



4th Quadrant of Victory Square International Architectural Competition Prague – Czech Republic

Jury Phase 2 Assessment Report

Team No. 11: MVRDV

Criterion a): The proposal presents a high quality solution for programme distribution, creates synergies between the activities, taking into account the needs of different types of users of the area.

Multistorey retail outlets situated partly in the underground or above the ground floor are less attractive from the commercial point of view. The mix of apartments tends too much towards large flats, however the site potential is more in smaller ones.

It is interesting how the cultural hub is situated in the arch in the centre of the axis, in the centre of gravity of Dejvice and is well connected with Victory Square. However, the multi-level layout of the cultural facility is impractical, and it is not clear how the details, including the visitor flows between each floor, are addressed. The overall program in the buildings is placed far apart or on different levels. Therefore, programme distribution is not creating a desirable synergies.

Schematic drawings of layout do not fully prove the possible meeting of the UCT building programme

Criterion b): The architectural and urban design proposal reinforces place qualities and respects the requirements regarding the urban design composition of Victory Square and its surroundings.

The compact blocks are inspired by some features of the original Engel's masterplan. Also, the Technická Street is given a prominent position between the large blocks preserving the vision of Antonín Engel and connecting Victory Square with the university area. Despite the rigid structure of the filigree the design, paradoxically, stands out by its sensitive response of the facades to the surrounding and has strong historical context.

However, the pocket parks are scattered and following a rhythm based on existing trees lead to unjustified positioning of spaces as well as the shifting of building volumes. The green on the residential part is questionable and its absence would highly change the quality of the architecture. Despite the innovative and unconventional approach to the preservation of greenery the impressive trellis/filigree installed in front of the facade can reduce light, cause shadows, reduces residents' comfort inside and obstruct views from the interior. Also, the facades are too uniform.

The UCT building design does not meet the requirements for a representative building of national importance which is supposed to be a building with distinctive architecture which makes it to stand out from the nearby commercial development. On the contrary, the building is integrated into a commercial monoblock.

Criterion c): The proposed public spaces and courtyards are architecturally and functionally interlinked with proposed buildings and enhance the socially cohesive functional mix and diversity of activities.

The strong feature in the vision is the prominence of Technická Street and how light shafts and water is connected with the cultural program.

However, there is little relationship between program, design and function of the spaces. Many spaces in the site are scattered and do not contribute to a synergy effects, as each space has to support itself. The inner courtyards of the blocks with narrow passages do not create attractive public spaces and do not utilise the site potential in the sense of permeability and pedestrian routes. The design of public spaces is inappropriate with relatively small areas of greenery. At the same time, closed blocks do not offer a more resourceful approach to the design of the courtyards in relation to the street frontage. Private and semi-public parts in the courtyards are absent, primarily in the residential area. The pedestrian connection via the shopping mall between the underground station and Technická Street is missing.

Criterion d): The proposal presents a high quality solution for the blue-green infrastructure of the development site and contributes to the city's climate goals.

It is appreciated how the project attempts to incorporate blue green solutions within the building structure, and make it part of the architecture. Integration of the existing trees and the design of diverse green public spaces including green roofs (the roof park), trailing and potted plants is the main positive feature of the design.

However, technical, and very likely expensive solutions do not seem to be feasible, maintenance friendly and environmentally sustainable. The project would have gained strength by applying better natural driven solutions on the ground floor. The calculation of the average floor area ratio to define the greenery ratio and documenting the performance of the calculation according to the zoning plan methodology is missing. Overall, the all-year-round, full-scope maintenance of the greenery is one of the biggest question mark in the design.

Criterion e): The proposal presents a holistic, feasible and sustainable mobility solution for all modes of transport.

The overall approach to infrastructure solutions is not elaborated as requested. The transport design is not very detailed: schematic drawing of the layout D in Šolínova Street with most bus stops located there is missing; it is not possible to verify the proposed flow of traffic in the underground; Šolínova Street is shown only schematically; the entire design of cycle routes and bicycle parking is shown only in the overall layout; bicycle parking inside the buildings is not indicated; the total sum of all parking spaces does not add up. The pedestrian connection from the metro into the site and the UCT building is not efficient.

Criterion f): The proposal presents a technological solution with a high degree of energy efficiency and flexibility.

Use of the artistic filigree structure to support balconies and facade elements, including solar panels is regarded as very positive.

However, the added structure comes with a high environmental, project and maintenance costs. Its long term function and grace as well as maintenance costs of vegetation and facades is highly questionable.