

CLOSING REPORT

as prepared by the inviter

The Office of the Parliament of Hungary

on the evaluation process of design proposals deposited

as competition documentations for the

„Creative design competition for the visual modernization of the Kossuth tér 6-8. office building.”

thru November 19 - December 14., 2015.

The Office of the Parliament of Hungary (*az Országgyűlés Hivatala*) has declared a design competition.

The subject and goal of the design competition is summarized below:

Subject: The development of various architectural ideas regarding façade and architectural massing of the “Budapest, V. kerület Kossuth tér 6-8.” office building, in connection to the planned reconstruction and modernization of the visual urban appearance.

Goal: After the projected reconstruction, the renewed Kossuth tér 6-8. office building will house various parts of the bureaucratic organization of the Office of the Parliament of Hungary.

The goal of the design competition is to develop architectural ideas and realization proposals for the new façade and architectural massing, in connection to the reconstruction described above.

Nature: Open competition - for design and architectural proposals, on the basis of regarding architectural design competition rules (*a Tervpályázati eljárások szabályairól szóló 305/2011.(XII.23.) Korm. rendelet*) as valid at the time of publication of the invitation for the creative design competition.

Inviter has answered, in due time, all clarification questions received during the preparatory period in relation to the creative design competition.

The opening of the deposited design proposals was performed collectively on November 19., 2015. at 8:00AM, at the “Kossuth” hall of the Parliament Building. The memorandum of the opening process documents the following observations:

There have been 40 design competition packages received in total. The members of the evaluation board have numbered each deposition (the same number has been placed, along with the signature of those present, on the external envelope, the cover page of the

documentation and in some cases - when it was judged that the documentation may fall apart - on all of the pages, as well as on the internal, closed envelope). The closed envelopes were guarded separately, in a closed cabinet, until the end of the evaluation. The envelopes of those design proposals which were selected for purchase were opened after the end of the evaluation process.

Four of the design proposals were deemed invalid. One of them was mailed after the deadline, one of them personally submitted at the of the Office of the Parliament of Hungary after the deadline and two have breached requirements in relation to confidentiality (information suitable for the identification of the competitor was not placed in a separate, closed envelope within the submitted documentation).

The work of the evaluation board in general and the evaluation process in particular have been documented by a continuously kept memorandum.

The evaluation board has conducted its activities according to the relevant laws and regulations, as well as according to its own work plan, as proposed by the chairman and approved by the members.

The evaluation board has, during the evaluation process, contemplated whether and to what measure the submitted design proposal would help inviter in the achievement of the goals announced in the design competition documentation. Therefore, suggestions in the submitted documentations were evaluated in a complex manner, according to minute expectations detailed below.

The 36 competition documentations found valid after opening were reviewed on multiple occasions by the evaluation board.

The evaluation aspects of the design competition documentations were as follows:

1. How well is the design proposal harmonized with its surrounding buildings and the general environment? What is the level of the architectural quality of the façade composition? How well is the proposal suited to the Parliament building and the Main Square of the Nation?
2. Do the structural system, the materials used and the technical solutions provided assure the realization of the proposal? Are the function dependent (category A office building) requirements safely met both by the façade and the roof covering in terms of acoustic, fire protection, thermal protection and facility management expectations?
3. What environment friendly, innovative solutions are used? How well do these solutions provide for the inexpensive operation of the building?

Judgement has been reached after three rounds of contemplation.

During round one, each member of the evaluation board declared his/her opinion on whether a particular design proposal was worthy of further investigation on the basis of its architectural

qualities, aesthetics and ideas contained. The evaluation board has decided that any proposal that was deemed to be worthy for further examination by at least one of its members, was to be included in round two of the evaluation process.

In round two, all proposals “still standing” were discussed in detail by all members of the evaluation board. After the discussion above, proposals were selected for round three on the basis of majority votes.

