the Competition are identified in the protocols, these protocols will be presented to the jury at the end of the evaluation meeting, after the opening of the AUTHOR envelopes. As HAVEL & PARTNERS law firm assessed the participants' compliance with the conditions of participation in the Competition and none of the participants was excluded, it can be assumed that all evaluated entries will comply with the conditions of participation during the evaluation.

Ing. arch. Vodák also presented the record of the site visit that took place on 20 September 2021 near the village of Kleneč, which is an annex to the Protocol of the Competition. Ing. arch. Vodák also introduced an explanation of the tender documentation, which also constitutes an annex to the Protocol of the Competition.

No request to record a different opinion of a jury member in the Protocol was made by the jury for the introductory part of the Competition evaluation meeting.

10:30 A.M. – Report on the review of the competition entries

- The Competition Secretary and the reviewers of the competition entries acquainted the present jurors with the reviewer's report, which forms **Annex No. 3** to this Protocol, and drew their attention to any findings in relation to individual competition entries. The scope of the review of individual competition entries is set out in Annex No. 3 to this Protocol.
- The jury acknowledged the reviewer's report. After jury's familiarising with the reviewer's report, the jury voted that all competition entries would be further evaluated.

10:39 A.M.

- Question of the Competition Secretary: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entries 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 being further evaluated in the Competition?"*

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

The chairman of the jury confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting. Following the result of the voting, the list of competition entries that will be evaluated in the Competition was then summarised, specifically:

Competition Entry No. 1
Competition Entry No. 2
Competition Entry No. 3
Competition Entry No. 4
Competition Entry No. 5
Competition Entry No. 6
Competition Entry No. 7
Competition Entry No. 8
Competition Entry No. 9
Competition Entry No. 10

10:30 A.M. – Invited experts – presentation by SŽ and SNCF

11. Ing. arch. Matyáš Hron presented the evaluation of the competition entries provided by the French high-speed railway manager of SNCF, whose representatives were invited experts in the Competition.
12. Competition Secretary Ing. arch. Miroslav Vodák then handed over the chairing of the jury evaluation meeting to the chairman of the jury Ing. arch. Petr Štefek.

1. EVALUATION ROUND

11:20 A.M. – Individual study of the competition entries and joint discussion of the competition jury

13. The jury studied the competition entries individually and discussed them together.

12:40 P.M. – Invited experts - presentation by representatives of the National Heritage Institute and Roudnice nad Labem

14. Invited expert Lenka Radová representing the National Heritage Institute repeated the basic requirements for the competition entries in terms of the sensitive setting of the competition entries in the landscape and the conservation area, after which the

participants discussed the setting of the entries in the landscape, while the impacts on the surrounding villages and areas were also discussed.

15. The invited expert Ing. arch. Lucie Kavánová, representing the town of Roudnice nad Labem, repeated the basic requirements for the competition entries in terms of the broader relations in the area.

1:00 P.M. – Joint jury discussion

16. Subsequently, the jury held a joint discussion on the individual competition entries in terms of the extent to which they fulfilled the evaluation criteria in Paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions.

3:00 P.M. – Jury voting – 1st round (advance to 2nd round)

17. The chairman of the jury announced a vote on which competition entries would advance to the second round of the competition entries evaluation.

The jury will vote based on the extent to which the individual competition entries have met the evaluation criteria in Paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, following the findings of the jury's individual study of the competition entries and the joint discussion held by the jury on the individual competition entries.

18. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: On the basis of presence, the regular members and alternates of the jury vote according to Point 4 of the Protocol. Each voting member shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury makes decisions by a majority of votes.

The procedure described above was agreed by the jury as follows:

FOR:	7
AGAINST:	0
ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING:	0

19. Voting on Competition Entry No. 1.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 1 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR:	6
AGAINST:	1
ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING:	0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 1 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

20. Voting on Competition Entry No. 2.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 2 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR:	2
AGAINST:	3

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 2

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 2 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

21. Voting on Competition Entry No. 3.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 3 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 3 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

22. Voting on Competition Entry No. 4.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 4 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR: 0

AGAINST: 6

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 4 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

23. Voting on Competition Entry No. 5.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 5 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR: 5

AGAINST: 2

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 5 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

24. Voting on Competition Entry No. 6.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 6 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR: 0

AGAINST: 7

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 6 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

25. Voting on Competition Entry No. 7.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 7 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 7 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

26. Voting on Competition Entry No. 8.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 8 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR: 1

AGAINST: 3

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 3

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 8 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

27. Voting on Competition Entry No. 9.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 9 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR: 2

AGAINST: 5

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 9 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

28. Voting on Competition Entry No. 10.

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 10 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation?"*

FOR: 6

AGAINST: 1

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

3:10 P.M.

