



DREAM OF GREEN URBANITY

MINUTES OF THE JURY PROCESS



• CONTENTS / CREDITS	2
• MINUTES OF THE FINAL JURY	3
• MINUTES OF THE PRELIMINARY JURY	9

EUROPAN 12 Competition

Site: BUDAPEST - ZUGLÓ

Municipality of the 14th district of Budapest
EUROPAN MAGYARORSZÁG

www.zuglo.hu
www.europan-hungary.hu

SECOND JURY ROUND OF EUROPAN 12, SITE BUDAPEST, ZUGLO**LOCATION**

The second jury round takes place in Pantin, France on the 10-11th of November (Sunday-Monday), 2013 at the Centre National de la Danse

PARTICIPANTS

Michelle PROVOOST	Architectural Historian, Director of the International New Town Institute (INTI) in Almere, the Netherlands (NL) – head of the jury
Jürg DEGEN	head of department of urban development, Basel (CH)
Elisabeth MERK	head of department of urban development, Munich (DE)
Markus PERNTHALER	Architect, Graz/Vienna (AT)
Christoph LUCHSINGER	Architect, Professor at the TU Vienna, Luzern/Vienna (CH)
Henri BAVA	Landscape Architect, AGENCE TER, Professor at the TU Karlsruhe, Paris/Karlsruhe (FR)
Marcel SMETS	Architect, Professor at the KU Leuven/Belgium (BE)
Peter Istvan BALOGH	Landscape Architect, Phd., Associate Professor at Corvinus University, Budapest (HU)
Lulzim KABASHI	Architect, Zagreb (HR)
Bern VLAY	Architect, secretary of European Österreich - non-voting member
Pia SPIESBERGER	Architect, member of European Österreich - non-voting member
Rron TRESI	Architect, member of European Kosovo - non-voting member
SZABÓ Árpád	Architect, national coordinator of European Magyarország – non-voting member

The jury evaluates the projects of European Austria, Kosovo and Hungary namely the sites: Vienna - Kagan, Vienna – Siemensacker; Graz, Amstetten, Gijlan and Budapest.

In the morning the jury members were made familiar with the sites and projects by the different organisations of European (Austria, Kosovo, Hungary), and the representatives of the cities and clients.

The jury decides unanimously to nominate:

Michelle Provoost as president of the jury.

Marcel Smets as vice president of the jury.

The jury consists of 9 votes for all sites.

Bernd Vlay introduces the procedure of the jury. In general, there is one winning project and one runner-up prize on each site, but there is also the possibility to define no winner and nominate 3 runners-up. The winning projects should be chosen not for easy and fast implementation but as contributions to architectural and urbanist innovation which inspires and initiates a challenging and fruitful process of implementation. They should also enable the cities and clients to understand the potential of the sites and to imagine new and unconventional ways to deal with them. Moreover a Special Mention can be awarded to a project considered of being especially innovative yet without addressing sufficiently the brief and demands of the site. The authors of such proposals do not receive a financial reward, but will be published.

1st prize: 12.000€ runner up: 6.000€

The jury process is organized in two days. The first day starts with the presentation of the sites and continues with the evaluation of the Graz, Amstetten and Budapest projects. The second day starts with the evaluation of the two Vienna sites, followed by the discussion of the Gijón site. The jury decides to first discuss the projects, then to make a further preselection and leave the final decision for the second jury day, afternoon of Monday 11th of November. The jury also formulates recommendations for the site owners and local municipalities that will be included in the minutes.

This document contains the discussion connected to the Zugló, Budapest site.

MINUTES

In the morning on the first day Arpad Szabo presents the site and answers the questions connected to the programme and the brief.

After that Bernd Vlay, president of the preliminary jury and Peter István Balogh, member of the preliminary jury presents the preliminary selection of the projects ('MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY', 'CHAIN REACTION', 'LETTING FLOW', 'TUNE UP, ZUGLO!', 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE').

The jury process of the projects of the Budapest site begins in the afternoon of the first day. It starts with a general discussion; first with the goal of deeply understanding the themes and aspects of the different projects.

Question of the site: transformation is generated by the new quality landscape or by with a large amount of various programme types

Landscape design oriented approach and the more programmatic approach seemingly contradict each other.