In round three, the evaluation board has made several fundamental decisions, namely:

- In accordance to the design competition documentation – and in parallel to the unanimous opinion of the members of the evaluation board – a winning design proposal should have been suitable, without significant modification, for direct application as part of a design program representing the expectations of inviter, in terms of the future façade and architectural massing of the Kossuth tér 6-8. office building. According to the decision of the evaluation board, no such design proposal has been deposited; all of the competitors have submitted proposals that, without significant modification, fall short of meeting all criteria laid down in the design competition documentation. (Since, on the basis of the above, no proposal has met the primary requirements to a level necessary for awarding, the investigation of further, less important parameters was deemed unnecessary.) As a result, the evaluation board has made the unanimous decision that no design proposal was to be awarded as winner of the competition (or to be named second, third etc. in position).
- According to the view of the evaluation board, however, several design proposals contained design elements that would be useful for further design activities. It was therefore decided, that 7 such documentations were to be chosen for purchase. Thru the majority vote of the evaluation board, only one of those design proposals that contained similar or identical suggestions were selected.
- After the detailed consideration of the individual suggestions and the general evaluation of the creative design competition itself, the evaluation board has unanimously decided that the full amount (200 000 EUR) dedicated for the awarding and purchasing of design proposals was not to be utilized, instead a 100 000 EUR sum was to be used for purchases.
- In terms of a decision on purchase, the evaluation board has not considered, as an independent value suitable for purchase from a competitor, the following:
 - basic elements in connection to the geometry of the building that were contained in several design proposals (and which typically could be derived from the logic of the creative design competition documentation): these were, amongst others, the north façade bays forming the cornerstones of the original Hüttl façade concept, the simple plane of the west façade or the general shape of the roof, etc.
 - various suggestions for the functional use of the building

- floorplan suggestions which were not part of the original design task as contained in the creative design competition documentation
- suggestions for the use of common, widespread, well known building materials
- suggestions for the use of architectural elements present in the Hüttl plans – and as a consequence in the neighboring buildings as well (stone surfaces, freeze elements, series of arched openings on the ground floor, roof shape etc.).
- The evaluation board has concluded that none of the design proposals selected for purchasing breaches the model space limit and all of the competitors whose work has been selected have paid the appropriate competition fee.

In conclusion and with reference to the above, the evaluation board has judged that the competition is also successful in terms of section (4) of 20. § of government decree no. 305/2011.(XII.23.).

General evaluation:

The most difficult part of the design task appears to have been the difficulty of creating a façade onto the seven story frame of the 1972 building in harmony with the rhythm of the façade of the neighboring six story historic building.

Several of the competitors replied to this question with the answer “as this is not possible, we should not even try to attempt it”. These design proposals have resulted with façade suggestions as follows:

on one occasion the end result was a finely developed, aesthetic office-building façade that would be a certain architectural value in most surroundings, however, this façade in particular does not fit at all into the general appearance of Kossuth square,

or

in other instances contained some kind of ideology based, exclamation type gesture (Hungarian creativity, great Hungarians, “circles of life” etc.) that - whether fixed or on a mobile (interactive) base - considered the architectural façade as a mere carrier surface, instead of considering it the integral part of the architecture of a specific building.

These design proposals were in no part supported by the evaluation board.

Other competitors have attempted variations that contained suggestions for the conservation or lesser re-iteration of the realized Pintér façade. True, neither the design competition documentation nor the evaluation board itself wished to take a firm position against the aesthetics of the building built according to the plans of Béla Pintér. However, if nothing more, the fact that there was a design competition for the renewal of the façade, itself should have made it clear that inviter was of the opinion, that today it must be possible to give much better answers to a Kossuth square magnitude architectural question. If this idea would be

impossible to realize during the refurbishment, then there would be no moral ground for the development of yet another modern building on the site. If there are no answers, better than the existing architecture, then the renewal should be limited to the mere modernization of the existing building (contemporary, better quality materials, higher level of comfort, more natural light etc.).

A large portion of the competitions have failed to satisfy the requirement that asked for a reasonably close adherence to the urban zoning limitations of the Hüttl plans in terms of the façade of the new building. In other words, these suggestions did not contain facades that were reflective or communicative with the other facades of the Kossuth square space wall, neither did they suggest solutions that would result with a representative, independently integral appearance of the south space wall.