Following the result of the voting, the list of competition entries that will advance to the next (2nd round) of evaluation was then summarised, namely:

Competition Entries Nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, 10
--

3:15 P.M. - Lunch break

29. The meeting was adjourned and a lunch break was announced.

2. EVALUATION ROUND

4:00 P.M. – Joint jury discussion

30. The jury then proceeded to a detailed joint discussion on the individual competition entries, which, based on the result of the previous voting, advanced to the next (2nd) round of the competition entries evaluation.

5:50 P.M. – Break

31. The meeting was adjourned and a short break was announced.

6:00 P.M. – Joint jury discussion

32. The jury continued to discuss the individual competition entries in detail.
33. Juror Ing. arch. Pavel Andršt proposed a revocation of the voting on Competition Entry No. 2 pursuant to Point 20 Protocol.
34. The chairman of the jury called for a vote on the motion to revoke.

Question of the chairman of the jury: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 2 advancing to the second round of the competition entries evaluation?"

FOR: 6

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 1

Voting result: Competition Entry No. 2 advances to the second round of the competition entries evaluation.

6:25 P.M.

35. Following the result of the voting under Point 34, the list of competition entries to be further evaluated by the jury was then summarised:

Competition Entries Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10

6:30 P.M. – Joint jury discussion

36. The jury then proceeded to another detailed joint discussion on the individual competition entries that should be awarded or given prizes.

6:55 P.M. – Voting on granting prizes and rewards

37. Ing. arch. Vodák repeated for the jury that the competition prizes for the first three places in the Competition were set in Paragraph 9.2. of the Competition Terms and Conditions as follows:

The first prize is set at CZK 2,000,000.

The second prize is set at CZK 750,000.

The third prize is set at CZK 500,000.

38. At the same time Ing. arch. Vodák pointed out that under the conditions set out in Section 10(8) and Section 12(2) of the CCA's Competition Rules, the jury may decide in exceptional cases not to distribute some of the prizes and the amounts allocated for them or to distribute them in another way. In special cases, the jury may decide to divide the total amount of the prizes differently. Regarding this, Ing. arch. Vodák asked the jury if any of the jurors made a suggestion to proceed according to Section 10(8) and Section 12(2) of the CCA's Competition Rules, adding that if no such suggestion was not made, then the prizes would be distributed as stated in Paragraph 9.2. of the Competition Terms and Conditions. None of the jurors made the above suggestion.
39. At the end of the joint discussion on the individual competition entries, the chairman of the jury announced a voting on the award/reward of the competition entries; the jury will base its voting on the extent to which the individual competition entries fulfilled the evaluation criteria according to Paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, following the findings of the jury's individual study of the competition entries and the joint discussion held by the jury on the individual competition entries.

40. Voting about ranking on the 1st awarded place

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 3 ranking 1st?"*

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 3 ranked 1st.**

41. Voting about ranking on the 2nd awarded place

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 1 ranking 2nd?"*

FOR: 6

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 1 ranked 2nd.**

42. Voting about ranking on the 3rd awarded place

Question of the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 7 ranking 3rd?"*

FOR: 6

AGAINST: 1

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 7 ranked 3rd.**

43. Ing. arch. Vodák reiterated for the jury that the total prize for the rewards was set at CZK 750.000 pursuant Paragraph 9.4. of the Competition Terms and Condition. This amount may be divided among the entries which have not been awarded a prize at the discretion of the jury.

44. Juror Ing. arch. David Hlouch further proposed the following distribution of the rewards, with 3 entries being rewarded with CZK 150,000 each and 4 entries being rewarded with CZK 75,000 each.

45. Voting on the distribution of rewards as proposed by Ing. arch. David Hlouch according to the Point 44 Protocol.

Question of the chairman of the jury: "Who is in favour of dividing the rewards according to the suggestion of the juror Ing. arch. David Hlouch?"

FOR: 6

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 1

Voting result: The rewards will be distributed as proposed in Point 44 Protocol.

