

Minutes of the
Jury Meeting - Second Stage
9 - 10 February 2006

International Urban and Architectural Design Workshop

RIVERGARDENS
Prague 8

Promoted by

Tesnovska Spolecnost, s.r.o.

Represented by

REAL ESTATE KARLIN GROUP

in co-operation with

CSAD Praha holding, a.s.

J&T Bank

and the

City of Prague

Day One – 9 February 2006

The Jury convenes on 9 February 2005 at 9:00 am at the Hotel Olympik, Sál Olymp, Sokolovská 138, Praha 8 for a preliminary meeting.

Mr. Uwe Drost welcomes the members of the Jury and experts and secures the names of those in attendance. He summarises procedural matters: Each team will have 15 minutes to present their scheme and there will be ten minutes for questions. All architects' teams may attend the presentation of other teams.

Professor Carl Fingerhuth will chair the meeting.

At 9:30 am Mr. Drost welcomes the participants of the workshop. Prof. Fingerhuth welcomes the architects' teams and explains the procedure of the workshop.

Those present:

Expert Jurors

Prof. Carl Fingerhuth, Architect/Urban Planner, Zürich, Switzerland

Regine Leibinger, Architect, Berlin, Germany

Prof. Roger Riewe, Architect, Graz, Austria

Prof. Jaroslav Safer, Architect, Prague, Czech Republic

Andreas Kipar, Landscape Architect, Duisburg/Milano, Germany/Italy

Deputy Expert Jurors

Ivan Kroupa, Architect, Prague, Czech Republic

Bet Figueras Ponsa, Landscape Architect, Barcelona, Spain

Flemming Frost, Architect, Copenhagen, Denmark

City Official Jurors

apologies

MuDr. Pavel Bem, Chief Magistrate, Prague, Czech Republic

Jan Lukavsky, Deputy Major – Prague 8, Czech Republic

Developer Jurors

Hans Jörg Brun, REKG, Zug, Switzerland

Serge Borenstein, REKG, Prague, Czech Republic

RnDr. Ales Hejkal, CSAD, Prague, Czech Republic

Experts

Jan Ludvik, REKG, Prague, Czech Republic

Zdenka Klupalova, Knight Frank, Prague, Czech Republic

Samuel Salganik, Ungelt Partners, Prague, Czech Republic

Vlasta Krahulcova, CSAD, Prague, Czech Republic

Uwe Drost, D&K, Hamburg, Germany

apologies

Filip Koucky, Chief of Building Office – Prague 8, Czech Republic

Svetlana Kubikova, Chief of City Development Department, Prague, Czech Republic

Tomas Kaderabek, REKG, Prague, Czech Republic

Tomas Jilek, Dopravni Podnik, Prague, Czech Republic

Guests

Petr Mares, representative of Prague 8 Construction Department

Jan Benda, CSAD, Prague, Czech Republic

Kamil Kosman, Ceska Sportelna, Prague, Czech Republic

Ludek Bican, CSAD, Prague, Czech Republic

Petr Vitek, Dopravni Podnik, Prague, Czech Republic

Pavel Obermann, A+R System, Prague, Czech Republic

Workshop Management/Organisation

Hana Samuelova REKG, Prague

Andrea Velekova REKG, Prague

Tereza Urbanova REKG, Prague

Uwe Drost D&K projektentwicklungsmanagement, Hamburg

Caroline Ahrens D&K projektentwicklungsmanagement, Hamburg

Lennart Beier D&K projektentwicklungsmanagement, Hamburg

The minutes are taken by Caroline Ahrens.

RESULTS OF THE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

The results of the preliminary assessment are summarised in a report giving information on the formal criteria as well as providing a comparable overview of all competition entries. Each submission is allocated six A4 sheets showing the overall plan, sections/elevations of the proposals, a brief description of the scheme and notes on the findings of the preliminary assessment team. The preliminary assessment was carried out according to the criteria stated in the Workshop Brief, Technical Documentation, the basic requirements and answers to queries made available in the course of the Workshop.

All 12 teams that took part in the First Stage submitted their work within the required time for the Second Stage.

All teams fulfilled the general scope of the workshop.

There are no formal requirements that would necessitate the preliminary assessment team to recommend the dismissal of any entries.

