

**TO THE MAYOR OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF  
VELIKO TARNOVO**

**REPORT**

Today on date 16.10.2018, the Selection Committee appointed by Order No ПД 22-985/13.06.2018 of the Mayor of the Municipality of Veliko Tarnovo in connection with a competition for a Project with subject-matter: COMPETITION FOR A NEW URBAN CENTER – VELIKO TARNOVO with number in Public Procurement Register 00073-2018-0018 and with address of the profile of the Buyer: <https://www.veliko-tarnovo.bg/bg/profil-na-kupuvacha/582/>.

**1. Membership of the Selection Commission, inclusive of changes made in the course of the work.**

CHAIRMAN: Prof. Dr GEORGE STANISHEV (Bulgaria);

AND MEMBERS:

1. ANDREA D'ANTRASSI - architect (Italy-China);
2. ANDREY CHERNIHOV - architect (Russia);
3. DR HELLE JUUL - architect (Denmark);
4. PROF. DR DOMINIQUE ROUILLARD - architect (France);
5. ANDREW YEOMAN - architect (Great Britain-Croatia);
6. YURIY LYUBOMIRSKI – architect - Chairman of the Regional College of the Chamber of Architects in Bulgaria - Veliko Tarnovo (Bulgaria)
7. NIKOLAY MALAKOV – Chief architect of the Municipality of Veliko Tarnovo (Bulgaria);
8. LORA BACHVAROVA - Chief Expert in Department of Spatial Planning in the Municipality of Veliko Tarnovo (Bulgaria).

**2. Number and date of the Order for appointment of the Committee as well as the orders by which the terms, its tasks and membership are changed;**

The Committee was appointed by Order No ПД 22-985/13.06.2018 of the Mayor of the Municipality of Veliko Tarnovo.

Amended by orders: №ПД 22-1227/20.07.2018г. of the Mayor of the Municipality of Veliko Tarnovo and №ПД 22-1242/26.07.2018г. of the Mayor of the Municipality of Veliko Tarnovo.

The tasks of the Selection Committee are: All the actions of the Selection Committee should be entered into Minutes of the Meeting and the results of the work shall be reflected in a report. The Report should be presented to the Contracting Authority, and all the documents executed in the course of the work of the Committee should also be attached to it along with the entire documentation under competition with subject-matter: “COMPETITION FOR A NEW URBAN CENTER – VELIKO TARNOVO”, with unique number 00073-2018-0018 in the Register of the Public Procurement Agency.

**3. Received projects with incoming:**

1. Бх.№ 53-2092-1/10.07.2018 г. 13:46 ч. – Casanova+Hernandez Architects;
2. Бх.№ 94-CC-16737-1/12.07.2018 г. 9:14 ч. – Sung Goo Yang;
3. Бх.№ 94-KK-9390-1/12.07.2018 г. 11:26 ч. – Karoli Ishtvan;
4. Бх.№ 53-2103-1/16.07.2018 г. 16:36 ч. – Osamu Morishita architects;
5. Бх.№ 53-2104-1/17.07.2018 г. 9:46 ч. – Nauta architectura i izsledvane;
6. Бх.№ 94-EE-5929-1/17.07.2018 г. 13:55 ч. – Eizo Nagasava;
7. Бх.№ 53-2107-1/17.07.2018 г. 16:48 ч. – Nomo studio architects;
8. Бх.№ 53-2108-1/17.07.2018 г. 16:56 ч. – MVR International /Arenas Basabe Palacios Arquitectos SL (LTD)/;
9. Бх.№ 53-2109-1/18.07.2018 г. 9:33 ч. – Fernando Deli and Fernando Sabatini architects;
10. Бх.№ 94-ДД-14124-1/18.07.2018 г. 16:07 ч. – Diego Terna;
11. Бх.№ 94-ЛЛ-3327-1/18.07.2018 г. 16:11 ч. – Lorenzo Chiku;
12. Бх.№ 53-2111-1/18.07.2018 г. 16:51 ч. – Rubriks architects limited
13. Бх.№ 53-2112-1/19.07.2018 г. 9:45 ч. – Boliarski Murfi LTD;
14. Бх.№ 94-ЦЦ-3579-1/19.07.2018 г. 9:50 ч. – Tsvetomir Tsenkov;
15. Бх.№ 53-2113-1/19.07.2018 г. 10:50 ч. – Architects for urbanity
16. Бх.№ 53-2114-1/19.07.2018 г. 10:53 ч. – OVO GRABCHEVSKI ARCHITECTS;
17. Бх.№ 94-MM-18996-1/19.07.2018 г. 10:56 ч. – Matteo Vilavidere;
18. Бх.№ 53-2115-1/19.07.2018 г. 11:25 ч. – Banker Nishta;
19. Бх.№ 94-CC-16748-1/19.07.2018 г. 13:24 ч. – Simona Nikova;
20. Бх.№ 53-2117-1/19.07.2018 г. 14:29 ч. – Interval Architects;
21. Бх.№ 94-KK-9400-1/19.07.2018 г. 15:29 ч. – Kris Kornelisen;
22. Бх.№ 94-KK-9401-1/19.07.2018 г. 15:32 ч. – Claudio Filipini;
23. Бх.№ 94-PP-2779-1/19.07.2018 г. 15:34 ч. – Rositsa Nikiforova;
24. Бх.№ 53-2119-1/19.07.2018 г. 15:37 ч. – Sunday Group LTD;
25. Бх.№ 94-ДД-14129-1/19.07.2018 г. 15:41 ч. – Dan Vulkers;
26. Бх.№ 94-KK-9402-1/19.07.2018 г. 15:45 ч. – Claudio Nardi;
27. Бх.№ 53-2120-1/19.07.2018 г. 15:47 ч. – De architekthe SIE liset mas
28. Бх.№ 53-2121-1/20.07.2018 г. 9:18 ч. – NOVIZA LTD;
29. Бх.№ 94-AA-11721-1/20.07.2018 г. 9:20 ч. – Atanas Nikolaev Topalov;
30. Бх.№ 53-2122-1/20.07.2018 г. 9:23 ч. – Project Vitae LTD;
31. Бх.№ 53-2123-1/20.07.2018 г. 9:25 ч. – Legaplan K.G;
32. Бх.№ 94-MM-18999-1/20.07.2018 г. 9:31 ч. – Maya Shopova
33. Бх.№ 94-ДД-14130-1/20.07.2018 г. 9:33 ч. – Desislava Lachezarova Parlapanska;
34. Бх.№ 94-AA-11722-1/20.07.2018 г. 9:36 ч. – Amos Amit;
35. Бх.№ 53-2124-1/20.07.2018 г. 9:38 ч. – Hiroiuki Ninno architectura;

36. Бх.№ 53-2125-1/20.07.2018 г. 10:04 ч. – ADA- Architectural and Design Agency AD (JSC);
37. Бх.№ 53-2126-1/20.07.2018 г. 10:07 ч. – Atelie 3;
38. Бх.№ 94-EE-5934-1/20.07.2018 г. 10:11 ч. – Eric Casar;
39. Бх.№ 53-2129-1/20.07.2018 г. 10:35 ч. – The Los Angelis disign group;
40. Бх.№ 53-2130-1/20.07.2018 г. 10:54 ч. – Nikonsult LTD;
41. Бх.№ 53-2131-1/20.07.2018 г. 11:54 ч. – NUC\_VT\_BG DZZD
42. ;Бх.№ 53-2132-1/20.07.2018 г. 12:08 ч. – Ozer Yurger Mimarlik LTD;
43. Бх.№ 53-2133-1/20.07.2018 г. 12:18 ч. – Am Atrium Ltd.;
44. Бх.№ 53-2134-1/20.07.2018 г. 13:02 ч. – ES EN 1 EOOD (LTD);
45. Бх.№ 53-2135-1/20.07.2018 г. 13:21 ч. – Stephen George International Bulgaria LTD;
46. Бх.№ 53-2137-1/20.07.2018 г. 13:36 ч. – Jo Palma + partners association;
47. Бх.№ 53-2138-1/20.07.2018 г. 13:39 ч. – Urbano LTD;
48. Бх.№ 53-2140-1/20.07.2018 г. 13:53 ч. – Image Bureau EOOD (LTD);
49. Бх.№ 94-MM-19001-1/20.07.2018 г. 14:00 ч. – Maria Flaccavento;
50. Бх.№ 53-2141-1/20.07.2018 г. 14:10 ч. – Ten Architects EOOD (LTD);
51. Бх.№ 53-2142-1/20.07.2018 г. 15:03 ч. – Institut za gradsko planirane;
52. Бх.№ 53-2145-1/20.07.2018 г. 15:50 ч. – Association Solaris Studio and Orchestra Design;
53. Бх.№ 53-2146-1/20.07.2018 г. 15:54 ч. – “Caps”;
54. Бх.№ 01-280-1/20.07.2018 г. 15:56 ч. – ELENA ARGIROVA
55. Бх.№ 94-ФФ-859-1/20.07.2018 г. 15:59 ч. – Fernando Donis;
56. Бх.№ 53-2147-1/20.07.2018 г. 16:02 ч. – Association Bonev and Chayka;
57. Бх.№ 94-ГГ-4549-1/20.07.2018 г. 16:05 ч. – Gocho Gochev;
58. Бх.№ 94-CC-6457-4/20.07.2018 г. 16:11 ч. – Stanimir Vladimirov Velichkov;
59. Бх.№ 94-33-79-1/20.07.2018 г. 16:21 ч. – Zdravko Rusev;
60. Бх.№ 5300-292-1/20.07.2018 г. 16:25 ч. – Masters LTD;
61. Бх.№ 5300-2148-1/20.07.2018 г. 16:34 ч. – Urbaneks LTD;
62. Бх.№ 5300-2149-1/20.07.2018 г. 16:59 ч. – Elina Dirba (Archigrey);

**4. Brief description of the working process. Participants in the procedure. Actions related to the opening, consideration and evaluation of each of the tenders. Classification and removal of Tenderers. Reasons for admission/removal of each Tenderer.**

The Selection Committee received the projects processed by the Committee of officials pursuant to Art. 90 of the Implementing Regulations of the Public Procurement Act by a Delivery and Acceptance Protocol. 62 Projects were submitted individualized by four-digit number and the information indicating the identity of the Tenderers is sealed by the Technical Committee which also handed over a list with the names of the Tenderers which is sealed in a non-transparent envelope and will be opened after the evaluation of the received projects.

The Selection Committee commenced a session on 27.07.2018 from 11:00 hours in the

building Exhibition Halls Rafael Mihaylov.

The Selection Committee signed declarations pursuant to Art. 80, Para. 7, sentence two of the Public Procurement Act and Art. 88, Para. 3 of the Implementing Regulations of the Public Procurement Act prior to the commencement of its work after which it initiated the consideration and the evaluation of the received projects.

Initially the Selection Committee started by consideration of the projects in connection with their conformity with the preliminary conditions given by the Contracting Authority in the Terms of Reference in Section REQUIREMENTS FOR PRESENTATION OF THE PROJECT DOCUMENTATION.

The examination led to the following conclusions:

**PROJECT No. 2707**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 2693**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

There are no:

4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;

There are no:

5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated..

### **PROJECT No. 8865;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

6. Explanatory text;
7. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 8162;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;

2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No.2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;

There are no:

7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

#### **PROJECT No. 9204;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
4. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;
6. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

7. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 3105;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

3. General plan fragment or schemes;
4. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.
5. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Explanatory text;
5. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

6. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
7. Situation 1:1000;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 9568;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
4. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;

3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 2082;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 2513;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.



On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 2685;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

8. Situation 1:1000;
9. Explanatory text;
1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 5035;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;

5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;
6. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

7. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 3064;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

During the review of the project, the jury found the following:

The construction planned, although not high, does not comply as a method of construction of a New Town Centre but is suitable for the construction of a peripheral territory.

There is a difference between the textual and graphical information as regards the functional distribution of the buildings. There are no buildings with socio-cultural functions envisaged.

The built-up water-supply and sewerage infrastructure has been compromised with the proposed construction with educational and residential functions. From the project, it is not clear where the transit traffic passes.

No account has been taken of the nature of the property in respect of the plot with the National Military Historical Archive building, with a pedestrian crossing envisaged through the plot. The property of Belyanka factory is also inconsistent.

The new residential construction planned is in close proximity to the building of the former Belyanka factory, which compromises the urban development solution.

After reviewing the project, the jury decided that it did not meet the requirements of the competition programme because of the contradictions found in Board 1. It was unanimously decided that the project should not be rated but removed from participation pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act.

### **PROJECT No. 5435;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Explanatory text;
5. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

6. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
7. Situation 1:1000;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 3761;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;

2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 7878;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
3. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
4. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

5. General plan fragment or schemes;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 9177;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 3780;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;

There are no:

6. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 8495;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

During the review of the project, the jury found the following:

Removal of part of the river-bank vegetation is planned for the construction of residential buildings.

There is no information about the seats in the Grand Hall.

The project proposal offers to split the Grand Hall into 3 small halls.

After reviewing the project, the jury decided that it did not meet the requirements of the competition programme because of the contradictions found in Board 1 and Board 2. It was unanimously decided that the project should not be rated but removed from participation pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act.

**PROJECT No. 5954;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;

There are no:

3. General plan fragment or schemes;

4. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

#### **PROJECT No. 1844;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

#### **PROJECT No. 5980;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;

2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Explanatory text;
6. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

7. Situation 1:1000;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 6097;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

During the review of the project, the jury found the following:



The project does not envisage to keep the military block of flats. The building of the University of Veliko Tarnovo is transformed into a museum. Neither of the two buildings is owned by the Municipality of Veliko Tarnovo and, thus, the concept contradicts the conditions of the competition programme.

