

**Report of Jury Evaluation Meeting  
of International Public Combined Urban  
Competition for Revitalization  
of Černá louka (Black Meadow)  
Area in Ostrava**

Date and Place of Meeting:	16-18 June 2010, Černá louka Exhibition Ground, Ostrava, Pavilion A, Congress Hall NA3
Dependent Full Members of the Jury:	Ing. arch. Adam Gebrian, prof. Ing. Vítězslav Kuta, CSc., Mgr. Lubomír Pospíšil, Ing. arch. Jan Sedlák, Ing. arch. Cyril Vltavský
Independent Full Members of the Jury:	Ing. arch. Vlastimil Bichler, Ing. arch. Ivo Koukol, Ing. arch. Josef Pleskot, Mgr. Cyril Říha, Ph.D., Ing. arch. Ján Stempel, doc. Akad. arch. Imrich Vaško
Absent Substitutes of the Jury:	Ing. Dalibor Madej, Ing. arch. Monika Mitášová
Excused:	Ing. Petr Kajnar, Ing. Zdeněk Trejbal, Ing. arch. Zdeněk Fránek
Competition Secretary:	PhDr. Allan Gintel, CSc. (Společnost Petra Parlěře)
Invited:	Ing. Petra Lednická (Společnost Petra Parlěře)

## Ostrava, this 16 June 2010 – 1st day of evaluation

1. On 16 June 2010 the following members were excused from the Jury meeting: PhDr. Allan Gintel, CSc., substituted upon his decision and mutual agreement between the Jury Secretary and Chairman for the purpose of the Report drafting by Ing. Petra Lednická; Ing. arch. Zdeněk Fránek substituted by Ing. arch. Ján Stempel; Ing. Petr Kajnar substituted by prof. Ing. Vítězslav Kuta, CSc. and Ing. Zdeněk Trejbal, Ph.D., substituted by Ing. arch. Jan Sedlák.  
Ing. Jiří Hudec (competition coordinator representing Ostrava municipality) had been present from 2 p.m. till 3.15 p.m.  
PhDr. Allan Gintel, CSc., the Competition Secretary, had been present from 7 p.m.
2. The evaluation meeting of the Jury was opened at 11 a.m. All members of the Jury (11) were present as well as the invited person (1) (see Annex No. 1 - Attendance List as of 16 June 2010).
3. Ing. Petra Lednická, being invited so by Ing. arch. Josef Pleskot, the Jury Chairman, introduced all members of the Jury to the Report of the Competition Proposals Registration and Submission:  
By 31 May 2010 the competition has registered **210** competitors, of which **188** Czech and Slovak, **22** from abroad, of which **5** invited studios.  
Pursuant to subsection 12.4. of the competition terms and conditions the office of Společnost Petra Parlěře, o.p.s. received **66** competition proposals. **4** competition proposals Nos. 67, 68, 69 and 70 were received after the determined deadline.  
  
Ing. Petra Lednická had read the Report on Check of Binding Requirements of the Competition Proposals' Form written by Ing. Jiří Kubát, the competition proposals reviewer (see Annex No. 2 – Reviewer's Protocol on the Competition Proposals Binding Requirements Check), from which following facts had resulted:  
**52** competitions proposals were correct from the formal as well as content point of view.  
With **18** competition proposals the reviewer registered minor or more significant defects which he submitted to the Jury for decision.
4. Proposals Nos. 1, 7, 18, 22, 31, 34, 35, 36, 47, 48, 64 and 65 (altogether **12**) showed formal defects contradicting the terms of the competition. The Competition Code of the Czech Chamber of Architects defines those as fractional formal defects which the Jury in its voting: **10** votes for / **0** vote against/ **1** vote abstained decided to keep in the competition for further thorough evaluation.
5. Competition proposals Nos. 27, 59, 67, 68, 69 and 70 (altogether **6**) showed the elements of breach of the competition terms and conditions and the Jury by its voting: **9** votes for / 0 vote against / 2 votes abstained decided to exclude those proposals from regular evaluation in the competition.
6. One juror commented on competition proposal No. 35, which in the reviewer's opinion showed formal defects and according to the Competition Code of the Czech Chamber of Architects did not fall into the minor defect category.

The Jury voted on accepting the competition proposal No. 35 for evaluation.

**5** jurors voted FOR the proposal.

Since the voting majority of 4/5 had not been fulfilled, the proposal had not been accepted for further evaluation in the competition.

7. The total number of proposals excluded from the competition rose to **7** (proposals Nos. 27, 35, 59, 67, 68, 69 a 70).
8. Individual analyses of the competition proposals followed.
9. The Jury then evaluated jointly all competition proposals.
10. Following that the Jury voted and, for the purpose of maintaining maximum fairness and equality of conditions, unanimously decided that after each round of vote any juror may request revocation thereof if properly reasoned. Upon such request the Jury should have repeated its vote about the proposal.
11. The Jury approached to the first voting round in which at least one vote FOR any of the proposals means such proposal proceeding in the following round of the competition.