It is a long urban park. The question is how programme related to local communities and implementation possibilities. Is it a top-down or a bottom-up project?

First revision of the projects:

Project 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE'

- "Normal" landscape design oriented project
- Uses traditional urban design elements based on composition and aesthetics. Top-down project with a large investment.

Project 'CHAIN REACTION'

- Based on traditional landscape oriented approach
- It creates a strong landscape vision combined with small, urban furniture scaled interventions
- It is more bottom-up than what it seems at the first sight.

Project 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY'

- Ambitious project: practical and logical toolbox, nevertheless it is contradictory in its communication
- Offers a tool: what they think could be useful → they use the creek as an experiment
- If they do not make it site specific it is just a general toolbox
- The project misses the site specificity, the creek is just an excuse
- Some of the toolbox proposals go beyond the scale and possibilities of its own methodology
- Identity is not about place, but created by people conquering the landscape → people can come and conquer and participate, support locals: participatory process that is working with cultural exchange / overall conception of occupying the place / conquering the landscape by participation

Project 'LETTING FLOW'

- The presentation of the project does not show too much; it is a collection of diagrams and schemes.
- There is no clear vision at the end. The proposed elements are not translated into spatial elements.
- From the landscape point it is rude. In a way the proposal has a very much technocratic approach
- The proposed system is interesting and site specific → clever project
- It is a mix of programming and mobility system
- What would the city do if this project is chosen? It is not a design of a process, not a spatial design. It is a toolkit.

Project 'TUNE UP, ZUGLO!'

- It is a sharp project in terms of analysis. It transforms the area of the creek into a strip with its own identity
- Identifies places where interventions are necessary/possible
- Landscape is very schematic and generic at several locations. Uses a lot of trees in a schematic way.
- It a very much organized project, integrates different levels of considerations.
- Defines the alley as a new element in the city
- The plan very much relies on a huge public investment. Financing the project is a question. What investments could be mobilized from the municipality or from the communities?
- Whom does the project want to mobilize?
- It wants to re-qualify landscape on the bases of reprogramming.
- It rather intervenes at the level of design, but not at the level of strategy. Process strategy does not appear in the drawings.
- It deals with the creek in a generic way, gives answers to generic situations.
- Experiments with time → could be read as a flexible framework of a long term vision
- The drawings imply a very rigid and defined understanding of space. The real atmosphere of the place is not clear from the drawings. Not very contemporary. Wants to "domesticate" the whole area, but makes it in an old-fashioned way.

Second revision of the projects with a summary of the most important aspects of the discussion:

Project 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE'

- Can be considered as a purely landscape design which rests on some kind of governmental (central, local) funding

Project 'CHAIN REACTION'

- A real and classical landscape design, it is a toolkit for furniture, as a method it is quite classical landscape design approach
- Very much based on the ecological quality of the creek.
- The idea of having a green backbone makes a lot of sense, but as a landscape design it is not the best nevertheless its quality comes from being modest. What does European has to offer through this project?! It creates quality with a low design solution.
- A low design solution with a high construction investment. It wants to achieve high biodiversity
- It could be implemented step by step. Interesting.
- What would it mean for the future transformation of the city to create a space that has a character? Is there a pressure on the housing market? What effect would it have on the first row of houses? The real estate will grow up.

The European jury proposes the combination of a "renaturalizing" and a more program based project. Critic has to be formulated on the relation of the shopping center to the creek.

Project 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE'

- eliminated from the discussion with a voting: 9 votes for elimination

Project 'CHAIN REACTION'

- Should be combined with another project? Gives a good strategy for the "renaturalizing" approach.

Project 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY'

- Could be combined with 'CHAIN REACTION'. It creates much more open tools with a clear strategy on socialization. Uses micro urban interventions

Combination of 'CHAIN REACTION' and 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY' seems to be a good compromise. Equal prizes should be awarded to the two projects. They very well complement each other.

Proposal:

Combine the two projects 'CHAIN REACTION' and 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY'. Both of them receive a Runner-up prize and the recommendations of the jury will be included in the brief.