There is no information about the construction parameters. There is no information about parking spaces. The lack of information should be equated with a lack of planned parking spaces as it is logical to assume that had they been planned, they would have been on the board.

The ownership was not taken into account.

After reviewing the project, the jury decided that it did not meet the requirements of the competition programme because of the contradictions found in Board . It was unanimously decided that the project should not be rated but removed from participation pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act.

### **PROJECT No. 2927;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 2285;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 6272;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

4. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
5. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 1800;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;

2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

#### **PROJECT No. 9634;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

#### **PROJECT No. 1611;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;
6. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

7. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 5483;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
3. Explanatory text;

There are no:

4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. Situation 1:1000;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 9246;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;
6. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

7. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 5259;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;\

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;

5. Explanatory text;

There are no:

6. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;

7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 4134;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 1344;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 8773;**

On board No. 1, there are no:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Explanatory text;

There are no:

5. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
6. Situation 1:1000;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 5641;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

5. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;
6. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

7. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 5912;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 6900;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;



2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;

There are no:

4. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 6695;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

5. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 4830**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;

There are no:

3. General plan fragment or schemes;
4. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
2. Explanatory text;

There are no:

3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. Situation 1:1000;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 5167;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
4. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;

3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 5509;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 5190;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 3079;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 9552;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;

5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 3200;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 5499;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;

4. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;
6. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

7. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

#### **PROJECT No. 2881;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;

There are no:

6. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;

7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 3222;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 8470;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 6727;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 6596;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;
6. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

There are no:

7. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;



The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 5938;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 5877;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;

6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 3864;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 7404;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;

5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

During the review of the project, the jury found the following:

There is no information as to whether the number of parking spaces required under the assignment was reached.

The hall offers 290 seats. The competition assignment envisages a hall with approximately 1,200 seats. The building proposed obviously does not meet this condition.

The requirements to distribute the area between the different functional zones were not met as the hall and the foyer have insufficient area.

The project proposal does not offer a solution for partitioning the Grand Hall.

After reviewing the project, the jury decided that it did not meet the requirements of the competition programme because of the contradictions found in Board 1 and Board 2. It was unanimously decided that the project should not be rated but removed from participation pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act.

### **PROJECT No. 4370;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 7956;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
3. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
4. Situation 1:1000;
5. Explanatory text;

There are no:

6. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 6599;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

There are no:

4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;

4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 3267;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. General plan fragment or schemes;
3. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans;
4. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
5. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;

There are no:

7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

**PROJECT No. 2084;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;

There are no:

4. General plan fragment or schemes;

5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
2. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
3. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
4. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
5. Situation 1:1000;
6. Explanatory text;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and, pursuant to Article 107, section 2 of the Public Procurement Act, decided not to allow the project to be rated.

### **PROJECT No. 9775;**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

During the review of the project, the jury found the following:

After reviewing the project, the jury decided that it did not meet the requirements of the competition programme due to the availability of options in the urban development solution. The volumetric decision provides for the construction of a high building in the plot of the Administrative Court, while such is missing in the the General Plan, which is a presentation of variants in the proposal and, thus, it

is not possible to decide which of the two options should be rated and for that reason the project is removed from further participation in the competition.

### **PROJECT No. 8930**

On board No. 1, there are:

1. General plan in scale 1:2000 + text;
2. Communication plan in scale 1:5000 or 1:10000 + text;
3. Communication plan fragment 1:2000;
4. General plan fragment or schemes;
5. Volumetric solution - axonometric perspective or plans.

On board No. 2, there are:

1. Situation 1:1000;
2. Explanatory text;
3. Plans and schemes clarifying the volumetric-spatial solution;
4. Plans, sections, and facades in scale 1:200;
5. Schemes, plans, axonometric and other clarifying functions and constructions;
6. 3D exterior and interior building visualizations;
7. 3D visualizations clarifying materials, surfaces and color solutions.

The Jury decided that the submitted boards meet the minimum requirements set by the Contracting Authority in the assignment and allowed the project to be rated.

On the grounds of the reasons indicated hereinabove Tenderers with the following numbers were removed at this stage:

1. 2693;
2. 8865;
3. 8162;
4. 9204;
5. 3105;
6. 9568;
7. 2513;
8. 5035;
9. 3064;
10. 5435;
11. 7878;
12. 3780;
13. 8495;
14. 5954;

15. 5980;
16. 6097;
17. 6272;
18. 9634;
19. 1611;
20. 5483;
21. 9246;
22. 5259;
23. 8773;
24. 5641;
25. 6900;
26. 6695;
27. 4830;
28. 5167;
29. 5499;
30. 2881;
31. 6596;
32. 7404;
33. 7956;
34. 6599;
35. 3267;
36. 2084;
37. 9775;

After completing the above actions, the jury finished its work at 19:00.

On 28.07.2018, at 10:00, the jury continued its work on reviewing and rating the projects admitted.

The jury proceeded to rate and rank the projects admitted in accordance with the methodology specified in the assignment.

**Project Proposal № 5938 – 25th PLACE - a total of 18 points**

**Rating Criterion № 1:**

**Functional solution, zoning and phased construction - 1 pts.**

Zoning and phased construction were proposed, according to which the realization of the exhibition center is mentioned in the first stage of the project proposal implementation of construction execution of The New City Center. A second stage, in the northern part of the constructive site plot is to build residential buildings and underground parking, hotels, sports hall, cafes / restaurants, media library. The third stage involves the construction building of more residential buildings, a commercial hall and a shopping mall. The final stage is the realization of the most southern and southeastern part of the constructive site plot, which will be built with mixed type of buildings. At all stages will be the



acceptance of the first one, a Public Private Partnership form may be suitable and may be sought. The project proposal design solution is comparatively in line with the recommended structure for the distribution of functions. There are suggestions only for some of the objects under item 11, but part of the newly proposed spaces and objects can be adapted for the purposes as well. The Belianka Mill building is to be preserved, giving it a new function - the "Incubator".

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

### **Rating Criterion № 2:**

#### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 1 pts.**

The project proposal contains a transport communication solution according to which the roundabout street is to be transformed into a special one (mostly pedestrian), in the central west part of one of the streets becomes a shared surface (only for servicing) and the main road traffic will be moved by an inner ring, with entrance and exit to the temporary parking lot in front of the university and along the block of flats. Private underground parking lots under the newly proposed residential and commercial buildings as well as public spaces located under the trading hall are envisaged to be constructed and it can not be concluded whether that their area will be sufficiently efficient to park in the central city area. A pedestrian network is developed in the area of coastal vegetation. There is no proposal for the transit traffic from the city center to the right bank of the river Yantra, the park and the Sveta Gora residential area. It is proposed to build a new pedestrian bridge over the river, but in the direction of railway station. The access to it will be via an elevator.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

### **Rating Criterion № 3:**

#### **Volumetric spatial and artistic solution - 1 point.**

The proposed volumetric and artistic solution focuses on the development of several approaches to the territory, which are highlighted by richer street landscaping. Through shapes, pavements and urban furnishings, public spaces are created, connected in a picturesque network, which ones are suitable for the purpose of recreation. Emphasis in the decision is the third stage of the development of The New City Center, where a triangular space is formed, which one is imitating the shape of the existing Marno Pole Park and bound to it by greenery. This will ensure the visual connection of The New City Center to the other parts of the city and will allow the invasion of fresh air masses from the meanders of the river as well. Panoramic grounds are also proposed. Although buffer landscaping is planned along Hristo Botev Street in the northwestern part of the territory, the proposed new volumes with residential buildings development buildings "crush" the existing ones on the left side of the street, some of which are bearers of artistic elements. It is envisaged a high-intensity and high-rise marking building in the south-east with hotel features. The marker can also serve the proposed market hall in the central western part of The New City Center, which one features basic pedestrian entrance functions. The project proposal has many pedestrian spaces, but they are developed in forms that do not allow masses to crowd.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

### **Rating Criterion № 4:**

#### **Concept of Landscaping and Enrichment of the Territory - 1 pts.**

The project contains a concept for landscaping and ennoblement on the territory, which offers a network of public spaces, formed with special pavements and landscaping. Natural light, sunlight and air conditioning are provided to ensure the quality of life of visitors, workers and occupants of The New City Center. Although the proposed vegetation is to be abolished, the project proposal proposes planting of compensatory vegetation in the envisaged, new, green areas.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 5:**

##### **Innovative Solutions of Public Spaces – 4 pts.**

The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution the development of an activity-rich street along the coastal vegetation, which can provide opportunities for the holding and organising of interesting and unique events. Another similar space is located in the central city area and is a pergola square area.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating Criterion № 6:**

##### **Sustainability of the solutions - 1 pts.**

The proposed project proposal solutions are tailored to the already functioning buildings in the New City Center and the already completed water and sewerage infrastructure. The routes of the street network under the current Detailed development plan are also largely preserved.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

**Totally for the city planning concept receives 9 points.**

#### **Rating Criterion № 7:**

##### **Original vision and volumetric spatial solution of the building - 1 pts.**

The project proposal for a building of the Exposition Center has a relatively interesting vision, although the conception of shaping the volume-space solution is quite exploited, depriving it of the originality necessary to perceive the building as a flagship of the future New City Center. The volume of the building is built in one form, spiral rising in the property. This solution provides good opportunities for organising different events, both in the exterior and in the interior as well. The disadvantage is that the project proposal is not in line with the large displacement of the terrain itself.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion №8:**

##### **Setting and entering the building in the urban environment - 1 pts.**

The project proposal proposes a situational solution where the building is located tightly on the limiting lines, according to the competitive conditions, such as the northern and southern facades, there are volumes going beyond these lines but bayonne. Due to its spiral shape and the choice of materials for the facades, especially with their dense vertical articulation, the building is logically and proportionally sized and proportional does not conflict with the surrounding construction and the urban environment. There remains a vague choice of orientation of the building in the space,

positioning its high proportion in the south and southwest of the property while in the area of displacement of the terrain, where it can be used - the height is considerably smaller.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 9:**

##### **Functional Solution - 1 pts.**

The proposed functional scheme is insufficiently considered in its terms of vertical communications and evacuation paths, which is particularly noticeable at the underground level, where the requirements for accessible environments are largely neglected. The choice of the location of the ramp for car access as well as the winding staircases, the lack of lifts and etc., are part of the shortcomings of the project. On the other hand, the requirements for the distribution of the areas between the different functional areas, as well as for the built-up and unfolded built-up area of the building are observed. The proposal for a Big Hall complies with the competitive conditions, providing 1500 seats, as well as a good solution for acoustics and lighting, but the stage is small and has a problematic corner position as well.

136 parking spaces are provided in the underground level. The roof is usable with pedestrian access from the terrain and provides panoramic grounds for observation of the old city district. The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution different spaces, such as scale and proportions, which ones are providing the opportunity to conduct different types of events. There is also a fully usable roof.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 10:**

##### **Originality of the decision to transform the BIG HALL - 4 pts.**

The space of the Big Hall, with 1500 seats provided, is of a single volume, but consists of four functionally divided parts located on two levels. The project proposal design solution proposes a good solution for partitioning the Big Hall, including a variation, where it is able to be transformed into 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 smaller halls. The transformation is interesting and relatively easy to realize because of the possibility of unilateral barriers. The only inconvenience is the overly elongated form of two of the small halls obtained by dividing the Big Hall into 6 parts.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 received 4 points.

#### **Rating Criterion № 11:**

##### **MAIN FOYER - 1 pts.**

The Main Foyer is located on the ground level in the western part of the building and has the ability to conduct exposition events, proposing a single volume space on two levels, as the second one is being a partially type of a gallery with sufficient height and "air". Its designation is not emphatical and clear enough (according to the competition program) in the exterior of the building.

This project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution a richly glazed atrium-like space that does not require sun protection in its larger volume due to the chosen facade articulation and building materials. Its structure is clear, with good functional opportunities for organizing and conducting various types of events, expositions and activities.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

**Rating Criterion № 12:**

**Environmental and energy-efficient project solutions - 1 pts.**

The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution for an Exposition Center building an energy-efficient project proposal solution, providing a facade sun protection. The building could be built with standard and publicly available building technology, which one implies the use of standard construction-equipment and equipment, with the exception of the fully usable roof, which one's functioning is necessary to be done, for which smooth operation will require the development of special details and the use of specialized materials for reliable waterproofing and coating for implementing the execution. Apart from this, the materials included in the project proposal are natural and generally available, so local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. Excavation works also do not extend to the whole property, but are limited to the limiting lines of construction. The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution landscaping in the property, including high vegetation, and a landscaped courtyard as well.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 5938 receives 1 point.

**Total conception of building - Exposition Center gets 9 points.**

**Project № 2285 – 24th PLACE - a total of 18 points**

**Rating Criterion № 1:**

**Functional solution, zoning and phased construction - 1 point.**

The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution a functional solution and a distribution that adheres to the recommended values in the assignment. There is no determined explicit stage in the realization of The New City Center. It is proposed to create four types of functional zones, developed alongside squares - the archive square, the market square, the university square and the administrative square. The project proposal's construction building is intensive and high-rise in the central longitudinal direction and has residential functions that can make the future New City Center undetectable. There is no suggestion for the specific location of the sites under item 11 / Museum of Photography, etc./, but part of the project proposal's design spaces and objects can be adapted for the purposes. Green and square spaces are proposed, as well as new sports facilities, which ones are covered to meet public expectations for the future city center.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 2285 receives 1 point.

