

Landscape, Urban, and Architectural Design Competition "Lake Milada"

Minutes from the meeting of the jury to evaluate competition proposals in the 1st Phase of the competition 7 - 8 January 2021

1/ PREPARATION FOR THE MEETING

All jury members and experts on the jury were provided with access to the textual and graphic components of all competition proposals in anonymised digital format at an external storage site prior to the jury meeting. Jury members and experts on the jury therefore had the opportunity to study the competition proposals in advance and to prepare verbal and points evaluations of the competition proposals according to the criteria for the evaluation of competition proposals in the 1st Phase of the competition.

Before making competition proposals public, the individual jury members and experts on the jury signed and sent to the secretary by e-mail a declaration that they would discharge the function of jury member/expert on the jury in a due manner, impartially, that they did not either directly or indirectly participate in work on the submitted competition proposals, that they do not know the names of the authors of the competition proposals, and that they have no conflict of interests according to Section 148(1) of the Public Procurement Act. At the same time, they undertook in the declaration not to provide the competition proposals to any other person and to use them solely for the needs of preparation for the 1st evaluation meeting of the competition jury.

Prior to the jury meeting of 6.1.2020, all jury members received a written evaluation of the competition proposals by the experts on the jury. The following provided their evaluations: Prof. PhDr. Michaela Hrubá, Ph.D. - Dean of the Faculty of Arts at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, PhDr. Roman Kroufek, Ph.D. - Head of the Department of Pre-primary and Primary Education at the Faculty of Education at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, doc. RNDr. Jaroslav Koutský, Ph.D. - Dean of the Faculty of Social and Economic Studies at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, doc. Mgr. Pavel Raška, Ph.D. - Head of the Department of Geography, Faculty of Science at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, RNDr. Diana Holcová, Ph.D. - Vice-Dean for Development, Faculty of Environment at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, and Ing. Zbyněk Sperat, Ph.D., specialist in sustainable mobility and transport.

Independent jury members provided their evaluation of the competition proposals to the secretary of the jury in writing prior to the meeting, or during the jury meeting. All the abovementioned evaluations constituted an internal working document for the jury meeting.

In light of the epidemiological situation caused by the spread of Covid-19, the jury meeting was held in person on day 1, in that 3 jury members attended the jury meeting by way of online transmission. Day 2 of the meeting was held online.

2/ 1st DAY OF THE MEETING

Day 1 of the jury meeting took place on 7.1.2021 in person at the registered office of Inovační centrum Ústeckého kraje (Innovation Centre of the Usti Region), Velká Hradební 2800, Ústí nad Labem, Czech Republic.

a) Opening of the meeting

The jury meeting began at 10:00.

The following persons attended the meeting in person:

Regular dependent members	Petr Kubiš, Tomáš Kupec, Jiří Řehák, Pavlína Janiková
Regular independent members	Filip Tittl, Jan Magasaník, Jitka Trevisan, Ondřej Špaček
Dependent substitutes	Jan Vondruška, Josef Kusebauch, Petr Nedvědický, Ondřej Beneš
Independent substitutes	Miroslav Janovský

The following persons were in attendance online throughout the meeting:

Regular independent members	Klára Salzmann
Independent substitutes	Milota Sidorová, Roman Bukáček

Petr Kubiš, Deputy Director of PKÚ, s. p., welcomed the attendees.

b) The programme and proceedings of the meeting

Petr Návrat summarised the objectives of the meeting and presented the programme of the meeting.

The attending jury members discussed the programme and how the meeting would proceed with the involvement of jury members attending online.

Motion for resolution: **The jury agrees that Klára Salzmann, regular member of the independent part of the jury, attending the meeting online, shall vote by way of online transmission.**

vote: in favour: 9 against: 0 abstained: 0

Voting:

Regular dependent members: Petr Kubiš, Tomáš Kupec, Pavlína Janiková

Regular independent members: Filip Tittl, Jan Magasaník, Jitka Trevisan, Ondřej Špaček, Klára Salzmann

Dependent substitute: Ondřej Beneš

Motion for resolution: **The jury agrees with the framework programme, and that Filip Tittl shall chair the jury meeting.**

vote: in favour: 9 against: 0 abstained: 0

Voting:

Regular dependent members: Petr Kubiš, Tomáš Kupec, Pavlína Janiková

Regular independent members: Filip Tittl, Jan Magasaník, Jitka Trevisan, Ondřej Špaček, Klára Salzmann

Dependent substitute: Ondřej Beneš

c) Change in the composition of the dependent component of the jury

The jury was informed, by Petr Kubiš, that there had been a change in the composition of the dependent component of the jury. Based on the results of the autumn elections to the regional assembly, former Deputy Governor of the Region Mr. Martin Klika was replaced by new Deputy Governor of the Region Mr. Jiří Řehák.