46. Voting on awarding a reward of CZK 150,000.

Question of the chairman of the jury: "Who is in favour of awarding a reward of CZK 150,000 to Competition Entry No. 10?"

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 is awarded a reward of CZK 150,000.**

47. Voting on awarding a reward of CZK 150,000.

Question of the chairman of the jury: "Who is in favour of awarding a reward of CZK 150,000 to Competition Entry No. 2?"

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 2 is awarded a reward of CZK 150,000.**

48. Voting on awarding a reward of CZK 150,000.

Question of the chairman of the jury: "Who is in favour of awarding a reward of CZK 150,000 to Competition Entry No. 5?"

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 5 is awarded a reward of CZK 150,000.**

49. Voting on awarding a reward of CZK 75,000.

Question of the chairman of the jury: "Who is in favour of awarding a reward of CZK 75,000 to Competition Entry No. 4?"

FOR: 6

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 4 is awarded a reward of CZK 75,000.**

50. Voting on awarding a reward of CZK 75,000.

Question of the chairman of the jury: "Who is in favour of awarding a reward of CZK 75,000 to Competition Entry No. 6?"

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 6 is awarded a reward of CZK 75,000.**

51. Voting on awarding a reward of CZK 75,000.

Question of the chairman of the jury: "Who is in favour of awarding a reward of CZK 75,000 to Competition Entry No. 8?"

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 8 is awarded a reward of CZK 75,000.**

52. Voting on awarding a reward of CZK 75,000.

Question of the chairman of the jury: "Who is in favour of awarding a reward of CZK 75,000 to Competition Entry No. 9?"

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 9 is awarded a reward of CZK 75,000.**

53. Following the voting result, the result of the evaluation of awarding and rewarding the competition entries was as follows:

Competition Entry No. 3	1. prize
Competition Entry No. 1	2. prize
Competition Entry No. 7	3. prize
Competition Entry No. 10	Reward of CZK 150,000
Competition Entry No. 5	Reward of CZK 150,000
Competition Entry No. 2	Reward of CZK 150,000
Competition Entry No. 4	Reward of CZK 75,000
Competition Entry No. 6	Reward of CZK 75,000
Competition Entry No. 8	Reward of CZK 75,000
Competition Entry No. 9	Reward of CZK 75,000

RECORD OF THE VERBAL EVALUATION OF THE COMPETITION ENTRIES

7:10 P.M. - Record of jury verbal evaluation and recommendations

54. The jury jointly formulated a verbal evaluation of the individual competition entries according to the extent to which the individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to Paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, in connection with the findings that the jury identified within the individual study of the competition entries and during the joint discussion held by the jurors on the individual competition entries.

