RENEWAL OF NYUGATI RAILWAY STATION AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

INVITATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION

FINAL REPORT

BFK

The present document is the final report (**Final Report**), prepared in accordance with Article 25 (3) of the Design Competition Decree by the Evaluation Committee of the invitational architectural design competition (**Design Competition**) for the renewal of the Nyugati Railway Station and its surroundings, initiated by the BFK Budapest Fejlesztési Központ Nonprofit Zrt. [Budapest Development Agency Ltd.] (**Client**) in accordance with the provisions of the Government Decree 310/2015 (X.28.) on design competition procedures (**Design Competition Decree**).

1. THE NAME, TITLE, OBJECTIVE, FORM AND CHARACTER OF THE DESIGN COMPETITION

1.1. The Client

BFK Budapest Fejlesztési Központ Nonprofit Zrt. [Budapest Development Agency Ltd.]

H-1027 Budapest, Horvát utca 14-26.

1.2. The title of the Design Competition

Invitational architectural design competition for the renewal of the Nyugati Railway Station and its surroundings.

1.3. The objective of the Design Competition

In the framework of this Design Competition, the Client is seeking architectural proposals for a modern building complex and landscaping that meets the requirements of modern, high-traffic railway operation and respects the heritage of the historic building, as defined in the Design program of the Design Competition, and that can serve the required functions to the highest possible standard and meet the evaluation criteria set out in the Competition brief.

The objective of the Design Competition is to ensure that, following the design competition procedure, a negotiated public procurement procedure is conducted without prior publication of a contract notice, according to the relevant Section 9 (2) the Design Competition Decree, and that on the basis thereof, the design contract is concluded.

1.4. The form and character of the Design Competition

Form of the Design Competition: invitational, single-round design competition with a value exceeding the Community threshold.

2. PROCEDURE OF THE DESIGN COMPETITION

In particular, the following legal provisions and conditions apply to the procedure of the Design Competition:

- The current legislation in force in Hungary,
- Act CXLIII of 2015 on Public Procurements (**Kbt.**),
- Government Decree No. 310/2015 (X. 28.) on design competition procedures,
- Government Decree 424/2017 (XII.19.) on the detailed rules of electronic public procurement (**Ekrsz**).

A Competition brief (**Competition brief**) was published in the Official Journal of the European Union under the reference **2021/S 203-531205**, amended by notices published under references **2021/S 209-548335** and **2021/S 236-622582**, and the Competition brief was finalised on 14.01.2022, with the answers to the questions.

3. SCHEDULE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE SUBMISSIONS

3.1. Schedule for the evaluation

The evaluation of the submission was carried out by the Client in accordance with the deadlines set out in the Competition brief, as follows:

Opening of submissions received in paper format and electronic opening of submissions received electronically	01.03.2022 13:30
Plenary session of the Evaluation Committee Day 1	16.03.2022 08:30
Plenary session of the Evaluation Committee Day 2	17.03.2022 10:00
Plenary session of the Evaluation Committee Day 3	18.03.2022 08:30
Preliminary settlement appearance expertise	23.03.2022
Disclosure of the authors of the submissions	24.03.2022
Publication of results	26.03.2022

3.2. The number and status of submissions received

Deadline for receipt of submissions in digital and paper format	01.03.2022 12:00
Number of submissions received by the deadline	12 pcs
Opening of submissions received in paper format	01.03.2022 13:30

The Evaluation Committee accepted all submissions as having been submitted by the deadline. Before the opening, the discloser taped the submission number on the parcels and replaced it with an evaluation code number, and the members of the Evaluation Committee present at the opening signed and numbered each document of the submission with an evaluation serial number. Only the discloser was able to identify the evaluation serial number with the submission number.

From a formal and substantive point of view, the Evaluation Committee did not find any deficiencies that would have made it impossible to evaluate any of the submissions, and all submissions complied with the requirements of the Competition brief; therefore, the Evaluation Committee did not exclude any submissions.

3.3. Evaluation criteria

The Evaluation Committee evaluated the incoming submissions based on the following criteria.

3.4. Adaptation to the environment

The Evaluation Committee positively evaluated if the building complex:

- its overall architectural impact, the mass of the remaining and designed buildings and extensions have appropriate proportions, and its urban appearance enrich the historical environment;
- has a distinct identity in a unique form, respectful of the historical values;
- the development of urban community spaces connected to its units provides urban space experiences for residents, those using the area, as well as those continuing their travel (view, outlook, orientation, civilized forms of recreation);
- enriches the established urban landscape in a high-quality manner, engages in dialogue with the neighbouring environment and existing structures, in particular in its approach to the remaining monuments and protected buildings, and the characteristics of the established traffic node;
- easy to access, easy to interpret on foot from public transport stops, as well as by bicycle or car, ensuring comfortable change of mode for all modes of transport;
- is connected to the city's green network system, connecting the pedestrian, cycling and green networks of the surrounding city districts.

3.5. Architecture and mass creation

The Evaluation Committee positively evaluated if the building complex:

- its overall architectural impact its proportion increase the quality of the environment, and it is connected to the rich history of the environment in a contemporary way;
- is building on the historical traditions of railway architecture, but in a contemporary manner and adapted to the latest technologies creating dynamically operating, high-traffic open-covered spaces that are organically connected to the surrounding public spaces;
- operates as a new, representative arrival hall in Hungary and represents an architectural quality reinforcing this image;
- able to meet the functional needs of daily commuters, intermittent long-distance travellers and international passengers while enriching the daily lives of residents of Budapest and the surrounding area with high-quality commercial-service functions;
- a distinctive part of the environment with a unique, innovative look and feel;
- the architectural quality of its interior and exterior spaces is of high quality;
- its spatial relationships are diverse but also clear and easily understandable for single travellers, and their usage possibilities are differentiated according to their purpose and role;
- its building structures befitting the monument but are modern, durable, and its material usage is innovative, using construction materials with a low environmental impact, manufactured with low energy consumption,
- proposes architectural solutions to support efficient and simple building operation and railway operation;
- its landscape architecture enforces the ecological aspects and contributes to improving the adaptation of urban areas to climate change;
- implements innovative building technology and technologies while respecting the monument;

- its sectioning and scheduling ensure the operation of the train station's functions even by temporary relocation.

3.6. Design program and function

The Evaluation Committee considered positively:

- compliance with the requirements of the design brief;
- high-quality solution for functional relations;
- simple and transparent design of transport systems;
- compliance with the technical aspects of the modern railway operation and with the track geometry and platforms issued as technical annexes;
- the placement of commercially sustainable catering and commercial-service functions on a realistic scale in accordance with and related to the regional transport hub, complemented by cultural and office functions appropriate to the scale and situation of the building complex;
- the placement of facilities and functions in the related design areas that complement the basic functionality of the transport node;
- the development of public areas and green areas in the urban green network available to the local public on a daily basis;
- the enforcement of sustainability requirements.

3.7. Economic considerations (investment and operating costs)

The Evaluation Committee positively evaluated if the building complex:

- is designed with an innovative and imaginative concept, yet cost-efficient in structural solutions and materials;
- ensures economical use of land;

- the temporary train station's functions can be guaranteed in good quality and in a cost-effective manner;
- the expected maintenance cost of the building complex is favourable, its functional mix contributes to the financing of the maintenance of the building;
- increases the value of its environment from a real estate market point of view;
- energy and resource efficient operation and maintenance
- takes into account the aspects of carbon neutrality and climate protection in operation.

4. OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE DESIGN COMPETITION

4.1. The working method of the evaluation

The Evaluation Committee, after having consulted the experts involved in the Design Competition, has examined the submissions in detail after their opening and considers the Design Competition to be successful on the basis of the solutions evaluated.

During the evaluation, the Evaluation Committee's aim was – in line with the evaluation criteria set out in the Competition brief – to select the proposal that, in addition to the development and capacity expansion of the Nyugati Railway Station, also provides a relevant response to the urban development aspects.

An important criterion in the evaluation was that the designed spaces and buildings, while adequately serving the transport objectives of the international, long-distance, and suburban segments of the Hungarian railway network, should preserve the historic and architectural values in an appropriate manner and create a liveable, high-quality urban environment.

The following specific architectural, railway, and urban design requirements have been formulated by the Client:

- Building on the historical tradition of railway architecture, but in a contemporary way and adapted to the latest technologies, the applicant should create dynamic, high-traffic, indoor-open spaces that are organically linked to the surrounding public spaces.
- The building complex should enrich the established townscape at a high standard and engage in dialogue with neighbouring buildings – especially in relation to the remaining listed and protected buildings.
- The renewed railway station should function as Hungary's new representative arrivals hall and have an architectural quality that reinforces this.

- Its spatial connections should be multiple, but at the same time clear and easy to understand even for occasional travellers, while its uses should be differentiated according to their purpose and role.
- Access should be easy and clear, whether on foot, from public transport stops, by bicycle or by car, with convenient transfers and mode changes for all modes of transport.
- It should connect to the city's green network system, linking pedestrian, cycling and green networks in the surrounding neighbourhoods, and reduce the impact of the railway, which is currently has an effect of splitting land use.
- Realistic, commercially sustainable catering, retail and service functions should be placed in the area, in line with the regional transport hub, complemented by cultural and office functions appropriate to the scale and location of the building complex.
- Landscape architecture and environmental design should integrate ecological considerations and contribute to improving the adaptation to climate change of the connected neighbourhoods.
- It should be designed in an innovative, imaginative formulation, using cost-effective structural solutions and materials.
- Its building structures should be modern and durable, in keeping with the historical monument, and its use of materials should be innovative. It should use building materials with low environmental impact and energy consumption.
- The phasing, timing, and scheduling of the future construction of the building complex should ensure that the railway station functions can be operated, even with temporary relocation.

The Evaluation Committee has carried out its evaluation work taking into account the assessments of the panel of experts.

The panel of experts was organised into the following six working groups:

- Rail Working Group,

- Urban Transport Working Group,
- Urban Planning Working Group,
- Urban Development, Real Estate Development and Regulatory Affairs Working Group,
- Architecture Working Group,
- Green Space Development Working Group.

In its detailed discussion of the submissions, the Evaluation Committee made the following observations.

4.2. Railway construction

- The submissions complied with the basic principles of the Competition brief regarding the integration of the published track layout. Exceptions to this were the Submissions No. NTP_02 with a minor modification of the surface track layout and No. NTP_11 with the lowering of the surface tracks below ground level, which was such a major change that the Evaluation Committee could not accept it.
- In the absence of an overview floor plan, it was not possible to assess the layout of the deep-level station tracks and platforms in the case of Submissions No. NTP_05 and NTP_06.
- In the case of Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_04, and NTP_08, the dimensioning, routing, and connectivity of the passenger traffic spaces under the Eiffel Hall were exemplary, but in the northern parts these directions were less developed. The Nyugati Square underpass connection of Submission No. NTP_01 was not optimal, but the gallery level Submission No. NTP_09 was outstanding, both in terms of functionality and sophistication.
- The passenger traffic connection between the deep-level station, the intermediate underpass level, and the M5 metro station was well solved by Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_09.

- Few submissions proposed a direct connection to the Ferdinánd axis and the Westend shopping centre. The Evaluation Committee appreciated the Submissions No. NTP_07 and NTP_09 for their good or easily improvable solutions.
- The location of the outdoor railway operation premises was well defined in Submission No. NTP_09, with well thought-out operational functions next to track no. XIII, and the placement of the other railway operation premises at the underpass level was also appropriate (e.g., in the case of Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_04).
- The commercial service and passenger functions were not well thought through in several submissions (Submissions No. NTP_02, NTP_06, NTP_10, and NTP_12). The functions were well solved, but the logistical possibilities were not so well developed in Submissions No. NTP_04 and NTP_08. The logistics were well managed in Submission No. NTP_09, with plans for further potential improvements.
- The Evaluation Committee accepted to keep the Westend car park and the roof garden (as in the case of Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_04), but also considered replacing the roof garden with a new hall roof to be a good solution (e.g., in the case of Submissions No. NTP_08 and NTP_09).