PRESENTATIONS

The workshop participants present their work:

09:45 – 10:05	Hrusa & Pelcak Architecti, Müller Reimann Architekten
10:05 – 10:25	Feilden Clegg Bradley
10:30 – 10:50	EM2N-Architekten ETH/SIA
10:50 – 11:30	Coffee
11:30 – 11:50	Studio A
11:55 – 12:15	Baumschlager Eberle
12:20 – 12:40	David Chipperfield Architects
	Lunch
01:50 – 02:10	Kees Christaanse/ KCAP
02:15 – 02:35	4a Architekti
02:40 – 03:00	Fink+Jocher
	Coffee
03:20 – 03:50	Meili Peter Architekten AG GmbH
04:00 – 04:20	Stephenson Bell
04:30 – 04:50	A.D.N.S. Architekti

4:50 pm end of presentations close of meeting.

Day Two - 10 February 2006

The Jury convenes at 9:30 am. Uwe Drost welcomes all to the second day of the Jury meeting. Professor Fingerhuth extends his welcome and states that he is pleased with the quality of the submissions to the workshop. The aim of the Jury meeting is to choose architects who should continue working on the project and to establish a general approach rather than necessarily finding designs for specific buildings. One landscape architect should be recommended to design an overall landscape masterplan and also to orchestrate the various architects' practices that will be working on the site. The site could possibly be split even further than for the First Stage to allow for greater diversification. Following this Workshop, a procedure for the collaboration between the Investors, architects, landscape architects and local planners will be established. The landscape architects should take on a coordinating role for the open spaces. The first step will be for the Investors to set in motion a process of clarification, with the support of Prof. Fingerhuth. The architects' plans may have to be amended to fulfil planning requirements, investors' demands and technical norms. Local consultants will be appointed for the technical coordination of the project, modification of the zoning plan and obtaining the necessary planning permission to legally set up the workshop proposals for further phases of the planning process. The architects recommended at the end of today's Jury meeting will be asked to make the necessary amendments to their plans prior to the application for planning permission under coordination of the landscape architect, local planning consultant and the Investor.

Prof. Roger Riewe summarises that a minimum of four architects will be recommended to continue working on the Rivergarden project. Generally one architect will be chosen for each section of the site (Area A–D), with the possibility of further subdividing the plots between architects. One landscape architect will be recommended to draw up a masterplan for the entire workshop site.

One major aspect of the Jury's task is to fit the projects together to form one coherent yet varied proposal.

ASSESSMENT OF ENTRIES

The jurors are asked to deliver a brief critique of each scheme. At 10:00 pm the Appraisal Round commences.

1070 – Architekti Hrusa & Pelcak

It is the stated intention of the scheme to adhere to the proposals of the masterplan, and, as such, it was well worked through. The result is clear and conventional. The treatment of the facades reacts to the uses of the buildings. Whereas some members of the Jury consider this an asset, others voice the opinion that elevations are too calm, too clean and lack interest and sophistication. The scheme fails to create atmosphere.

The landscape proposal, with large areas of hoggin and some tree planting is hardly recognisable.

1071 – Feilden Clegg Bradley

Generally, the scheme was well presented and thorough in its execution. It deviates from the masterplan in response to the river landscape. Opening the site to the north adds great quality, a distinctive identity to the buildings and provides attractive entrance situations. The housing proposal is interesting and the office building generally well resolved. The step down to three storeys and the projections on the rear elevation of the office/retail building are controversially discussed. The division of the long office building facade into two individual buildings with different volumes and facades is seen positively. The communal spaces in the residential building are too large and may be inefficient. The height of the north-western building is at conflict with neighbouring buildings. Daylighting has been well resolved. The quality of views through gaps in the residential blocks is questionable.

The landscape proposal is over-designed with too many different features located in an area which should primarily unite and draw together diverse architectural schemes. The follies along the axis do not add to the beauty of the scheme. However, the proposal of a main square to the west around the existing buildings is considered appropriate.

1072 – EM2N-Architekten

The stepping down in scale of the studio flats in the north provides an interesting composition. The scheme shows the right degree of control. It attempts to integrate architecture and external spaces. The narrow and deep layouts of the flats are well designed with flexible room layouts and make for an interesting mix. The north-south provides gives sufficient amounts of daylight and takes advantage of the views to the river. The office building is not suitable for the purposes of the Investor; it is too neutral and lacking identity. The landscape proposal provides structure and order to the open space. A hierarchy of circulation routes is established, paved spaces clearly defined and the existing buildings well integrated.