PROPOSAL No.	NUMBER OF VOTES	PROCEEDED TO FOLLOWING ROUND
1	3	YES
2	2	YES
3	0	NO
4	0	NO
5	0	NO
6	0	NO
7	2	YES
8	6	YES
9	0	NO
10	0	NO
11	0	NO
12	0	NO
13	0	NO
14	0	NO
15	3	YES
16	3	YES
17	2	YES
18	0	NO
19	0	NO
20	0	NO
21	1	YES
22	2	YES
23	0	NO
24	8	YES
25	5	YES
26	0	NO
28	4	YES
29	3	YES
30	0	NO
31	2	YES
32	0	NO
33	2	YES

PROPOSAL No.	NUMBER OF VOTES	PROCEEDED TO FOLLOWING ROUND
34	2	YES
36	7	YES
37	0	NO
38	0	NO
39	0	NO
40	0	NO
41	1	YES
42	2	YES
43	0	NO
44	0	NO
45	5	YES
46	4	YES
47	0	NO
48	0	NO
49	4	YES
50	0	NO
51	0	NO
52	0	NO
53	1	YES
54	0	NO
55	3	YES
56	0	NO
57	2	YES
58	5	YES
60	0	NO
61	2	YES
62	0	NO
63	2	YES
64	3	YES
65	0	NO
66	3	YES

12. **30** proposals had proceeded to the following competition round.  
 13. Revocation of proposal No. 30. The Jury voted for revocation unanimously with 11 votes.

Proposal No. 30 had got **3** votes for its proceeding into the following round.

14. Therefore **31** proposals had proceeded into the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of the competition.  
 15. The selected proposals had been discussed extensively and the Jury had approached to the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of voting in which to proceed to the following round of the competition required majority of votes.

PROPOSAL No.	NOT TO PROCEED / PROCEED / ABSTAINED	PROCEED
1	11/0/0	NO
2	9/1/1	NO
7	8/2/1	NO
8	0/7/4	YES
15	8/3/0	NO
16	10/1/0	NO
17	11/0/0	NO
21	10/1/0	NO
22	4/6/1	YES
24	2/9/0	YES
25	4/6/1	YES
28	8/3/0	NO
29	11/0/0	NO
30	6/5/0	NO
31	8/1/2	NO
33	9/1/1	NO
34	8/2/1	NO
36	4/6/1	YES
41	8/3/0	NO
42	8/2/1	NO
45	6/3/2	NO
46	8/1/2	NO
49	5/5/1	NO
53	10/1/0	NO
55	7/1/3	NO
57	11/0/0	NO
58	9/2/0	NO
61	9/0/2	NO
63	10/1/0	NO
64	7/3/1	NO
66	10/0/1	NO

16. After the 2<sup>nd</sup> round there remained **5** proposals in the competition.
17. The Jury had not closed the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of voting for the purpose of possible revocation of the results on the following day of evaluation.
18. The meeting was closed on 10.20 p.m.

### **Ostrava, 17 June 2010 – 2<sup>nd</sup> day of evaluation**

1. The evaluation meeting of the Jury was opened at 9 a.m. All members of the Jury (11) were present, as well as the Competition Secretary (1) and the invited person (1) (see Annex No. 1 – Attendance List as of 17 June 2010).
2. The Jury Chairman had invited the jurors to assess individually or in groups the proposal that failed to proceed into the 2<sup>nd</sup> round.
3. The Jury recommended revocation of **6** proposals (Nos. 41, 45, 49, 55, 57 a 64) and approved such revocation unanimously.
4. The Jury voted about which individual proposals should have been returned into the evaluation process.

<b>PROPOSAL No.</b>	<b>FOR/AGAINST/ABSTAINED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
41	2/7/2	NO
45	6/4/1	YES
49	6/3/2	YES
55	7/3/1	YES
57	1/10/0	NO
64	3/7/1	NO

5. **3** proposals were returned into the evaluation process after revocation.
6. The Jury claimed that altogether **8** competition proposals Nos. 8, 22, 24, 25, 36, 45, 49 and 55 had proceeded into the following competition round.
7. The Jurors evaluated all **8** competition proposals in extensive discussion.
8. Following that the jurors had drafted detailed preliminary evaluations of the competition proposals.
9. The meeting was closed at 11 p.m.