Voting:

- Projects 'CHAIN REACTION' and 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY' are the two projects that receive prizes? - 9 votes for the proposal, 0 votes against

Voting:

- The two projects receive equal prizes? Both of them will be Runner-ups? - 9 votes for the proposal, 0 votes against

Discussion of the possibility of Special mention projects:

Project 'LETTING FLOW'

- not acceptable as a special mention project

Project 'TUNE UP, ZUGLO!'

- Introducing the importance of design
- One of the most comprehensive plans, but it is not innovative in the classical sense, but innovative in its comprehensiveness!
- In European it is special to have such a comprehensive project. In that sense it is outstanding. Details and complexity are integrated in the main ideas
- Defines good long term visions for green and public spaces.

Voting:

- Project 'TUNE UP, ZUGLO!' proposed as a Special Mention - 8 votes for the proposal, 1 votes against

Recommendations by the EUROPAN jury for the municipality of Zuglo
Project site Budapest

The two Runner-up projects can complement each other in a beneficial way and they should be combined to create a project of a clear and implementable strategy.

The idea of creating a more ecological park should be investigated more deeply, but the project has to be started with small interventions. This way initially only small investment is needed that can already generate new dynamism and a series activities in the area.

In the first step the areas of the first interventions should be identified with a clear program, while the three main areas defined in the brief should have a more precise urban role.

The strategy for the implementation should be:

- Make a common project combining the two Runner-ups and start a process of participation with the involvement of local communities
- Define a time schedule of implementation → first an overall master plan should be created
- Start with light things, that should be commissioned by the city and can reach visible results with small interventions and small costs
- Localise the spots of intervention and the areas of transforming the existing canal into a naturalized canal. Localising the generic catalogue into a series of implementable interventions

For the design process: (1) the jury strongly recommends to make a workshop on the site with the authors of the two Runner-up projects. (2) Invite and include local communities and local residents into the process → process of participation has to be initiated

Role and duty of the municipality in this process:

- Actively accompany the procedure and support the process of participation. Invite and involve people who are experienced with community involvement in the process.
- Establish a long-term concept of financing the project.
- Commission the winning teams for the first phase. That is the basis to get funding for the next steps. It has to be the initiating phase that triggers future development.

The initiating phase is crucial, and it should be run and managed by the local municipality!

The possibility to involve European Union money in the ecological rehabilitation on the bases of the Danube Waterway Strategy should be thoroughly investigated.

The final results of the competition are the following:

No WINNER prize is awarded.

The RUNNER-UP is
and

CM063 CHAIN REACTION
CB574 MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY

The SPECIAL MENTION is

IZ264 TUNE UP, ZUGLO'!

The final results of the competition after opening the digital authorship documents:

RUNNER-UP:

CM063 CHAIN REACTION

Sándor Guba - HU – Associate
Balázs Besenyei - HU – Associate
Lilla Szabó - HU - Associate

CB574 MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY

Romain Granoux - FR – Associate
Francois Justet - FR – Associate
Margaux Minier - FR - Associate

SPECIAL MENTION:

IZ264 TUNE UP, ZUGLO'!

Alessandra Glorialanza - IT – Associate
Eliana Saracino - IT – Associate
Orsola Nina Artioli - IT – Associate
Francesco Scillieri - IT – Contributor,
Enrica Olita - IT – Contributor
Antonio Guerrieri - IT – Contributor



Michelle PROVOOST
head of the jury

2013. 11. 11. Pantin, France
minutes prepared by Arpad Szabo

CODES OF PROJECTS:

5	CB574	MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY
6	CM063	CHAIN REACTION
8	DV913	LETTING FLOW
15	IZ264	TUNE UP, ZUGLO'!
23	VD545	„THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE”

FIRST JURY ROUND OF EUROPAN 12, SITE BUDAPEST, ZUGLO

LOCATION

The first jury round takes place in Budapest, Zugló (HU) on the 4th of October (Friday), 2013 at the at Marriage Hall of the Municipality Building of Zugló, (Budapest, 1145, Pétervárad utca 11-17.)