COMPETITION ENTRY NUMBER	OVERALL QUALITY OF THE URBAN, ARCHITECTURAL, CONSTRUCTION, TRANSPORT, LANDSCAPE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTION OF THE COMPETITION ENTRY	ECONOMIC ADEQUACY OF THE CONSTRUCTION ENTRY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF INVESTMENT PROPOSALS
1	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> generous architectural design of the terminal with a distinct identity of the building location of waiting rooms near the platform bus and cycle transport solutions with short transfer links transport connection of both parts of the premises to the existing roads and the solution of the multi-storey car park possible phasing of the whole project adequate architectural, technical and transport solution of the maintenance depot <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> slightly oversized size of terminal building, especially at the entrance areas location of retail outside the main pedestrian routes partial formal and schematic radial layout of the surface parking area vertical circulation is interrupted by short escalators due to the chosen floor level layout proposed maintenance-intensive photovoltaics above the track the second bridge in terms of investment costs 	<p>according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.</p>
2	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate size of the terminal with a modest architectural look and clear layout bus and cycle transport solutions with short transfer links maximum use of the area between the corridor and the motorway use of photovoltaic panels for car park roofing <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p>	<p>according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • schematic layout of the public areas in the foyer of the terminal and the relaxation park • schematic design and dimensions of the structures • arrival of all vehicles before the entrance to the terminal and longer walking distance from the car park • wider pedestrian and cycling connections • architectural, technical and transport solution of the maintenance depot • non-compliance with the recommended track position of the conventional part of the station 	
3	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • architectural and construction solution of the terminal, which is defined by simplicity and modesty • adequate terminal size with a clear interior space with great variability • bus and cycle transport solutions with short interchanges and continuity of pedestrian and cycle paths • landscape solution of all parts of the premises that appropriately responds to and develops the potential of the directly adjacent landscape • adequate architectural, technical and transport solution of the maintenance depot and its very good integration into the landscape <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mutually accessible footbridges around the perimeter of the terminal which require further development in terms of transport safety • internal height of the terminal ceiling with the issue of shading and maintenance of large glazed structures • from a maintenance point of view, the green roof is in a hazardous area at height and also above the traction catenary lines • openness of escalators and staircases to platforms 	<p>according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.</p>
4	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • distinctive architectural gesture with organic shaping of the terminal roof material • elegant entrance space solution • appropriate size of the terminal building • bus and cycle transport solutions with short transfer links <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • chosen form sometimes stifles the function and has the impact on the layout, e.g. inappropriate location of the retail • form of platform roofing, which does not look convincing in the connection to the terminal • very schematic transport solution • one-sided orientation of the terminal with the main transport axis directed to the roundabout 	<p>according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the location of the multi-storey car park at a great distance from the terminal and its accessibility via the platform subway architectural, technical and transport solution of the maintenance depot 	
5	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> generous architectural design with a simple and memorable building landscape solution in whole and in detail bringing a distinctive motive responding to the character of the surrounding landscape solution of public spaces around the terminal and interior solution of the terminal bus and cycle transport solutions with short transfer links potential of the proposed urban structure location of waiting rooms directly on the platform <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> significantly oversized size of the terminal building, which does not match the planned capacity larger dimensions of the inclined bridging solution of vertical passenger movement and formal layout of the terminal interior designing the green roof of the terminal with regard to its maintenance and poorer accessibility architectural, technical and transport solution of the maintenance depot 	<p>according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.</p>
6	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of the area between HSR and D8 <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> architectural and urban solution without a clear and convincing concept larger area bridged by the terminal building unconvincing ground plan and layout of the terminal bus and bicycle transport solutions with poorer interchange links and pedestrian and bicycle path connections architectural, technical and transport solution of the maintenance depot with connection only towards Kleneč 	<p>according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.</p>
7	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> elegant form of architectural design, based on a very pragmatic solution and approach it is a fully functional multimodal interchange terminal in all respects urban design solution, including views on the further development of the wider area clarity and compactness of layout minimisation of the built-up area architectural, technical and transport solution of the maintenance depot <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p>	<p>according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> higher investment costs for the chosen solution of multi-storey car parks, which can be however divided into phases issue of the solution of the full-grown greenery on large areas of roof structures and the subsequent requirements for its maintenance higher height of roofing on platforms 	
8	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> architectural design with a distinct identity of the building the volume efficiency of the proposed concept <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> one-sided orientation of the terminal without using the land between the corridor and the motorway layout of the terminal, influenced by the chosen form, and access via the platform subway to the second platform, which is significantly less attractive compared to the others. secluded solution of the second car park with a long walking distance to the terminal schematic and formal urban, landscape and transport solutions architectural, technical and transport solution of the maintenance depot 	according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.
9	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> architectural design with a distinct identity of the building bus and cycle transport solutions with short transfer links preservation of the existing grove <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> chosen triangular material, which appears to be contrasting and is not convincingly justified transport and landscape design in the foyer of the terminal one-sided orientation without land use between the motorway and the corridor location of the car park behind the grove and greater walking distance to the terminal architectural and technical design of the maintenance depot with costly green facade solutions 	according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.
10	<p><u>The jury considers the following appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> architectural design of the terminal building with a clear identity of the dynamic motive, urban motive of the main axis compact volume design and elegant design of the interior, public spaces and platform roofing proposal of possible urban development of the area architectural, technical and transport solution of the maintenance depot <p><u>The jury considers the following less appropriate:</u></p>	according to the information provided by the participant, the construction entry appears to the jury to be economically reasonable in terms of investment costs.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • distinctive geometry in many places has an influence on the more formal layout and technical connections to other structures and spaces • transport solution of bus stops with a crossing in front of the entrance to the terminal building • at the western car park, all vehicles pass through the entry into the terminal • bike racks moved aside 	
--	--	--