Motion for resolution: **The jury agrees with the change in the composition of the dependent component of the jury, in that Martin Klika is replaced by Jiří Řehák.**

vote: in favour: 9 against: 0 abstained: 0

Voting:

Regular dependent members: Petr Kubiš, Tomáš Kupec, Pavlína Janiková

Regular independent members Filip Tittl, Jan Magasanik, Jitka Trevisan, Ondřej Špaček, Klára Salzmann

Dependent substitute: Ondřej Beneš

d) Conclusions drawn from reviewing the competition proposals

K. Koupalová summarised the requirements placed on the content and format of submitting competition proposals set out in the Competition Terms and the conclusions drawn from reviewing the competition proposals:

All competition proposals comply with all binding requirements placed on the content and form of submitting competition proposals, as ensuing from the Competition Terms.

Motion for resolution: **The jury acknowledges the conclusion drawn from reviewing the competition proposals and agrees to retain all competition proposals in the evaluation.**

vote: in favour: 9 against: 0 abstained: 0

Voting:

Regular dependent members: Petr Kubiš, Tomáš Kupec, Pavlína Janiková, Jiří Řehák

Regular independent members Filip Tittl, Jan Magasanik, Jitka Trevisan, Ondřej Špaček, Klára Salzmann

e) Evaluation of individual competition proposals

The jury successively considered competition proposals 1, 2, and 3 from 10:50 to 12:30. Each jury member, including those in attendance online, conveyed their evaluation of each proposal.

Roman Bukáček was absent between 11:00 and 11:35.

f) Lunch break

The meeting broke from 12:40 to 13:20, when lunch was served in the meeting room.

g) Continuation of the evaluation of individual competition proposals

The jury successively considered competition proposals 4, 5, and 6 from 13:20 to 15:10. Each jury member, including those in attendance online, conveyed their evaluation of each proposal.

Roman Bukáček was absent between 14:05 and 14:40.

Dependent jury member Mr. Jiří Řehák left the meeting at 14:30. He was represented at the meeting thereafter by Mr. Ondřej Beneš.

h) Joint discussion about the competition proposals and selection of the 3 advancing competition proposals

Joint discussion of the competition proposals proceeded from 15:15 to 17:00.

The jury heard and corrected a recording of the verbal and points evaluation of the individual competition proposals, compiled by the jury secretary in the course of the previous jury meeting according to the evaluation of jury members and discussion on the individual competition proposals. The evaluation of individual competition proposals will be used as a component part of justification for the choice of competition proposals in the invitation to submit competition proposals and as a component part of justification of notification of the exclusion of competition proposals from the competition.

The jury agreed that the jointly compiled verbal and points evaluation of individual competition proposals would be confirmed and approved on day 2 of the meeting.

At the end of the discussion and evaluation of individual competition proposals, each jury member (regular jury members and substitutes) in attendance in person and online indicated 2 competition proposals which according to their evaluation should advance to the 2nd Phase of the competition and 2 competition proposals which should not advance to the 2nd Phase of the competition. A record of the statements of the jury members is found in Table 1.

Table 1: Record of the statements of jury members (regular jury members and substitutes) in attendance in person and online in favour and against the advancement of competition proposals to the 2nd Phase of the competition

Competition proposal number	Number of jury members in favour of the advancement of the competition proposal to the 2nd Phase	Number of jury members against the advancement of the competition proposal to the 2nd Phase
1		14
2		13
3	9	
4	6	1
5		2
6	15	

The jury members expressed the view that competition proposals 3, 4, and 6 would advance. The jury proceeded with a vote on which competition proposals would advance to the 2nd Phase of the competition and which competition proposals would not advance to the 2nd Phase of the competition.

Motion for resolution: **The jury agrees that competition proposals 3, 4, and 6 shall advance to the 2nd Phase of the competition and that competition proposals 1, 2, and 5 shall hereafter be excluded from the competition,**

and recommends that the contracting authority invite the authors of competition proposals 3, 4, and 6 to submit competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition and hereafter exclude the authors of competition proposals 1, 2, and 5 from the competition.

vote: in favour: 9 against: 0 abstained: 0

Voting:

Regular dependent members: Petr Kubiš, Tomáš Kupec, Pavlína Janiková

Regular independent members: Filip Tittl, Jan Magasanik, Jitka Trevisan, Ondřej Špaček, Klára Salzmann

Dependent substitute: Ondřej Beneš

i) Discussion of specification of requirements on the content of competition proposals for the 2nd Phase of the competition

The jury considered specification of the requirements on the content of competition proposals for the 2nd Phase of the competition from 17:00 to 17:30.