4.3. Urban transport

- The Evaluation Committee did not agree with the proposal to replace the overpass to be demolished with an underpass tunnel between the Váci Boulevard and the Bajcsy-Zsilinszky Boulevard (Submission No. NTP_02).
- It was not the intention of the Client to relocate tram stops no. 4-6, but significant relocation was included in Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_02. Submissions No. NTP_02, NTP_03, NTP_09, and NTP_11 severed the connection between the M3 metro and tram but did not provide a new connection.

- Several submissions proposed a tunnel instead of the Ferdinánd Bridge. Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_09 kept the bridge in a modified form, Submissions No. NTP_11 conducted the Ferdinánd Road through the elevated park surface. In Submissions No. NTP_08 the Ferdinánd Tunnel was extended perpendicular to Podmaniczky Street, thus widening the street. The Evaluation Committee did not agree with this solution.
- Of the bicycle routes on the Podmaniczky Street side, the Evaluation Committee considered the solutions that led the bicycle paths through the linear park to be appropriate (Submissions No. NTP_05, NTP_06, NTP_07, NTP_08, NTP_ 09, NTP_10, and NTP_11).
- For pedestrians and cyclists, the Evaluation Committee liked the solutions that linked the areas cut off by the railway with an adequate number of crossings and green passages (Submissions No. NTP_03, NTP_04, NTP_05, NTP_07, NTP_08, NTP_09).
- There were several proposals for the placement of car parks; several submissions made the car parks accessible from the Ferdinand Tunnel (Submissions No. NTP_02, NTP_04, NTP_05, NTP_07, NTP_10). For these solutions, the loads on the tunnels should be reviewed. The access to the deep-level car parks from Podmaniczky Street is both an excessive burden on the street and reduces the usability of the park above (Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_08, NTP_10, NTP_12).
- The Evaluation Committee agreed with the proposals for the positioning of bicycles were. The bicycle storage placed under the Nyugati Square was a good solution (e.g., in the case of Submissions No. NTP_02, NTP_10, and NTP_12). Access to the bicycle storage from the tunnel was flawed (in the case of Submission No.NTP_06). The solution whereby bicycles could only be brought down to the storage area below ground level by escalator was not acceptable (Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_05). Submission No. NTP_09 proposed accessible and covered surface bicycle storage facilities, which is also acceptable.
- The P+R parking lots have not been covered by several submissions. The placement in several locations was a good solution (Submission No. NTP_05). The placement of the P+R parking lot

on the axis of the crossroads was inappropriate (Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_09). The placement of the P+R parking lot on Eiffel Square was not acceptable (Submission No. NTP_07).

4.4. Urban planning

- In relation to the masterplan, Submissions No. NTP_04 and NTP_05 were the most faithful to the ideas of the Client, but Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_08, NTP_09, and NTP_12 also showed good results in terms of functional design, scale, green space management, and connecting the neighbourhoods. Submissions No. NTP_03, NTP_07, and NTP_10 got into over-building.
- The drafting of the Nyugati Square proved to be one of the most difficult tasks. In Submission No. NTP_04, the platform covering of the surface tracks and the connecting passageway did not allow for the construction of the station entrance space wall, similar to the high hall structure without façade of Submission No. NTP_09. Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_08 have restrained entrance façades but with space walls. In Submissions No. NTP_05 and NTP_07, the design of the façade facing the space wall was excessive. Submission No. NTP_01 incorrectly placed an underground car park and exit ramp under the square. Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_08 got the transversal Nyugati Square – Podmaniczky Street pedestrian axis wrong. The most generous but somewhat functionally lacking public space connection between the Nyugati Square and the Eiffel Hall was provided by Submission No. NTP_09.
- The public space systems and the connection between the Nyugati Square and Podmaniczky Street were well solved by some of the submissions (Submissions No. NTP_03, NTP_04, NTP_05, NTP_07, NTP_09, NTP_12). In the case of Submission No. NTP_01, the Podmaniczky Street connection is damaged on both spatial levels. In Submission No. NTP_08, the Nyugati Square underpass system was connected to the public spaces by a wrong-way entrance. In Submission No. NTP_06, the Eiffel Hall was designed to host cultural events, completely isolated from the public spaces connected to it.

- The spatial system of the linear park layout was, according to the Evaluation Committee, adequately presented in Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_04, NTP_05, NTP_08, NTP_12.
- The linking of neighbourhoods and the reintroduction of green spaces was a quite strong programme point; therefore, the Evaluation Committee particularly appreciated the green crossings and passages in Submissions No. NTP_03, NTP_04, NTP_05, NTP_08.
- In the Podmaniczky Street development, Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_04, and NTP_05 proposed a good airspace ratio and space wall. Submission No. NTP_07 proposed a tree line along the axis of the Podmaniczky Street, thus increasing the width of the street. Submission No. NTP_09 built in the northern end of the linear park, so a diagonal transfer to the Vágány Street side was planned there.
- For the placement of the congress centre, the Evaluation Committee considered as suitable those submission that provided access from the underground station (Submission No. NTP_01) or from the subway system (Submission No. NPT_07, NPT_08).
- The Evaluation Committee appreciated the submissions that merged the area around the church with the east-west green corridor area, bypassed the church from the Váci Boulevard and only routed the tram line through the green area (Submissions No. NTP_03, NTP_05, NTP_09, NTP_10).

4.5. Urban development, real estate development and regulation affairs

- The Evaluation Committee considered those submissions to be suitable where the development proposal was in keeping with the urban fabric (Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_04, NTP_05). Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_03, NTP_04, NTP_05, and NTP_09 highlighted the green urban axis between the Kodály Circus and the Szent István Park.
- The Evaluation Committee appreciated the submissions that were well integrated into the environment of the railway station, with clear spatial schemes, cross-connections, and good logistical service (Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_04, NTP_08). It was not possible to agree to

an office building (Submission No. NTP_05) or congress centre (Submission No. NTP_10) above the tracks).

- The commercial and catering functions were well placed and well organised in Submissions No. NTP_03, NTP_04, NTP_05, NTP_07, and NTP_08. Submission No. NTP_05 included commercial features on the east side of the tracks and in the structure above the tracks. Submission No. NTP_09 provided commercial functions in the areas on the side of the railway station, next to the opening of the deep-level station.

4.6. Architecture

- The submissions all met the requirements of the design program, except for Submission No. NTP_11, in which the surface tracks were lowered below the ground level by the designer.
- None of the proposals for using the Eiffel Hall were perfect. The best solutions were provided by Submissions No. NTP_05, NTP_01, NTP_04, NTP_08, and NTP_09, but the 10% slope of the NTP_04 ramp to the underpass level and the arching of the side walls of Submissions No. NTP_09 were not acceptable. The Evaluation Committee could not agree with the proposal for the incorporation of the gallery in front of the south glass wall in Submission No. NTP_10 and the proposal for an event space in Submission No. NTP_06.
- In the design of the underpass and underground station levels, the Evaluation Committee appreciated those solutions that resulted in transparent circulation spaces and provided adequate service functions (Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_04, NTP_05, NT-P07, NTP_08, NTP_09). Some of the most outstanding of these, with their natural light-lit underpass and deep-level station, were Submissions No. NTP_04 and NTP_09. In the case of Submissions No. NTP_08 and NTP_12, connecting the Eiffel Square and Nyugati Square with the underpass level was a good solution.
- The greatest difference in architectural character between the submissions was in the covering of the station surface tracks. Submissions No. NTP_04 and NTP_06 proposed coverage only above the platforms. Among them, Submission No. NTP_04 was appreciated for its other high-

quality solutions. The new hall of Submission No. NTP_12 was covered with unique tarpaulin structural elements, but their long-term sustainability was questionable. Large, wooden hall roofs were used in Submissions No. NTP_02, NTP_03, NTP_05. Of these, Submission No. NTP_05 stood out for its architectural quality. Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_08 proposed a coverage of a series of longitudinal structures above the tracks. Submission No. NTP_01 used a solution seen in several places recently, while Submission No. NTP_08 stood out for its uniqueness; both have developed valuable proposals. Submission No. NTP_09 was unique and unusual (but not unprecedented); it consistently exploited advantages of the editing. It also seemed to be the best solution for the relationship between the old and the new hall. The covering and superstructure of the new hall, composed of several different elements, and its structure linked to the Eiffel Hall, is not acceptable (Submission No. NTP_10).

- The Evaluation Committee judged those submissions that proposed a solution for the entrance space wall at the Nyugati Square entrance to be suitable (Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_05, NTP_07, NTP_08). The covered/open cross passage between the Eiffel Hall and the new hall was not considered sufficient (Submissions No. NTP_03, NTP_04, NTP_10, NTP_12). Submission No. NTP_09 deliberately did not touch the Eiffel Hall, leaving an uncovered pedestrian passage between the halls.
- Many of the submissions proposed thoughtful structural solutions (Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_03, NTP_04, NTP_05, NTP_09, NTP_12). Submission No. NTP_07 used a large number of prefabricated elements to build the new hall. Submission No. NTP_10 used a variety of structures to cover the space. Submission No. NTP_11 did not deal with the structure of the vegetated cover above the tracks below ground level.
- The expected maintenance costs were lowest for Submissions No. NTP_01 and NTP_09. The use of large quantities of timber in the new halls requires ongoing maintenance and therefore increases costs (Submissions No. NTP_02, NTP_03, NTP_04, NTP_05). The size and large glass surfaces of Submission No. NTP_07 increased maintenance costs. The tarpaulin structure of Submission No. NTP_12 is not recommended in a metropolitan central station

environment. The large park proposed by Submission No. NTP_11, especially in the area of the reinforced concrete slabs above the tracks, has significant maintenance costs.

- In terms of estimated investment costs, Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_08, and NTP_09 were low-cost; Submissions No. NTP_05, NTP_06, NTP_10, and NTP_11 were high-cost.
- The issue of sustainability and carbon neutrality was addressed in sufficient depth in most of the submissions. Submissions No. NTP_09, NTP_10, and NTP_12 proposed alternative energy use.

4.7. Green space development

- The connection to the urban green network has been properly ensured by Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_02, NTP_04, NTP_05, NTP_06, NTP_08, and NTP_10. Submissions No. NTP_04 and NTP_05, NTP_08, NTP_09, NTP_12 were created with an ecological systems approach. The pedestrian crossing to the Zoo was a good solution in Submission No. NTP_02. The linear green corridor at the northern end of Dózsa György Boulevard is too narrow and should be avoided (e.g., Submissions No. NTP_03, NTP_09).
- Among the proposals for the linear park, Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_04, NTP_08, NTP_09, NTP_10, NTP_12 stood out with their detailed solutions, greenery, walkways, sports facilities, playgrounds, and water features. The linear park of Submission No. NTP_07 with its series of separate garden sections was wrongly conceived.
- Some of the submissions proposed extensive green roofs on top of planned new buildings to improve the urban climate (Submissions No. NTP_04, NTP_08, NTP_09, NTP_10, NTP_11, NTP_12). Several submissions included linear water surfaces and rainwater utilization in the linear park (Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_03, NTP_04, NTP_06, NTP_08, NTP_09, NTP_10, NTP_12).
- The disposal of contaminated soil from construction works is foreseen in Submissions No. NTP_05 and NTP_09. Submission No. NTP_12 used the phytoremediation method in the

contaminated areas. Submissions No. NTP_01, NTP_06, and NTP_07, NTP_08, NTP_12 have used most of the excavated soil on site.