The most accentuated elements of the Hüttl plans are the two identically symmetric bays of which the eastern one was built. Design proposals not chosen for purchase contained on several occasions suggestions that failed to realize the importance of the requirements above.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | The suggestion contains a false mobile façade that attempts to reenact the original plans and tries to unify the current contradictory composition of the space wall. The general ideas of the architectural massing suggest a correct direction, however the details fail to harmonize and they look as if there was no thought behind their selection. This especially shows in the development of the roof mass which lacks concept. Another telltale is the detail of the perforated façade and the rhythm of the openings. The perforated elements also raise the issue of enough natural light entering the building while the size of the elements may fail to realize the suggested wave like appearance of the building. A positive element of the plans is the elimination of the saw-tooth space wall on the west side via the plane surface connection to the neighboring building. |
| 2 | The simplicity of the plans, the sterile forms and the gentle reference to the Hüttl mass are both encouraging, but the general ideas have failed to unify into a single thought in the concept as a whole. The façade has little real connection to the facades of the neighboring buildings, as the proposal merely reflects the surrounding area and the other buildings. The saw-tooth problem was not dealt with on the west façade, another issue that lessens the unified closing of the square. The general ideas of the plan – with the use of consequent forms and matching materials - could be supported. |
| 3 | The plan shows a minutely developed concept which presents a building that is well designed in its details. A real school example, which at the same time fails to contribute new, neither in form nor in material. Conceptually, its value lies in the framework placed in front of the skeleton frame which reflects upon the underlying structure. The solution also adheres to the original architectural massing. Its outdated formal vocabulary, however, makes it unsuitable for the closing of the grandiose main square of the nation. |
| 4 | The main idea of the proposal should be highlighted. Great Hungarian names and motifs collected on the main square of the nation as remembrance and tribute should be |