**Rating Criterion № 2:**

**Transport and communication solution and parking - 1 pts.**

The transport-communication solution of the project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution that, the main part of the road traffic will take place along the street in a central longitudinal axis, whose northern entrance is unjustifiably shown with the connection to / from the calm Alexander Stamboliiski Street. The same street is also the main backbone for pedestrian and bicycle traffic, tangling the four different squares. There is no suggestion to facilitate and secure the various types of road users. There is no suggestion for a street to run a transit car stream from the central city area to the right bank of the river, Sveta Gora park and residential area. The development of the public transport network is envisaged, with a proposal to create new bus stops along the periphery and within the New City Center. The coastal protection zone is ennobled with a pedestrian network. The street east of the property has been confirmed for an exhibition center. There are 2000 parking spaces, which are provided underground and above ground.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 2285 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion №3:**

**Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 4 p.**

This design project offers a voluminous spatial and artistic solution that has been designed in consideration of the terrain relief and the existing buildings. The best part of the voluminous units are concentrated along the central long axis, emphasizing the focus of the new town structure. The buildings in the northwestern part are low and articulated, including abundant vegetation and sport facilities that do not conflict the existing buildings along the left side of Hristo Botev Street. It is a good idea to build a square in front of the campus of Veliko Tarnovo University in the northwestern part of the terrain as it may be assumed that the main pedestrian approach to the New Town Center will continue in that direction, taking into consideration how the terrain is situated with respect to the existing administrative and historical centers, the South road junction and the river as a dividing lane. The concentration of so many residential buildings in the very heart of the New Town Center is not convenient and contrast the public expectations for the prospective urban structure.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides good solutions to the specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 4 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №4:**

**Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 1 p.**

This design project offers landscaping and cultivation of the terrain and reduction of existing vegetation. As a compensation the design includes ideas for street landscaping and for planting new species in the parks.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №5:**

**Innovative public space solutions - 4 p.**

The conceptual design for urban development offers interesting solutions for public amenities which can be grouped into four types of areas. Taken individually they do not seem to be unique but taken in combination they offer services and quality that could satisfy the interests of different social groups. The design includes an interesting proposition to preserve Belyanka flourmill factory and to embed it into the surrounding structures thus creating the link between the past and future in the architectural vision for this terrain.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides good solutions to the specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 4 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №6:**

**Solution sustainability - 1 p.**

This design project provides for solution sustainability only within the frame of the minimal requirements, that is, to preserve the functions of existing buildings, existing technical infrastructure and the coastal vegetation area. The Arc of Generals is also preserved.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

## **The conceptual design for urban development scored the total of 12 points.**

---

### **Rating criterion №7:**

#### **Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 1 p.**

The proposed design project is entitled "The Bridge" carries strong aspiration for original and message rich vision but unfortunately those expectations were not met. The dimensional aspect of the building is developed under the terrain level using the difference of terrain levels and presents a V-shaped structure consisting of two components, forming at the place of their joined ends a courtyard-like "square" space surrounded by steps. The direct association for a bridge is vaguely present, mostly from the northern part and less from the intensively built Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street, and the expected, indirect and intuitive inspiration of the linking the historical and cultural epochs is hardly discernable, and if it is at all discerned, it would be due more to the pretentious title and not to the actual characteristics of the design project. The dimensional solution for the building provides the possibility to organize and conduct different types of events both in the exterior and the interior of the building. The roof is fully accessible and partially lawned merging into the nearby green area.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

### **Rating criterion №8:**

#### **Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 1 p.**

The proposed design project offers a well-situated solution by positioning the building within the border lines in accordance with the competition requirements. The dimensional solution of the building as well as the shape and materials to be used for the building construction do not conflict the surrounding buildings, but quite on the contrary, the different outlook and the light appearance of its spacious arrangement solution, the landscape of abundant vegetation and the vast clear aerial spaces allow the adjacent buildings, namely the 5<sup>th</sup> campus of Veliko Tarnovo University and the County Administration, the possibility for optimal display in the newly designed urban space. The building entrances are designed only from Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street /that is from north-northeastern direction/, except for the motor vehicle access to the underground parking level which is from southwestern direction - from the newly designed street running between the 5<sup>th</sup> campus of Veliko Tarnovo University and the prospective Exposition Center, creating a danger when changing the traffic direction while entering the ramp.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

### **Rating criterion №9:**

#### **Functional solution - 1 p.**

The functional layout of the building is as simple as a military barrack and useful to the minimum. This parallel structure combined with the elongated spaces give the impression of an endless underground gallery, which is further emphasized by the reinforced perspective of the inclined roof. The big hall is also designed in elongated shape, the evacuation routes are short and lead directly out to the terrain. The requirements for accessible environment are not fully complied with. The requirements for area distribution between the separate functional areas have been complied with. The requirement for floor area of the building, and for total floor area respectively, has been complied with. The design includes underground parking lots on two levels. There is no ground parking lot. The roof is fully accessible by pedestrian approach starting from the terrain, lawned and ensuring wonderful opportunities for panoramic views of the old town.

The peculiarities of the terrain and the approaches to the building are designed in consideration of the street gradients but direct approach from the square of the New Town Center is missing.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №10:**

**Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 1 p.**

The Big Hall is designed in compliance with specification requirements. The Big Hall will have 1210 seats. The proposed solution regarding the acoustic properties and lighting capacities is good. The proposed solution provides the possibility for the Big Hall to be divided into 6 smaller rooms.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №11:**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 1 p.**

This design project provides the main foyer to be a separate unit but the type of the spaces is transitory – corridor-like, therefore limiting the possibilities to conduct different events, in fact, with regard to this space only the minimum specification requirements are satisfied.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №12:**

**Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 1 p.**

This design project provides for landscaping of the terrain, including high vegetation but information on any additional energy-efficient solutions is missing.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2285 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**The conceptual design of the building– Exposition Center – scored the total of 6 points.**

**Projects numbered 5938 and 2285 have scored equal points, so by applying the instructions given in the specification in case of parity, the contestant, whose conceptual design for urban development scored higher, takes precedence, therefore design project № 5938 is the 25 place and design project № 2285 is the 24 place.**

**Project № 8470 -23 PLACE – total score 21 points**

**Rating criterion №1:**

**Functional solution, zoning and stage construction - 4 p.**

There is not any distinct solution for stage by stage construction of the New Town Center, or for any firm functional zoning. Judging upon the intensity of constructions it could be assumed that the territory has been divided in two parts – northern and southern – the northern featuring greater intensity of constructions, whereas the southern part shall be the venue for parks and sport playgrounds. In addition, there will be both underground and ground constructions, and most of the new buildings in the northern part will accommodate units intended for most diverse functions. Parking lots and some of the shopping units will be situated in the underground constructions whereas the higher floors of the buildings will be used for residential purposes. The combination of such diverse functions allows the creation of different forms of public-private partnerships and will ensure the economic return on investments, bearing in mind that the completed construction of the northern part will provide the financial means necessary to construct the public amenities and buildings in the southern part. This design project adheres to the recommended function distribution structure specified in the instructions. No particular location has been proposed for the units intended for construction in the second stage of the Integrated Plan for Urban Reconstruction and Development, nevertheless some of the proposed design amenities and buildings could be adapted to serve for such purposes. The proposed design buildings correspond to the results from the sociological study on the public expectations with respect to the New Town Center.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides good solutions to the specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 4 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №2:**

**Transport and communication solution and parking - 4 p.**

This design project provides a good transport and communication solution, the bypass road is intended to have restricted motor vehicle access and to be used mainly for pedestrian walks and bicycling. A pedestrian network will be developed in the area of coastal vegetation and a pedestrian promenade with viewpoint stops looking out the old town, the river and Sveta Gora Park. It is proposed the traffic in some of the streets to be rearranged as one-way. The street in the eastern part will be kept in accordance with the specification requirements. Provisions are made for 410 ground and 1600 underground parking places. The proposed project does not contain any solution for arranging the motor vehicle traffic from the town center towards the right bank of the river, the Chancellor's headquarters of Veliko Tarnovo University and Sveta Gora District.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides good solutions to the specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 4 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №3:**

**Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 1 p.**

This design project provides such a voluminous spatial and artistic solution that positions the most intensive construction of new buildings in the northwestern part of the terrain. To certain extent it is appropriate to position the construction of new buildings next to the existing buildings in urban environment and to position the less intensive constructions close to the natural sites – the river meanders and Tarnovo Heights. On the other hand, the constructions in the northwestern part is so intensive and dominating on the existing buildings along the left side of Hristo Botev Street that it would hinder the view and perception of their facades and hamper the traditional entry of visitors through the Arc of Generals. The size and spatial orientation of the buildings seem more suitable for the peripheral parts of the town and not so convenient for the New Town Center. The former flour mill Belyanka, the Arc of Generals and the fence are preserved but no solution is offered for their exposition.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №4:**

**Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 1 p.**

This design project offers minimum landscaping and cultivation of the terrain by identifying six types of green area – private courtyards, public gardens, the central park, the coastal vegetation area, lawned sport grounds and buffer strip. Some of the existing woods will be preserved and new ones will be planted in the courtyards, the park and public gardens.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №5:**

**Innovative public space solutions - 1 p.**

The conceptual design for urban development does not offer any original solutions for the public spaces. Instead, it offers the construction of a network of facilities that could accommodate the organization and conduction of events of different types and scale.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.



In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №6:**

**Solution sustainability - 1 p.**

This design project provides for solution sustainability only within the frame of the minimal requirements, that is, to preserve the functions of existing buildings, existing technical infrastructure and the coastal vegetation area.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**The conceptual design for urban development** scored the total of 12 points

---

**Rating criterion №7:**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 1 p.**

The appearance of the building reminds of the commercial centers that were typically built in the 80-ties of 20<sup>th</sup> century in every municipal center /the so called town or district department store/, which contrast to the specification requirements of the competition concerning the construction of a building with original and memorable modern look – to be the marker of the prospective New Town Center. The voluminous spatial solution offers the possibility to conduct different types of events, both in the exterior and in the interior part.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №8:**

**Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 1 p.**

The designed building is situated within the border lines set out in the specification. The building fits into the urban environment and does not obstruct the perception of surrounding buildings. It is not aggressively conflicting the surrounding construction.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №9:**

**Functional solution - 1 p.**

The functional layout of the building is comparatively clear, providing for short cuts for evacuation directly to the terrain. All the requirements for accessible environment have been complied with. The project offers different spaces in terms of scale and proportions for the organization and conduction of different events. The roof is not accessible.

Two underground parking lots are designed. There is also a ground parking lot for 28 motor vehicles. The building design has taken into consideration the terrain particularities and the approaches are designed in consideration of street gradients. The requirements for area distribution between the separate functional areas have been complied with.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №10:**

**Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 4 p.**

The Big hall has been designed in accordance with specification requirements. The solution provides for good acoustic properties and lighting capacities. The design project offers a solution to divide the Big Hall into 6 smaller rooms although the description of the technology of such transformation is missing, nevertheless the design includes a pneumatic system to change the floor inclination gradient.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides good solutions to the specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 4 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №11:**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 1 p.**

The design project provides the main foyer to be constructed as a separate unit providing the functional capacity to organize and conduct different types of events.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №12:**

**Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 1 p.**

The design project offers minimum landscaping of the terrain. It lacks mentioning of any energy-efficiency solutions or any ideas in this respect.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8470 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**The conceptual design of the building– Exposition Center – scored the total of 9 points.**

**Project № 8930 -22 PLACE – total score 24 points**

**Rating criterion №1:**

**Functional solution, zoning and stage construction - 1 p.**

The proposed zoning and stage by stage construction of the New Town Center is unclear and it cannot be judged whether or not the recommended function distribution structure has been complied with, instead the exact positioning of the buildings according to point 11 of the specification is proposed. It is proposed to zone the terrain on the basis of the functions of the buildings to be constructed in the terrain. The existing buildings in the area of the New Town Center have been taken into consideration. It is proposed to intensify the terrain with buildings, whose construction and functioning could ensure economic return on investments (preferably under point 7).

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8930 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №2:**

**Transport and communication solution and parking - 1 p.**

This design project offers an interesting transport and communication solution, including preservation of the street network structure according to the Detailed Site Development Plan in terms of direction while at certain points the streets pass underground whereas at others underground pedestrian passes are proposed. In general, the ground level is intended to give priority to pedestrian traffic. There is an original proposition to construct 1 km long running track. The design includes an underground parking. The street in the eastern part shall be preserved. The design does not include any solution for a street to take care of the transit motor vehicle traffic from the town center to the right bank of the river.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies only the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8930 is awarded 1 point under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №3:**

**Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 4 p.**

This design project offers a voluminous spatial and artistic solution for the terrain in consideration with the natural relief and the existing natural peculiarities of the terrain. It is proposed to make an

artificial lake in the northern part while taking advantage of the remnants from the former stadium there. The western part includes open spaces or spaces with low buildings to compensate for the existing buildings along the left side of Hristo Botev Street and the existing pedestrian approach on the side of the Arc of Generals. The construction along the central long axis is more intensive, the new buildings being of different heights and density, some of them having lawned roofs to prevent the creation of a visual obstacle from the New Town Center to the other urban structures and vice versa. The southern part includes a building-free corridor with abundant vegetation, which is meant to connect visually and environmentally Marno Pole Park, Yantra River and Sveta Gora Park. The network of pedestrian alleys is arranged in a vegetation area of irregular shape, which combined with the architecture in Deconstructivism style will create interesting perceptions and orientation for the visitors of public amenities.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides good solutions to the specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №8930 is awarded 4 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating Criterion № 4:**

**The Concept of landscaping and enrichment of the territory - 4 points.**

The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution landscaping and enrichment of the territory, with the maximum preservation of the vegetation available. It is planned to plant a new one in the new park areas. Water is an important element in the enrichment of the territory. Natural lightening, sunshine and aeration are provided. The new green spaces and water bodies take into account the results of the sociological survey and the recommendations made after a competition organized by the local architectural community.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 8930 received 4 points.