### **Ostrava, 18 June 2010 – 3<sup>rd</sup> day of evaluation**

1. The Jury meeting was opened at 8.30 a.m. The meeting was attended by all jurors (11), the Competition Secretary (1) and the invited person (1). From 10 p.m. Mgr. Jiří Hudec, an invited guest, had also attended the meeting (see Annex No. 1 – Attendance List as of 18 June 2010)

2. The Jury unanimously agreed that prizes should have been awarded to competition proposals Nos. 8, 24 a 49. In the following vote the prizes were distributed as follows:

**1<sup>st</sup> place** – proposal No. **24**                      ratio of votes:                      **9 for/2 against/0 abstained**

**2<sup>nd</sup> place** – proposal No. **49**                      ratio of votes:                      **7 for/4 against/0 abstained**

**3<sup>rd</sup> place** – proposal No. **8**                      ratio of votes:                      **7 for/4 against/0 abstained**

3. Following that the Jury, in accordance with Section 10 subs. 7 of the Competition Code of the Czech Chamber of Architects, assessed the competition proposals excluded from the competition – whether these include any proposals with especially remarkable features which the Jury may, upon its decision passed with two-thirds majority of regular votes, appraise with a special prize. The Jury unanimously agreed that there were no such proposals.

4. Next the Jury voted about prize awarding. The Jury also decided under Section 10 subs. 8 of the Competition Code of the Czech Chamber of Architects to redistribute the amount of prize money determined in the competition terms and conditions in order to better reflect the voting results for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> place were rather. The Jury in its vote **9 for/2 against/0 abstained** decided as follows:

1<sup>st</sup> Prize:                      **CZK 900,000**

2<sup>nd</sup> Prize:                      **CZK 500,000**

3<sup>rd</sup> Prize:                      **CZK 400,000**

5. The Jury also decided to grant a **special appraisal** in amount of CZK 125,000 and divide the prize money equally between 2 competition proposals. This decision was passed by the Jury with **10** votes for/ **0** vote against/ **1** vote abstained.

Proposal No. **25** – **CZK 62,500**

Proposal No. **45** – **CZK 62,500**

6. The Jury heard a memorandum which was after a short discussion and minor amendments of its wording unanimously passed (see Annex No. 3 – Jury's Memorandum).
7. The Jury had read the final evaluation of the awarded proposals (proposals Nos. 24, 49, 8), winners of the special appraisal (proposals Nos. 25, 45) and proposals that proceeded to the final round of the competition (proposals Nos. 22, 36, 55).
8. The Jury then opened the envelopes with authors.

The 1<sup>st</sup> Prize won the proposal No. **24** submitted **Maxwan Architects + Urbanists** (the Netherlands), Rients Dijkstra, Hiroki Matsuura, Jason Hilgefert, Artur Borejszo, Nobuki Ogasahara, Anna Borzyszkowska.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Prize won the proposal No. **49** submitted by **SIAL architekti a inženýři s.r.o.**, (Czech Republic), Ing. arch. Jiří Buček, Jiří Chmelík, Ing. arch. Jan Kadlas, Ing. arch. Pavel Šťastný.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> Prize won the proposal No. **8**, submitted by designers' team (Slovak Republic) of Peter Stec, Brian Tabolt, James Lowder and Peter Stec Sr.

Special appraisal was awarded to the proposal No. **25** submitted by **NL Architects** (the Netherlands), Pieter Bannenberg, Walter Van Dijk, Kamiel Klaasse, Gen Yamamoto, Barbara Luns, Qili Yang, Liping Lin, Katharina Riedel, Lorena Valero Minano, Ines Quinteiro Antolin.

Special appraisal was awarded to the proposal No. **45** submitted by designers' team (Czech Republic): Ing. arch. Josef Kiszka, Marcin Jojko, Bartłomiej Nawrocki, Krzysztof Czech, Grzegorz Ostrowski.

9. The Jury's meeting was closed by signature of the Report (see Annex No. 5) at 12.30 p.m.

Ostrava, this 18 June 2010

**Ing. arch. Josef Pleskot**  
**Jury Chairman**

Recorded by: Ing. Petra Lednická

Certified correct by: PhDr. Allan Gintel, CSc., Competition Secretary

Annexes:

1. Attendance List of 16 June 2010, 17 June 2010 and 18 June 2010
2. Reviewer's Report on Check of the Competition Proposals' Binding Requirements
3. Jury's Memorandum
4. Evaluation of Competition Proposals Nos. 24, 49, 8, 25, 45, 22, 36 a 55
5. Report Signature Page
6. List of All Evaluated Competition Proposals

**Public - Combined Urban Design  
Competition for Revitalization of the Černá louka („Black Meadow“) Area  
in Ostrava**

**R E P O R T**

On Check of the Competition Proposals' Binding Formal Requirements

1. The check had been undertaken on 10–11 June 2010 in the premises of „Ostravské výstavy a.s.“, conference hall NA 3.
2. The check had been performed by Ing. Jiří Kubát – „the Competition Proposals Reviewer“ (see subs. 1.5 of the Competition Terms and Conditions). Bc. Aleš Rotter and Bc. Petr Opěla, students of Technická univerzita (Technical University) in Ostrava had attended the check as the reviewer's assistants.
3. 70 proposals had been submitted for review. Our check was based on subsections 6.1., 6.2., 6.3., 6.4, 7.1., 7.2., 7.3. and 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions.
4. All submitted proposals had been unpacked, the binding requirements were checked and all proposals were numbered. Finally all proposals were packed back again and stamped over the seal in order to prevent any unpacking thereof in the period between the check and Jury meeting.
5. Our check had brought out the following defects contradicting the Competition Terms and Conditions:

**Proposal No. 1** – missed the designation “Author” on respective envelope.

**Proposal No. 7** – CD carrier in an unsealed envelope, without the distinguishing frame.

**Proposal No. 18** - CD carrier in an unsealed envelope.

**Proposal No. 22** – CD carrier in an unsealed envelope.

**Proposal No. 27** – the wrap showed the compiler (FOA – Foreign Office Architects), the panels showed the compiler (FOA) as well, the distinguishing frames on the panels were missing, the envelopes missed the designation “Author”, the text section and CD carrier missed the distinguishing frame.

**Proposal No. 31** – the distinguishing frame in the text part and CD carrier was missing, no “Author” on the envelope

**Proposal No. 34** – there were two unmarked envelopes – impossible to guess which contains the text part and which the “Author”. The only guide might be the schedules numbering.

**Proposal No. 35** – drawings are with no back and folded, the text part misses the distinguishing frame.



**Proposal No. 36** – frames on drawings were on black background, we used white stickers.

**Proposal No. 47** – CD carrier in an unsealed envelope.

**Proposal No. 48** – CD carrier in an unsealed envelope.

**Proposal No. 59** – the wider relations drawing in other than required scale, other drawings were missing or not with the required contents, reasoning was included in the text part.

**Proposal No. 64** – urban section was on the visualisation drawing, i.e. in other than required place.

**Proposal No. 65** – text part, CD carrier and the “Author” envelope without distinguishing frames.

**Proposal No. 67** – proposal delivered to the SPP office on 31 May 2010 at 12.20 p.m.; in the Czech Chamber of Architects office it was at 11.45 a.m. already.

**Proposal No. 68** – proposal delivered to the SPP office on 31 May 2010 at 1.25 p.m. The CD carrier was not included, delivered later. In the check the CD was added to the only proposal that missed it.

**Proposal No. 69** – proposal delivered to the SPP office on 1 June 2010.

**Proposal No. 70** – proposal delivered to the SPP office on 3 June 2010, but it had reached the Czech Chamber of Architects office on 27 May 2010 already. The proposal missed the text part, the CD carrier missed the inscription CD, the inscription “Author” was missing.

Altogether **18 competition proposals** showed minor or larger defects to be assessed by the Competition Jury.

6. No formal defects have been found with the following **52 competition proposals**:

Proposals Nos.: **2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66.**

7. All proposals have been deposited in the premises of Ostravské výstavy a.s., conference hall NA3. The keys have been deposited with Ing. Dan Tyleček, Assistant Manager of the said company.

Ostrava, this 11 June 2010

Ing. Jiří Kubát

Competition Proposals Reviewer

## Appendix No. 3 - Memorandum of the Jury

### Memorandum of the Jury

The competitive examination confirmed that Černá louka (Black Meadow) is not just a backup area for the extension of the Ostrava city historical center, but that it is the space into which it is worth to add more urban and architectural values, because in a short time it can become the social and cultural center of the whole of Ostrava.

In the past the Černá louka territory was an intensively used open land lying between the historic city and the Ostravice river. In the south part of this territory the important old Vítkovická Route cut through leading to one of the three city gates – the Vítkovická Gate. It has always been a territory attacked by the many influences and there have been a large number of suburban, historical and natural phenomena; cattle trade took place there and it was also a territory of safe leveling of the Ostravice river.

With the progressive industrialization of Ostrava, there began to appear hardly penetrable barriers. Černá louka became the dumping area with waste heaps and storages, in short, an industrial zone that for a long time separated the city from its river and countryside.

In recent decades the Černá louka barriers have been quite naturally disposed of. For some time part of it became a fenced area for exhibitions, shows and many other occasional activities.

Although Černá louka began to form again as a unique urban space within the rehabilitation of the city center image, many barriers still remained.

The unique importance of Černá louka within the whole city was what the participants of the "Ostrava – the 2015 European Capital of Culture" project bet on. They defined it as a potential cultural cluster and initiated an ideological urban competition the main tasks of which was to confirm its unthought-of uniqueness, to find the perfect way of opening it up to the whole city and its inhabitants, and to create a place with a specific atmosphere, which will demonstrate to Europe the spirit of the original city and of the whole region, of which it is a part.

The competitive proposals that could achieve the set values the most convincingly advanced to the final round of assessments. These were proposals which showed that all expectations can be met. They showed absolutely and undoubtedly that the Černá louka area can be completely transformed and for a long time become Ostrava's place of focused intense social power, which can safely place the most significant urban houses, such as a concert hall, exhibition halls and other.

The winning proposal also showed that it is possible to create a completely affable original urban landscape on Černá louka, or some contemporary park, which will become a magnet with the force to possibly unite the entire city.