PARTICIPANTS

Bernd VLAY	Architect, Secretary of EUROPAN Austria, Head of the Jury
BALOGH Péter István	Landscape Architect, PhD., Associate Professor at Corvinus University, Budapest
BARTA Ferenc	architect, Chief Municipality architect of Zugló
KÖRMENDY Imre	architect, president of the Hungarian Urban Knowledge Center
MIHÁLYFI László	architect, manager of the Hungarian National Asset Management Inc.
TIHANYI Dominika	landscape architect
ONGJERTH Richárd	architect, Managing Director at Hungarian Urban Knowledge Center
HORVÁTH Zsuzsanna	architect, representative of the Municipality of Zugló (<i>substitute</i>)
SZABÓ Gyöngyvér	National Coordinator EUROPAN Hungary (<i>substitute</i>)

Excused:

SOÓKI -TÓTH Gábor architect, developer, director of Real Estate at CBS Property Zrt.

Non-voting participant:

SZABÓ Árpád	National Coordinator EUROPAN Hungary (<i>non-voting member, minutes</i>)
GYÖRFFY Máté	architect, representing the Chief Municipality Architects office of Budapest (<i>expert</i>)

All members of the jury have received in advance the full site file of the Zugló site, and has had a possibility to look at the digitally handed in files of the competition projects.

The EUROPAN Hungary Secretariat has prepared a technical report for assisting the jury process. This technical report has been received by the jury members at the beginning of the jury. The technical report is to help the jury process and will not be publicly accessible.

MINUTES**10.15-11.15 site visit**

with the guidance of EUROPAN Hungary staff

Members of the preliminary jury meet at the competition site and look at the publicly accessible areas of the project sites with the guidance of Árpád Szabó.

11.30 arrival to the jury venue

The jury process took place at the City Hall of Zugló

12:00 Welcome speak: Bernd Vlay, Head of Jury

- introduction to European platform and E12 competition cycle
- E12 Hungarian site, Zugló - the site is highly suitable to the competition as it incorporates two scales, strategic scale meets with acupuncture implementation potentials
- Rákosszentimre creek has more potential as most of the Austrian sites as it is a highly complex task to solve
- it's not what we usually expect from an architectural competition because of the landscape impact
- the site provides platform for visionaries
- asked for a contribution from the Municipality Chief Architect Mr. Ferenc Barta to introduce the aims and efforts of the municipality regarding European12

Contextual presentation: Árpád Szabó, European Hungary National Coordinator

- introduction of the Zugló District and the Rákos creek:
- Rákos creek in the urban fabric of Budapest, position
- urban character, infrastructures, green areas
- urban development plans on the area
- municipal development forces and aims
- municipalities along the creek: collective challenges and actions
- land use, landowners and stakeholders
- collective urban memory of the site in pictures
- aerial photographs
- setting the scene: introduction to the competition brief and the project sites

Questions and answers discussed; Bernd Vlay, Head of Jury

1. More detailed information about the Thököly street - Rákos creek connection that reaches the Project Site #3
2. Where can the infrastructures of everyday life be found regarding the site?
3. Is there a local demand on recreational functions?
4. The 1910's City Development Plan (presented by Árpád Szabó) was realized partly?
5. Is there any important information on the linear infrastructures on the site e.g. sewage, high-voltage?

Municipal welcome: Ferenc Papcsák, Mayor of Zugló

- interesting and remarkable solutions on a high standard
- highlighted the importance of the experimental solutions
- wished great success for the competitor and the jury
- the Municipality is ready to welcome an exhibition in Stefánia Palace

Current plans in Zugló: Ferenc Barta, Chief Municipal Architect

- we have to consider past, present and future at the same time to understand the site
- to manage the whole length of Rákos creek (38 km) has been an all-municipal intention for decades
- the collaboration in-between the municipalities along the creek is in progress, the Central Government of Budapest took over the operational management
- many joint development areas e.g. tourism, rehabilitation of industrial sites, brownfields,
- the site has a diversity in character
- most of the users are locals from the district

He divided the future possibilities into two main objectives:- long-term future

- a coherent and well-connected ecological-touristic green corridor
- holistic approach on the whole length