**Rating Criterion № 5:**

**Innovative project proposal solutions of public spaces - 4 pts.**

As interesting solutions can be described the usage of water in urban furnishings, to set up a 1 km of treadmill and picturesque pedestrian spaces.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 8930 received 4 points.

**Rating Criterion № 6:**

**The Sustainability of project proposal solutions - 1 point**

The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution for the sustainability of the project proposal solution only within the framework of the minimum - maintenance of the functioning buildings, the existing technical infrastructure and the coastal protection zone.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 8930 receives 1 point.

**Total city-planning concept receives 15 points.**

**Rating Criterion № 7:**

**Original vision and volumetary spatial solution of the building - 1 point.**

The vision of the building could hardly be perceived as a building-marker of the future The New City Center as well as a building of the future Exposition Center. Looking out of The New City Center, the building is fully dug out, as the access to it is only north / Alexander Stamboliyski street.

The bulky spatial solution envisaged as a project proposal solution the opportunity to hold different events both, as in the exterior and in the interior as well.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 8930 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion №8:**

##### **Situating and entering the building in the urban environment - 1 point.**

The project proposal is located in the restrictive lines set in the competition program. The building fits in the urban environment and does not interfere with the perception of the surrounding buildings, and does not conflict with the surrounding construction because it is embedded in the terrain.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 8930 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 9:**

##### **The Functional Solution - 1 point.**

The proposed functional scheme is simple. Short-range evacuation routes are provided on-site and the requirements for an accessible environment are met. The requirements for the distribution of the areas between the different functional areas have been complied with. The requirement for the built-up area and the unfolded built-up area of the building is complied with. The roof is fully usable. There is an underground parking level as well as an underground one for seven vehicles. The building is in line with the terrain's displacement, as well as the approaches to it with the street level. There is a lack of entrance up from the side of The New City Center.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 8930 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 10:**

##### **Originality of the project proposal solution for the transformation of the BIG HALL - 1 point.**

The Big Hall project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution is tailored to the competitive conditions, with the opportunity to look for better project proposal solutions for acoustics and lighting. The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution a solution to split a Big Hall into 6 smaller halls, but nothing less than a formal one, without the clarity and acknowledgement of the partitioning technology.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal No 8930 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 11:**

##### **MAIN FOYER - 1 point.**

The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution the Main Foyer as a separate volume, where there is a functional opportunity for conducting different events. It consists of two levels, firmly separated with additional functions but with insufficient area for the size of the hall.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal No 8930 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 12:**

##### **Environmental and energy efficient solutions - 4 points.**

The project proposal is envisaged to implement for execution rich landscaping in the property, including the roof that is accessible from the terrain and provides the opportunity for panoramic views and observations of the old city district. The building could be constructed with standard and generally available building technologies, which implies the use of standard construction-equipment and equipment, with the exception of the green roof, which will require the development of special details and the use of specialized materials for reliable heat, waterproofing insulation and a coverage. Apart from this, the materials included in the project proposal are natural and publicly accessible, so local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. Excavation works extend only to the limiting lines of construction, which means that they are able to preserve the existing trees to a large extent.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 8930 received 4 points.

#### **Total conception of building - Exposition Center receives 9 points.**

#### **Project proposal № 4370 - 21st PLACE - a total of 27 points**

##### **Rating Criterion №1:**

##### **Functional solution, zoning and stage implementing of the execution - 4 points.**

The project proposal proposes for implementing of the execution zoning the territory, dividing it into a "core" and "periphery". The vast majority of the buildings, whether in the core or at the end of The New City Center, have mixed functions. The project proposal complies with the recommended structure for the distribution of different functions. Basement or underground levels of most of the buildings are available for parking, and residential units are located on high floors. The project proposal does not propose the stage type for implementing of the execution of The New City Center. Saturation with objects is proposed, and the realization and functioning of which can provide economic return revenue. Proposals were made for the specific positioning of part of the objects of the second stage of the Integrated plan for urban regeneration and development, and for the other stages the newly proposed spaces and buildings could be adapted.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of assignment.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 4 points.

##### **Rating Criterion № 2:**

##### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 4 points.**

A good project solution is given to the project proposal, which preserves the street network as a direction, but on some of its streets the car traffic regime changes. The main car traffic approach is proposed at the roundabout up from Hristo Botev Street, where it is divided into two directions. The gauges of these two streets proposes two-sided construction of bicycle paths, which ones to reach the ring road, located in the eastern part of The New City Center. It is also intended for car and bicycle traffic as well. It is proposed to build a street for transit traffic and connect the central city area to the right bank of the Yantra river, the Sveta Gora Park, the Rectorate of University of Veliko Tarnovo and Sveta Gora residential area. Its route has been proposed to be at the terrain level, whereby physically the territory will be fragmented into two different parts and the various road users will be at risk. Pedestrians and cyclists are also proposed to travel there as well. The same street will be the carrier of a public transport line. In the west direction it is planned the construction of a pedestrian crossing over the traffic road. In the central longitudinal direction there will be mainly pedestrian

traffic, so two streets in the northern and southern parts of The New City Center is proposed the streets to be built as pedestrian streets with reinforced flooring for car traffic. 2290 parking spaces are provided, of which 580 are in a multi-storey public car park, 189 street parking spaces and 1521 underground parking spaces.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of assignment.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 4 points.

### **Rating Criterion № 3:**

#### **Volume spatial and artistic solution - 1 p.**

The project proposal provides a volume-spatial and artistic solution, which makes a smooth transition in the height of construction from the north and south direction to the core of the territory. The tallest buildings are located along the street, which will be the carer of transit traffic to central cross street direction. In the vicinity of the circular intersection with Hristo Botev Str. and near the above-ground pedestrian zone, it is proposed the construction of high-rise buildings to be executed for construction, which can serve as a marker indicating the location of The New City Center through a visual view from the neighboring urban territories. The rest of the building is low or medium-level. In the northwest part, it is proposed to create a square space, which is an appropriate project proposal solution in terms of the existing pedestrian approach to the New City Center territory. The extension of Hristo Botev Street is planned, with a green island between its traffic lanes as well, which one is creating a spatial buffer between the new envisaged in the project proposal to be executed and the already existing building along the street. However, the proposed multi-storey parking lot in the northwestern part of the territory has a large area and strongly contrasts the shapes and the articulation of the existing residential building on the left side of Hristo Botev Str. In the northeast part, where the exhibition center is to be built, the construction is lower, which is keeping the New City Center's visual link to the historic part of the city. The preservation of the Arc of the generals and some of the fence sections are suggested for implementation of the execution .

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 1 point.

### **Rating Criterion № 4:**

#### **The Concept of landscaping and enrichment of the territory - 4 points.**

The project proposal proposes for implementation of the execution minimal preservation of the available tree vegetation. Compensatory landscaping is suggested for implementation of the execution as part of the street and park zones. Generally, natural sunlight, lightening and airing are provided. From the circular intersection of Hristo Botev street there is a wide boulevard is proposed in the south-east direction and in the southern part of the territory there is no intense construction proposed, which provides the physical connection and the unimpeded invasion of fresh air from the Yantra River to the Marno Pole Park field and the modern administrative center of the city.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of assignment.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 4 points.

### **Rating Criterion № 5:**

#### **Innovative project proposal solutions of public spaces - 1 point**

The city-planning concept proposes the establishment of a sports and educational cluster in the neighbourhood, close to the former Belianka factory and on shared spaces in the southernmost part of

the territory of the The New City Center. They are not represented to be unique themselves, but they are new as a type of buildings for the city, and with their implementation of executing their building construction they can create conditions for conducting heterogeneous events.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 6:**

##### **The sustainability of project proposal solutions - 1 point**

The project proposal envisages for implementing of the execution the sustainability of the project proposal solution within the minimum set-up requirements according to the given assignment - maintenance of the functioning buildings, existing technical infrastructure and coastal landscaping.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 1 point.

**Total city-planning concept receives 15 points.**

#### **Rating Criterion №7:**

Original vision and volumentary spatial project proposal solution of the building - 1 point.

The building can hardly be seen as a visual marker and a starting point for the future development of The New City Center. The bulky spatial solution is trivial, although it offers opportunities for conducting different events, both in the exterior and in the interior as well.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 8:**

##### **Situating and entering the building in the urban environment - 1 point.**

The project proposal is envisaging for implementation a well-designed project proposal solution, situating the building on the limiting lines according to the competitive conditions. The volume project proposal solution of the building, as well as the shape and materials with which it is built, do not conflict with the surrounding building construction.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating Criterion № 9:**

##### **Functional solution - 4 pts.**

The proposed functional scheme is simple. Short-range evacuation routes are provided on-site and the requirements for an accessible environment are met. The requirements for the distribution of the areas between the different functional areas have been complied with. The requirement for built-up and unfolded built-up area of the building is complied with. The building is adapted to the terrain displacement, as well as the approaches to it with the street level. Underground parking is on two levels and provides 132 parking spaces, and overground parking provides 8 parking spaces. The roof is partially usable with access from the terrain.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of assignment. Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 4 points.

**Rating Criterion №10:**

**Originality of the project proposal solution for a transformation of the BIG HALL - 4 pts.**

The project proposal suggest for the BIG HALL complies with the competition conditions, including acoustics and lighting, and provides 1200 seats. The design project proposal solution allows the transformation of the BIG HALL into 6 smaller halls, with the corresponding variation - 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 ones.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition on this rating criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 4 points.

**Rating Criterion № 11:**

**Functional possibilities in the MAIN FOYER - 1 point.**

The project proposal envisages the Main Foier as a separate volume where there is a functional opportunity for conducting different events. There is no good functional organization of the foier.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 1 point.

**Rating Criterion № 12:**

**Green and energy-efficient project proposal solutions - 1 point**

The project proposal is envisagin for implemetation minimal landscaping in the property including high vegetation as well. The building could be implemented for eecution of the construction by using standard and generally available building technologies, which implies the usage of standard construction-equipment and equipment, with the exception of the partially usable roof, which will require the development of special details and the usage of specialized materials for reliable heat, waterproofing insolation and coating as well. Apart from this, the materials included in the project proposal execution of the construction are natural and publicly accessible, so local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. Excavation works extend only to the limiting lines of construction, which means that they are able to preserve the existing trees to a large extent.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal № 4370 receives 1 point.

**Total for the Concept of Building - Expo Center receives 12 points.**

**Project №. 1844 - 20th PLACE - total 27 points**

**Rating Criterion № 1:**

**Functional project proposal solution, zoning and staging - 1point.**

Functional zoning and gradual construction of the New City Center was proposed, but the implementation of the execution of the exhibition center is suggested to fail in the second phase together with the other zone in the southern part of the territory where is envisaged to implement the cistruction of public and cultural objects . At the last stage, it is envisaged for the implementation of the construction of a limited number of residential functions, situated in the southernmost part of the territory . It is proposed the implementation of execution the construction of sites, in the execution of the constructing and in the operation of which can be provided economic random return of the public funds. The construction of the sites envisaged for the implementation of the second stage of the Integrated plan for urban regeneration and development is suggested. The design project proposal



solution is in line with the recommended structure for the distribution of functions, stand in judgment from the areas of the functional areas and the specific location of some of the sites.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal № 1844 receives 1 point.

### **Rating Criterion № 2:**

#### **Transport and communication project proposal solution and parking - 7 pts**

The project proposal provides a solution for the construction of a street in a central transverse direction, which will carry a transit car traffic from the central city part to the right bank of the river Yantra, Sveta Gora park, the Rectorate of University of Veliko Tarnovo and Sveta Gora residential area. At the heart of The New City Center this street is designed to be build underground. Similarly, the street traffic will start on the street, starting from the roundabout intersection crossroad of Hristo Botev Street, with the direction "northwest - southeast" and connecting to the ring road. In the central longitudinal direction is also envisaged the construction of an underground street, which start is in the north direction is going to be put into practice from the territory between the Corps 5 of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the future exposition center. It is envisaged in the project proposal to preserve the street from the east in accordance with the requirements of the assignment. On the above-ground level, a dense pedestrian network is developed, to which there are interconnected inner spaces. In the area of the roundabout crossroad it is envisaged in the project proposal to change the route of mass public transport by establishing a new bus stop. It is unclear whether enough space can be provided to solve the problem of parking and garage parking in the central city area and to provide the proper functioning of The New City Center. The project proposal is rational and economically viable in terms of the vertical planning that is available after the implementation of the Water Supply Seweridge, vertikal planning.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal № 1844 receives 7 points.

### **Rating Criterion №3:**

#### **Volume spatial and artistic solution - 1 point.**

The project proposal envisages for the implementation for the construction a volume-spatial and artistic project proposal solution, consistent with the relief of the territory. The Northwest part of it is ingenuously preserved as an open and unspoiled spacious space, free of construction, that will be richly planted and can accommodate a large number of people entering the traditional entrance to the Arc of the Generals. The exhibition center itself is proposed to be a low-rise building that will keep the visual link from The New City Center to the picturesque historic part over the river. From the circular junction of Hristo Botev street In a southeastern direction there is a street envisaged to be implemented for construction, whose building construction is withdrawn as a front, which preserves the vista corridor to Sveta Gora park and Turnovo heights. In the eastern part, it is envisaged for construction to build the tallest building, which will be located in sanitary distances from the existing building and the project proposal building, but visually will contrast with the construction in the historical part of the city. On the other hand, it can serve as a marker indicating the location of The New City Center in the urban structure. The construction in the northwest part is a middle-floor, with broken shapes and a distance away from the existing one on the left side of Hristo Botev Street, which will ensure the conflict-free entry of The New City Center into the existing urban environment. On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal №1844 receives 1 point.