The jury recommends that the city politicians recognize the quality of the winning proposal and allow its authors to influence the emergence of the regional urban study, which must consequently be developed by the city. Furthermore, we recommend to support, strengthen and develop the implementation of the proposal, and thus create the **"place for a happy life"** for the citizens of the city.

The results of the competition certainly vindicated the city representatives' decision to organize the competition within the unusually above standard parameters.

Appendix No. 4 - Evaluation of Proposals No. 24, 49, 8, 25, 45, 22, 36 and 55

## **Evaluation of Proposal No. 24**

The basic idea of the proposal is simple and clear: to change the "Black Meadow" to a "cultural meadow" - a new type of public space with new socio-cultural identity, which will be the place for various activities, which will be flanked by a "ring" of (not only) cultural buildings. The ring creates a transition zone between the historical center and the scenic character represented by the meadow and the river. The proposal places the individual buildings within the territory of the former exhibition area without entirely overbuilding it. Conversely, it dedicates a generous, open vacant space in its core area. This space will serve as the main center, the focus of cultural activities of Ostrava, not only in 2015.

The individual buildings are designed as solitaires, loosely dependent on each other, which are united by the lining promenade and the possible expansion of its activities from the interior to the exterior of the meadow. The proposal succeeds in easily integrating the existing buildings (Hall A, Hall G, the former market hall building) with the new ones. It finds a special place for a concert hall, which partly stands out of the ring and is more connected to the city, within close proximity of the two theaters.

The ideological core of the project is the reduced, but dramatically transformed meadow, newly sloping to the Ostrava river and urging for an intensive use. As one of the few the authors are working with the third dimension of the meadow. Via a gentle terrain profiling they succeed in dividing and hierarchizing the space. Even though the proposal partly anticipates the future form of the individual buildings, the proposed concept will work with whatever form these buildings take. Their concrete form will emerge from separate architectural competitions.

For us the greatest quality of the proposal is finding the appropriate level of a clearly defined character, and yet enough openness for future development and phasing. The gradual completion will only reinforce the concept, which is consistent with the definition of a successful masterplan.

## **Evaluation of Proposal No. 49**

The platform disconnected from the urban structure creates an open urban system, which allows, within the given limits, the gradual development with buildings of various functions and architectural expressions.

The concentration of materials and the wide variety of activities support their mutual overlap and interaction.

The author offers many phasing options, by quadrants or individual sites. The cultural forum development linking the existing central part of the city with the river and the castle creates by the given tight form the space for the newly created park between the southern edge of the city and the watercourse. The proposal offers a different perspective from the other valued proposals.

## **Evaluation of Proposal No. 8**

The authors named the project the "Wild Urbanism" and it is an experiment using public space for the interaction between different kinds of cultures represented by different users and different parallel activities. Discovering the unknown and the unpredictable, the confrontation of Ostrava and Europe. The machine for testing of different cultures.

A healthy natural forest as a principle of the uniqueness of the architectural design, structured into the natural surroundings, the glade and the forest as a meeting and convergence place.

A unique experiment with landscape and urbanism, an original solution with multiple interpretations of the landscape, the meadow, the black and Ostrava phenomenon, the non-hierarchized pavilion structure arrangement.

The unique and phenomenal territory and space. The proposal globally reveals and addresses the issues of the ecology of landscape and of the Ostrava region, the social and sociological issues, and creates the author architectural vocabulary of archetype, typology and cluster. The project is a lifestyle strategy.

From the beginning the jury positively perceived the uniqueness and poetics of the solution, and later the jury discussed the positive interpretations of a "happy life".

## **Evaluation of Proposal No. 25**

It is based on feeling the strong potential of the existing green and of the river phenomenon. According to its own terms it offers the concept of an "urban park", consisting of nearly 30 architectural objects in a freely-designed park green that are spread regularly. In pursuit of the maximum connection with the river area, it transfers the existing coastal road to the interface area of the existing block development of the center and Černá louka itself. It finishes the disturbed development in a coordinated manner and thus creates a clear urban interface with a specific potential. The parterre area of the park is designed as a playground for every generation. It presents a catalogue of architectural forms of the different functional types of the buildings, deliberately not seeking the unity of expression, but rather the maximum diversity of forms. The coordination is seen in their volume similarities and the regular spreading across the territory. Clustering is forbidden. But that is also a problem because the building programs of the individual buildings are very different.

## **Evaluation of Proposal No. 45**

The jury appreciated the clear concept based on respect for the specific character of Černá louka as a place with a special combination of natural conditions on the one hand, and social and city-formative functions on the other.

The persuasive proposal of the two layers was evaluated positively. The base layer of landscape shaped meadow dominates; it is an area with low vegetation without formal structures and adapted for free movement. On it, without any solid anchor, there is a

layer of a minimum number of objects with the mandatory functions, which are only very loosely connected to each other in contrast to the organized and strictly shaped buildings of the adjacent town.