- short-term vision

- actions on water quality management already started effectively
- years ago the central municipality of Budapest ordered a waterbed rehabilitation plan from a Viennese planning studio; the plan only dealt with the possibilities of rehabilitating the watercourse, but did not deal with the integration of the surrounding area (it was rather a water management plan than a complex landscape proposal), the plan had good proposals with a new re-naturalized and meandered waterbed, but the municipality and the city of Budapest were way too far - both financially and intentionally - to accomplish it
- this term means the seek for new uses and livability for Rákos creek
- as a main problem he pointed out that the site lacks attractions, "you have no intention to stop and enjoy"
- to the sports facilities and possibilities he added that the district won 80 billion HUF (approx. 270.000 EUR) by the City Municipality of Budapest to develop the sports center near Mogyoródi Street

Questions and answers discussed; Bernd Vlay, Head of Jury

1. Is it a local or regional bicycle road running along the creek? Who are the users?

- Mostly locals, in 90% - Currently there are no possibilities for connection into city-wide bicycle roadmap. The possibility to join the Budapest Bike program came up recently, but the Municipality did not respond because they want to prepare a proper roadmap concept before.

Árpád Szabó, European Hungary National Coordinator

Introduced the voting members. There are 7 voices (voting members) in the jury.

Bernd Vlay, Head of Jury

Introduced the judgment procedure in Austria and Kosovo. Positive voting: every project that gets at least 2 votes in the first round goes towards the second. 50% of the plans can be selected this way.

12.30-18.00 revision and evaluation of the projectsFirst round:

After the general discussion the jury decides to start the revision of the projects. Although everybody had a chance to look at the projects previously, the jury makes a first round of looking at the projects without discussion and evaluation. Árpád Szabó non-voting member of the jury presents all the projects with the aid of the Technical Report.

Second round:

The jury decides to make a second round still without discussion, eliminating all projects which have no voice in favor.

01 – 'EDIBLE CREEK'	→ 3 VOTES	→ KEPT
02 – 'RAKOS PATAK ECOLOGICAL WATER CORRIDOR'	→ 3 VOTES	→ KEPT
03 – 'PATCHED CORRIDOR'	→ 3 VOTES	→ KEPT
04 – 'XXS INCEPTION'	→ 4 VOTES	→ KEPT
05 – 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY'	→ 3 VOTES	→ KEPT
06 – 'CHAIN REACTION'	→ 4 VOTES	→ KEPT
07 – 'PERFECT TIMING'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
08 – 'LETTING FLOW'	→ 6 VOTES	→ KEPT
09 – 'AS MANY TREES AS POSSIBLE'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
10 – 'URBANOTATION'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
11 – 'CURE THE CITY'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
12 – 'THE FRAMES OF IMAGINATION'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
13 – 'THE MILLS' PARK'	→ 5 VOTES	→ KEPT
14 – 'RESEWING THE CITY'	→ 5 VOTES	→ KEPT
15 – 'TUNE UP, ZUGLO!'	→ 6 VOTES	→ KEPT
16 – 'WITHIN THE CREEK'	→ 4 VOTES	→ KEPT
17 – 'THRESHOLD'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
18 – 'CURRENT ~ FLOW'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
19 – 'WHO SAID FLOODING WAS A PROBLEM?'	→ 3 VOTES	→ KEPT
20 – 'THREE TALES ALONG THE RAKOS TRAIL'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
21 – 'MOVING GROUND'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
22 – 'BALTHASAR – MICRO IS MORE'	→ 2 VOTES	→ KEPT
23 – 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE'	→ 3 VOTES	→ KEPT
24 – '84000M3'	→ 2 VOTES	→ KEPT
25 – 'THE RIBBON'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT
26 – 'NEEDLE AND THREAD'	→ 0 VOTES	→ OUT

Third round:

The jury looks at the projects with discussion - if necessary - and eliminates the projects that have less than 50% of the votes (3 votes or less) in favor. Körmendy Imre and Mihályfi László have to leave the jury. The substitutes take their place in the discussion.