1073 – Studio A

The approach of closing off the central axis of the site but letting the open space percolate through is interesting; the intended transparency, however, has not been achieved. The housing layout is attractive and busy, offering terraces with views to the river. The viability of some of the room depths is questionable. The north-west corner building is problematic. The break between the commercial and residential development has not been satisfactorily resolved. The south-west corner does not require an eye catcher; this part of the scheme is considered inappropriate. The landscape proposal appears indistinctive. It has a clear directional bias, but no other features.

1074 – David Chipperfield Architects

The permeability of the central open space through the gaps between proposed residential towers works well. The scheme provides a clear solution which could make a positive contribution to the masterplan. Some doubt is expressed about the tight spaces between the blocks. The corner situation in the north-west has not been resolved; the building would have insufficient supply of natural daylight. The facades are clear and simple. The opening of the blocks in the south is not needed, whereas the gap to the north-east contributes to the permeability of the scheme.

The landscape proposal does not appear to be of the same scale as the architecture. The pattern-like landscape represents a disconnection between architecture and open space. It is not urban and fails to respond to the site and to the proposed architecture as well as the existing

buildings. The continuous water feature could be an interesting feature, but its design has not been formalised.

1075 – Baumschlager Eberle

The proposal has remained true to the masterplan intention in creating strong, simple building volumes which are urban and strict in character with a compact and solid facade. The proposal does not show sufficient detail for the central site and the suggested uniformity may result in monotony. The east-west orientation of the plan and the minimised staircases of two per residential unit are a surprising solution and controversial in terms of efficiency. Some of the layouts of flats are unconventional for the Czech market. However, the typology generally seems to have been worked through in terms of flexibility and provides a sophisticated system offering numerous possibilities. The stairwells do not receive daylight. In the central part of the site access from underground car parks to flats remains unsolved.

The landscape proposal attempts to unify the space using a band of gravel and grass across the entire public space. Tree planting is proposed in private areas and along the main road and the river. The proposal has not been developed further from the more superficial level of the first stage of the workshop.

1076 – Fink & Jocher

The scheme has been thoroughly worked through. It provides extremely flexible flat sizes on a flexible grid. The layouts of both offices and housing are adaptable and offer good design solutions. Possible monotony and monumentality of the design were controversially discussed amongst the Jury members. The potentially monumental character of the elevations is alleviated by the sculptured appearance.

The landscape pattern representing a transitional zone between the river landscape and the urban area to the south is expressed in alternating intensities of hard and soft surface treatment. Although the proposal shows an interesting approach, it is doubtful whether the intended fluidity would transpose to detail level.

1077 – Kees Christiaanse / KCAP

The proposal takes centre stage in the masterplan and does not tie in with the adjacent block structure. It provides a pathway across the masterplan site and opens to the north. Overlapping buildings create interesting breaks to the north, but along the main road in the south the system fails to work as the structures seem to compete. The distances between buildings in the north could provide a problem. The Jury recognises the strong identity of the proposal as an asset but considers it inappropriate in this particular setting. The layouts of flats are schematic and unconvincing.

No landscape plan for the overall site was submitted. The submission is reminiscent of a bridge between two areas and negates the east west aspect of the site. Tree planting shown on underground car parking is not realistic.

1078 – 4a Architekti

The playful interpretation of the masterplan blends well into the adjacent sites. The juxtaposition of housing and offices is interesting with corresponding but different facades. Diagonal staircases across the robust structure provide a contrasting feature. However, the access to flats does not meet the quality standards expected by the Investor. The innovative design of the administrative building elevation reflects a modern approach to new offices. The overall building volume of the proposal does not meet requirements. The pathway across the area and gaps

through buildings has not been sufficiently resolved and may reduce the quality of the semi-private open spaces in the north-western part of the site.

No landscape proposal for the masterplan area was submitted.

1079 – ADNS Architekti

The proposal seems uninspired. The combination of housing and offices in the south-east corner has not been resolved. The flexibility of the residential typology seems to work and the specific layouts are well designed. The office building elevations do not reflect the different situations of facing courtyard or noisy street.

The landscape proposal is entirely schematic, sectioning the site into functional units. The road along the central open space represents a traditional suburban approach which is not an appropriate response to the workshop brief. It divides the central space and thereby destroys the special feature of the masterplan design. The scheme does not link into the river landscape to the north.

1080 – Stephenson Bell

The proposal tries to create diversity by adding different elements. The central corridor layout in the northern block is a misinterpretation of the brief. Good views from the flats to the river in the north would not compensate for their north-facing orientation. These flats would be difficult to sell. Parking in three levels is not feasible and the efficiency of the office building is too low.