**Rating Criterion № 4:****The Concept of landscaping and enrichment of the territory - 4 points.**

The project proposal suggests a well-developed pedestrian network among the rich greenery of the above-ground level. The existing vegetation is largely tailored and proposed for preservation. Compensatory landscaping is also envisaged as a part of the street landscaping and in the separate park zones as well. It is proposed to create the richly landscaped inner-quarter spaces and various types of squares - a commercial square, a cultural square and a sports square. The proposal is in line with the results of the sociological survey and the recommendations made after a competition organized by the local architectural community as it is envisaged for the implementation sports facilities, green areas and square spaces.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal №1844 received 4 points.

**Evaluation criterion No. 5 :****Innovative solutions of public spaces - 4 p.**

The urban development concept proposes interesting solutions for the design of public spaces, ensuring unimpeded pedestrian movement and utilization of the area formed subsequent to realization of the water cycle.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds, the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal provides a good design solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. 1844 has been awarded 4 points.

**Evaluation criterion No. 6 :****Sustainability of the solutions - 1p.**

The project proposal ensures sustainability of the solution by preserving functioning buildings, the existing technical infrastructure and the green area providing coastal protection.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds, the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal satisfies only the minimum requirements of the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. 1844 has been awarded 1 points.

**Overall score for urban development concept – 18 p.****Evaluation criterion No. 7 :****Original approach and building spatial design - 1 p.**

The project proposal offers minimalist design of the Exhibition Centre building. The materials selected are similar in appearance and colour to those of the surrounding public buildings. The east side is made up of several dynamically located structures, in contrast to the north side which has a solid minimalist façade. The spatial design provides an opportunity for staging various events both inside and in the exterior area.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds, the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal satisfies only the minimum requirements of the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. 1844 has been awarded 1 points.

**Evaluation criterion No. 8 :****Positioning of the construction and fitting into the urban landscape - 1 p.**

The designed building is located within the outlines specified in the competition program. In the east part, a smooth transition is made to the main premises of the building via the exterior design, without conflict with the surrounding built-up area.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds, the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal satisfies only the minimum requirements of the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. **1844** has been awarded 1 points.

**Evaluation criterion No. 9 :**

**Functional solution - 1 p.**

The functional design of the building is classic and basic, fulfilling requirements for accessible space. The exit from a large hall leads directly to the area surrounding the building. There are 2 underground parking levels and no above-ground parking. The terrain specifics and approaches to the building match the street level. The roof space is intended for use with pedestrian access directly from the site and offers panoramic view of the old city area. The requirements for spatial positioning of the separate functional areas and the requirement for built-up area and total floor area of the building have been complied with.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds, the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal satisfies only the minimum requirements of the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. **1844** has been awarded 1 points

**Evaluation criterion No. 10 :**

**Original approach for transformation of LARGE HALL – 1 p.**

The large hall has a capacity of 1200 seats and satisfies the minimum requirements set out in the competition program. The project proposal does not provide an adequate solution for acoustics and illumination and provides an inefficient solution, given the climate specifics, for opening up to the exterior. The transformation of the large hall is poorly rendered in terms of technical solution and functional capacity of the resulting interior spaces.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds, the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal satisfies only the minimum requirements of the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. **1844** has been awarded 1 points

**Evaluation criterion No. 11 :**

**Functionality of the MAIN LOBBY - 1 p.**

Under the project proposal the main lobby is conceived as a separate space with functional possibility for staging of various events. No sun protection is envisaged from the east side. It is difficult to partition the space into separate areas, which limits its functionality and use.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds, the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal satisfies only the minimum requirements of the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. **1844** has been awarded 1 points

**Evaluation criterion No. 12 :**

**Ecological and energy efficient solutions - 4 p.**

The project proposal for a building to house the Exhibition Centre offers a good solution in terms of energy efficiency, providing an opportunity for passive protection against temperature changes in some of the spaces /inside the solid parts/ and no sun protection has been provided for the glass surfaces of the façades, but the problem can be overcome in view of their position and the relatively small glass surface area. The building can be developed using standard and publicly available building technologies, which implies use of standard construction equipment, except for the fully usable roof area, where the development of special components and use of specialized materials is

required to provide reliable heat insulation, waterproofing and coating. Apart from this, the materials envisaged in the project proposal are natural and commonly available, so local suppliers and manufacturers can be relied on to supply them. Excavation works are concentrated within the construction outlines, which means that, to a large extent, existing trees can be preserved. A shortcoming is that the project offers minimalist landscaping of the property, as well as the location of high vegetation mainly in the northern portion of the property.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds, the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal provides a good design solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. 1844 has been awarded 4 points.

### **Overall score for building concept of the Exhibition Centre – 9 p**

**Projects No. 4370 and 1844 have been awarded an equal number of points, and in view of the conditions of the terms of reference, in the event of an equal score, priority is given to the project whose urban development concept has received a higher score, which means that project No. 4370 is ranked in place 21 and project No. 1844 – in place 20.**

### **Project No. 3864 – Ranked in place 19 – Total score of 30 points**

#### **Evaluation criterion No. 1 :**

##### **Functional solution, zoning and phased construction - 4p.**

The project envisages the development of the new town centre to be implemented in six stages, the first of which involves the construction of the Exhibition Centre. The recommended structure of allocation of functions has been complied with, the proposed zoning is linked to the phased construction of the sites in the allocated territory. The project proposal envisages building up of a sufficient number of sites that guarantee return on investment. Part of the sites envisaged for realization in the second stage of implementation of the Plan for Urban Reconstruction and Development are to be constructed and the rest can be adapted from some of the proposed buildings and open spaces.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal provides a good design solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. 3864 has been awarded 4 points.

#### **Evaluation criterion No. 2 :**

##### **Transport and communication solution and parking -4 p.**

The project offers a solution that to a certain extent will preserve the structure of the street network, in terms of direction of traffic. The street approaching from the east will also be preserved. Traffic will remain at ground level, pedestrian traffic will be organized at above-ground level in some places. Construction of a new pedestrian crossing over the river has been proposed as a continuation of the pedestrian flow from Marno Pole Park entering the circular intersection of Hristo Botev Str. The main pedestrian flow will be in the northern premises of the area, where construction of a square (thoroughfare) is envisaged. Its natural extension will be a pedestrian network within the coastal protection area, with panoramic playgrounds and a platform above the river. Another prominent pedestrian destination is positioned in the northern part of the territory and centrally in longitudinal direction, which, although combined with automobile traffic, is organized alongside lush street landscaping. The project includes no proposal for organizing transit motor traffic from the central city area to the right bank of the river, “Sveta Gora” Park, the central building of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and residential area “Sveta Gora”. It cannot be determined whether the proposed parking areas will be sufficient for the proper functioning of the new town centre and whether they will help solve the serious problem of parking and storage siding in the central city area.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal provides a good design solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. **3864** has been awarded 4 points.

### **Evaluation criterion No. 3 :**

#### **Spatial planning and artistic solution - 4 p.**

The project proposal provides a solution which is consistent with the area terrain. In the north area construction of a square (thoroughfare) has been planned, that can accommodate gatherings of people attending events at the future Exhibition Centre and from the direction of the new town centre as a whole, using the existing entrance from the Generals' Arc and taking into account the location of new town centre in relation to the existing modern administrative centre and historic district, the Yantra river and the south transport node. The thoroughfare ends in a terraced approach to the river, providing a visual link of the new town centre and the picturesque historic quarters above the river. This reflects public attitudes with respect to the future use of the new town centre. The spaces and segmentation of the new construction take into account existing buildings, providing a smooth transition with a plunging skyline and an area in the south direction. On the other hand, the planned construction in the north-western part of the territory is more intense and could create visual conflict with existing buildings on the left-hand side of Hristo Botev street. As a visual marker may be used the buildings along the central cross-axis, ending in high-rise built-up areas, right up to the new pedestrian crossing over Yantra river. To the south, the built-up areas are low rise and organized in such a way that open-plan areas are formed within the residential areas, richly landscaped, to ensure inflow of fresh air to the downtown area from the riverbed.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds the board has decided that under this evaluation criterion the project proposal provides a good design solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

In accordance with the rules of the competition, for this evaluation criterion project proposal No. **3864** has been awarded 4 points.

### **Evaluation criterion №4:**

#### **Concept of landscaping and enrichment of the territory - 4 points.**

The project offers maximum conservation of the available tree vegetation. New landscaping is also planned in the separate park zones. A partially engraved coastal protection zone is preserved. The planned new building is located at a distance from the existing buildings, which ensures the natural sunlight, illumination and aeration of the territory. With the planned construction in the southern part of the territory, a smooth invasion of fresh air masses is ensured in the central part of the city and a favourable ecological environment is created.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №**3864** receives 4 points.

### **Evaluation criterion №5:**

#### **Innovative solutions to public spaces - 1 point**

The town-planning concept does not offer non-standard solutions for organizing public spaces, but the project can provide conditions for various events, mainly around the Exhibition Center.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №**3864** receives 1 point.

### **Evaluation criterion №6:**

**Resilience of decisions - 1 point**

The proposal provides for the sustainability of the solution only within the framework of the minimum - maintenance of the functioning buildings, the existing technical infrastructure and the coastal protection zone.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3864 receives 1 point.

**Total city planning concept receives 18 points.**

**Evaluation criterion №7:****Original vision and spatial solution of the building - 1 point**

The project offers a combined solution consisting of a semi-ducted volume of the building on the one hand and a high plate-shaped body commensurate with the volumes of surrounding public buildings. The design solution offers different spaces, such as scale and proportions, to provide different types of events both in the interior and the exterior of the building.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3864 receives 1 point.

**Evaluation criterion №8:****Positioning and entering the building in the urban environment - 1 point**

The envisaged building is located in the restrictive lines given by the competition program. The building fits in the urban environment, offering a peaceful and interesting intersection of the facades. The planned building is not in an aggressive conflict with the surrounding building. The materials are similar to those of existing public buildings, which fits into the urban ambience.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3864 receives 1 point.

**Evaluation criterion №9:****Functional solution - 4 points**

The functional scheme of the building is clear and simple. Short escape routes are provided, and the requirements for accessible environments are fully met. Underground parking spaces are provided. There is also an overground parking lot. The area distribution requirements between the different functional areas are respected. The requirement for the built-up area of the building, respectively the total built-up area is met. The peculiarities of the terrain have been taken into account. Approaches to the building are tailored to the street level. The roof is usable with pedestrian access directly from the terrain and provides panoramic views of the old city area. The functional solutions envisaged in the project meet the minimum requirements and upgrade them by offering a good functional layout of the spaces, in which the issues and needs of the building and its visitors are solved.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3864 receives 4 points.

**Evaluation criterion №10:****Originality of the decision to transform the GREAT HALL - 4 points**

The Great hall complies with the conditions set in the competition program. The proposed acoustics and illumination are good and functional. The design solution offers the possibility of dividing a Great Hall into 6 small halls, giving options -2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, which builds on the minimum requirement on the assignment.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3864 receives 4 points.

#### **Evaluation criterion №11:**

##### **Functionalities of the MAIN LOBBY - 1 point**

The project envisages the main lobby as a separate volume and in a way that implies a functional opportunity for holding events without giving original ideas and functional possibilities above the minimum in the competition program.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3864 receives 1 point.

#### **Evaluation criterion №12:**

##### **Environmentally friendly and energy-efficient solutions - 1 point**

The project proposal for an Exhibition Center building offers an energy efficient solution providing the possibility of passive protection against temperature changes only in some of its volumes (in its dense parts, with the other glass facades being provided with sun protection). The building could be realized with standard and publicly available building technologies, which implies the use of standard construction equipment and machinery, except for the fully usable roof, which will require the development of special details and the use of specialized materials for reliable heat, waterproofing and coating. Apart from this, the materials included in the project proposal are natural and generally available, so local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. Excavation works extend only to the limiting lines of construction, which means that there is an opportunity to preserve the existing trees to a large extent, unfortunately, the project offers minimal landscaping in the property and also high vegetation predominantly in the northern part of the property.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3864 receives 1 point.

**Total for the building concept – the Exposition Center receives 12 points.**

#### **Design No. 3079 - 18 PLACE – total 30 points**

##### **Rating criterion No.1 :**

##### **Functional solution, zoning and stage construction – 4 pts.**

The design provides solutions for functional zoning in conformity with the recommended structure for distribution of the functions as per the assignment. There is a proposal for stage-by-stage implementation of the urban planning concept, and during the first stage the construction of the exhibition centre is envisaged, for which there is financing allocated. At the second stage the implementation of the main city square is envisaged under which a large sports centre is situated along with buildings of all functional types except the educational infrastructure situated in the north-western part of the territory. Thus, the territory is full of sites for the implementation and during the functioning of which the public-private-partnership form can be applied. The third stage of implementation encompassed the territory situated in the northern central part where again the

construction of sites of various functions is proposed, including an educational site and a park. The last but one stage envisaged is the construction of buildings and public areas in the triangle formed by the surrounding street and the streets starting from the roundabout on Hristo Botev Str. Its implementation again envisages the construction of buildings of various functional types by means of which the economic return of investments can be provided. The fifth stage envisages the construction of the southern-most part of the territory where the residential, hotel and commercial sites are concentrated. No proposal has been made as to the specific positioning of the sites under item 11 of the assignment /Museum of photography and so on/ but part of the design spaces and sites can be adjusted for the purposes of the second stage of the Integrated Plan for Sustainable Urban Recovery and Development /IPSURD/. The design solution is in conformity with the urban planning parameters as per requirement under item 10 in the assignment.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 4 points under this criterion.