The jury decided at the end of this section of the meeting that the jointly compiled specifying requirements on the content of competition proposals for the 2nd Phase of the competition shall be verified and approved during day two of the meeting.

j) Discussion of requirements and recommendations for the finalisation of individual competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition

The jury considered the definition of requirements and recommendations for the finalisation of individual competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition between 17:30 and 18:30.

The jury concurred that recommendations for the finalisation of individual competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition would be specified during day 2 of the jury meeting.

Day one of the meeting was closed at 18:30. The meeting shall continue online at midday on 8.1.

	diagram of the target state of the landscape
	diagram showing proposed property relations in the area
	diagram of role and activities in the area
	diagram showing proposed phasing of the execution of the proposed concept, with indication of conditional projects
	other diagrams, sketches, and images showing the proposed design of the themes of the assignment
Panel 4 to 6	diagram of the network of places suitable for the location of architectural or artistic projects, interventions in the area
	architectural or artistic designs of the initiating project
	visualisation showing the setting of this element into the area
	design of most important principles of the creation of public space around Milada which should be a component of the future design of the manual for the area

Specification of Competition Terms, paragraph 9.4, Particulars of the content and layout of the textual component in the 2nd Phase of the competition

(supplementation and elaboration marked in bold print)

The textual component (publication) shall contain the worded expression of the competition proposal, accompanied by the graphic expression of the competition proposal from the competition panels, and shall be written in Czech and English (see Chapter 16.1 of the Competition Terms).

The textual component must comprise a maximum of 80 A3 pages (total size of Czech and English version).

The textual component shall comprise:

- a) a brief annotation of the competition proposal;
- b) a description of the concept for the layout and strategy of development of the competition site;
- c) a description of setting the concept of the competition site into the context of the general location;
- d) a description of the spatial and functional design of the 2 areas with development potential shown on the competition panels;
- e) a description of the concept of individual themes of the assignment, **focusing on tasks for the design defined in the competition assignment for individual themes;**
- f) a framework calculation of the costs of execution and future management of the area;**
- g) a description of one architectural, landscaping, artistic, or other intervention;

- h) a description of the most important principles of the creation of public space around Milada which should be a component part of the future design of the manual for the area;
- i) a completed table of the proposed price of processing individual subsequent contracts (the table will be an annex to the invitation to submit competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition);
- j) and a **response to the suggestions** specified by the jury in the invitation to participate in the 2nd Phase of the competition.

Specification of Competition Terms, paragraph 11.2, Evaluation criteria for the 2nd Phase of the competition

(supplementation and elaboration marked in bold print)

The criteria according to which competition proposals will be evaluated when evaluating competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition are set out as follows, in no order of importance:

- a) the overall urban design quality and landscaping quality of the proposal;
- b) the quality of the design of architectural detail;
- c) the degree of respect for the fundamental principles of the shared vision of developing Lake Milada and the competition assignment;
- d) the level of feasibility and **economic and operational sustainability** of the proposed development strategy.

Motion for resolution: **The jury agrees with the specification of the requirements on the content of the graphic and textual components of competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition and criteria for evaluating competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition presented above.**

vote: in favour: 9 against: 0 abstained: 0

Voting:

Regular dependent members: Petr Kubiš, Tomáš Kupec, Pavlína Janíková

Regular independent members: Filip Tittl, Jan Magasanik, Jitka Trevisan, Ondřej Špaček, Klára Salzmann

Dependent substitute: Ondřej Beneš

c/ Specification of requirements and recommendations for the finalisation of individual competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition

The jury considered the finalisation of requirements and recommendations for the finalisation of individual competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition which it had defined on day 1 of the meeting between 12:30 and 13:15. These constitute an annex to the minutes, which shall be approved by the jury members by way of circular resolution, but will not be made public and will be used in the invitation to submit individual competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition.

d) Verbal and points evaluation of competition proposals

The jury dealt with verification of the verbal and points evaluation of individual competition proposals from day 1 of the meeting, doing so between 13:15 and 14:00.

The verbal evaluation of individual competition proposals is found in an annex to these minutes, and shall be approved by the jury members by way of circular resolution, but will not be made public. The verbal evaluation will be used as a component of the invitation to submit individual selected competition proposals and as a component of justification of notification of the exclusion of competition proposals which are not advancing. The points evaluation of competition proposals, according to the criteria set out in advance in the Competition Terms, is shown in Table 2.

N.B.: The highest level of achievement of individual sub evaluation criteria is expressed using the number 100.