This composition allows to create at a relatively large distance the desired contact between the city block development and the river. At the same time it offers an extremely flexible space for a variety of social, cultural and leisure activities practically in the center of the city and thereby promotes an environment of natural qualities to a socially valuable space.

Perhaps the crucial aspect of the proposal, however, is the accentuation of the context. In it Černá louka becomes just one of the links in the multi-kilometer green belt along the Ostravice river, however, it is a single link, in which the natural environment blends with the cultural layer. Thus the place spontaneously becomes a natural focus of the large area.

The jury appreciated the surprisingly simple plan to achieve a positive outcome and also stated that the proposal is realistic, economically acceptable and fully corresponds to the assessment according to the competition criteria.

## **Evaluation of Proposal No. 22**

This is a proposal that is conceptually beyond the traditional approach to urban structure of the central part of the city. The proposal offers an alternative view of how to spatially link the river, as an important natural element, the Černá louka area and the city center. The main idea, inspired in its organic shape by shot through shattered glass, accentuates the confluence of the Ostravice and Lučina rivers and the beach located near it as the central theme, into which pedestrian routes or public spaces are concentrated.

This theme is accentuated by the system of irregularly spaced buildings, including the buildings mandatorily required by the competition rules. The proposed urban structure is fully subordinated to this idea, even at the price that it does not connect to the existing structure of the historic part of the city, to which it adheres closely. Surely we can discuss the possibilities of phasing of the construction, the sensitivity of solutions to the historic track of the city center, or the preservation of Černá louka identity as such. Certainly we can call into question the possibility of the gradual realization of this idea through subsequently awarded architectural competitions for various architectural teams, and the ability to maintain the original idea. However, the solution was so different from the other approaches that it has undoubtedly rightly compelled the advancement into the third round of assessment.

## **Evaluation of Proposal No. 36**

The idea behind this competition proposal is to create vivid urban structures protruding from the existing layout of the city center, which mingle with the enclaves of greenery projecting from the area of the present Černá louka park. The urban structures include the desired cultural amenities complemented by residential houses. The lay-out of the amenities in defined spatial units is in principle possible. However, its spatial expression

and architectural design is adverse. The concentration into monstrous clusters evokes an impression of a supermarket or a factory. The scale of these structures in the given space is almost unacceptable. An important phenomenon, with which the proposers work, is greenery. The powerful enclave of it projecting up to the historic square is an interesting compositional principle. Another, less powerful beam envelops the tram route and isolates it from the surrounding buildings. The ground plan of the central unit of greenery itself that is adjacent to the river is not interesting and does not reflect the current park. The lesser creativity of the concept and its spatial and functional design disqualify the proposal from the category of solutions suitable for awards or rewards. The ability to serve the idea of the 2015 European Capital of Culture project is small. The visual processing of the whole report is excellent.

## **Evaluation of Proposal No. 55**

The main concept of the proposal lies in the explicit, albeit questionable decision to make a sharp border between the full and the empty in the city, i.e. between the buildings near the historic city center and the meadow at the confluence of the Ostravice and Lučina rivers. The project thus removes the transition zone of the current exhibition area, where the municipal buildings are loosely located in the greenery. In about the middle of its space there is a new dividing line, the "Luční" road, which is flanked on one side by a clearly defined urban structure, and on the other side by a unitary meadow environment. The Exhibition Hall A building and the newly completed blocks of Waldorf Schools, resorts and hotels form the urban boundary. On the contrary, the meadow area is vague, left for a variety of recreational activities. The existing coastal road is moved, thereby removing the barrier separating the meadow from the river. There is a beach planned on its bank. The crossing to the other bank is facilitated by three new foot bridges. The linking of the full and the empty space is concentrated in the place where the fourth major historic entrance to the city used to be. It is realized through a new object of a cultural cluster, a "finger" directed from the city center (the extension of blocks designated by the Muzejní and Dlouhá streets) to the river, which combines the functions of an urban gallery and a concert hall and is finished by the visually dominant object of the contemporary music center. The concentrated cultural function is inside the "pier" properly combined with the commercial use of the parterre. Thus in detail, the project removes barriers, however, through its total urban schedule also creates them.