01 – 'EDIBLE CREEK'

- The project addresses the problem of maintaining unused public areas → we have a lack of contemporary tools to maintain these public spaces (issue of money) → gives a strategy to reuse unused areas
- These community gardens are very much liked by people → they form and generate communities
- It does not deal with the integration of the waterbed of the creek into the concept
- It is a very generic and fashionable proposal, it is not adapting to local conditions
- privatizes space → becomes a community space, which is not publicly accessible anymore → how to make programs that invite people to reused these unused areas?
- It can be considered as a complementary use as an element of a more complex project

→ 1 VOTES

→ OUT

02 – 'RAKOS PATAK ECOLOGICAL WATER CORRIDOR'

- It uses the three large elements as main symbols of the project
- It is a complex proposal with an almost metaphorical approach at the level of ecological systems and networks, but the relation of these systems to the three large scaled elements is not clear
- It uses playfulness in the large symbolic elements, but the use of scale is mistaken

→ 0 VOTES

→ OUT

03 – 'PATCHED CORRIDOR'

- The meandering fragments space
- It is a concept and a patchwork together, but the patchwork is not systematically adapted to the concept
- The project articulates the area of the creek with creating high intensity and low intensity zones
- The creek remains just a line, it is not involved in the concept

→ 2 VOTES

→ OUT

04 – 'XXS INCEPTION'

- The logic of the drawings is somewhat confusing
- Acupuncture approach
- Uses the 'Folie' as a typological element: not in a formal, but in a programmatic way: to make people stop
- Sections: has a precise idea about the spatial relations of the creek and of the surrounding: differentiates space smartly
- only formally works with/uses the linearity of the creek: the acupuncture effect is questionable without the next step of the project
- The proposal is not strong enough either at an urban either at an architectural level

→ 3 VOTES

→ OUT

05 – 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY'

- The project is interesting because of its very generic answer: it uses toolkit in a smart way → draws up a range of opportunities
- social responsibility handed over to the communities
- Uses a generic strategy: it is the strongest in the toolkit category
- It contributes to the possible future approach of the implementation: has clever ideas and reflects on important issues
- reflects on issues of the locality, but without making it to be the main topic of the project

→ 4 VOTES

→ KEPT

06 – 'CHAIN REACTION'

- Small scaled toolkit proposals reflecting on many questions
- Uses the scale of the proposed elements in a wrong way
- It has a strong and well-proportioned landscape concept, with good spatial relations and good decisions in many solutions, while other elements seem to be schematic

→ 3 VOTES

→ OUT

08 – 'LETTING FLOW'

- A strong and interesting "toolkit" project with a reaction on the questions of location
- Uses open tools that catalyze activities and makes communities get involved in the project
- Flexible system whose elements can be applied simultaneously and independently, but can be adapted to local topography (importance of the site)

→ 7 VOTES

→ KEPT

13 – 'THE MILLS' PARK'

- Deals with the typology of the creek and of the landscape in a smart way
- Its proposed identity is rather a stereotype
- It recalls the "heavy" landscape architecture of the 1980s

→ 3 VOTES

→ OUT

14 – 'RESEWING THE CITY'

- It shows that a lot of workforce has been put into the project with some very nice and elaborated details (nature pocket spaces)
- The program and the process of the project is explained very deeply

→ 4 VOTES

→ KEPT

15 – 'TUNE UP, ZUGLO!'

- Realistic and very much acceptable at its programmatic level, gives answers to a lot of issues raised in the brief at the level of reprogramming space
- It is a smart project with drawing up the quality of the possible urban conditions along the creek

→ 7 VOTES

→ KEPT

16 – 'WITHIN THE CREEK'

- Very thorough and elaborated project with many good statements (intensification, population growth), but the sensitivity is missing
- The densification issue could be important, but it is not possible with the constraints of the current zoning plan

→ 2 VOTES

→ OUT

19 – 'WHO SAID FLOODING WAS A PROBLEM?'