### **Rating criterion No.2 :**

#### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 4 pts.**

The design provides solutions for improvement of accessibility, the traffic organization, safeguarding of the various participants in the traffic, optimization of public transport and a solution to the problem of parking and stationing in the central urban part. The construction of a street is envisaged along which transit automobile traffic will take place from the city centre to the right bank of the river where a new roundabout is organized without sufficient data of the terrain's capacities. The street will be a ground one but in the section where it crosses the street with longitudinal central axis the construction of a square area is envisaged on the upper level thus enabling obstacle-free pedestrian and bicycle link between the northern and the southern part of the territory of the New City Centre. Parallel to the automobile bridge above the river, the construction of a funicular is envisaged which will be leading the visitors of the centre to the Sveta Gora Park. A similar facility is envisaged for construction in the south-western part as well, starting from the existing bus station next to the Southern Road Junction, through the territory of the New City Centre and reaching the railway station. In the region of the bust station the construction of a pedestrian bridge is also envisaged, with an elevator, which will facilitate the access of pedestrians coming from Drujba Park and from the bus station. A new pedestrian bridge is also envisaged above the roundabout on Hristo Botev Street by the construction of which the access of both pedestrians and cyclists from Marno Pole Park will be facilitated and the organization of the traffic will be improved. The natural terrain and the existing terrain inherent features are used in such a manner as to organize underground parking under the new construction the access to the places of which being from the sections of the street network sinking under the ground. The street network is preserved in terms of directions in compliance with the plans in the active Detailed Development Plan /DDP/. The street from the east is also preserved in compliance with the requirements of the assignment. A proposal is made for a new bus-line with a stop, as well as for a new tourist bus-station in the region of the roundabout on Hristo Botev Street. The area with bank protection plants is elaborated with an alley network.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 4 points under this criterion.

### **Rating criterion No.3 :**

#### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 4 pts.**

The design envisages voluminous spatial and artistic solution taking into consideration the natural relief, the existing terrain inherent features as a result of the implementation of the water cycle, the surrounding urban environment and the historical use of the territory of the New City Centre. The design construction follows with its front the relief's horizontal lines and where there were barracks



and a stadium before, now the establishment of the buildings and the intervals of construction it is possible to say that it is integrated in the urban structure despite its intensity. No construction is envisaged in the remotest north-western part where the Generals' Arc is preserved and from where, traditionally, the pedestrian access to the territory core takes place. The established open spaces can take up larger people groups, which is a feasible solution in view of the position of the New City Centre as to the historical and contemporary administrative centre, the river and the Southern Road Junction. New square spaces are also proposed in the south-western and south-eastern parts offering a view to the Tarnovo hills, the meanders of the Yantra river, Southern Road Junction and Sveta Gora Park. The volumes and forms of construction are organized in four circles and semi-circles in whose centre the establishment of public areas is proposed. The exhibition centre with its soft shapes, the hotel in the south-western part and the commercial centre at the entrance from the roundabout on Hristo Botev Street can be regarded as the markers indicating the New City Centre location. The Generals' Arc and the former flour production factory, Belyanka, is planned to be preserved.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 4 points under this criterion.

#### **Rating criterion No.4 :**

##### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 4 pts.**

The design offers maximum preservation of the available tree plants. The zone with bank protection vegetation is cultivated by means of new alley network. Good communication links are provided with other city parks by means of which the New City Centre is integrated in the city's green system. The new construction envisaged is distanced from the existing buildings thus ensuring the natural sunshine, lighting and ventilation of the territory. The proposal is in conformity with the results from the sociological research and the recommendations drawn up after a contest organized by the local architects' community, and a multitude of square areas, sports sites and green areas are envisaged within the range of the New City Centre.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 4 points under this criterion.

#### **Rating criterion No.5 :**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions - 4 pts.**

The urban planning concept offers interesting solutions for the public spaces organized according to the relief and historical development of the territory and located in the heart of four groups of concentric construction. With their positioning, they will be remembered and recognizable by the visitors of the New City Centre, at the same time providing conditions for organizing events of various scale and nature.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 4 points under this criterion.

#### **Rating criterion No.6 :**

##### **Solution sustainability – 1pts.**

The proposal envisaged sustainability of the solution within the minimum – preservation of the functional buildings, the existing technical infrastructure and the bank protection area.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Total for the urban planning concept the design gets 21 points**

**Rating criterion No.7 :**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 4 pts.**

The building has an original concept and vision, which distinguish it from the surrounding buildings and it could be interpreted as a marker-building of the future New City Centre . The building offers a different vision depending on the perspective; it is especially interesting from the old town part from where it can be perceived as a rose flower. Unfortunately, the technologies of implementation of such a building are extremely expensive, along with the maintenance during operation, especially of the roof covering, which is unusable and difficult to access. The voluminous spatial solution offers the opportunity to conduct various events both in the exterior and in the interior.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 4 points under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.8 :**

**Situating and fitting of the building in the urban environment - 1 pts.**

The building envisaged is situated within the border lines provided in the contest programme. In terms of volume the building fits into the urban environment and the surrounding construction but due to its extremely eccentric vision and specific shapes it conflicts with the existing construction.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.9 :**

**Functional solution - 1 pts.**

The proposed functional layout envisages short evacuation paths. The requirements for accessible environment are not observed to an adequate level, which is a source of problems related with the public function of the building. One hundred and twenty parking places are provided in an underground level. There is no ground parking lot. The terrain specifics have been taken into account and the approaches to the building are in conformity with the street leveling but are not sufficiently well designated in the building exterior.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.10 :**

**Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 1 pts.**

The proposal for the big hall is in conformity with the set conditions, as it is envisaged for 2000 people. The solution is good in terms of acoustics and lighting. The design solution offers an option to establish six separate halls, and a transforming system is envisaged for the hall.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.11 :**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 1 pts.**

The design envisaged a main foyer in a multi-floor structure, as part of the spaces have couloirs' characteristics. The functional capabilities to conduct various events are quite limited in view of its total area and positioning.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.12 :**

**Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 1 pts.**

The design proposal for a building of the Exhibition Centre does not offer a very good energy-efficient solution, ensuring an opportunity for passive protection from temperature changes for only part of its volumes – the thick and complex in shape and structure covering of part of the roof and part of the facades, and the remaining part is deprived of sun protection. The building could hardly be built with standard and generally accessible construction technologies, which presupposes the use of unconventional construction equipment and machines, including the geometrically complex cover of the building, in relation to which the development of special parts will be necessary along with the use of specialized materials for reliable thermal insulation, hydro-insulation and unknown at this stage material of the coating. The excavation works will encompass the entire property and not only within the limiting lines of construction, meaning that the design does not preserve the existing trees.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **3079** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Design No. 6727 -17 PLACE – total 30 points**

**Rating criterion No.1 :**

**Functional solution, zoning and stage construction - 7 pts.**

The territory concept proposes that the implementation of the New City Centre should take place in four stages, the first of which envisages the construction of the exhibition centre for which financing is provided. The solution is unconventional in its second stage when the construction and cultivation of the remotest south-western part of the territory is envisaged, which consists of a 5-floor buffer parking lot, above-ground parking lot, 15-floor office and administrative building upon the implementation and functioning of which in combination the application of a public-private partnership will be possible. On the third floor the construction of the northern central zone is envisaged in which commercial sites are offered; under the remotest eastern one again a parking lot is organized on two underground floors, residential sites and an educational site. During the last stage the utilization of the southern central zone is proposed in which the prevailing part of construction in the New City Centre is concentrated. The sites in its composition are of all types of functions because of which partnership with private persons will be possible along with accomplishing economic return on investment. The recommended structure of distribution of the functions is complied with although no proposals were made as to specific positioning of part of the sites under item 11 of the assignment. Nevertheless, within the scope of the design buildings and public spaces it would be possible to ensure area for the purposes of the second stage of the Integrated Plan for Sustainable Urban Recovery and Development /IPSUPD/.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents efficient solutions, better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 7 points under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.2 :**

**Transport and communication solution and parking - 1 pts.**

The concept related to the territory provides an unconventional proposal to free the northern part of the New City Centre from automobile traffic. The surrounding street is preserved; by means of that street, as well as from Hristo Botev Street, the access to the newly envisaged construction will take place. This proposal is not sufficiently well-thought in terms of fire safety and power supply of the sites in the inside of the territory, which are specified as commercial sites. No street is envisaged along which the automobile traffic could take place as fast as possible from the city centre in the direction of Sveta Gora Park. In the southern part, the envisaged in the active DDP street network is

preserved, with a slight exception in the remotest south-western part of the territory. The proposal for constructing several above-ground and underground parking lots along the territory periphery and limiting the automobile traffic in the interior of the New City Centre is valuable as the priority is entirely granted to pedestrians' and cyclists' traffic.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 1 point under this criterion.

### **Rating criterion No.3 :**

#### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 4 pts.**

The design envisages that the northern part of the New City Centre should be with more open public area at the account of the southern one, which is a feasible solution in view of the traditional entry towards the territory from the Generals' Arc and the positioning of the New City Centre as to the historical and contemporary administrative centres, as well as to the Southern Road Junction and the river. In the western part square area is organized, which smoothly transforms into a park eastwards and it can take up larger groups of people and it corresponds to the public moods in relation to the vision of the New City Centre . The building of the exhibition centre is with volume corresponding to the existing ones in the contact territory – the District Government and Corpse 5 of the Veliko Tarnovo University. In the north-western part building is medium-rise, distanced from Hristo Botev Str. and partite, thus not establishing visual conflict with the existing on the left side of the street. In the central crosswise axis, an entirely pedestrian area is envisaged and its continuation in the direction of Marno Pole Park the planting of additional vegetation is proposed thus establishing the New City Centre as a centre of a system of city parks – Marno Pole Park, the meanders of the Yantra river, Boruna Park and Sveta Gora Park. The high-rise building envisaged in the south-western art of the New City Centre may serve as a marker, which should be sufficiently distanced from the built-up contact territory and will be visible from the Southern Road Junction and from other urban structures. Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 4 points under this criterion.

### **Rating criterion No.4 :**

#### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 4 pts.**

By means of implementation of the urban planning concept the existing tree vegetation will be maximally preserved. Through the implementation of the square and park space on the northern part of the territory the green system in the central urban part will be developed. Preserving the central crosswise axis of pedestrian traffic, direct physical connection of the city with the river will be provided, enabling the infiltration of fresh air and accomplishing quality parameters of the environment. The envisaged new construction is at a distance from the existing buildings, its positioning ensures good natural sunshine, lighting and ventilation of the territory.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **5190** gets 4 points under this criterion.

### **Rating criterion No.5 :**

#### **Innovative public-space solutions - 4 pts.**

The urban planning concept does not offer original solutions for the public spaces but provides sufficient in are ad number zones in which the conducting of events of various nature is possible. The square envisaged in the northern part interestingly combines its functions of a park and urban forum.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 4 points under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.6 :****Solution sustainability - 4 pts.**

The proposal envisages the general preservation of the functioning buildings, the existing technical infrastructure and bank protection green area, although it strongly transforms into a street networks in the northern part of the territory and that new construction is envisaged close to the former Belyanka Factory. It is proposed that the building of Belyanka itself be used as a site of the educational infrastructure. The Generals' Arc is graphically preserved but there is no proposal for its exposure along with the fencing panels along Hristo Botev Street.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents good solutions of the requirement set forth in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 4 points under this criterion.

**Total for urban planning concept the design gets 24 points**

---

**Rating criterion No.7 :****Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 1 pts.**

The vision of the building cannot be perceived as a marker-building of the future New City Centre, due to the specific shape of the basic volume making associations not typical for the culture and customs of the region of Veliko Tarnovo. The voluminous spatial solution is good and an opportunity is provided to conduct various events both in the exterior and in the interior.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.8 :****Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 1 pts.**

The building envisaged is situated within the limiting lines provided in the assignment. Due to its large and unallocated volume, which is irregular in shape and with sloping façade panels, the building does not correspond either with the neighbouring buildings or with the atmosphere and personality of the city. The building is easier to perceive from the south – New City Centre but that is not true of the other facades, especially from the north where the scales are gigantic and does not in any manner correspond to the buildings along Alexander Stamboliyski Street and Corpse 5 of Veliko Tarnovo University.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.9 :****Functional solution - 1 pts.**

The functional layout of the building is not sufficiently thought-of and establishes several conflicts in some of the levels. The evacuation paths envisaged are too long, also they pass through staircases, which is discrimination to people with disabilities. Parking places are provided in an underground level but no above-ground parking is envisaged.

The design proposal has taken into account the specifics of the terrain. The approaches to the building are coordinated with the street levelling. The requirements for area distribution between the separate functional areas are preserved. The requirement for built-up and spread-out built-up area of the building has been complied with. The roof is not usable.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.10 :**

**originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 1 pts.**

The proposal for the big hall is according to some of the conditions set forth. The solution does not offer good acoustic and it is necessary to think of acoustic panels on the ceiling. The design solution offers an option for transformation of six smaller halls but is absolutely formal, in view of the seats envisaged.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.11 :**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 1 pts.**

The design envisages a main foyer with a two-floor structure. The functional capabilities for simultaneous conducting of various events are limited.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 1 point under this criterion.

**Rating criterion No.12 :**

**Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 1 pts.**

The design proposal for the Exhibition Centre building offers an energy-efficient solution providing an opportunity for passive protection from temperature changes, as well as sun protection – double façade. The building could be made with standard and generally accessible construction technologies, which presupposes the use of standard construction equipment and machines, excluding the implementation of the sloping facades as for their construction the development of special parts will be necessary along with the use of specialized materials and systems. Except that, the materials envisaged by the design solution are natural and generally accessible, so that local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. The excavation works are spread within the limiting lines of construction, meaning that the design has a great chance to preserve a large percentage of the existing trees. The design ensures landscaping in the property, including high vegetation.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **6727** gets 1 point under this criterion.