## Appendix No. 6 – List of All Evaluated Competition Proposals

- Proposal No. 1** Ing. arch. István Kiss, Szeged, Maďarsko  
Ing. Eva Kissné Gárgyán, Szeged, Maďarsko
- Proposal No. 2** FUGO Architects, Ing. arch. Jakub Krčmář, Praha  
Ing. arch. Martina Šotkovská, Praha
- Proposal No. 3** Ing. arch. Tomáš Tornyos, Bánská Bystrica  
Ing. arch. Kristian Szabó, Rimavská Sobota
- Proposal No. 4** Atelier 38, s.r.o., Ostrava, kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Jan Zelinka
- Proposal No. 5** Ing. arch. Dušan Rosypal, Ostrava  
Ing. Václav Šimek, Hodslavice  
Bc. Jan Šebesta, Frýdek – Místek  
Zbigniew Sikora, Orlová
- Proposal No. 6** Ing. Daniel Matějka, Ostrava  
Ing. Lukáš Lattenberg, Vlkoš  
Ing. Hana Zemanová, Kolín
- Proposal No. 7** Ing. arch. Zbyněk Ryška, Praha  
Ing. arch. Petr Baletka, Praha
- Proposal No. 8** Peter Stec, Bratislava  
Brian Tabolt, Buffalo, USA  
James Lowder, Buffalo, USA  
Peter Stec sr., Bratislava
- Proposal No. 9** Jan Gadziala, Brno  
Tomáš Růžička, Brno  
Milan Šuška, Brno  
Jan Vrbka, Brno
- Proposal No. 10** Bc. Olga Sobolová, Brno  
Bc. Lukáš Moštěk, Brno  
Bc. Tomáš Págo, Brno
- Proposal No. 11** Ladislav Němec, Ostrava  
Petr Lichnovský, Ostrava
- Proposal No. 12** Arch. Design, s.r.o., Brno, kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Radoslav Novotný
- Proposal No. 13** Ing. arch. Tomáš Beránek, Prostějov  
Ing. arch. Martina Kodetová, Golčův Jeníkov
- Proposal No. 14** Ing. arch. Jan Sedlický, Praha  
Ing. Tomáš J. Sucharov, Praha
- Proposal No. 15** Ing. arch. Petr M. Hájek, Praha

Ing. arch. Gabriela Minářová, Praha  
Ing. arch. Adéla Píbrová, České Budějovice

- Proposal No. 16** CUBOID ARCHITEKTI, s.r.o., Praha,  
kontaktní osoba Ing. arch. Milan Vít
- Proposal No. 17** Ing. arch. Katarina Ciglanová, Bratislava  
Ing. arch. Rastislav Straňák, Bratislava  
Ing. Marián Lauko, Bratislava
- Proposal No. 18** CPP Architekture ZT KG, FELLERER VENDL ARCHITEKTEN, Vídeň,  
Rakousko, kontaktní osoba: Eva Česka
- Proposal No. 19** Kokes partners, s.r.o., Praha, kontaktní osoba: MgA. Přemysl Kokeš
- Proposal No. 20** FUGO architects, Ing. arch. Michal Šotkovský, Ostrava  
Ing. arch. Petr Strojný, Opava
- Proposal No. 21** MOBA studio, s.r.o., Praha, kontaktní osoba: Yvette Vašourková
- Proposal No. 22** Mgr.A. Jiří Jindřich, Praha  
Mgr.A. Ondřej Kubík, Praha  
Mgr.A. Leona Matějková, Praha
- Proposal No. 23** Michal Krištof, Kláštor pod Znievom  
Matej Štrba, Tatranská Lomnica  
Petr Kundrát, Frýdek - Místek
- Proposal No. 24** MAXWAN Architects + Urbanists, Rotterdam, Nizozemí,  
kontaktní osoba: Riens Dijkstra
- Proposal No. 25** NL Architects, Amsterdam, Nizozemí,  
kontaktní osoba: Kamiel Klaasse
- Proposal No. 26** Josef Havlíček, Ostrava  
Tomáš Havlíček, Brno  
Jan Havlíček, Ostrava
- Proposal No. 27** Foreign Office Architects, Londýn, U.K.,  
kontaktní osoba: Manuel Tavora
- Proposal No. 28** MgA. Ing. Adam Kukela, Praha
- Proposal No. 29** Jakub Kopec, Dolní Lhota  
Jaroslav Sedlák, Brno  
Jiří Vítek, Žďár nad Sázavou  
Jan Weiss, Jeseník  
Petr Hurník, Brno
- Proposal No. 30** Bc. Lukáš Brus, Kopřivnice  
Ing. arch. Jiří Huške, Kopřivnice
- Proposal No. 31** Anne Lacaton & Jean Philippe Vassal Architectes, Paříž, Francie