55. The jury then formulated a jury recommendation to the Contracting Authority on the awarded competition entries, which will be further discussed with the Selected Supplier in the event of negotiations for a subsequent contract award.
56. Competition Secretary Ing. arch. Vodák and the chairman of the jury Ing. arch. Štefek then proceeded to open the AUTHOR envelopes and acquainted the jury with the identification details of the individual participants of the Competition, which are listed at the end of the Protocol.
57. The jury then proposed the following recommendations to the Contracting Authority:
 - Správa železnic, státní organizace is one of the largest public investors in the Czech Republic. The jury appreciates the fact that planned HSR terminals and other major buildings have often been awarded through design competitions in recent years, as recommended by the Architecture and Building Culture Policy of the Czech Republic for public contracting authorities.
 - The jury urges the Contracting Authority to continue to monitor the wider urban context of all structures on the planned HSR network that will have a significant impact on towns and landscape. In particular, it is about limiting the necessary agricultural land occupation, minimising paved areas, using rainwater, preserving natural bio-corridors or respecting cultural values in the landscape.
 - Regarding or HSR terminal projects, the jury recommends a broader discussion of further development anticipated in their vicinity. Foreign experience shows that over time there will most likely be pressure for more intensive use of these hubs and specific development plans will emerge. Their mutual coordination should be reflected primarily in the documentation of the Principles of Spatial Development, and subsequently in the municipal local plans.
58. At the end of the meeting, the jury thanked the Contracting Authority for organising the Competition and expressed its gratitude for the Contracting Authority's decision to announce the Competition. At the same time, it expressed its conviction that the selected competition entry, if implemented, will fulfil its main function properly and at the same time it will urbanistically complete the wider surroundings in an appropriate way.
59. The jury also thanked all the participants of the Competition whose entries were of high quality, which was reflected in the distribution of prizes and rewards. The competition entries presented a wide range of possible solutions and sufficiently verified different approaches to addressing the competition brief. The discussions of the jury and the evaluation of the entries may serve as suggestions to the Contracting Authority in the preparation of further procurement documents.
60. At the end of the meeting, the Competition Secretary and the representatives of the Contracting Authority thanked the members of the jury for their work, their cooperation throughout the Competition and for the overall approach of all the jurors to the Competition and the intention of the Contracting Authority.

61. Competition Secretary Ing. arch. Vodák then asked the jurors if any of the voting jurors were interested in exercising their right of revocation or entering any dissenting opinion into the Protocol. None of the voting members of the jury exercised this right.
62. The jury meeting was closed at 7:25 p.m.

Annexes to the Protocol:

Annex No. 1 Attendance List

Annex No. 2 Reviewer's Report

INFORMATION TO THE JURY ABOUT THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE COMPETITION

Competition entry received under the serial number (paper submission):	Competition entry received under the serial number (electronic submission):	New number of the competition entry after opening the envelopes with the graphic part of the competition entries:	Participant
5	5	1	<p>dh architekti + METROPROJEKT on behalf of METROPROJEKT Praha a.s.</p> <p>dh architekti Terronská 656/45, 160 00 Prague 6 – Bubeneč ID No.: 09769391</p> <p>METROPROJEKT Praha a.s. Argentinská 1621/36, Holešovice, 170 00 Prague 7 ID No.: 45271895</p> <p>Author Dalibor Hlaváček Ludvík Holub Zuzana Kučerová Petr Malinovský Petr Vyskočil</p> <p>Co-author Jaroslav Vala</p> <p>Cooperating person Tereza Čechová Pavel Štruhař Lenka Žitná František Denk</p> <p>Architect Dalibor Hlaváček / Authorisation A1</p> <p>Designer of transport structures Jaroslav Vala</p>
9	12	2	<p>Studio COSMO s.r.o. Biskupský dvůr 7, Prague 1, 11000 ID No.: 07155042</p> <p>Ing. Tomáš Petr Nad Vápenicí 42, Jimramov ID No.: 01320963</p>

			<p>Ing. arch. Tereza Kabelková Uralská 5, Prague 6, 160 00 ID No.: 734 377 813</p> <p>Ing. Milan Pelikán Lučiny 1186/1, Žďár nad Sázavou ID No.: 18117422</p>
			<p>Author Jiří Kabelka Tomáš Petr</p> <p>Tereza Kabelková Milan Pelikán</p> <p>Co-author Petr Moschner Justýna Kaislerová Dominik Cvrček</p> <p>Cooperating person -</p> <p>Architect Tereza Kabelková / Authorisation A1</p> <p>Designer of transport structures Tomáš Petr</p>
6	6	3	<p>Rusina Frei, s.r.o. Bubenská 225/49, 170 00 Prague 7 ID No.: 2308002</p>
			<p>Author Martin Rusina Martin Frei</p> <p>Co-author Petr Tej Josef Filip Gabriela Sládečková Jiří Valenta Jakub Finger</p> <p>Cooperating person Matěj Hoffman</p> <p>Architect Martin Frei / Authorisation A1</p> <p>Designer of transport structures Josef Filip</p>