5. DETAILED PROFESSIONAL EVALUATIONS OF EACH SUBMISSION, BY SERIAL NUMBERS OF THE SUBMISSIONS

5.1. Submission No. NTP_01

The submission makes fundamentally sound choices in urban planning. The location of the pedestrian/cycle axis connecting the green areas between the districts is fine, thus creating the opportunity for the development of the Szent István Park – Lehel Square – Nyugati Railway Station – Kodály Circus green axis. The weakness of the plan is that it does not create additional pedestrian/cycle crossings above the station, so the north-south crossing and the linear park crossing cannot be created. The Ferdinánd Bridge will continue to have an overhead crossing according to this plan, resulting in an unfavourable overall appearance with the architecture of the track covering.

The development on Podmaniczky Street matches the blocks on the opposite side and its rhythm balanced. The engine hall will in future have a cultural function, so it is a pity that this area is also being built on and that a green urban space is not being created. The new development on Podmaniczky Street it starts and ends with taller buildings. We do not consider these accents to be justified. The volume and layout of the new development along the Váci Boulevard is appropriate, the conference centre is ideally located, but its location does not allow for generous access.

The design of the Nyugati Square and the architecture of the Westend shopping centre entrance are elegant but could be even greener. The Evaluation Committee was positive about its architecture, which uses a proportional mass system to solve the issue of adjacent construction and creates an appropriate main entrance for those arriving through the square. The access to the car park under the Nyugati Square, where the existing underpass is located, will take up too much space, and the construction of an underground car park is not justified from a transport and functional point of view either.

The P+R parking lot next to the Eiffel Square blocks the linear park, and its positioning obstructs and expropriates the access from Podmaniczky Street.

The submission carefully plans the areas related to the operation of the railway station. The functional layout of the ground floor of the historic hall is appropriate and serves the needs of passengers and visitors at a high level. An appropriate urban indoor space is created, visually linked to the underpass level and the deep-level station. The functional layout of the underpass level below the hall is appropriate, but the two narrower transitions towards the Nyugati Square are undersized. The existence of a garage is an obstacle to the better use of this area. The Evaluation Committee was positive about the east-west underpass under the hall, but the plan does not take advantage of its additional potential, especially the transition towards the M3.

The underpass level under the new hall will not have any functions; these functions will be essentially concentrated under the Eiffel Hall, creating excessive empty circulation spaces and under-utilisation of the underpass level.

The connection between the deep-level station, the intermediate underpass level and the M5 metro station is well solved.

The architectural design of the deep-level station and the covering of the surface station create an elegant, clean image. The Evaluation Committee was positive about the provision of natural light and ventilation in the underground station. The multi-level space system of the transverse axis with the overlooks is excellently composed. The new hall reflects the architecture of the Eiffel Hall with humility and dignity. The modular supporting structure and roof are of modern design, can accommodate overhead lines and can be used well during the scheduled construction. The bright, naturally lit space allows for good orientation and safe movement. For the longitudinal modular system, the overlap can be continued or shortened as required. On the negative side, it has significant similarities with the design of the Vienna and Warsaw railway stations, which does not favour the idea of uniqueness.

The plan provides parking in mostly inappropriate locations; the lift access to bike parking is inadequate.

The planting of the green areas is correct, and its level of detail is commendable.

The plan's concept of sustainability is well thought out and includes unique ideas. It meets carbon neutrality and climate protection requirements.

Overall, the submission gives good answers both in its urban design and in the architectural formulation of the new main station. The new hall roof is elegant but lacks uniqueness. The architectural design of its deep-level station, its underpass level, and the opening of the surface areas are all beautifully composed.

In recognition of the undisputed achievements of the submission, the Evaluation Committee has recommended the design for a **shared 2nd prize**.

5.2. Submission No. NTP_02

During the preparation of the submission, the applicant slightly shifted the surface track layout (tracks no. 9, 12 and 13), but the change is not significant. By pulling away of the tracks, the switch-tower and the surrounding passenger area will be preserved. The change of track layout is therefore acceptable to this extent, although contrary to the Competition brief. However, the only partially covered terminus is less advantageous from a railway station operation point of view.

The plan is characterised by a well-thought-out passenger flow, with well-designed vertical walkways, but the number and capacity of connections to the surface and the deep-level station is not optimal. The layout of the Eiffel Hall in this design is well-proportioned: the pedestrian spaces are generous, but still leave a large breakthrough to the deep-level station. However, there is no connection to the Ferdinánd Bridge from the surface platforms, so the submission is incomplete at this point, and the M5 connection system is also oversimplified.

The rooms of the outer tracks' specialist service are not indicated. The new hall will not feature overhead wiring, which will take the slightly market hall-style architecture further towards the factory-type architecture. There is also a lack of passenger information services and development of the lighting system. The presentation of the construction phases is also missing, with neither textual explanations

nor plans included in the submission, so that phasing, scheduling, temporary conditions and solutions cannot be assessed.

From an urban transport point of view, the road underpass towards the centre of the Nyugati Square will place an unacceptable public road burden on the city centre. The plan fails to provide the necessary transit connections through the Nyugati Square to replace the demolished M3 underpass system, thus increasing the severity of the disconnection effect. The relocated tramway no. 4-6 has not been thought through; the rearrangement of the Grand Boulevard (Nagykörút) is beyond the scope of the tender; its operability depends on too many other parameters as well.

The design of the Ferdinánd Tunnel is fine, along with the parking spaces at the gallery level, as it gives function to a space that cannot be used for anything else. The location of the P+R parking lot, however, is inappropriate, disadvantageously designed, and only in favour of the hotel.

From an urban planning perspective, the plan contains several questionable and problematic design elements. The new hall wants to be a “modest” reflection of the Eiffel Hall, but there is no real dialogue between the two buildings. The different roof slope makes the new hall look more like a temporary structure, with a lack of harmony. The Nyugati Square gets lost between three strikingly different architectural elements. The heritage hall does not communicate with the public space, and the resulting “incision” makes the connections between the Nyugati and the Eiffel Square within the hall quite narrow. The building proposal for the development area along Podmaniczky Street practically ignores the 6th and 19th century buildings, creating a world of its own. Pulling the planned buildings away from Podmaniczky Street will create a mixed streetscape.

The linear park functions as part of a very wide and ample-arched urban promenade, but the buildings along Podmaniczky Street “encroach” on the railway area. The green space is also disadvantaged in terms of use, the functionally expected intimate areas are not realised, it cannot play the role of a transition zone between the railway areas and the areas intended for development.

The Vágány Street area is not addressed in any way in the plan.

From the point of view of urban and real estate development and regulation, the submission is moderately developed: it contains several specific ideas, but few of these are worth considering. The development proposal is haphazard, although it follows the contours of the surrounding streets. The framed blocks of nearly equal height are not attractive. The placement of the functions is not well thought out. The convention centre and hotel will be squeezed between the engine shed and the Eiffel Hall, right next to the station. It is difficult to make sense of the additions to the sides of the Westend, and the new building placed in front of the main entrance from the Nyugati Square is particularly disturbing.

The submission partially meets the requirements of the design program for green space development. The depiction of the green corridor on a separate plan sheet is missing. Its green network connections do not prevail too well transversely, above the rails. The only appreciable advantage is that it connects to the Zoo via a pedestrian bridge. Cycling and pedestrian links between the green areas exist, but access to them seems cumbersome. The central green space functions as an urban park but places the sports functions too close to the Podmaniczky Street.

From an architectural point of view, the design is uneven, with traffic management problems and a new hall concept that was intended to be generous but is fundamentally flawed. There are no service elements in the main passenger zones at the subway level, creating empty spaces with many level changes. The roof over the new hall is of an extreme size and out of proportion, dominating the view of the whole complex despite its intentions.

Planning costs are underestimated but realistic in proportion. Construction costs are also slightly underestimated. There is no major proposal for carbon neutral and climate efficient operation in the documentation.

5.3. Submission No. NTP_03

The submission makes strong architectural statements with the hall and the block-wide transversal passage, but in its details, and especially in its functional organization, it often uses a residual principle, and does not adequately address the spatial tensions and relational problems created by the gestures.

The continuation of the historic hall is an elegant gesture, but the covering of the tracks next to the Westend is dissonant. From the Nyugati Square, the covered-open foreground and the intact façade of Westend do not provide a sufficiently prominent entrance to the railway station; the urban space wall is incomplete. The large and sufficiently green space lacks function; its pedestrian traffic management is cumbersome and illogical. The covered-open foreground provides good pedestrian access to Podmaniczky Street. The hall is an exaggerated “botanical garden” with modest public space connections. The designer also provides space in front of the new hall’s northern façade with good public space connections, but the two limiting office buildings are excessive and costly due to the track superstructures.

The proposal to complete the urban fabric and connect the neighbourhoods is well thought out, with a well-placed cross-connection over the railway. The blocks are of matching height, and their design provides a liveable environment. However, the building density, especially along Podmaniczky Street, is highly exaggerated. The generous linear park is a requirement, but the plan does not respect it, it clearly overbuilds the area. The congress centre is in a good position but lacks the direct connection to the deep-level station. The block-like designation of the central park is a powerful idea, it is well positioned, separates different uses, connects the districts, and links the St Margaret’s Church’s square with the new Váci Boulevard connection of the Lehel Street. It creates a strong, generous pedestrian and green link between the districts, reinforced by three additional bridges, but these are not well positioned. In the north-south direction, however, the block-width crossing has a severing effect. The integration of the locomotive shed into the urban fabric and the creation of the northern gate of the railway station are important ideas. The use value of residential buildings pushed towards the tracks is questionable.

Along Podmaniczky Street, it adjusts to the street front development on the opposite side, creating a very definite space wall. A narrower area can be provided for public green space and tree lines. The proposed development in this part of the site maximises the development potential, so that the linear park becomes only a very narrow strip. The green roofs and the greening of the superstructure are not a substitute for the required fully green, ecological, and recreational areas.

The connection to the urban green network is mainly in the form of tree-lined areas between buildings. It creates a new transverse connection with a wide green space strip, but the longitudinal green spaces parallel to Podmaniczky Street are fragmented and rather more relevant for the local microclimate. The green spaces permeate the new neighbourhood on both sides, but the minimum amount of green space required by the design program, i.e., 1 ha of contiguous green areas are not met. From the point of view of urban climate, it is noteworthy that it also creates green spaces in the Nyugati Square, keeping the plane tree, but creating a parking lot along the Podmaniczky Grove.

It places a strong emphasis on rainwater retention, with the creation of reservoirs and rain gardens. However, this amount of roof gardens and the palm grove in the hall space are not ecologically sustainable.

The diagonal pedestrian crossings on the Nyugati Square do not fit the future traffic conditions and should be abandoned. At tram stops no. 4-6, the stair arms are demolished, thus the more direct M3 metro connection with lifts and escalators is missing. The plans place this far away, with a long walking distance.

The planned development in the underpass system and on the surface is congested, the circulation spaces are a little dense and lack transparency. The underpass level creates new connections between the transport spaces, the Westend basement and the Izabella Street.

The crossings over the railway from Podmaniczky Street are well located, suitable for both pedestrians and cyclists. The Ferdinánd Tunnel and the pedestrian-cyclist crossing above it, as well as the pedestrian axis between the Westend and the hall, are positive points. The access and location of the bicycle storage facilities is well thought out.

The car parks are so far away that they become independent car parks instead of serving the railway station. The P+R location is not ideal but rather based on a residual principle. Although the applicants conduct it as a road exploring the Vágány Street, the traffic connection issue in the development area behind the Westend is not sufficiently resolved.

Architecturally, the historic hall has an attractive greenhouse character, dominated by plants. Such a design for the historic hall is a mistake; a hall full of palm trees would be reminiscent of the well-known Atocha example, forgetting that the public space network system of the Nyugati Railway Station is different. Functionally, it is mainly an entrance hall and a railway service facility.