| | |
|----|--|
| | recommended. Good ideas with a finely drawn graphical adaptation on the façade. The architectural massing of the building is simple; the west façade closing – as seen before – with a simple plane should again be encouraged. There are, however, almost no references to the Hüttl plans. The roof structure and the great glass covering are overemphasized and insensitive in relation to the detail of the other solutions. Even a fine graphic façade may not be supported in this scale. |
| 5 | A positive trait of the suggestion is the main concept that a bridge should be made between past, present and future. The Hüttl plans were evidently analyzed and understood, this is shown in the connections to the neighboring buildings. In the end, however, this thought was realized via means too much on the didactic side. The imitation of the original plans and the simplification of the façade (e.g. in the spacing of the openings and in the divisions of the architectural massing) are both usual tools in heritage conservation projects. In this case, unfortunately, the solution has no relation to the underlying structural system (especially the slab system). The imitative nature and monumental ideas of the concept cannot be accepted for the closing of the Kossuth square. |
| 6 | The suggestion does not contain ideas or solutions that add to the existing structure either in form or in content. The end result shows little deviation from the current architecture. The strange superstructure on the top is incomprehensible in relation to the other parts of the building. A positive attribute is the elimination of the saw-blade façade problem on the west side. The current state of these plans, however, is not suitable for the closing of the Kossuth square. |
| 7 | This plan functions with brutally simple, monotone, unremarkable tools. There are no references to the original concept. These plans are not suitable for the refurbishment of the building, nor for the closing of the Kossuth square. |
| 8 | The façade development of the plans may be questioned from several directions. The application of the details of the original plans onto the new façade is a good idea, however pairing the details with an absolutely inadequate opening division results with a contradictory building appearance. A positive element is the fact that the superstructure and the bay-like extension subtly refer to the original Hüttl concept. It is sad, that the thought was not continued onto the west corner. The plans, however, cannot be supported neither for the refurbishment, nor for the closing of the square. |
| 9 | The realized concept is based on a very basic, antique, simple mass. As if from great, raw stone blocks the intricate final version was yet to be borne. The feeling is emphasized by the development of the ground floor. This space is not opened adequately to the pedestrian area, although the presence of the subway entrance would justify the spatial connection. The western side of the new façade cleverly dissipates the contradiction of the original recessing. The solution connects well to the internal structure that is to be retained. The different façade surfaces use the same toolset, yet on a different scale as they try to connect to the façade structure of the neighbouring buildings. The solution, however, still falls short of a convincing, integral space wall texture. |
| 10 | This is a design concept that is correct, both in its scale and in the use of its elements. There are parallel elements to another similar contemporary building on a different |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>Budapest location in Vörösmarty square. We may state that the suggestion has an inner city appearance. As an architectural product removed from Kossuth square, the roof superstructure is a less well versed unnecessary extension. Another advantage is that it irons out the west Danube façade and as a consequence the new elements can easily be placed onto this surface as well. The turning of the corner is, however, not considered an important architectural problem by the designer. The form is not complicated in this location, is not adapted to the actual position. The translucency of the ground floor - as a requirement - is easily satisfied by this concept. The advantages of this contemporary façade concept, however, turn to disadvantages in the area surrounding the Parliament building. The simple, strong, geometric form becomes ever more dominant, even when just compared to the existing façade. As of yet, the vertical divisions of the Parliament are imitated, this is to be replaced with an even stronger formal language, as suggested by the competitor.</p> |
| 11 | <p>The designer of this proposal did not operate with architectural tools. Furthermore, he/she did not deal with the west façade at all. The building, as a media, is truly a modern thought. We know of minimal or biomorphic buildings which show light effects or artistic appearances as situative self-statements. The concept goes around the design process and revolves around a single gesture. A surface such as this grabs the attention away from what counts. It is capable of illustrating content not necessarily suitable for the Kossuth square.</p> |
| 12 | <p>The glass façade included in this concept seems to remove itself from the square, as opposed to getting closer to it. As if this material use could be suggested anywhere. This, however, does not mean that the multiply abstractive perceptive process could be skipped. Unfortunately, the vertical fragmented nature of the west façade is retained. The ground floor is closed, as opposed to its originally open nature. An advantage of this proposal is the fact that the remaining structure fits well with the slab disposition. Kossuth square, however, has a new axis, a north-south oriented axis that connects the subway station with the visitor center in parallel with the Danube. The new axis leads visitors thru green areas and thru the most exiting area of all, the area between the main entrance of the Parliament and the flagstaff. From this area the new façade should be noticed by all and composed by the designer as a reception of the new axis. An answer must be searched for not only on the ground floor, but also in the corner area, as well as thru the reiteration of the main freeze line of the Hülthl plans.</p> |