7	9	4	<p>JAKUB KLASKA LTD 43 Loddiges Road, E96PW London, United Kingdom ID No.: 11726245</p> <hr/> <p>Author Jakub Klaška Jan Klaška</p> <p>Co-author -</p> <p>Cooperating person Matěj Mareš Martin Chrastil Tomáš Slavíček Aleš Marek Šárka Schneiderová</p> <p>Architect Jakub Klaška / Authorisation A1</p> <p>Designer of transport structures Matěj Mareš</p>
3	4	5	<p>CHYBIK + KRISTOF ASSOCIATED ARCHITECTS & AFRY CZ</p> <p>CHYBIK + KRISTOF ASSOCIATED ARCHITECTS S.R.O. Dominikánské náměstí 656/2, Brno-město, 602 00 Brno ID No.: 03887707</p> <p>AFRY CZ s.r.o. Magistrů 1275/13, 140 00 Prague 4 ID No.: 453 06 605</p> <hr/> <p>Author Licence Agreement – CHYBIK + KRISTOF ASSOCIATED ARCHITECTS & AFRY CZ - namely Michal Křištof as a chief architect and Prokop Nedbal as a designer of transport structures</p> <p>Co-author -</p> <p>Cooperating person -</p> <p>Architect Michal Křištof / Authorisation A1</p> <p>Designer of transport structures Prokop Nedbal</p>

10	10	6	MS architekti s.r.o. U Nikolajky 1085/15, 150 00 Prague 5 ID No.: 62580426
			Author Michal Šourek Kseniya Bahdanovich Linda Svobodová Kateřina Fišerová Pavel Hřebecký Karina Rodriguez Anna Goncharenko Co-author - Cooperating person Jindřich Jirák Architect Michal Šourek / Authorisation A0 Designer of transport structures Jindřich Jirák
1	1	7	SARMA & NORDE Arhitekti Ltd Ulice Grecinieku 11a-5, Riga, Latvia, LV-1050 ID No.: 40103084449
			Author Visvaldis Sarma Inga Zudina Co-author Aleksandrs Nedzveds Cooperating person Jurijs Rusinovs Architect Visvaldis Sarma Designer of transport structures Jurijs Rusinovs
2	3	8	SBS ENGINEERING GROUP SP.Z O.O Olszanicka 30-242, Krakow, Poland ID No.: 366761190
			Author Maher Matar Co-author -

			<p>Cooperating person</p> <p><u>Architecture design team:</u> Agnieszka Gozdek Tomasz Giefert Anna Eckes Joanna Ryś Joanna Tomecka Michal Sajdek</p> <p><u>Transport design team (Dornier Consulting International GmbH):</u> Tine Haas Daniel Schwarz Sravan Singh</p> <p>Architect Maher Matar</p> <p>Designer of transport structures Tine Haas</p>
4	11	9	<p>Tomáš Dvořák architekti s.r.o. Rajhradská 12, Brno 619 00 ID No.: 27661334</p> <p>Author Tomáš Dvořák</p> <p>Co-author -</p> <p>Cooperating person Petr Soldán Adam Repaský Ondřej Kufa Kateřina Mičová-Polesná David Kotek</p> <p>Architect David Kotek / Authorisation A1</p> <p>Designer of transport structures Kateřina Mičová-Polesná</p>
8	8	10	<p>Boele s.r.o. Korunní 2569/108G, 101 00 Prague 10 ID No.: 10881476</p> <p>Author Pavel Fajfr Petr Šuma Tomáš Kroužil</p> <p>Co-author -</p> <p>Cooperating person</p>

			<p>Petr Rospopčuk Jiří Kott Phil Longman</p> <p>Architect</p> <p>Pavel Fajfr / Authorisation A1</p> <p>Designer of transport structures</p> <p>Petr Rospopčuk</p>
--	--	--	---