The new hall, as a continuation of the old one, covers only part of the tracks, while the current, rather unattractive structure remains above the rest. This results in a strangely fragmented situation. The new roof is a large, robust wooden structure with an overbuilt environment.

The modularity of the wooden hall allows for easy construction and is structurally well thought-out, but its atypicality is unusual and can lengthen the authorisation process. The structural solutions for the park arched over the tracks may pose a feasibility risk. The support and horizontal glass surfaces of the glass structure between the halls may be questionable.

The building energy solutions for the new hall are state-of-the-art. The wooden structure can be a long-term maintenance challenge; the plant establishment of the Eiffel Hall requires careful management.

The estimated design fee is average, and slightly high in relative terms. The construction cost is significantly underestimated, overall mid-range.

From a railway operation point of view, the plan meets the basic principles of the Competition brief. The main concept is to evoke today's hall with a new structure, with a significantly longer distance, reaching out almost up to the Ferdinánd Bridge. The plan creates several internal problems with this: on the one hand, it does not address the tracks that will fall out of the new, extended hall, which will be covered by a simple platform roof, completely separated from the central tracks and functions. On the other hand, the new cross street between the two parts of the hall separates rather than unites.

The cross-street's connection to the public spaces is also inadequate; there is no separation between the public space and the operational space; the side tracks essentially start from the end of the public space, reducing it to a simple traffic space instead of a meeting and transfer point. By retaining the switch-tower, the platform has become very narrow, and its end point is virtually inaccessible, making it unusable. The design of the connection between the M5 and the railway station is sketchy but can be developed with further planning.

On level minus 1, there is a relay room, which is not only badly located for railway operations, but also renders the end of the hall towards the ring road a dead space with no connection between the deep-level station and the hall. The McDonald's is removed, and the railway operation functions are relocated here, which technically unfortunate, as the location choice is questionable.

The design documentation does not include a structural plan, which should cover the entire structure – from Dózsa György Boulevard to the railway station – according to the design program.

The overhead line is not represented, so its placement and design are questionable; the passenger information systems and the lighting are incomplete.

The phases of the construction work are presented, but insufficiently elaborated.

5.4. Submission No. NTP_04

In the opinion of the Evaluation Committee, the best urban design response to the Competition brief.

It fits well into the existing urban fabric. The Podmaniczky Street space wall is well proportioned, as the pullback of the buildings is adequate. The space wall opens in a good position, in front of the former engine shed, which is thus also open from this direction. The grouping of the green areas facing the railway is particularly favourable. The connection of the Podmaniczky Street to the Dózsa György Boulevard with the green opening also provides a solution for the function of the narrowing area.

The integration of the Lehel Square above the railway into the green axis as a cross-axis is also a well-proportioned solution to connect Districts VI and XIII, although the survival of the planted trees on the superstructure is questionable. The conversion of the Ferdinánd Bridge into an underpass is also

functionally beneficial for the deep-level station. However, the Evaluation Committee missed the additional pedestrian and cycling connections between the two districts over the railway.

From a real estate development point of view, the location of the congress centre behind the Westend Shopping Centre in District XIII is an excellent solution in terms of location and size.

The urban public space planned to replace the current bus station and surface car park in the Nyugati Square has a good ratio of paved to green areas, but surface openings create some obstacles to passenger flow. The plan works with minimal architectural means on the surface (solar-powered platform roof), so the arrival from the square is uncertain. At the same time, the historic railway station building is therefore a win-win situation, and its closure and future use as a stand-alone building may be possible. The pedestrian axis between the building and the surface tracks, connecting the Váci Street and the Podmaniczky Street, is of a generous design, partially covered with a platform roof.

The ground floor cutting of the historical railway station building is excessive; the ramp is a particularly accident-prone solution, and a lot of usable space is lost next to it. Otherwise, functionally the shops are well located next to the passenger flow spaces. The M3 and M5 metro lines are accessible from the intermediate underpass level, and there is also an exit to the Eiffel Square, which is fine but not essential. The deep-level garage installed on this level, which can be accessed from the Ferdinánd underpass, is particularly well positioned, and this level could have accommodated more functions, even commercial ones.

From railway operation point of view, it has good connections from all directions, although the direction of the underground escalators is the opposite of the pedestrian traffic. The architectural solutions of the deep-level station are elegant, its lateral opening (towards the Podmaniczky Street) is a good solution in terms of natural light and ventilation, which reduces the mechanical requirements by an order of magnitude. However, the sloped solution along the side rails poses operational problems.

The design was intended to have a restrained architectural appearance; however, given that the Competition brief primarily required a new above-ground track hall, the Evaluation Committee did not

find the solar platform roof to be an acceptable architectural solution. This solution is not worthy of the capital and the future main railway station of Hungary.

In recognition of the achievements of the submission, the Evaluation Committee has recommended the design for a **shared 2nd prize**.

5.5. Submission No. NTP_05

The submission reflects the quasi-spiritual character of the place at the highest level. It blends Eastern and Western philosophies; it carries the spiritual charge that Budapest means to the people who live here, to our country, and to the wider world. It appears in the urban space as seen from a distance, from the heights, from the air, and from the surrounding hills and mountains.

The new, now intermodal centre, the Eiffel Hall, is the heart of the design area, both in a spiritual and physical sense, as its focal point. It carries at once the classical proportions of Greco-Roman European culture, the hidden, superconscious, intangible inner beauty of the golden ration, and the Zen-Buddhist idea of creation in infinite, plus-minus space, which has also become classical.

The railway station extension has a split, well-proportioned, ornate roof, echoing the Eiffel Hall's roof curvature, reflecting the colourful, carpet-like urban landscape value of the famous Zsolnai ceramics, representing cultural preservation in the deepest sense of the word, and imposingly acting as a façade. Its green thinking carries the presence of life-giving water in shaping public spaces and uses its power in the biosphere proposal. It evokes the waters of the Danube, the Danube riverbed, not only as an energy source, but also as a park and landscape element, and recommends the use of geothermal energy, which is found everywhere in Hungary.

The scenario of the plan faithfully reproduces the human movement, flow, arrival and departure experience at different speeds. The arrival in the city is solved from several directions and in 3D, creating an "urban living room" out of the Eiffel Hall, with an outstanding programme. The more sophisticated catering is located at the level of the square and the fast-food restaurant on level minus 1.

The spatial distribution of functions and the dynamics of the space rows are provided in a subtle and elegant way, according to the “human flow”.

The proposal for the new hall, with a roof structure that slides onto the historic hall from the rear, is divisive both in terms of its appearance and its feasibility and difficulty of maintenance. While from some points of view it appears as if the new hall will incorporate the old one, in reality it does not touch it; the composition of the roofs is complete with the tower-like part of the Eiffel Hall’s gateway to the ring road.

The smaller roof facing the Nyugati Square clearly marks the entrance to the new railway station, but the transverse underpass excavation at the Nyugati Square cuts across the movement in this direction, narrowing the surface pedestrian route and causing a cyclist conflict.

The linking of the M3 metro and the Nyugati underpass system, the solution provided for the underground transport, and the leading of the underpass system through the entire railway station area and its accessibility are all excellent.

The plan clearly shows the different character and coordinate system of Districts XIII and VI. The rearrangement of the Lehel Square is well connected to the urban bustle, the active functions, and the business life of Váci Boulevard. A valuable idea is the connection of the church square with the Szent István Park down to the Danube bank, as well as the excellent landscaped passage above the railway, and the subtle connection with the pedestrian and mixed traffic of the Csanády and Szinyei Merse Pál Streets. The number and function of the additional crossings over the railway is also excellent.

The congress centre is one of the most valuable transformation points of the upgraded Lehel Square pole. The plan proposes to proportionally place three mobility points in the area: on the Nyugati Square, on the Podmaniczky Street, and on the Lehel Square, with the congress centre next to the Salt House (Sóház) – with a connection to the railway station – forming an arc between the business/office district on the Váci Boulevard behind and the airport railway. The surrounding street network is sophisticated and well-functioning, and the missing section of Vágány Street will be completed.

Overall, from both an urban planning and architectural point of view, the submission brings a range of forward-looking ideas, which we recommend to the client for use in long-term developments (e.g., the

bus roundabout under the congress centre is an interesting idea). The character, the number, the connectivity, and especially the role of the community space of the bridging over railways is exemplary and metropolitan in character but will also have repercussions on the micro- and macro-community level.

The conversion of the Ferdinánd Bridge into an underpass is a preferred transport solution because it aids the new railway station's parking and service connections, it serves the expanding commercial functions well, and it is essential that it provides access to the platforms.

The urban development direction of the Terézváros side is rather a transfer of the recreation, culture, leisure, and green axis towards the City Park (Városliget). The density of the historic, fabric-like neighbourhood is being transformed and broken down nicely in the submission. Only the building at the northern end of the linear park is questionable, because although it continues the traditional street starting emphasis of the district, it closes the green passage to the City Park (Városliget). This idea could be further reviewed.

The linear green park, with its north-south axis, is an excellent introduction to the new railway station, and the transversal cross-linking connects the two aforementioned district sides with a good rhythm of alternating surfaces and urban space-mass façades.

The design and land-art level development of the green spaces is of outstanding value, integrated both aesthetically and through their mixed functionality. The Evaluation Committee is particularly sympathetic to the proposal to develop a water and biosphere programme, making better use of the opportunities offered by Budapest and choosing the plants.

Unfortunately, however, beyond the architectural solutions of the vision of this biosphere, there is no in-depth sustainability programme.

From this green promenade, the most visible feature of the new station's roof is the transitional, transforming roof, a system of greened terraces with steps, which partly extends the existing commercial function, but also suggests the development of large-scale commerce in the railway areas. It is an interesting proposal that the congress centre is accessible from both the park and the station.

Overall, the submission is outstanding in terms of both urban planning and architecture. The participating designers are professional and experienced in the rehabilitation of large transport and urbanising neighbourhoods. The connection to the urban fabric presented in the masterplan is an exemplary solution that represents an excellent vision for the development of the Eiffel Western Station into a 21st century intermodal hub. A further comment and criticism are that the design of the deep-level station is subway-like, without admitting natural light.

The gigantic wooden-framed hall is used to cover the surface tracks, with a multi-storey structure built over the tracks at the northern end. It is a radical proposal, a very intense development, and a controversial sight. The justification of the programme elements is questionable.

The forward-looking green construction, the biosphere, would require further research in the future. It is imperative to address this concept and a pilot group of researchers could be set up to make use of it in the implementation.

The Evaluation Committee, in recognition of the architectural and urban design qualities of the submissions, recommended the plan for **purchase prize**.

5.6. Submission No. NTP_06

The surface track layout has been integrated in accordance with the design program, but the layout of the deep-level tracks and platforms cannot be examined in the documentation as no overview layout is available. This submission is comparatively poorly elaborated, with several inconsistencies between the design and the visual plans.

Surface exploration of the underpass level is insufficient, there is little natural light. Combined with the low ceilings, this makes the situation even worse at lower levels. The longitudinal over-lights are also a traffic barrier. The new hall roof does not provide adequate protection from the weather, which also affects the maintenance of the railway station surfaces.

The documentation does not place much emphasis on the design of surface communal spaces. The plans show that the hall as a passenger area is not envisaged at all by the applicant, which is a serious

mistake from the point of view of the Competition brief. The connectivity between station levels is poor, not well developed towards external transfer points, with barriers and narrow pedestrian connections towards major passenger flow directions. The crossing of the M5 metro tunnel is shown on the plans, but access to the metro platforms is not detailed. The operating facilities at the underpass level are favourably organised in a single block, but the plans do not include the internal access facilities. The presentation of the construction phases is sufficiently detailed, supported by diagrams and textual explanations, with a proposal for phasing.