---

**Total for the building concept – Exhibition Center the design gets 6 points.**

---

---

**The designs with numbers 3864, 3079 and 6727 have an equal number of points in view of the assignment provisions, in such cases priority is granted to the design whose urban planning concept is higher-ranking, therefore design No. 3864 ranks 19-th; design No. 3079 ranked 18 and design No. 6727 ranked 17.**

---

**Design No. 5190 - 16 PLACE – total 33 points**

**Rating criterion No.1 :**

**Functional solution, zoning and stage construction - 7 p.**

The urban planning concept offers the implementation of the New City Centre to take place in 6 stages, which are closely related to the functional designation of the spaces and sites envisaged for construction. During the first stage the construction of the Exhibition Centre is proposed, for which financing has been provided. During the second stage the construction of the western and south-eastern part of the territory is proposed where function related to recreation and trade will take place.

Within the scope of the park area the construction of low-rise sports buildings is proposed. The aim is that the revenues from implementation of a given stage should guarantee the implementation of the next one. At stage three the construction of a centre for ecology and green energy, educational centre, sports centre and library is envisaged and on their ground floors commercial sites are located turning with their front to the main street in the central longitudinal direction. At the fourth stage the development of the remotest southern part of the New City Centre is proposed where residential buildings are envisaged for construction, along with a military museum and a youth art-centre. For the fifth stage the implementation of a school of photography and media centre is envisaged; on their ground floors again commercial sites are positioned with entrances from the main street. During the last stage of the implementation of the vision for a New City Centre the construction of residential buildings is proposed with commercial sites on the ground floors, as well as of a centre for research and protection of the river. The recommended structure for the functions' distribution by assignment has been complied with, as well as the construction parameters. Proposals are provided for specific location of the sites envisaged for implementation during the second stage of IPSURD and they are described in item 11 of the assignment.

Based on the above-described grounds under this rating criterion the jury decided that this design solution presents efficient solutions, better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Pursuant to the contest terms and conditions, design proposal No. **5190** gets 7 points under this criterion.

#### **Rating criterion #2:**

##### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 4 p.**

A suggestion is made with a concept for the territory to drastically modify the street network, provided under the current Detailed Site Development Plan. It is planned that the back street will be transformed into pedestrian and cycle lanes. Bicycle traffic is done at the periphery of the entire center, as well as in the internal ring of the longitudinal direction. It is proposed that enrichment of the zone should be made with bank-protection vegetation, and an alley network with panoramic platforms is differentiated within its scope and a platform towards the river which could be reached with an elevator. The main automobile and pedestrian traffic will be made in the central longitudinal axis, where the access to the underground parking areas under the newly proposed buildings shall be made as they are planned according to the conception. It will be possible to provide over 2000 parking places, in accordance with the design solution, which will make the situation with parking much easier and guaranteed in the central city area. The transport and communication network has not been very well founded, because with the realization of such a solution, a lot of conflicting points will be created between the pedestrian and the car traffic. Cross alleys are offered through the park and through Hristo Botev Street, which will connect the New City Center with the Marino Pole park. This solution has also not been well-founded due to the serious car traffic on Hristo Botev street. There is a proposal for a lift, starting from a playground at the south-east area of the territory, which will be in help for reaching Sveta Gora park and to the village of Arbanasi. The proposals include introducing of new bus lines that will circulate at short distances, and their starting points will be located on the territory of the New City Center. Although they are a suitable proposal for the city, their routes should be studied. There isn't a proposal for a street, on which the transit car traffic should be made from the center of the city in the direction of Sveta Gora park, the rector's office of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the district of Seta Gora. It is proposed to build stations for charging electrical cars.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this criterion for rating, the jury has decided, that this project proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this criterion for rating, project proposal **#5190** receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion #3:**

##### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 1 p.**

The project suggests town-development and building, developed in 4 longitudinal directions. In the farthest western area of the territory, building of a parking zone is planned, full of small-areal and low-rise sports and leisure facilities, and with this solution the New City Center shall fit without any

conflict next to the existing modern and administrative center and shall not create any inconveniences for the people living in the buildings on the left side of Hristo Botev street. The solution with an open public space in the western area is felicitous and in terms of the location of the territory compared to the existing central areas, the river and the South Road Junction, is respectively suitable for events, offering crowding of bigger masses of people. The concept suggests increasing the intensity of building in eastern direction, which is felicitous from the point of view of the territory borders with a river and that it is not necessary any elongations from the existing building to be observed, but from the other side, this part of the New City Center is visible from the historical area and will strongly contrast it. It is proposed to keep the chimneys of the former steam power plant, and the panels from the fence of the former military school are planned to be exhibited in military museum which is newly proposed to be built in the sough area of the territory. The Arch of Generals will be kept as being the main entrance towards the New City Center. The differentiation of several playgrounds, from where perceiving of the different areas of the city and its district will be possible. If intensive building in the eastern part of the territory is not admitted, it can not be said that there is any distinctive marker, indicating the location of the New City Center.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion, the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion, project proposal #5190 receives 1 point.

#### **Rating criterion #4 :**

##### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 4 p.**

With the project solution, the predominant part of the existing tree vegetation is kept, as the green system of the city is planned to be enriched with the realization of the park territory in the western area of the New City Center. In this sector it is even suggested a space where the trees, subject of removal at realization of part of the building, could be moved. The pedestrian network is developed, consisting of alleys, leading the visitors to the area with bank-protection vegetation over the river meanders. Entering of fresh air within the interior of the city will be allowed with these physical corridors. The New City Center appears to be the core of the existing urban and suburban parks. New building is planned to be at elongation from the existing buildings. Its location provides good natural sunlight, exposition and airing of the territory. The building of several new objects is suggested that accentuates over environmental and water protection, as well as the use of ecological transport.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents good solutions, of the requirements set in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project, proposal #5190 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion #5 :**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions - 4 p.**

Innovative solutions for the public spaces, organized in a park territory, allowing conducting events various in their nature, are provided with this city-planning concept. Environmentally friendly lifestyle is encouraged through optimization of the public transport, reduction of the infrastructure of car traffic at the expense of the pedestrian traffic, construction of stations for charging electrical cars, etc. The objects for sports and recreation planned in the development do not correspond to the type and the scale of a New City Center.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #5190 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion #6 :**

##### **Solution sustainability - 1 p.**

The suggestion provides keeping the realized infrastructure and developed actions, as well as it is in compliance with the public opinion, the results from previously held architectural competition, the contract territory and the natural relief.



On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #5190 receives 1 point.

**Total for the city-planning concept receives 21 points**

---

**Rating criterion #7 :**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 1 p.**

The vision of the building is interesting and borrowed from the towers and the walls of Tsarevets and Trapezitsa fortresses, but the visual balance of the ramp incline from the north is lost compared to the other volume. The voluminous spatial solution offers the possibility for holding different events, in both, the exterior and the interior. The project offers different spaces such as scale and proportions providing holding of different types of events.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #5190 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion #8 :**

**Situating and fitting of the building in the urban area - 1 p.**

The provided building is located in the restrictive lines, given in the competition program. The building fits in the urban area in relation to the materials used, but in relation to the scale and segmentation do not match the adjacent building. From the side of the new City Center the building is not sufficiently distinguished, unlike north, where the activity and the flows of visitors are limited.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #5190 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion #9 :**

**Functional solution - 4 p.**

The functional scheme of the building is good, with the exception of covering the requirements for accessible environment and evacuation. Insufficient number of sanitary facilities. Parking places are provided at the underground level, and a parking lot on the ground is not planned. Peculiarities of the terrain are not fully respected, as well as the approaches to the building compared to the street leveling. The requirement for area-distribution between the separate functional areas is kept. The requirement for built-up area and total floorage of the building is kept. The roof is partially usable with a pedestrian access from the terrain and provides the opportunity for panoramic view of the old city area.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #5190 receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion #10 :**

**Originality of for the BIG HALL transformation solution - 1 p.**

The big hall provided is in conformity with the specified conditions, providing 1,244 seats. But has a number of drawbacks related to the hall ceiling, including constructive, architectural, insulating, caustic problems, etc. The project offers solution for the transformation of the Big hall to 6 smaller halls without clarity how exactly the division will be made. The smaller halls receives in this way are of the same size and with elongated shape, which makes them unfit for any type of events.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #5190 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion #11 :**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 4 p.**

The project provides that the MAIN FOYER of two levels in a way offering the functional capability for simultaneous holding of different events, with independent approaches from one another. The part of it in front of entrances/exits of the big hall is larger, which is logical. Sufficient number of sanitary facilities is provided, as well as vertical communications and additional servicing functions.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #5190 receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion #12 :**

**Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 1 p.**

The project proposal for the building of the Exposition center offers not really good energy effective solution, providing capability of passive protection from the temperature changes of only a small part /the solid/ of its volumes, as the rest is not small, the glazed part is missing this, as well as protection from the sun. The building could be realized with standard and generally accessible construction technologies, which implies the use of standard construction technique and equipment, with the exception of the implementation of the used part of the roof, for its functioning without problems, the development of special details will be necessary, and use of specialized materials for reliable heat and waterproofing and coating. With the exception of this, the materials used in the project proposal are natural and generally accessible, so that local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. Earth moving is expanded over the entire property, not only within the boundary lines of the building, which means that the project does not keep the existing trees.

The project offers minimal territorial landscaping in the property including with high vegetation, as well as on small part of the building roof.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #5190 receives 1 point.

---

**Total for the building conception – Expository Center receives 12 points.**

---

**Project # 3761 – 15th place– total 36 points**

**Rating criterion #1 :**

**Functional solution, zoning and stage construction – 1 p.**

In the city-planning conception there isn't a direct proposal for its execution in stages. Conditionally the territory is divided in three areas – north, middle and south, in which suggestions of urban, architectural and designer nature are made. The project building is complied with the parameters set according to the assignment. The green system and the pedestrian spaces are developed with priority, which is in compliance with the public opinion of the New City Center vision and the results of the former architectural competition held, but on the other hand, many public objects are offered, the funds for the construction and the functioning of which is impossible to be provided by the municipality, as well as it will be difficult to search any kind of form of public-private partnership. There isn't a proposal for the specific positioning of the objects under p.11 of the assignment, but in the city-planning conception suggestions are made for open spaces and buildings that could be adjusted for the purposes of the second stage of the Integrated Plan for Urban Regeneration and Development.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion #2 :**

### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 7 p.**

In accordance with the project the transport-communication network in the New City Center will be built in two levels, using the peculiarities of the natural relief and terrain as a result of the water cycle implementation. A street is proposed in the central lateral axis, which will lead the car traffic faster to the center of Veliko Tarnovo towards the right bank of the river, Sveta Gora park, the rector's office of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the district of Sveta Gora. The section of this street, where it crosses a street in the central longitudinal direction in the northern area, is proposed to be underground and a parking space to be made on a ground level. The solution is felicitous in terms of the capability to provide passing of pedestrians and bicycles without problems from the north to the central area and back. The transit street is offered to be the barer of both, the pedestrian and bicycle traffic. New pedestrian bridge is provided at the south-east direction towards the railway station, where bicycle traffic is possible. It is like a continuation in peculiar manner of the rich green boulevard, leading its start from the roundabout of Hristo Botev street and Marno Pole park, where it is implied that large pedestrian flow will come. The street network under the detailed Site Development Plan in the northern area is reduced, and what is left for the car traffic is the perpendicular streets with directions north-west– south-west and south-west–north-west, crossing the area between the buildings of the district administration, the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the future expositional center. Sections of them are under the ground with the aim to provide more parking spaces on the ground level. From these streets, the access to the underground parking places will be possible. Places for ground parking at the three areas are also planned, but there isn't information whether their number will be sufficient for the functioning of the New City Center without any problems and whether the problem with parking at the central city area will be decided. Renovation of the Stambolov bridge is offered, but it is kept only for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The pedestrian network in the area of bank-protection vegetation is partially developed, around the former plant Belyanka. Elevators are planned for providing an access of the people with limited mobility. Efficient solutions are given with the project for making safe of the traffic participants, improvement of transport environment at the center of the city in general and for promoting of the environmentally friendly way of transportation.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions are better from the minimum requirements in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 7 points.

### **Rating criterion #3 :**

#### **Voluminous-spatial and artistic solution - 4 p.**

The project plans voluminous-spatial and artistic solution, complied with the relief, terrain peculiarities, the current vegetation and the historical use of the territory, as well as with voluminous-spatial parameters and functional purpose of the contact areas. Construction of buildings that is planned is concentrated at the sections, where such already exists. Suggestions for playground spaces and parking areas are prevailing. The solution for keeping the open public spaces in the north-western area of the territory free of buildings is appropriate because it is where the traditional pedestrian approach towards the interior of the New City Center is implemented and a spatial conflict with the existing building on the left side of Hristo Botev street will not be created. The use of natural materials for the pavements and the urban furnishing is proposed, as well as for the construction of the clock tower as a mandatory element in the city center. It is interesting that the solution for „mirror copying“ of Marno Pole park in the middle area, is the focus over the development of the New City Center as the core of the city green system. There is a proposal for exhibiting of the fence and for inspiring new life in the building of the former plant Belyanka. Capabilities for visual connections from the territory towards the picturesque historical part, meanders of the river and Turnovo heights are created, but there isn't a proposal for the outlining building with colour, height and volume, which serves as a marker of the New City Center.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion #4 :**

**Conception for the territory landscaping and cultivation of the territory - 7 p.**

The project offers extremely good conception for the territory landscaping and cultivation, at maximal preservation of the initial tree vegetation. The territory is full of many open playground spaces and green areas. There is a proposal for planting of vegetation towards the direction of Marino Pole park, aiming the creation of a green corridor, through which the entering of fresh air into the inner part of the city center will be possible. Partial cultivation of the area with the bank-protection vegetation is also planned, which helps for including it within the city system for relaxation. New building at a large elongation from the existing buildings is planned, as the volume and the location provide a very good natural sunlight, exposition and airing of the territory. The planned developed actions upgrade the minimum under the assignment, as the offered efficient solutions for the territory landscaping and urbanization of the territory in compliance with the public needs.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions are better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion #5 :**

**Innovative public-space solutions - 1 p.**

The solution for the creation of public space at the place of the former stadium – „city tribunes with podiums“ is good, as well as of many thematic squares, within the scope of which there is a prerequisite for organization and conducting of various events. On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion #6 :**

**Solution sustainability - 4 p.**

The proposal provides keeping the realized developed actions under water-supply and sewerage and territory landscaping. The existing buildings are kept. Part of the foresights of the Detailed Site Development Plan is transferred into the city-planning conception. Special attention is paid to the results of the sociological survey and the former architectural competition held.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 4 points.