| 13 | <p>The design proposal simplifies the building mass consistently and as much as possible. The simplification gives space and opportunity to place quasi-graphical compositions on the façade plane. Vertically we see a consistently lightened fragmentation. This is a true and seen trait of our inner city historic buildings. As we advance higher up, the inner floor heights are decreased, the walls are thinner and the openings are lesser. The Hülthl building even has terraces to this effect, removing the building mass from the facade. The selected solution, however, runs into a contradiction on the ground floor where the subway entrance requires the opening of the building to the exterior. As a result, we see a closed, undeveloped suggestion. We also perceive the landing of a UFO on the top of the building. This mass probably attempts to break up the façade mass that</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | became too rocky and blocky. These kinds of gestures seem impossible to function in a historical environment. |
| 14 | The disposition contains architectural tools and massing that is undeveloped and schematic. The use of techniques seen in textile art or in paper mosaics is in itself theoretically supported. The end result is, however, that the competitor fails to remove his work from the limitations of the original concept, a concept that was judged to be unfit for the surroundings in Kossuth square. One of the retained motifs, for example, is the fragmentation of the west facade. The development of the ground and of the other floors is not connected. We see a pitched roof that is not part of the building as a whole. The concept does not really do away with the plans of Béla Pintér, his work appears somewhere in the background. |
| 15 | This design proposal seems, as if it contained three different plans. The roof is removed from the west and north façade. The cave-like openings on the ground floor may be reflective of the tunnels of the subway system. Above this is a lamella line that wrinkles in a comfortable, but self-proposing manner. It may be possible that offices in the background lack adequate natural light. The west façade remains structurally vertical. A greater problem is that the sectional, gradually recessed massing is retained and other than the use of similar materials there is basically no connection between this façade and the other parts of the exterior of the building. |
| 16 | This suggestion simplifies the mass of the building to the extreme. There are plane like metallic perforated shading elements placed in front of the façade. These shading devices aim to form, from the first floor up, an architectural mass seen in the Hüttl plans. It is hard to understand why the ground floor was left out of this idea which, consequentially, stops short one floor up from the ground level. The façade system should contain finer architectural details (such as pilasters, openings and divisions), pixels perforated into the shading devices are, according to the view of the evaluation board, not suitable for this purpose. This solution also limits the entry of natural light in an uncomfortable degree. |
| 17 | Excluded – The envelope, that should have contained information suitable for the identification of the competitor and which should have been closed, was open. Furthermore, declarations that have been placed in the closed envelope were also mistakenly placed into the envelope containing the CD. As a consequence, along with the contents of the CD, the evaluation board may have gained knowledge of the competitor’s identity. Confidentiality requirements were thus breached. |
| 18 | The concept aims to follow the Hüttl plans in its architectural massing – segmentation, roof shape, etc., at least on the first floor and above. The most noticeable element of the suggested façade system is a covering that contains perforated bronze elements which move in windy weather. This may be an ideal solution in many locations, however, in the Kossuth square it is to be judged as a mistake. A constantly changing façade in motion does not harmonize with the grandiose, celebratory nature of the façade of the other buildings on Kossuth square. The ground floor of the building does not even try to form an integral part with the neighboring buildings or with the façade of the rest of the stories above. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 19 | <p>The design proposal contains, as declared by the competitor himself/herself, the original plans of Béla Pintér. The concept evidently limits its involvement to the “correction” of deviations from these plans, as mistakes made during construction. Inviter does not question architectural values of the existing building; however he is very aware of limitations of the situation in which Béla Pintér made the plans at the time. The design competition documentation is based on the belief that a much better architectural answer could be given to the contemporary requirements of a modern office building on Kossuth square in terms of façade and massing. This belief is in obvious opposition to relinquishing the existing structure. The reiteration of the original plans is, as an architectural declaration in itself interesting. This, however, cannot be considered as an independent, creative architectural value original to the competitor and thus cannot be recommended within the framework of this design competition.</p> |