From an urban transport point of view, the design of Nyugati Square is ill-conceived, and the planned public space design is undeveloped. The bridging of the Bajza Street – Bulcsú Street pedestrian-bicycle axis and the linear park is missing. The access to the high-capacity bicycle storage from the Ferdinánd Tunnel is not appropriate, as cyclists are mainly looking for the Nyugati Square and the city centre. The bicycle lane through the linear park is an advantageous solution, as it leads through a more human environment instead of the Podmaniczky Street. The parking spaces are not shown on the plan sheets, only in the technical specifications.

The plan contains several significant errors from an urban planning perspective. It operates with an undulating platform roof behind the Eiffel Hall as a landmark element, which provides an interesting view especially from the new linear park. The Nyugati Square is green, but undeveloped in its details. The new main entrance “squeezes” into the square, in front of the royal waiting-room, thus overbuilding the space. The space is primarily for transport purposes, without urban public space use, and the hall is reinterpreted as a kind of cultural, multifunctional space, completely cut off from the station, losing the possibilities that could be created by the integration of the historic hall with the underground station below and the connection of the hall to the adjacent public spaces.

The Grand Boulevard (Nagykörút) between the Nyugati Square and the Podmaniczky Street is in fact difficult to access from the Westend, the floor plans and visual plans are contradictory. The long corridor connecting the Nyugati Square and the Eiffel Square at the underpass level is an unfavourable route and will rather be avoided in the long term. However, a high-level connection between the Westend and the railway areas is an exciting idea.

The plan provides a rather schematic proposal in the masterplan. The development area behind the Westend raises several issues, both in terms of height, layout, and urban fabric. The park proposed here is not intrinsically linked to the railway overpass either. The row of buildings along Podmaniczky Street is also problematic. The linear park appears undeveloped, even illogical in places, with a large expanse of water occupying a significant part of it. The level of elaboration of the development proposal is rather low. The shaping of blocks is possible, the concept is too closed, the narrow courtyard design should be avoided. There is no connection to the Lehel Square. The connection between districts is weak, even missing in the north.

The area demonstrates the need to connect to the urban green network, but this is not clearly served by the actual design in all directions (e.g., towards the church). The submission is characterised by functionally unjustifiably large areas of water that are difficult to operate in an urban environment, a haphazard route organisation within a public park, and a crude environmental design. In some places there are annoyingly steep steps and slopes. Green areas are not detailed from ecological perspectives but are depicted as high maintenance trees in grassland. The submission leaves the plane trees on the Nyugati Square and plans a pedestrian crossing at the Podmaniczky Grove.

The plan does not substantially address sustainable technical or operational solutions.

5.7. Submission No. NTP_07

It is a well-developed submission in terms of its connections and proportions. Its architecture is excitingly formed, but heavily overbuilt, and its design does not reflect the spirit of the 21st century. The masterplan is grandiose in scale, disconnected from the surrounding neighbourhoods in terms of scale. Very well and efficiently organised railway station operations.

Of all the submissions received, this one offers the most closed development, with a closed-off wall in the direction of both districts, creating no link between the districts. The connection between the two districts is provided by the substantial coverage of the railway area. It is a grandiose but unrealistic solution. It proposes an intensive development which, while following the established street pattern of District VI, is alien to its surroundings and does not fit into the urban fabric of either district. It does not

react to the Lehel Square and the church. Takes the development of Vágány Street into account as a service road for the new development behind the Westend.

The linear park is somewhat formalised, with little connection to the Podmaniczky Street, and consists of a series of thematic gardens. The starting point is the Eiffel Square, whose restructuring cannot be considered successful. The continuation of the park provides little experience, it is isolated, serving more as a recreational garden for the people in the office buildings than a public park. The park areas have little use value, are poorly accessible from the existing districts, while the extensive overbuilding above the tracks makes them expensive. The linear park loses its distinctive character from the line of the Bulcsú Street.

The congress centre is well integrated with the station complex at ground level, but its architectural appearance is that of a terraced house, competing with the historic buildings. The height accents along Podmaniczky Street are unjustified. The central tree-lined alley on Podmaniczky Street is an exciting idea, but it requires a significant widening of the public space, and the traffic engineering is questionable.

The railway station, which uses a very different formal language from the hall, is highly representative, but its relationship with the Eiffel Hall is contradictory, dominated by the latter from a cityscape point of view. On the Nyugati Square, a real station lobby will be created, a fitting prelude to the new hall building and the side entrances to the Eiffel Hall. The integration of the new railway reception wing with the Westend entrance is an exciting idea, marking the entrance with a powerful but architecturally outdated, monumental gesture, creating the mass of the cross axis, organising traffic and the connection between the old and new halls. A unified, uncluttered space wall is created, slightly dominant in relation to the historic hall.

The design of the Nyugati Square is somewhat subdivided by the two-storey space, but it is nevertheless logical. It has received appropriate public space functions. It also offers direct downward access from the Grand Boulevard (Nagykörút), next to the Eiffel Square. The green areas of the Nyugati Square and the Eiffel Square are lowered in an oval depression each, making them less dominant on

the square. The submission proposes elegant, minimalist, yet slightly empty public spaces. However, the conversion of Eiffel Square into a P+R parking lot is a mistake in terms of public space organisation.

The connection between the Nyugati Square and Podmaniczky Street is impresses through the covered and open foreground, but it is actually a through-route of the railway station.

The green space units are conceived as a kind of Renaissance garden parterre system or baroque bosques, with separate garden sections. The residential and office buildings are designed with green roofs with grass. Proposes a more favourable green cover without tall trees, a water surface, and a flower garden on the new railway slab. However, the modular arrangement of the square green spaces does not visually cohere into a green corridor.

Green space functions are too segregated. The square garden areas, divided by building masses, are not suitable for the development of biodiversity, the plan is not ecologically forward-looking. The plan places great emphasis on the use of rainwater and proposes the local use of the soil excavated during the construction of the deep-level stations.

This is the only plan that modifies the no. 4-6 tram axis to fit into the urban fabric, improves the track curve and, by raising the level of the Grand Boulevard (Nagykörút), facilitates the unimpeded flow of the large volumes of pedestrian traffic expected in the future, but is somewhat questionable from a traffic engineering point of view, and is viable in the event of a radical reduction in vehicle traffic.

The Eiffel Hall's slab breakthrough is thoughtful, beautiful, and functional. The transport and the design of the underpass system is exemplary, with rational and clear organisation of pedestrian, vehicular and logistical traffic.

It covers the Ferdinánd Tunnel well, placing a part of the city integrated into the urban fabric in the axis, with good pedestrian and cycling connections. It reveals from the tunnel the parking spaces created at the gallery level, which is a feature that is the developed in the most space-saving way in this particular plan; the duplex car park with its depressed height is a compact solution with a well-thought-out approach.

The design and access to the bicycle parking areas is ideal, with well thought-out pedestrian and cyclist axes. It guides cyclists through Podmaniczky Street instead of the park.

The taxi bay next to the bus stops on the Váci Boulevard is ingenious and useful.

Access to the Eiffel Square P+R parking lot from the Grand Boulevard is difficult, but it is ideally located for P+R points, adapted to the railway station's passenger traffic.

The highly ambitious architectural programme and the surface station overwhelms the historical part of the building, completely transforming the image of the area.

Creates a clean and clear underpass level. The architectural formulation of the underground world is calm and clear, although some elements need to be functionally corrected. The underground P+R placement and connectivity is one of the best, the P+R zone above the Westend is a less architecturally attractive solution, creating a depressed, dark space above some of the platforms, like today's arrangement, while the curved hall roof above the car park creates a space that is difficult to fill with function.

The new three-bay hall building offers a real railway spatial experience. The result is one of the most complete and architecturally well-managed main platforms. The new central is on the axis of the old hall, aligned to it in all directions, and its internal opening is also exciting. At the rear end, the façade is exaggerated, monumental, and in addition it even runs through the old buildings (engine hall).

Although the technical specification emphasises a high degree of modularity and prefabrication, it requires an extremely large number of different prefabricated elements, which is costly to implement and specially to operate.

The Nyugati (Western) Square's mainly paved, urban space-like design simplifies operational tasks; the gardening tasks are mainly concentrated along the Podmaniczky Street axis. For the glass surfaces of the new above-ground halls, the formation of a cove system at the junction of the dome surfaces meeting at an acute angle (rainwater, snow). The glazed dome shell will most likely consist of flat glass panels, which can change the visual appearance considerably. Solar exposure (as almost the entire outer dome shell is of the same design) is difficult to control.

The estimated design fee is high, but realistic in relation to the estimated construction costs. The estimated construction costs are significantly underestimated, but one of the highest estimates. The plan uses very expensive solutions for all parts of the construction due to the special structures; the railway section of the work is even overpriced. Cost-effective solutions: locating rail service areas in the head building closing the surface station covering, creating an underground car park within the station substructure, keeping the existing engine hall for a change of function. Cost-increasing solutions: surface covering of the railway station and its laterally closed design up to the Ferdinánd Bridge and conducted to the Westend roof terrace, a new road underpass and a new green bridge in place of the Ferdinánd Bridge.

Aims to achieve carbon neutrality, makes superficial proposals for alternative energy supply for operations.

From a railway operations point of view, the submission has met the basic principles of the Competition brief, the design of the surface and the deep-level station is appropriate. The use of concrete blade walls at the entrance are an unfortunate choice. The technical specifications are incomplete and do not include a chapter on transport.

The functional layout of the station is basically sound, with commercial, catering, passenger service, and operational functions well located. The direction of the escalator, which varies from platform to platform in the historic hall, is a formal gesture, but not practical.

In the case of the station connection system, the direct link between the surface tracks, the Westend, and the Ferdinánd Bridge should be highlighted. The deep-level station and the surface station are separated, the surface platforms are not accessible from the intermediate underpass level, so the Westend can only be reached by detour from the deep-level station. The station's internal passenger flow system is basically thoughtful, with the designer playing well with the differences in level. The access and design of level minus 1 is less well thought out than other parts of the railway station. The relationship between the M5 and the rear tract is ill-conceived, but essentially, it can be improved.

The traffic control and stationmaster's office are placed in an unfavourable location, but the operator's building offers many possibilities. The waiting room is located too far away from retail outlets.

The overhead wiring is not represented, so its location and design is questionable. Travel information systems and area lighting are incomplete.

5.8. Submission No. NTP_08

The submission recognised the key challenges posed by the complex interrelationship between the multifaceted task and the construction site, and for the most part provided thoughtful responses. In its architectural character, strength, and the design of its spaces, it displays the unique and distinctive solutions and formal features expected of a main railway station. The result of consistent planning is an ethereal, fluid hall roof and carefully detailed circulation spaces, but the same gestural system applied to all elements and scales is almost mannered – especially in the overly organic shaping of the historic hall and the urban masterplan.

The innovative, albeit familiar (from the world of international airport architecture) form of the platform roof over the tracks, which ends in a hall, echoes the Eiffel Hall's roof, and is elegantly connected to it. Although it appears as a huge surface within the urban landscape, its beauty compensates for this. It has the advantage of forming a smooth transition between the curved entrance zone of the surface head platforms and the less used external platform sections. The structures, colours, and materials of its interior make playful, yet respectful references to the historic building. The new hall creates an appropriately shaped, protected, and sufficiently attractive main platform and cross-axis, with a harmonious, well-scaled main façade facing the Nyugati Square, which will be a good solution both as a space wall and as an entrance sign.

The complex roof shape, however, poses a number of structural, construction, and operational challenges to which the design does not provide a satisfactory answer: the difficulties of implementing the facings are already evident in the visual plans, as the multiple curved surfaces and support structures already generate fitting problems in the virtual environment; the distorted surfaces of the pillar heads can at most be achieved by a costly and structurally disruptive process (e.g., milling); illuminators

embedded between distorted surfaces with an appearance in line with the visual design can only be achieved at considerable cost.