- Basic statement about the issue of managed flooding is important
- A very elaborate project, but it is too grandiose in its proposals and many elements of the project are not possible to be implemented

→ 0 VOTES

→ OUT

22 – 'BALTHASAR – MICRO IS MORE'

- Emotional project, but it is hard to understand
- Nicely drawn; it presents a series of dreams about the site → building up the message of the project is smart
- It is like a children's playground and it is not more than a Building Catalog
- It builds up a narrative but at the end it stays schematic

→ 3 VOTES

→ OUT

23 – 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE'

- Formal scheme with clear diagrams and with some very professional aspects → it is a carefully constructed project, which can be useful for the municipality in many aspects
- The proposed hills rather separate the landscape from the surrounding housing, so at the end of the day the visibility on the site will be blocked

→ 4 VOTES

→ KEPT

24 – '84000M3'

- It has a territorial scale proposal with some good considerations
- The project has a strong image, but it is not really reasonable
- Does not react on a lot of problems of the area

→ 3 VOTES

→ OUT

Fourth round:

Detailed discussion of the five projects in competition with the possibility of bringing back and reconsidering projects with 3 votes

05 – 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY'

- A generic project, its strength and also its weakness comes from its generic strategy
- Has some really finely and sensitively detailed proposals
- A project which is not easy to communicate at the local political level or to locals → it does not really give a scenario, it is "just" a general toolkit
- The communication of the project is the question, since not all the proposals/toolkits are completely true or adaptable to the site
- It is the future of Urban Design → democracy and opportunities, a range of possibilities with an open future

06 – 'CHAIN REACTION'

- The project is brought back to the discussion, because of its strong vision of a new landscape
- A project that could be easily accepted at the local level, with its high quality landscape proposal

14 – 'RESEWING THE CITY'

- Care given to collective space, but not all the elements are convincing
- Superficial at the general locations – the sections are wrong, they are only implementable by a lot of investments
- Very nice green project, but it is not smart enough and even not innovative
- The jury has taken the unanimous decision that the project is not discussed any more

→ OUT

08 – 'LETTING FLOW' + 15 – 'TUNE UP, ZUGLO!'

- These two projects are not discussed anymore in this jury round. Since they got 7 votes in the previous voting they will go further to the final jury in Paris.

06 – 'CHAIN REACTION' + 23 – 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE'

- (06 – 'CHAIN REACTION') General image of a green park
- It is good to have a range of projects for the final discussion in Paris and it is also good for the municipality
- (23 – 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE') The Universal approach is great, but the efforts are relatively too expensive at the end
- (06 – 'CHAIN REACTION') It provides a strong image for the future; low maintenance project, which could be the possible solution for some parts

05 – 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY'

06 – 'CHAIN REACTION'

23 – 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE'

- The jury has taken the unanimous decision that besides the previously decided two projects these three projects will go to the final jury in Paris.

The preliminary jury underlines that the most important criteria in the final evaluation of the projects should be (1) to find the proper toolkit, (2) to combine it into a proper concept and (3) to create a well-founded and realistic relation of the concept to the site.

As a result of the jury process 5 projects go to the final jury round in Paris:

05 – 'MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY'

06 – 'CHAIN REACTION'

08 – 'LETTING FLOW'

15 – 'TUNE UP, ZUGLO!'

23 – 'THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE'

The jury session closes at 18.05

2013. 10. 04. Budapest – minutes prepared by Arpad Szabo

CODES OF PROJECTS:

1	AF102	EDIBLE CREEK
2	AQ477	RAKOS PATAK ECOLOGICAL WATER CORRIDOR
3	AV763	PATCHED CORRIDOR
4	BD298	XXS INCEPTION
5	CB574	MANUAL TOWARDS A CLUMSY CITY
6	CM063	CHAIN REACTION
7	CO069	PERFECT TIMING
8	DV913	LETTING FLOW
9	DY877	AS MANY TREES AS POSSIBLE
10	ER343	URBANOTATION
11	FO794	CURE THE CITY
12	GR995	THE FRAMES OF IMAGINATION
13	HT054	THE MILLS' PARK
14	IT207	RESEWING THE CITY
15	IZ264	TUNE UP, ZUGLO'!
16	JU776	WITHIN THE CREEK
17	LO983	THRESHOLD
18	LR070	CURRENT ~ FLOW
19	OE586	WHO SAID FLOODING WAS A PROBLEM?
20	QC550	THREE TALES ALONG THE RAKOS TRAIL
21	RD458	MOVING GROUND
22	RO165	BALTHASAR – MICRO IS MORE
23	VD545	THE RHYTHM OF THE LINE
24	WL797	84000M3
25	WN986	THE RIBBON
26	YE296	NEEDLE AND THREAD