| 20 | <p>The north façade of this proposal simply and schematically copies the façade system of its neighboring building. The disposition of the openings has no relation to the underlying structure; as a consequence, totally unrelated elements of the skeleton frame structure may be seen thru the windows in several instances. The suggestion for the assurance of adequate natural light provision – namely the transparent epoxy resin laminate façade elements – on one hand most probably would limit natural light entrance to an undesirable degree, while on the other hand also would certainly limit the view from the interior to the outside. On the western façade the competitor utilized an option described in the creative design documentation and has suggested a plane-like façade surface. This was done, however, in a manner that instead of solving the original architectural contradiction merely hid the problem behind a false, decoration-like simple glass façade covering.</p> |
| 21 | <p>The suggestion contains plans that imitate on both sides of the building the facades of the adjacent buildings. On the north side this may be understood, but on the Danube side neither historical, nor architectural reasons justify the choice. There seems to be no grounds for copying the Kossuth square no. 5. building’s façade. Furthermore, the two unrelated facades contained in the proposal meet uncomfortably at the corner of the building. The form of the roof has no relation to any of the facades and the laborious copying of the decorative stone elements of the Hüttl building cannot be understood as the reiteration of the historic façade system of the original plans, as perhaps suggested by the creative design documentation. Another problem is that the stone of the Hüttl building is totally alien to the selected modern materials of the design proposal.</p> |
| 22 | <p>The design proposal shows only in general outline the Hüttl architectural massing; the chosen façade system is not capable of containing finer architectural detail in a smaller scale. The two dimensional visualization as assembled from small glass pixel planes – which, as an added variation, move in windy weather - fail to reflect upon the strong character of the original plans. The difference would be especially noticeable when light would hit the façade at a narrow angle. The solution aims to solve the west façade contradiction thru the insertion of a merely visual, decoration-like false façade, but it is impossible to understand why the original façade is retained in the background.</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| 23 | The Hülthl building is re-enacted both in mass and surface appearance by a perforated copper false façade hung in front of the existing structure. Although the designer has not demonstrated that the chosen material is suitable on this scale for the assurance of adequate natural light for the recessed spaces and there are questions to be raised in terms of upkeep, still the concept both in structure and materials' choice was found to be suitable for further investigation. The evaluation board has decided that this design proposal was to be chosen for purchasing. |
| 24 | The design proposal considers the original Hülthl façade, as shown on the aquarelle, as a simple plane and reenacts its elements in tone via façade holes with various dimensions. The existing, retained structure is hidden by a perforated shading wall that satisfies both the natural light requirements and excess light protection needs of the office quarters behind. The end result is an exciting revitalization of the 19 th century façade space wall with 21 st century architectural elements. The solution provides for an appearance that is in successful harmony with the surrounding buildings and adequately reinstates the original space wall concept. Although the designer has not demonstrated that the chosen material is suitable for the assurance of natural light entering the building on such scale, but the concept, both in terms of structure and materials' use is worthy of further investigation. Thus, the decision was made that the design documentation was to be purchased. |
| 25 | This design proposal is based on the architectural disposition of the existing building but aims to reiterate its content in a modern manner that does not wish to compete with the Parliament building. The suggested solution handles the north and west facades independently and without obvious reason, thus it fails to connect even to its own elements. The formal language used is in some unique manner connected to the facades of the adjacent buildings. This, however, results with a strong visual statement that is, in its present form, not suitable for the corner of Kossuth square. |
| 26 | The design proposal has chosen to further "develop" the existing building, in a manner that intensifies the pillar division to a degree that fits the dispositions of the Hülthl building's façade character. This original idea, however, fails to create an overall final appearance that is in harmony with the facades of the surrounding buildings. The chosen direction of "refurbishment" does not contain values suitable for the Main Square of the Nation or for the Parliament building. |
| 27 | This design concept suggests that the original façade should be used for the originally chosen symmetric closing of the Kossuth square space wall. The façade is not a false structure, the openings reflect real functions and the glass surfaces are the result of the unification of internal and external elements. The solution solves its corner concept on a high architectural level both in terms of form and materials' choice. As an end result, the proposal fits well into the texture of the surrounding buildings. The Kossuth square and the Parliament may receive a suitable new element when this concept is further developed. This is also true in terms of the historical development of the city. The design proposal is suitable for further investigation; the evaluation board has decided that the documentation was to be purchased. |
| 28 | The design proposal respects the existing building to a level where the suggestion is a re-enactment of its architectural ideology. On the north façade, it tries to harmonize with perhaps the Parliament, via formal solutions strange to this environment. The concept, therefore, is basically some kind of renewal of the existing building that fails |