The Eiffel Hall would be renovated as a railway reception building, with transparent and usable interiors, according to the plan. The plant application is on an understated, believable scale.

The modern use of materials and surfaces at the underground level of the railway station is alien to the nostalgic interior of the world above, with its combination of wood and blue powder-coated metal. There are minimal slab penetrations between the surface and the underground level, resulting in poor visual connectivity between levels and a lack of natural lighting. The ventilation of the underground levels would require an extensive mechanical system, but this is not shown within the submission.

The internal transport system is well designed, with clearly defined public transport focal points and axes. It is connected to the surrounding public spaces and the Nyugati Square underpass system with appropriate openings and well-managed entrances from all directions, and the spatial groupings and emphases for retail, services, and passenger facilities are also appropriate. The plan divides the waiting rooms and provides them in several places in the hall. Special mention should be made of the additional pedestrian crossing under the Eiffel Hall, which facilitates the connection between the underground station and the M3 metro, as well as a better passenger flow. Compared to these, the unused, sterile spaces of the intermediate gallery level, several hundred metres long, are an unworthy solution, while the design places the underground garage in a separate underground structure under the Podmaniczky Street public park in a rather unfavourable way.

From a railway operational perspective, the design meets the basic requirements of the Competition brief; both the surface and the deep-level stations are well designed. At the same time, the railway premises would be located at an unfavourable distance from the operational areas, and the technological details (such as the fixing of overhead lines) cannot be judged.

The design of the Nyugati Square is car-centric, with few green spaces, the placement of which impedes pedestrian movement. The road traffic on the Ferdinánd axis is relocated to the underpass, with a favourably conceived pedestrian-cycle bridge in its place. The large bicycle storage facility at the

Podmaniczky Street is moved to a favourable location. However, the treatment of Podmaniczky Street is flawed in several respects: the proposed widening for road underpasses will disproportionately increase traffic and paved surfaces; the approach to the Ferdinánd Tunnel with perpendicular entrances and exits is liable to cause accidents; the relocation here of the underground car park from the railway station will cause a disproportionate increase in traffic.

The gesture of “intertwining trusses”, kept throughout the entire plan, is an interesting organizing principle for the development plan, but at the same time it leads to compromises in the organization of space, both in the Nyugati Square and in the private development area. The blocks appear to follow the established street structure of District VI, but the scale of their overbuilding is exaggerated.

The linear park starts as a prominent, full-width park next to the railway station, runs through the area, and connects to the other side of the track are on several strands, offering good reception areas for the bridges. It is a brave and correct decision to free the engine shed and the proposal of the water surface next to it. However, the Podmaniczky Street space wall formation is missing.

The transverse connections of the area are solved by several bridges in this submission; an important connection is the Westend overpass between the Westend and the linear park. The green axis is not ideally oriented, it does not reflect upon the Lehel Square and the church, nor on Szabolcs Street. The diagonal cut through the development area towards Vágány Street is a unique and strong element of the plan. The location of the congress centre on the north side of the Ferdinánd Tunnel is advantageous, with underpass connections to the railway station.

From a green space perspective, this plan is one of the most imaginative: it envisages a complex green network throughout the entire site; its creates a green areas of sufficient size to guarantee biodiversity, which is adequately protected and yet of a satisfactory size, meeting the requirements of the design plan.

The Evaluation Committee has recommended the submission for the **3rd prize** for its strong and coherent conceptual content.

5.9. Submission No. NTP_09

The new station hall, which forms the central element of the submission, engages in a sensitive dialogue with its surroundings: its grid, perpendicular to the historic track hall, its clearly separated mass, and its roof of similar height emphasise its independence, while its use of colour and materials, the angle of the roof pitch, and the positioning of its lighting fixtures also evoke it at the same time. The scale and proportions of the hall, which is designed to cover the remaining tracks of the terminal railway station, convey a sense of calm and rationality that transcends passing fads. It covers the space with structurally well-thought-out solutions, with an optimum use of materials, while showing the intention of protecting the busiest parts of the platform from the weather. The overall conceptual approach foresees fast, accurate, and efficient construction; the design of the steel pillars allows on-site assembly. Its weakness is the façade design: the curtain walls providing protection against the weather are only symbolically visible in the plan, and the space wall towards the Nyugati Square and an adequately emphasized main entrance are sorely lacking.

This may be the result of a conscious design decision, as the design clearly takes a position in favour of the railway function of the Eiffel Hall, treating and shaping the central element of the triple spatial system of the Nyugati Square as an actual “station foreground”. At the same time, the functions of the hall space and the side wings are somewhat schematic, and the otherwise well-structured pedestrian routes between the main entrance and the underground platforms below the hall space are longer than optimal. The creation of a cross-corridor by arching two side wings to complement the narrow sidewalks of the Teréz Ring Road is a unique idea is – but the solution is of concern from a heritage perspective.

The use of materials on the underpass and underground level reflects the spirit of classic modern transport architecture. The design of the underground spaces is exemplary: it has a sufficiently airy and spacious feel, with a believable flow of natural light and air; the revealed spatial system is clear and pleasing to the eye from all angles. The “moat” delimiting the surface station area provides a visual link between the underpass level and the surface, revealing the northern end façade of the monument building and opening a stair space to Podmaniczky Street. Passenger service facilities, shops, and rentals are optimally placed at the focal point of passenger flows, but their floor area is slightly

undersized. The waiting room is located too far from the tracks. The construction of the connecting branch of the Nyugati Square underpass system is a significant shortcoming, as the M3 metro does not provide an obstacle-free approach to the station in this way.

One of the main virtues of the submission is the creation of transparent, open, permeable, human-scale spaces that provide complex connections through logical lines. A key element of this is the cross axis between the Váci Boulevard and Podmaniczky Street, which functions as a fully public street (although, contrary to the Competition brief, an uncovered one). A unique and promising solution is the pedestrian bridge over the tracks, which, in addition to the access to the surface platforms, also connects the linear park along Podmaniczky Street and the central hall of the Westend shopping centre. This submission is also unique in proposing an elevated pedestrian promenade from the congress centre behind the Westend to the Nyugati Square, which will organically connect the different areas of the site and integrate at the same time with the green ecological corridor.

The plan complies with the basic conditions set out in the Competition brief from a railway point of view; the design of the surface and deep-level stations is appropriate. It preserves the switch-tower and rebuilds it on the Podmaniczky Street side. The station's railway operation facilities, the loading and unloading route, and the underground car park are located in a sensible and well-organised manner at the rear of the underpass level underground station box, close to the Ferdinand axis. However, it is not beneficial that some of the rooms would be located in the basement of the Eiffel Hall, which is not only disadvantageous from a railway operation point of view, but also hinders the surface connection of the deep-station level.

The submission is almost the only one to propose the retention and widening of the Ferdinánd Bridge; however, this could only be achieved to this extent with a complete replacement of the superstructure and new substructures. The choice of the Podmaniczky Street junction location is unfavourable.

The design of the Nyugati Square is very sketchy, bleak, and representative design is undermined. The linear park operates with well-organised, meaningful green spaces, most of which face the Podmaniczky Street. This puts the green area at a disadvantage in terms of use and prevents it from acting as a

transition zone between the railway and the areas to be built up. The southern part of the park is functionally poor for its size. The plan creates green spaces of appropriate size and ecological richness.

The building concept responds nicely to the surrounding street grid but is somewhat schematic in the private development area. It correctly identifies the most appropriate location for the convention centre on the north side of the Ferdinánd axis. The green pedestrian cross axis between the Kodály Circus and the Lehel Square church is designated in the plan, but it is narrow and rather uncertain at the Lehel Square end. On the Podmaniczky Street side, the placement of the buildings is unfavourable: the engine shed is placed in an overbuilt corridor; the three lane buildings on the street are rather haphazard; the plan proposes possible residential buildings further out, in the immediate vicinity of the tracks; the low-intensity residential building type is questionable here; and the northern section of the linear park is narrowed and simplified into a cycle path. The connection of districts is provided at key structural points. It is unfortunate and even impossible, due to the elevation of the railway tunnel ramp, to keep the underpass in the Bulcsú Street axis; however, the proposed cycle bridge along Munkácsy Street gets into a favourable position.

The Evaluation Committee, having regard to the exemplary solution of the railway station, has recommended the submission for the **1st prize**.

5.10. Submission No. NTP_10

From an urban transport perspective, the Ferdinánd Tunnel's lead-through is exaggerated and the junction designed for approaching the car park is unfavourable from a traffic safety point of view. The relief above the railway is ingenious, but the position of the pedestrian-cycle axes needs to be improved. The road extension of Szabolcs Street and Vágány Street is doubtful; it could be practically an escape route for Podmaniczky Street. The underground car park entrances and exits designed for Podmaniczky Street cause an unjustified increase in traffic and greatly increase the paved surfaces. The freight service is in line with the plan.

On the basis of the evaluation from a railway perspective, the application met the basic requirements of the Competition brief. The designer did not plan any breakthrough to level minus 1 in the Eiffel Hall. The

removal of the Eiffel Hall from passenger traffic flows at this level is contrary to the disposition. The new hall, built behind the current one, makes a good impression with its colourful, translucent roof and high ceilings, but it does not answer the question of how to protect passengers from the wind and cold. The surface tracks are completely overbuilt in a wide strip after the platform covering, but the exact solution for this is not shown. The track layout is presented, and there is also good connectivity in all directions between station levels and external access points. The latter operates on so many levels that it would certainly require a high-quality information system. No connection provided towards the Ferdinánd Bridge from the surface platforms. The station's well-designed exit public spaces facilitate access to the railway station. The M5 connection is not developed. The operational block is placed on a single site, which is advantageous, but it is located at the underpass level away from the railway functions.

Based on urban planning findings, the new hall building appears to be an overly abstract mix of urban elements, presenting an extremely chaotic urban architecture. The design of the Nyugati Square is intended to follow the grid projected on the whole square, which leads to functional and usage problems; green spaces are bleak, too few, and inappropriately positioned. The underpass remains a separate element, not connected to the space. At the underpass level, there is a good place for bicycle storage under the Nyugati Square. The proposal for a corridor leading from the Nyugati Square underpass directly under the historic hall is unique. The axial connection to the hall is a good solution in theory, but not necessarily feasible in practice. The placement of the gallery level and stairs on the south glass wall of the Eiffel Hall is unfavourable and unjustified.

The urban development proposal adopts the axes of both connected districts, continuing all the streets of District VI. There is no response to the Lehel Square church. The private development area is densely built up and does not provide adequate connections between districts. The three tall buildings next to the tracks are distracting next to the Eiffel Hall. It retains little of the locomotive shed It reckons on a large scale and unrealistically with the overbuilding of the tracks with buildings or a park, building up the space above the tracks up to Bajza Street. The north-south linear park is conducted broadly, with a diverse range of functions, but a large part of the widening central park is located on a slab, without

ground connection, which is neither economical nor sustainable. Placing the congress centre above the rails is particularly costly.

The plan is broadly in line with the green space requirements of the design program. The sustainability concept of the submission is convincing; thermal energy is mainly based on geothermal energy; the concept of recycling organic waste and the concept of water recycling is thoughtful.

Overall, the proposal is in line with the design program, but raises a few operational and feasibility issues.

5.11. Submission No. NTP_11

From a railway point of view, the applicant has deviated significantly from the Competition brief. The surface track group was moved to level minus 1, which also pushed all other parts below it downwards. The consequences of this decision were not anticipated in the tender, nor was a more distant, above-ground approach to the track system presented, nor does a slab system bridging underground structures of this scale seem feasible. The underground station is placed deeper than planned, thus delaying the arrival of the tracks at the surface, and the tunnel will have to be bored deeper than planned.