The landscape scheme is interesting in providing unity while creating diversity. It responds to the idea of river gardens by connecting a unified space across the site which breaks down in scale to allow diversification. Mounding above underground car parks allows tree planting on the site. The hierarchy of spaces and the linear tree planting are controversially discussed.

1081 – Meili, Peter Architekten

The proposal remains true to the masterplan scheme of the first stage and its sculptured volumes are successful, also at this scale. The position of the proposed tower is interesting as it is not associated with the town but is oriented towards the river landscape. Breaking up the building blocks is well handled, creates a distinctive residential address and also alleviates possible shading of residential facades. The resultant interesting building shapes are worked into excellent floor plans of flats. However, the layout of residential blocks with access points via central cores is problematic. Also north-facing flats are not desirable. The green facade is considered a superfluous addition to the building elevation.

The landscape proposal is a coherent treatment of different landscape layers. It benefits from the distinct spaces and additional north-south openings bring the landscape into the site. The formal approach to the central space and the rationality of the simplified shapes are controversially discussed.

The First Appraisal Round ends at 1:05 pm.

After breaking for lunch, the Jury reconvenes at 1:40 pm to discuss its recommendations to the Investors.

At 2:15 pm, the Jury comes to an unanimous conclusion on the architectural design of the site (see Recommendations by the Jury).

The Jury then discusses aspects of the landscape masterplan for the overall site and decides to further consider proposals by the practices Vogt Landschaftsarchitekten AG, Zürich, Terra Nova Landschaftsarchitektur, Munich and Schweingruber Zulauf Landschaftsarchitekten BSLA, Zürich.

At 2:30 pm a two-tier vote is held with the following results:

Terra Nova	For 0	Against 11
Schweingruber Zulauf	For 11	Against 0
Vogt	For 4	Against 7
Zulauf Seippel Schweingruber	For 7	Against 4

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE JURY

The Jury unanimously recommends that the Investors appoint the following architects for further work on the sites, or parts of sites:

Site A (west)

Offices in south: Feilden Clegg Bradley
Residential in north: EM2N Architekten

Site B (centre)

East of access road: Baumschlager Eberle
West of access road: David Chipperfield Architects

Site C (middle section)

Residential to north of open space: Fink + Jocher
Residential to south of open space and offices: 4a Architekti

Site D (east)

Eastern site: Meili, Peter Architekten

The Jury recommends that the landscape architects Schweingruber Zulauf Landschaftsarchitekten BSLA, Zürich, Switzerland, be appointed for the design of a landscape masterplan.

Further recommendations:

Site A (west)

Office block by Feilden Clegg Bradley: The north elevation, the step in the building and the continuous cornice height on the western elevation in the south-west corner of the site were discussed controversially. The Jury's recommendation to the Investors is to re-examine these aspects of the design.

General: The length of the office building and the design of the front elevation should be re-examined in terms of appropriate sections and ownership boundaries.

Residential building by EM2N Architekten: The availability of roof terraces should be looked at.

Site B (centre)

Residential building by David Chipperfield Architects: The north-west corner of the proposal should be modified with a view to daylight in the flats.

Site C (middle section)

Residential block by Fink + Jocher: The building should be made compatible with the design on the adjacent site (4a Architekti). The material of facades should be reconsidered and the daylight study should be verified.

Residential building by 4a Architekti: The access to flats (stairs) should be re-examined. The daylight studies should be verified with a view to local planning requirements.

Site D (east)

Meili, Peter Architekten: The floor plan of the residential buildings should be amended regarding north-facing flats and daylight availability. The underground parking layout should be redesigned in accordance with the overall parking scheme.

General

It is recommended that the local planning consultants coordinate the design the layout of the underground car parks for the entire masterplan area.

Mr. Drost thanks the members of the Jury and experts for an interesting discussion and the concentrated effort.

Mr. Brun and Mr. Borenstein, on behalf of the Real Estate Karlin Group, extend their thanks for the dedicated contributions of all involved. Dr. Hejkal thanks the Jury for their constructive advice to CSAD and the City of Prague.

The Chairman approves the preliminary assessment report and offers his thanks for the thorough preparation of the meeting. He thanks the promoter and the Jury for productive cooperation.

The meeting closes at 3:05 pm.

The minutes of the meeting are agreed by the Chairman of the Jury.

10.02.2006

D&K projektentwicklungsmanagement, Hamburg

Attachment: Signatures of the Jury