| | |
|----|--|
| | to achieve the successful, harmonized closing of the corner of Kossuth square, neither does it assure the desired revitalization of its surroundings. |
| 29 | The design proposal contains a suggestion that refurbishes the existing building with the quasi-following of the Hülthl building's façade decorations, shoulders, stone balconies and pilasters. Unfortunately, when compared to the existing structure, these plans do not represent new values that would be worthy for the closing of Kossuth square and that could be considered harmonized elements of the closer and wider surroundings. |
| 30 | The Hülthl concept remains a torso and the design proposal chooses to finish this work via the utilization of the materials of the original zoning regulation. The suggested façade comes to being thru the use of contemporary architectural tools such as stone lamellas. The original urban design principles are retained, thus the plans handle on a high architectural level the problem of the corner and the harmonization with the surroundings. The building is current, but at the same time it also shows respect for the original concept for the Kossuth square. The evaluation board has chosen the proposal for purchasing. |
| 31 | The competitor has kept the vertical divisions of the original 1972 façade undisturbed, but released and opened up façade in general, all this in order to harbor the needs of the current function. The suggestion contains a glass surface that is positioned behind the vertical stems, in-between which a vertical lamella series is placed. The lamellas are mobile, which, according to the view of the designer, will satisfy all acoustic, natural light and energy type requirements. The finely envisioned, perforated lamella surfaces, when rotated, form a continuous surface which serves as a reenactment or re-visioning of the Hülthl building's façade. The contemporary architectural solution successfully and comprehensively unifies the early 20 th century space wall concept and the late 20 th century realized building with the expectations of our days. The suggested structure is worthy of further investigation, the evaluation board has chosen the solution for purchasing. |
| 32 | The competitor has unified the original Hülthl space wall concept with the 20 th century envisioning of the 1970s office building's façade via a contemporary architectural solution. The newly built, homogenous, full surface façade is complemented by a fixed, building high, evenly spaced, vertical lamella series. The Hülthl type facade plan elements appear as relief impressions. The solution is curved around onto the Danube side façade. As if to avoid the too direct application of the eclectic façade plans, the upper and lower sections are confidently sheared off. Thus, the connection to the early 20 th century façade concept becomes symbolic. The roof shape is to be favored. The ground floor opening, however, is questionable both in terms of its appearance and size. Further questions may be raised regarding the "turning of the corner" of the two facades. The evaluation board has decided that the design proposal was to be purchased. |
| 33 | The competitor suggests that the existing structure should be completed with the use of pre-fabricated concrete crust panels which are to be hung onto the current skeleton frame. The appearance is the simplified, reiterated version of the Hülthl concept; the |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>suggestion continues the placement of the crust panels on the Danube side façade as well. This solid plane – since the window openings are also covered by the crust panels – is opened up thru identical window openings, also made of concrete, according to the functional needs of the office building behind. All this is done in a manner altogether independent of the eclectic façade orders. The competitor has assured harmonization with the surroundings and with the unified space wall thru the use of contemporary architectural tools. The solution also considers the structural order and functional needs of the existing building. Questions may be raised in connection to the necessity and possible realization of the glazed ceramic tile façade coverings. The evaluation board has decided for the purchasing of the design proposal.</p> |
| 34 | <p>The competitor has placed an interactive surface in front of the existing false façade of the current office building. The variable, programmed motion, lenticular elements are placed onto a vertical lamella series. There are several suggestions for the materials choice for the lenticulars; however the final selection is left open. The competitor suggests that graphical representations, either in connection to the Hüttl façade, other motifs or events on the square may be shown on this display. Although the original concept may be considered interesting, the suggestion did not – according to the view of the evaluation board – result with a solution that is in harmony with the surroundings and that which is adapted to the existing space wall.</p> |
| 35 | <p>The main concept of the competitor was the placement of stone-lookalike “kváder” blocks onto the façade of the existing building, in supposed harmony with similar surfaces found on neighboring buildings. The block elements are to be pre-fabricated from fiber reinforced concrete as crust panels. The end result is a homogenous surface with horizontal divisions. As reference to the eclectic façade elements of its neighbors, occasionally the homogenous surface is sectionally extended in a diagonal manner. The competitor, however, does not do much more in order to assure the unified nature of the space wall’s appearance. He/she did not attempt further connections thru the division of the openings, thru scaling, proportions or philosophy, generally speaking there is weak connection with the surroundings. The extensions breach the encompassing model space limit.</p> |
| 36 | <p>The competitor has, without much modification, reenacted the Hüttl façade concept, the sample being the neighboring building. The structure, the use of the materials and the architectural detailing are all identical. The competitor has done the same on the Danube side on a lesser scale. According to this suggestion, not only the façade walls would be re-built, but also - thru the partial demolition of the existing structure – the framework of the complete lateral tract. The suggestion wished to solve the discrepancy between the current 8 story building and the proposed 7 story building in such manner. Besides the fact that the proposal contradicts elements of the creative design documentation (which states that the existing structure is to be retained) the factual realization of demolition work above an operational subway station is also to be questioned.</p> |
| 37 | <p>The competitor suggests the placement of a two layer façade covering in front of the existing building’s façade. The inner layer is composed of a solid glass plane, while the external layer is composed of large geometrical elements found in gothic forms. The external façade is made of translucent concrete elements. The solving of the façade in</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | such manner is alien not only in its philosophy, but also in terms of form and scale to the current surroundings. Harmony with the Main Square of the Nation, harmony with its meaning and harmony with the celebratory nature of the surrounding buildings is not achieved. The plans fail to separate the main entrance of the building from the entrance of the subway station. As the proposal lacks adequate detail, the technical viability of the facade solution cannot be judged. |
| 38 | Excluded – The envelope which was to be handed in sealed was open. |
| 39 | Excluded – The proposal was mailed on November 13., 2015. |
| 40 | Excluded – The hand-in procedure was breached, section 16.§ (1) rule was not adhered to (personal delivery instead of mailing or equivalent) and the due date was also missed. |

Suggestions for methods and opportunities for the subsequent use of the results of the creative design competition:

The evaluation board has, after reaching its decisions described above, finalized this closing report and after common reading unanimously approved its content. Subsequently the closed envelopes were opened.

on the date and at the place stated above

Members of the evaluation board:

.....

Zsolt Füleky chairman

.....

Dr. Balázs Szeneczey

.....

Zoltán Cselovszki

.....

Dr. Péter Hajnóczy

.....

István Sárváry

.....

Tihamér Szalay

.....

Tamás Wachsler

Legal expert

.....

Dr. Katalin Laczkó