The connection system is transparent, providing connections in all the necessary directions from both the level minus 1 platforms and the underground stations. The design of the M5 connection is, however, oversimplified, and the passability of the drawn connection is low. The listing and elaboration of the operational premises is vague and imprecise. The design does not meet expectations from a rail transport point of view.

From an urban transport perspective, the plan puts form before functionality and transport. The applicant deviates from the constraints imposed by the design program. The submission relocates the bus terminus from the Nyugati Square, generating additional runs. The stairs corner at tram stops no. 4-6 will be demolished, so the missing connections should be replaced. The rethinking of the Ferdinánd axis is ingenious but depicts unregulated pedestrian-cyclist crossings. The bicycle storage facilities are

uncovered, far from the railway, on the surface. No large-capacity bicycle storage is shown on the drawings, and issues of P+R, taxi, and other parking facilities are not addressed.

Both the urban planning and the urban and real estate development analysis concluded that the lowering of the surface tracks could not be achieved.

The design of the Nyugati Square is sketchy, with a significant amount of paving. In the absence of a new hall building, the Eiffel Hall and the new office building row prevail. The square does not provide real connections with the new world below the surface. The new station is located below ground level, creating a huge pedestrian area between the Nyugati Square and Podmaniczky Street. The proposed buildings in the development areas are schematic and out of place, the buildings along Podmaniczky Street are rather ad-hoc, underdeveloped, functionally and geographically questionable. The green space in the northern development area is disconnected from the built-up areas. The building blocks are surrounded by vehicular traffic from all directions, with no active pedestrian zone. In the private development area, the park is developed next to the Westend, placing the congress centre in an inconvenient location, adjacent to the residential area. The residential blocks are too dense, and the proposed form for building is not favourable either. The parking garage and the roof garden are demolished and replaced by a new building starting from ground level.

From a green space development point of view, longitudinal and transverse green space connections are not fully developed throughout the whole area; the applicant operates instead with diagonal paths and the Ferdinánd axis that is conducted on the surface. The Eiffel Square and the Western Square have low green space values. There too many paved areas and areas with unfavourable conditions for plants. The plan uses ecologically insufficiently diverse, high maintenance grasslands and trees, and develops small ponds and pools. The valuable trees are not preserved.

Overall, the application deviated significantly from the Competition brief and did not meet professional requirements.

5.12. Submission No. NTP_12

The railway-focused assessment shows that the proposal locates the underground and surface stations as specified in the Competition brief, but there are minor inconsistencies between the visual plans and the site drawings. The operability of the membrane-like canopy platform cover over the high-voltage lines is highly questionable. The removal of foreign objects from the upper plane of the funnel-shaped roof is essentially impossible. It connects the Eiffel Hall, the Podmaniczky Street, and the Ferdinand Bridge area in its network system, but the latter only from the deep-level station. At the same time, no direct connection to the Westend is given. In the Eiffel Hall, the central pedestrian promenade is a self-serving solution, as it does not communicate with the passenger transport functions but obscures the generous breakthrough between the underground station and the hall, created on level minus 1. Vertical passages are unthoughtful, forcing passengers to change direction repeatedly on level minus 1, which is not filled with other major functions. The M5 metro connections are undeveloped in the drawings but is explained in detail in the technical description. The premises for operational functions at the underpass level are appropriately designed in one block, but the operational premises at the surface station are missing.

The applicant has left out the bus terminus from the Nyugati Square, turning buses in a loop through the Ferdinánd Tunnel, causing overrunning. The size of the Nyugati Square pedestrian crossing is out of proportion, it does not fit with the real routes. The green area development is poor and unfavourable. The design of the underpass is not logical from a pedestrian point of view; the platforms are unduly narrowed by the supporting columns, which prevents the installation of escalators and limits the free space that can be provided next to them.

The design completely opens up the ground floor slab of the historic hall and uses an airy platform roof above the surface tracks, which does not compete with the Eiffel Hall, but its design is not worthy of the role of the station, it has a temporary effect, it does not form a space wall and does not have the function of an entrance designation. It is an essential problem that the design of the disrupted historic hall and the new structures, both in the underground station and on the surface, are not in any harmony whatsoever with each other. The structure of the surface station is a unique, structurally well-thought-out

solution, but its design is not common in domestic practice. The plan does not really make use of the Eiffel Square, it does not integrate it into the underpass system, and the historic hall only opens onto the Nyugati Square. The design of Nyugati Square, however, is well done, with a varied, green look. The new development is realistic, linked to the existing urban fabric. The building blocks are surrounded by vehicular traffic from all directions, a pedestrian zone is created within the blocks, but their passability is questionable. The design, width, and equipment of the linear park basically create a usable recreational area, but its major flaw is that it starts only from the Ferdinánd axis. A The connection between the districts, the axis from the Kodály Circus to the Szent István Park is well identified, but the passage is narrow on the Terézváros side and the designation of the park on the Lehel Street side is too rigid. The separate cycle bridge in the immediate vicinity of the pedestrian-cycle crossing over the railway seems unnecessary.

Excellent compliance with the green space requirements of the design program. The project proposes a logical concept and a realistic solution for the environmental design and the railway crossings without making exaggerated statements. The solutions that symbolically represent the area's railway history as land art are outstanding. The applicant designs some of the residential and office buildings with realistically sustainable, extensive green roofs and green terraces. The large, paved area next to the covered platforms is not justified, but the idea of a transition from an urban park to an ecological park is quite imaginative. The striving for carbon neutrality is given attention in the planning, and the alternative energy supply is planned to be solved primarily with thermal water from the Margaret Island (Margitsziget) thermal well. The coverage of the surface station acts as a water catchment; the drainage solution is not presented.

Overall, the submission complies with the specifications, the applicant has fulfilled the requirements, but has operational and feasibility issues.

6. PRELIMINARY SETTLEMENT APPEARANCE EXPERTISE

Pursuant to Article 25 (3a) and (3b) of the Design Competition Decree, the Client – having regard to the provisions of Government Decree 314/2012 (XI.8.) on the settlement development concept, the integrated settlement development strategy, settlement planning instruments, and certain particular legal regimes for settlement planning – provided the submissions proposed for award and purchase to the Minister responsible for settlement development and planning for the purpose of establishing a preliminary settlement planning expertise.

The Minister has given his prior consent regarding settlement appearance for all the winning submissions and those proposed for award and purchase at 020/2022, on the 23.03.2022.

The Client has sent copies of the submissions to the Minister responsible for the protection of cultural heritage, acting in his capacity as the person responsible for the central register of protected cultural heritage elements, pursuant to Article 27 (8) of the Design Competition Decree.

7. THE RANKING OF THE WINNING SUBMISSIONS

Based on the evaluations described in Chapter 5, the Evaluation Committee ranks the submissions in the following order:

- 1st prize is awarded to: Submission No. NTP_09,
- shared 2nd prize is awarded to: Submission No. NTP_01,
- shared 2nd prize is awarded to: Submission No. NTP_04,
- 3rd prize is awarded to: Submission No. NTP_08,
- purchase prize is awarded to: Submission No. NTP_05.

8. THE ALLOCATION OF THE AWARDS AND THE PURCHASE, WITH A BRIEF JUSTIFICATION

The Evaluation Committee has set the amounts to be paid to the authors of the winning and purchased submissions as follows:

- 1st prize: €110,000 gross
- 2nd prize: €85,000 gross
- 3rd prize: €65,000 gross
- purchase prize: €60,000 gross.

The Evaluation Committee has decided that the invitation fee (€31,750 gross) can be paid to the designers of all 12 submissions, as all of them were valid.

The prizes represent gross amounts, including VAT and all other taxes due, and are taxable income. In the case of foreign prize-winners, applicants with purchased submissions, and special prize winners, VAT will not be paid for the prize-winner, the applicant with the purchased submission or the special prize winner but will be paid directly by the Client to the Hungarian tax authorities. This avoids the need for the foreign partner to register as a VAT payer with the Hungarian authorities, and he is entitled to issue an invoice for the net amount.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE METHODS AND OPPORTUNITIES TO USE THE DESIGN APPLICATION

9.1. Negotiated public procurement procedure without prior publication

The Evaluation Committee declares the Design Competition valid and successful and finds that the submission awarded 1st prize in the Design Competition (Submission No. NTP_09) is suitable for being invited by the Client to submit a bid in a negotiated procedure without publication for the provision of design services. In accordance with the rules of the negotiated procedure without prior publication, the public procurement procedure may be launched, and the design services contract may be awarded subject to the terms and conditions set out in the documentation, as recommended by the Evaluation Committee.

Pursuant to Articles 25 (3) k.) and 26 (2) of the Design Competition Decree, the Evaluation Committee recommends only the author of the design awarded the 1st prize to be invited to submit a bid in the public procurement procedure following the Design Competition.

The concept and the proposed functional, structural, and technical solutions of the 1st prize-winning submission are suitable to serve as a basis for further design. The complexity of the submission and its clear, feasible, cost- and time-effective answers to all the questions in the Competition brief make it suitable for recommendation for further design by the Evaluation Committee.

9.2. Recommendations of the Evaluation Committee for the further design of the winning submission

Based on the evaluation and thorough examination of the 12 submissions received in accordance with the design program, the Evaluation Committee recommends that the following design directions, conceptual and technical solutions be considered by the Client and the successful Applicant in the further design process.

9.2.1. Urban transport

- The Evaluation Committee agrees with the demolition of the road overpass at Nyugati Square in line with the Váci Boulevard – Bajcsy-Zsilinszky Boulevard and the continuation of the trams terminating at Lehel Square; it considers this to be a direction to follow in future planning phases and recommends that the decision-makers implement it.
- The existing underpass system at the Nyugati Square and the M3 metro underground station need to provide a generously dimensioned, direct pedestrian connection to the Eiffel Hall's intermediate underpass level, with a direct route and without obstacles from both exits. The utilisation of the spaces of the current underpass is a task for further planning.
- The balance of the railway station's pedestrian entrances is important: while the Podmaniczky Street underground access is expected to be of minor importance despite all its architectural merit, the direct public accessibility of the Nyugati Square surface tracks and the emphasis of the public entrance(s) should be improved for the suburban passengers rushing to the trains.
- In the case of the Ferdinánd axis, the Evaluation Committee, having considered the proposals of all the submissions, considers the tunnel design to be the preferred option and recommends that it be implemented. Access to the car park placed at the intermediate underpass level and the logistics yard from both the Váci Boulevard and the Podmaniczky Street should be ensured, at least indirectly. The station should be accessible from public transport services (trolleybus No. 76) using the new road tunnel.

9.2.2. Urban planning, urban development

- The Evaluation Committee agrees with the extension of the urban master plan to include the Lehel Square and the church area and its integration into the transversal green area strip; considers it to be a direction to be followed in further planning phases to improve the pedestrian aspect of the area around the church and to reduce the occupation of the area by road traffic.

- The Evaluation Committee agrees with the separate level transition of the linear park above the Dózsa György Boulevard, for both Vágány Street and Podmaniczky Street; recommends that it be further examined and designed as part of the urban master plan.
- The development along Podmaniczky Street needs to be designed in a way that is sensitive to the urban environment. Along Podmaniczky Street, a development line reflecting at the rhythm of the eclectic urban fabric but breaking up at key points – especially in front of the engine shed –, is desirable. The façade of buildings facing the railway should be treated as equivalent. The design and development intensity of the narrowing strip of land at the end of Dózsa György Boulevard needs to be reconsidered.
- The review of the linear park design is recommended. The green stripe should go on with a varied spatial position in the inner section of the area, alternating sides between the railway and the street, freeing the building of the engine shed, while on the outer section, it is advisable to run it along the railway track in a protected position until Munkácsy Street.
- The development of the park should aim to use the excavated earth from civil engineering works in situ.
- It is proposed to renovate the engine shed, as a public institution of urban status, while preserving its historical values in the further design, as a key element of the new linear park. It is desirable to create open spaces around the building to ensure adequate visibility.
- For the congress centre, the Evaluation Committee considers the development area north of the Ferdinand axis in the first block facing the Lehel Square to be the most suitable, and the first prize winning submission also proposes this location. The facility will be appropriately positioned between the Ferdinand axis and Lehel Street, but efforts should be made to ensure direct pedestrian links to the railway station and the Nyugati Square, with protected pedestrian connections on as long a stretch as possible. The building mass of the congress centre should be placed in the first block from Lehel Square, and its façade in this direction should stop in line

with the Salt House (Sóház), opening to the Váci Boulevard with a public space, and retaining the boundary of the development at the corner of the development site in line with the Westend.