Table 2: Points evaluation of competition proposals

Proposal number	Criterion	Points	Total
1	overall urban and landscaping design quality of the competition proposal	40	140
	quality of design of the vision of architectural detail	40	
	the degree of respect for the fundamental principles of the shared competition vision and assignment	30	
	the level of feasibility of the proposed development strategy	30	
2	overall urban and landscaping design quality of the competition proposal	60	220
	quality of design of the vision of architectural detail	50	
	the degree of respect for the fundamental principles of the shared competition vision and assignment	50	
	the level of feasibility of the proposed development strategy	60	
3	overall urban and landscaping design quality of the competition proposal	80	330
	quality of design of the vision of architectural detail	90	
	the degree of respect for the fundamental principles of the shared competition vision and assignment	80	
	the level of feasibility of the proposed development strategy	80	
4	overall urban and landscaping design quality of the competition proposal	80	300
	quality of design of the vision of architectural detail	70	
	the degree of respect for the fundamental principles of the shared competition vision and assignment	80	
	the level of feasibility of the proposed development strategy	70	
5	overall urban and landscaping design quality of the competition proposal	70	280
	quality of design of the vision of architectural detail	70	

	the degree of respect for the fundamental principles of the shared competition vision and assignment	80	
	the level of feasibility of the proposed development strategy	60	
6	overall urban and landscaping design quality of the competition proposal	90	330
	quality of design of the vision of architectural detail	70	
	the degree of respect for the fundamental principles of the shared competition vision and assignment	90	
	the level of feasibility of the proposed development strategy	80	

Motion for resolution: **The jury approves the points evaluation of individual competition proposals according to the evaluation criteria for the 1st Phase of the competition as shown in Table 2 of the minutes.**

vote: in favour: 9 against: 0 abstained: 0

Voting:

Regular dependent members: Petr Kubiš, Tomáš Kupec, Pavlína Janiková

Regular independent members: Filip Tittl, Jan Magasanik, Jitka Trevisan, Ondřej Špaček, Klára Salzmann

Dependent substitute: Ondřej Beneš

e) Specification of times in the 2nd Phase of the competition

The jury dealt with specifying the times of the 2nd Phase of the competition, which are stated in the Competition Terms.

Subparagraph 13.12.3, **Period for submitting competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition**, is modified as follows:

The final deadline for submitting a competition proposal, meaning the time at which the period for submitting competition proposals ends, is set at 30 April 2021 at 17:00 Central European Time.

The other provisions of subparagraph 13.12.3 of the Competition Terms remain valid.

Paragraph 13. 11, **Explanation of Competition Terms in the 2nd Phase of the competition**, is modified as follows:

Participants may, under the terms and conditions laid down in Chapter 7.3, request an explanation of the Competition Terms **in relation to the scope of the competition and the competition assignment until 5 March 2021 and in relation to organisational matters until 12 April 2021**.

The contracting authority shall publish explanations, together with the wording of the request (inquiry), without identifying the participant, in relation to the organisational matters of the competition within 3 business days of the delivery of the request, and in relation to the scope of the competition by 12 March 2021, on the contracting authority's profile in E-ZAK and at the competition website.

Paragraph 13.14, **Evaluating meeting of the jury on the 2nd Phase of the competition**, is modified as follows:

The date of the meeting of the jury to evaluate competition proposals in the 2nd Phase of the competition is provisionally set for May 2021. The exact date of the evaluating meeting will be set during the competition.

The other provisions of the Competition Terms remain the same.

Motion for resolution: **The jury approves the specification of the times in the 2nd Phase of the competition presented above.**

vote: in favour: 9 against: 0 abstained: 0

Voting:

Regular dependent members: Petr Kubiš, Tomáš Kupec, Pavlína Janiková

Regular independent members: Filip Tittl, Jan Magasanik, Jitka Trevisan, Ondřej Špaček, Klára Salzmann

Dependent substitute: Ondřej Beneš

Day 2 of the meeting closed at 14:30.

The jury secretary will finalise the minutes, including annex with the evaluation of individual competition proposals and recommendations for the finalisation of competition proposals in the 2nd Phase, and will send these to all jury members for comments procedure. The minutes will subsequently be approved by all jury members in attendance at the meeting by way of circular resolution.

4) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - CLOSE OF THE JURY MEETING

All jury members in attendance at the meeting approved the wording of the minutes, including annex with the evaluation of individual competition proposals and recommendations for the finalisation of competition proposals in the 2nd Phase, by way of circular resolution by 15.1.2021. This ends the jury meeting.

Minutes taken by: Karolína Koupalová

Dependent component of the jury - regular members

Petr Kubiš

Tomáš Kupec

Pavλίna Janiková

Jiří Řehák

Dependent component of the jury - substitutes

Josef Kusebauch

Petr Nedvědický

Ondřej Beneš

Independent component of the jury - regular members

Klára Salzmänn

Filip Tittl

Jan Magasaník

Jitka Trevisan

Ondřej Špaček

Independent component of the jury - substitutes

Roman Bukáček

Milota Sidorová

Miroslav Janovský