- Proposal No. 32** Olga Skaba, Architect, Dipl. Ing., Berlin  
Verena Kyrein-Meixner, Architect, MSc., Dipl. Ing., Berlin
- Proposal No. 33** Ing. arch. Jozef Seman, Praha
- Proposal No. 34** Mixage, s.r.o, Pardubice, kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Ondřej Teplý
- Proposal No. 35** Nadine Buslaeva, architect, Berlín, Německo  
Andrey Buslaev, architekt, Rusko  
Nikita Tyukov, Rusko
- Proposal No. 36** ASGK Design, s.r.o., Praha  
Grido, architektura a design, s.r.o., Černošice u Prahy
- Proposal No. 37** autorský kolektiv: prof. Ing. arch. Ivan Ruller, Brno  
Ing. arch. Miroslav Korbička, Brno  
Ing. Vlastislav Novák, CSc., Brno  
prof. Ing. Ivor Otruba, CSc., Brno  
Vít Musil, Brno
- Proposal No. 38** FANDAMENT, s.r.o., Brno  
kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Pavel Zacharov
- Proposal No. 39** IKP Praha, s.r.o., Praha, Ing. arch. Petr Tichota
- Proposal No. 40** CASUA, s.r.o., Praha, kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Oleg Haman
- Proposal No. 41** Ing. arch. Martin Jančok, Bratislava  
Ing. arch. Lukáš Kordík, Bratislava  
Ing. arch. Štefan Polakovič, Bratislava
- Proposal No. 42** Bc. Ondřej Chybík, Modřice  
Ing. arch. Martin Zamazal, Pravice
- Proposal No. 43** Adam Rujbr Architects, s.r.o, Brno,  
kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Adam Rujbr
- Proposal No. 44** Ing. arch. Jan Vojtíšek, Brno  
Ing. Jakub Staník, Brno
- Proposal No. 45** Josef Kiszka, Havířov  
Marcin Jojko, Bartłomiej Nawrocki, Krzysztof Czech,  
Grzegorz Ostrowski
- Proposal No. 46** Martin Daněk, Oldřišov  
Bc. Martin Doležel, Boskovice  
Ing. arch. Jan Foretník, Veverská Bitýška  
Bc. Andrea Honejsková, Praha  
Ing. arch. Bc.A. Barbora Ponešová, Ph.D., Brno  
Klára Stachová, Křelov
- Proposal No. 47** Compass, s.r.o., Bratislava,  
kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Juraj Benetin

- Proposal No. 48** Bc. Daniel Baudis, Praha  
Bc. Jakub Adamec, Liberec
- Proposal No. 49** SIAL architekti a inženýři, s.r.o., Liberec,  
kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Jiří Buček
- Proposal No. 50** MBM architekti, Praha, kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Petr Bouřil
- Proposal No. 51** Ing. arch. Lenka Leššová, Vyškov  
Ing. arch. Petra Hlaváčková, Praha  
Ing. arch. Martin Heil, Litoměřice  
Ing. arch. Ondřej Tichý, Praha
- Proposal No. 52** Ing. arch. Ivan Matys, Sv. Jur, Slovensko
- Proposal No. 53** D3A, s.r.o., Praha, kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Jaroslav Zima
- Proposal No. 54** Branislav Ivan, Košice  
Miloslav Kováč, Košice  
Peter Serfözö, Košice
- Proposal No. 55** Projektíl architekti, s.r.o., Praha
- Proposal No. 56** Ing. arch. Petr Čáslava, atelier VIZAGE s.r.o., Brno  
Ing. arch. Martin Klenovský, Brno  
Ing. arch. Tomáš Pína, Praha
- Proposal No. 57** MS architektura a design, s.r.o., Ostrava,  
kontaktní osoba: Akad. arch. Pavel Hřebecký
- Proposal No. 58** Bc. Jiří Šerek, Brno  
Bc. Kateřina Špidlová, Ostrava  
Bc. Hana Šrajerová, Opava  
Bc. Jiří Štásta, Brno  
Bc. Václav Zvěřina, Brno
- Proposal No. 59** Bc. Martin Štěpánek, Holubice
- Proposal No. 60** Ing. arch. Vladimír Charvát, Praha  
Ing. arch. Martin Pospíšil, Liberec – Vratislavice nad Nisou  
Bc. Ania Majewska, Wroclaw, Polsko  
Bc. Kamila Kurek, Wroclaw, Polsko  
Bc. Rafal Bulka, Wroclaw, Polsko
- Proposal No. 61** Break Point, s.r.o., Praha, kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý
- Proposal No. 62** Ondřej Synek, Praha  
Jan Vlach, Praha
- Proposal No. 63** MgA. Jakub Doubner, Liberec  
MgA. Jiří Novotný, Praha  
MgA. Petra Oplatková, Modřice  
MgA. Renata Řezníčková, Praha

- Proposal No. 64** Ing. arch. Kristina Magasaniková, Copenhagen, Dánsko  
Ing. arch. Jan Magasanik  
Ing arch. Roman Prachař  
Ing. arch. Lukás Brom  
Ing. arch. Markéta Burešová
- Proposal No. 65** Bc. Josef Kubát, Praha  
Ing. arch. Jana Dostálová, Praha
- Proposal No. 66** D a M, s.r.o., Praha, kontaktní osoba: Ing. arch. Petr Burian
- Proposal No. 67** PLANS Architekti, s.r.o., Praha,  
kontaktní osoba: Ing. Libor Přeček, Ph.D.
- Proposal No. 68** ATELIER HUNGRY, Praha, Ing. Petra Kunarová, Ing. Jiří Lukeš
- Proposal No. 69** Marek Chytil, Zlín
- Proposal No. 70** Ing. arch. Andrea Bočková, Košice  
Zuzana Töröková, Košice  
Dana Bodnárová, Košice