- The pedestrian-cyclist connections between the districts, lifted over the railway track, should provide three directions with a direct alignment and a generous width: the Kodály Circus – Szent István Park axis, the Bajza Street – Bulcsú Street axis, and the continuation of the linear park to Vágány Street starting from the line of Munkácsy Street. In all three cases, the planned design of the crossings should allow for the unobstructed passage of cyclists and pedestrians.
- The most important east-west open-air connection should be wider and more south-facing than the one in the winning submission, providing different directions, with a clear opening of the park towards the Lehel Square church.
- It is recommended to extend Vágány Street to Bulcsú Street, bearing in mind the possibility of continuing the linear park on the District XIII side.
- The adequate provision of human infrastructure (nurseries, kindergartens, schools, health care, sports facilities) should be ensured in the further planning.
- The intensity and spatial location of the development should be determined considering the general utility infrastructure developments (electricity, sewerage, district heating and cooling).
- The design of the linear park should give greater emphasis and ecological importance to the development of the water architecture; it is desirable of creating a larger surface area of water in line with the proposals of several submissions.

9.2.3. Architecture and interior functionality

- The sustainability aspects formulated need to be examined in detail, and clear indicators that can be monitored during the planning process and linked to targets need to be defined to ensure that they are met in the subsequent planning stages.

- Further developments to the roof height and weather side protection of the new hall are required, in coordination with the rethinking of the façade design of the Nyugati Square and the new park.
- The northern space wall of the Váci Boulevard side of the Nyugati Square (Puczi Béla Square) and the new main façade of the railway station need to be clearly defined.
- The covering of the less frequently used parts of the platforms extending beyond the new hall should be designed in a way that is consistent with the architectural instruments used.
- It is proposed to review the excessively wide arcade openings of the Eiffel Hall's side aisles.
- The pedestrian circulation system between the ground floor, mezzanine, and deep-level station platforms of the Eiffel Hall should be reconsidered; the platforms should have underground exits closer to the main entrance on Teréz Ring Road.
- The targeted functional complexity justifies the establishment of a comprehensive retail and service strategy to support the design program, defining the functions of the hall and subway level, with the focus on the urban public in the hall and the passengers at the subway level. The Eiffel Hall will be used primarily as a covered, but traversable public urban space, for a catering and cultural functions. Shops and services in the Eiffel Hall and on the distribution level below are to be provided with a larger floor area, better distributed, and aligned with the main passenger flow routes.
- It is necessary to ensure that the Eiffel Hall is closable and protected from the weather.
- In addition to the gangway above the surface tracks, a transverse connection at the intermediate underpass level towards the central area of the Westend shopping centre should be assessed to provide direct access to the underground platforms.
- The number, size, and positioning of the gangways from the Nyugati Square to the new hall should be reviewed.

9.2.4. Railway operation

- The deep-level station is also the entrance to the tunnel planned for the future, which should not be overlooked in the technical design, and its structural, mechanical and technological requirements should be integrated into the design.
- The flexible operation of the station tracks and the high passenger traffic do not allow for large crowds waiting on the platforms. For this reason, the optimal location of the central waiting and passenger distribution areas is at the intermediate distribution level; passenger transport functions (customer centre, long-distance passenger lounge, etc.) should be concentrated here.
- The interchange between the surface and the deep-level station shall also be provided at the level of the underpass, related to the central waiting area, if the final track geometry allows.
- All pedestrian routes and station services are expected to be easily accessible by the shortest route, without obstacles, in accordance with the European Union's rail interoperability requirements.
- Further development of the connection between the deep-level station and the Ferdinánd axis and the Westend shopping centre, which was only indirectly solved in the project, is needed.
- The placement of the operational functions in the rear wing of the railway station area is highly advantageous, but the proposed railway buildings above them should be reduced in mass or relocated due to their unfavourable proximity to the engine shed.
- The dimensions of the technological operational rooms (signal reception room, power supply room, telecommunication equipment room, etc.) may vary depending on the technology to be used.
- The elements of overhead contact lines and cables necessary for the railway operation technology, the acoustic, static, and dynamic passenger information services, and the elements of railway lighting are not present in the Submission, but they need to be integrated in the further design into a unified system.

9.3. Final provisions

The Evaluation Committee calls on the Client to conclude the contracts for the transfer of the rights of use of the winning and the purchased submissions with the designers in accordance with Article 27 (4) of the Design Competition Decree.

Finally, the Evaluation Committee draws the attention of the Client to the fact that, at the time of drafting this Final Report, as a document recording the professional reviews, the details of the applicants associated with the submissions have not yet been made available by the discloser. If a reason for exclusion under Article 12 (3) or 13 of the Government Decree arises after the disclosure of the identity of the author of the first prize-winning submission, or if the public procurement procedure with this applicant impossible, the Evaluation Committee shall recommend that no further winners be selected for negotiated procedure without prior publication, pursuant to Article 26 (2) of the Design Competition Decree.

Based on the unanimous decision of the Evaluation Committee, the discloser revealed the identity of the authors of the winning and purchased submissions to the legal representative, who informed the members of the Evaluation Committee of the result.

Budapest, 24 March 2022

The members of the Evaluation Committee have given their consent to the Final Report in accordance with Article 19 of the Rules of Procedure of the Evaluation Committee and the Experts by means of recorded, traceable, and identifiable electronic means.

Dr. Balázs Fürjes Chairman	**Zsolt Füleky** Co-Chairman	**Dávid Vitézy** Co-Chairman
Gyöngyvér Iványi	**Dr. László Mosóczi**	**Marianna Szetei-Szőke**
Zoltán Erő	**Máté Győrffy**	**Judit Rab**
Katalin Massányi	**Anthony Gall**	**Katalin Csillag**
László Molnár	**Bálint Dományi**	**László Somodi**
Csaba Tóth	**Judit Z. Halmágyi**	**Anthony Dewar**
Mojmir Nejezchleb	**Tihamér Szalay**	**Sándor Fegyverneky**

Annex No. 1: Preliminary settlement appearance expertise

MINISZTERELNÖKSÉG

GULYÁS GERGELY
miniszter

TKF-71/424/1/2022

Országkép- és településképvédelmi szempontú előzetes vélemény

A „Nyugati Pályaudvar és Környezetének Megújítása" tárgyban kiírt építészeti tervpályázat díjazásra és megvételre szánt pályaműveinek köréről

A kiíró elnevezése:	Budapest Fejlesztési Központ Nonprofit Zrt.
A kiíró székhelye:	1027 Budapest, Horvát utca 14-26.
A tervezett építési beruházás által érintett ingatlan címe, helyrajzi száma:	1062 Budapest VI. kerület, Teréz körút 55-57. Hrsz.:28224/51

A településfejlesztésért és településrendezésért felelős miniszter 020/2022 számú, országkép - és településképvédelmi szempontú előzetes véleménye:

A díjazásra és megvételre szánt pályaművek körével kapcsolatban az előzetes településképi hozzájárulást megadom.

Indokolás

A „Nyugati Pályaudvar és Környezetének Megújítása" tárgyban a Budapest Fejlesztési Központ Nonprofit Zrt., mint a főváros és agglomerációjának közlekedés- és városfejlesztési beruházásaiért felelős állami szervezet – kétfordulós nemzetközi építészeti tervpályázatot írt ki, a Nyugati pályaudvar műemléki rekonstrukciójának és felszín alatti bővítésének tervezési feladataira vonatkozóan. A tervpályázati eljárásokról szóló 310/2015. (X. 28.) Kormányrendelet 25. § (3a) és (3b) bekezdései alapján a kiíró kérelmezte a megvételre javasolt pályaművek körét bemutató dokumentáció Országkép- és településképvédelmi szempontú előzetes véleményezését.

A településfejlesztési koncepcióról, az integrált településfejlesztési stratégiáról és a településrendezési eszközökről, valamint egyes településrendezési sajátos jogintézményekről szóló 314/2012. (XI. 8.) 23/I. § meghatározottak alapján a pályaművekről megállapítható, hogy az ismertetett építészeti koncepcióik kielégítik a településkép védelméről szóló 2016. évi LXXIV. törvény 2. § (1)-ben rögzített célokat, ezért a pályázat zárójelentésének megfogalmazásához az előzetes településképi hozzájárulást megadom.

Budapest, 2022. március „23."

Gulyás Gergely

Miniszterelnökséget Vezető Miniszter

1055 Budapest, Kossuth Lajos tér 2-4. Telefon: +36 (1) 896 7895, +36 (1) 896 0017 E-mail: miniszterelnokseg@mvh.gov.hu

Annex No. 2: List of the authors of the winning and purchased submissions, identified by the discloser based on the evaluation serial number

APPLICATION CODE	APPLICATION SUBMISSION NUMBER	PRIZE OR PURCHASE	APPLICANT	COLLABORATIVE DESIGNER, EXPERT
NTP_01	BESZ_903410	**2ND PRIZE**	**ALBERT WIMMER ZT-GMBH**	BOLLINGER UND GROHMANN ZT GMBH AXIS INGENIEUR-LEISTUNGEN ZT GMBH TRANSSOLAR ENERGIETECHNIK GMBH YEWO LANDSCAPES GMBH
NTP_02	BESZ_127716		**BENTHEM CROUWEL INTERNATIONAL B.V**	
NTP_03	BESZ_252483		**FOSTER + PARTNERS LIMITED**	
NTP_04	BESZ_312320	**2ND PRIZE**	**AREP ARCHITECTES AREP**	ÉPÍTÉSZ STÚDIÓ KFT.
NTP_05	BESZ_921387	**PURCHASE PRIZE**	**KENGO KUMA & ASSOCIATES, INC.** **M-TEAMPANNON KFT.**	
NTP_06	BESZ_885008		**JOHN MCASLAN + PARTNERS LTD.**	
NTP_07	BESZ_883505		**CRUZ Y ORTIZ ARQUITECTOS, S.L.P** **ESTUDIO LAMELA S.L.P** **SZÁNTÓ & MIKÓ ÉPÍTÉSZEK KFT.**	

APPLICATION CODE	APPLICATION SUBMISSION NUMBER	PRIZE OR PURCHASE	APPLICANT	COLLABORATIVE DESIGNER, EXPERT
NTP_08	BESZ_111180	3RD PRIZE	ZAHA HADID LIMITED FINTA ÉS TÁRSAI ÉPÍTÉSZ STÚDIÓ KFT. BURO HAPPOLD LIMITED ABUD MÉRNÖKIRODA KFT. LAND ITALIA SRL	
NTP_09	BESZ_380079	1ST PRIZE	GRIMSHAW INTERNATIONAL LIMITED	NAUTES ARCHITECTS WSP VOGT TURNER & TOWNSEND
NTP_10	BESZ_564202		SWECO ARCHITECTS AB / GATEWAYS	
NTP_11	BESZ_628158		OVE ARUP & PARTNERS INTERNATIONAL LIMITED	DVM GROUP
NTP_12	BESZ_327353		HAWKINS & BROWN ARCHITECTURE LTD. PLANT – ATELIER PETERKIS KFT.	