**Total for the city-planning concept receives 24 points.**

---

**Rating criterion #7:**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 1 p.**

The vision of the building is not aggressive, it fits the environment, but it does not have the original characteristics and can not be perceived as a building marker of the future New City Center. The planned façade arches are incommensurable in scales with the adjacent buildings and their partition. The voluminous spatial solution offers the capability for holding different events, at both, the exterior and the interior. The project offers different spaces such as scale and proportions providing the holding of different types of events.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion #8:**

**Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 1 p.**

The planned building is located within the boundary lines set in the competition program.

The building fits the urban area, and does not enter into conflict with the surrounding building, with the exception of the arches. The proposal does distinguish with originality.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion #9:**

**Functional solution - 1 p.**

The functional scheme of the building is working, but with long paths /corridors/ between the separate functional areas, unlike evacuation – which is well organized. The building is not in conformity with the requirements for accessible environment. 215 parking places are planned in three underground levels, without a parking place on the ground level. The peculiarities of the terrain and the approaches towards the building compared to the street leveling are kept. The distribution between the separate functional areas with the planned three parking levels is not balanced, compared to the requirement for built-up area and total floorage of the building. The roof is partially used with a pedestrian access from the terrain and provides the capability for panoramic view of the old city area.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion #10:**

**Originality of the solution for transformation of the BIG HALL - 4 p.**

The planned big hall provides 1,500 seats and is in conformity with the conditions set. The project offers good solution for acoustics and lightness, as well as for transformation of the Big hall in 6 smaller halls, with different size. The offered transformation provides simultaneous holding of different events, as well as an idea of technical realization is given.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion #11:**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 1 p.**

The project plans a main foyer, but the functional capability of holding of different events is limited. The necessary representativeness and space is missing.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided, that this project proposal covers only the minimum requirements of the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion #12:**

**Environmental and energy efficient solutions - 4 p.**

The project proposal for building of the Exposition center offers energy effective solution, providing the capability of passive protection from the temperature changes. The building could be realized with standard and generally accessible construction technologies, which implies the use of standard construction technique and equipment, by excluding the implementation of the greenery usable roof, which functioning without problems would be necessary for the development of special details, and the use of specialized materials for a reliable heat and waterproofing. Excluding this, the materials set in project proposal are natural and generally accessible, so that local suppliers and manufacturers can

be used. Earth moving is extended almost over the entire property, not only within the boundary lines of the building, which means that the project will keep the existing trees in small extend. The project offers territory landscaping in the property, as well as for a part of the building roof, including high vegetation.

On the grounds of the above described reasons under this rating criterion the jury has decided that this project proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set in the assignment.

In accordance with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion project proposal #3761 receives 4 points.

---

**Total for the conception of the building – Exposition Center receives 12 points.**

---

**Project No. 5509 –14th place – 39 points total**

**Rating criterion No.1:**

**Functional solution, zoning, and stage construction - 4 pts.**

The urban development concept is envisaged to be realized in four stages, with the construction of the Exposition Centre being the first one. Further, the territory is divided into Zones A and B, sub-zones B1 and B2, and individual sectors in accordance with the transport-communication links, the future functional use of the territory, and the financing of the proposed urban development measures. Zone A is considered pre-determined with the construction already realized and the predetermined location of the building of the Exposition Centre. It is believed that it can function as a centre only during administrative working hours so efforts are directed towards building a site to attract visitors after the limited timeframe. Effective for this purpose will be the realization of the proposal to use the territory of the former stadium for holding bazaars, sports events, outdoor concerts, etc. The creation of such a public space, together with the realization of a new tourist bus station, is envisaged in the second stage of the implementation of the concept. In these two stages, the measures are of public nature and budget funds should be provided, which can be considered a serious disadvantage of the project. The third and fourth phases envisage the development of the most southern and the south-eastern part of the territory of the New Town Centre, including sites for the construction and functioning of which it will be possible to use some form of public-private partnership and there will be economic return of the public investments made. There is no proposal for the specific positioning of the sites under item 11 of the assignment but in the urban development concept proposals have been made for open spaces and buildings, which can be adapted for the purposes of the second stage of Integrated Urban Reconstruction and Development Plan.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. 5509 receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.2:**

**Transport and communication solution and parking - 1 pt.**

Many of the solutions of the urban development concept are aimed namely at improving the transport and communication environment in the town centre, securing the participants in the traffic, and promoting the environmentally friendly mode of transport. A street for transit road traffic is envisaged from the town centre to Sveta Gora Park, the Rectorate of the University of Veliko Tarnovo, and Sveta Gora residential area. A bicycle-lane network is formed and a bicycle parking lot is provided. A new bus station with 10 stops is envisaged to cover the increasing tourist interest in the town. There are proposals for a new cableway to the railway station, a rack-railway to Sveta Gora Park, horizontal marking for improving the organization of the traffic and facilitating the pedestrian crossing within the roundabout on Hristo Botev Street, a new pedestrian subway under Hristo Botev Street in the area of the University of Veliko Tarnovo; a pedestrian bridge from Boruna Park to the historical part of the town, etc. In the longitudinal central axis, a street is proposed going underground in the heart of the New Town Centre, which will allow access to underground parking lots under the

newly-proposed construction. Terrestrial by-the-street parking is envisaged. A proposal has been made to develop a parking lot on Marno Pole Square. Kraybrezhna Street is confirmed. A pedestrian network is developed at an elevated level, part of which is the large square in the northern part. A weakness of the project is that most of the proposals require serious public investment for the provision of which there is no proposal; additional field studies are required, too. Another weakness of the project is that the transport-communication plan envisages transport access through Stambolov Bridge, which is pedestrian and forbidden for motor vehicles. There are weaknesses and contradictions between the transport-communication plan, the visualization, and the general plan that create ambiguity about the transport-communication solutions proposed.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 1 point.

### **Rating criterion No.3:**

#### **Volumetric spatial and artistic solution - 7 pts.**

The project envisages a volumetric spatial and artistic solution in accordance with the relief, the terrain specifics, the historical development, and the contact zones. The Exposition Centre and its mirror universal sports hall are envisaged as semi-underground, thereby keeping the visual connection from the New Town Centre to the scenic historical area over the river. In the north-western part of the New Town Centre, spacious and construction-free spaces are left, which avoids the opposition, in volume and vision, of the project construction with the existing one on the left side of Hristo Botev Street. In addition, the large square allows for larger masses of people entering the territory of the New Town Centre from the Arch of the Generals. The latter is preserved and renovated and the fences are restored. The Belyanka building is also preserved and no specific purpose is intentionally assigned to it. The construction of two hotels is proposed, which, with their height and vision, can mark the location of the New Town Centre from the Southern road junction and other parts of the town. In the southeast direction, a street is proposed starting from Marno Pole Square and ending with a panoramic ground with a view to the meanders of the river and Tarnovo heights. An unpleasant impression is the use in this conceptual competition of photos from projects and realizations of other architectural and engineering sites.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 7 points.

### **Rating criterion No.4:**

#### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 1 pts.**

The urban development concept proposes to create a multi-purpose green area in the northwest zone, which is more appropriate than a standard town park solution. It cannot be judged whether and to what extent the foreseen urban development measures will affect the existing tree vegetation, and the one in the northern part of the territory is envisaged to be preserved as much as possible. The green system can only be judged for by visualizations and from the scarce information of the general plan. The proposed tree vegetation is insufficient and does not correspond to the public attitudes to the territory. The project development is located at a distance from the existing and project buildings, which will guarantee the natural aeration of and sunshine on the territory. Minor interventions are also envisaged in the zone of the river-bank vegetation.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion No.5:****Innovative public-space solutions - 7 pts.**

It is a good and effective solution to create a public space on the site of the former stadium. Panoramic grounds and lifts are planned over natural and anthropogenic sites. Within the scope of many of the public sites, there are conditions for organizing and conducting diverse events and getting to know the town in an interesting manner.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.6:****Solution sustainability - 1 pt.**

The proposal envisages the preservation of the implemented measures for water supply and sewerage and landscaping. The existing buildings are preserved. Some of the projections of the Detailed Development Plan have been transferred to the urban development concept. The results of the sociological survey and the last architectural competition have been taken into account.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 1 point.

**Total points received for the urban development concept: 21**

---

**Rating criterion No.7:****Original vision and volumetric spatial solution of the building - 4 pts.**

The project proposal for the building of the Exposition Centre has a rather bold and partly vague concept of shaping the volumetric spatial solution but does not lack originality. The volume of the building is composed of two essentially different in form and material parts, with the main one being "squeezed" under the other, and the second one being cut at places into the first, forming a futuristic-technological composition with associations of air and sea velocity design.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.8:****Situating and fitting the building into the urban environment - 1 pt.**

The project proposal offers a well-situated solution placing the building on the boundary lines according to the competition conditions. The unfolding of the shape and the volumes, rather than the choice of the materials used for the construction, conflicts with the buildings of the surrounding construction as well as with its aggressive design. One of the reasons why the project has such an aggressive and atypical for the town and the surrounding construction vision, apart from the "cutting edges" and the sharp angles of the metallic coating, is the structure of the facades - a modular system of white-coloured dense and ajour protruding triangular elements arranged in a logic that is not susceptible to analysis.

The buildings of the Regional Administration and the 5th Corps of the University of Veliko Tarnovo as well as the residential buildings in the next street will hardly co-exist with this project proposal. The walking approaches to the building are resolved at different levels. The car access to the underground parking level is also from the north /from the side of Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street/.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.



Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion No.9:**

**Functional solution - 4 pts.**

Functionally, the project offers a good solution, providing a functional scheme at two basic and three partial levels, namely: first ground and main level - grand hall, second overground and partial level - main foyer, third ground and also partial level - technical and administrative zones, first underground and main level - underground parking lot with entrance from the north /from the side of Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street/, and, finally, second underground and partial level - also underground parking lot with entrance from the northeast.

The main foyer is located on two levels, each with a separate entrance. The connection between them is through staircases, escalators, and elevators. They are II-shaped and cover almost the entire building perimeter except the south-eastern and north-eastern part of the building, but are insufficient as an area for holding exposition events, providing a unified space with options for separation and dividing. The vertical communications are grouped and functionally separated, providing a good connection between all levels through stairways and elevators, and are sufficient for the building's capacity. The project proposal for a Grand Hall has a capacity of more than 2,000 seats, the shape of the hall is chosen so as to ensure good visibility of the stage, the floor is even, which, for a hall with such capacity, is not a good solution having in mind visibility. The ceiling is envisaged with a slope, which is good from an acoustic point of view. The functional solution of the hall is good, providing easy access and evacuation to and from anywhere; the required number of entrances/ exits as well as of evacuation ones is envisaged, with all of them at different locations. The main disadvantage of the project proposal is the extremely small stage as well as its angular layout. In front of the hall, the project envisages a lobby-type foyer with access to sanitary facilities, which are extremely insufficient for the capacity of the hall. Part of the roof is richly planted and usable by visitors and provides good visibility to the old town and the surroundings of Veliko Tarnovo.

The project proposal envisages two underground parking levels that provide over 200 parking spaces and a good transport-communication plan. As regards the areas, the project proposal fulfils the requirements of the competition programme.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.10:**

**Originality of the GRAND HALL transformation solution - 4 pts.**

The project proposal for the building of the Exposition Centre offers a scheme for transformation of the grand hall into up to 6 smaller halls using the entrances and exits of the hall so that each individual part has access and evacuation respectively. In addition to the 6 small halls requested under the programme, the proposal provides for the division into 2, 3, 4, and 5 halls. The functional capabilities of the halls, result of the division under this project proposal, are excellent but it is not clear how the division will be realized and what type it will be - vertical or horizontal. If vertical, the hall is small to hide the elements of the "curtains", moreover, the slope of the ceiling is an additional complication; if the second type, there are no rooms envisaged for storing the panels. The stage is dysfunctional and small in size for the capacity of the hall.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.11:**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 1 pt.**

The main foyer is located on two levels, each with a separate entrance. The connection between them is through staircases, escalators, and elevators. They are II-shaped and cover almost the entire building perimeter except the south-eastern and north-eastern part of the building, but are insufficient as an area for holding exposition events, providing a unified space with options for separation and dividing. There is no clear indication of the volume and location of the main foyer /according to the competition programme/ in the exterior of the building. This project proposal offers a two-level lobby space, illuminated with natural light only in its central part.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 1 point.

#### **Rating criterion No.12:**

##### **Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 4 pts.**

The project proposal for the building of the Exposition Centre offers a good ecological solution to use the roofing area for landscaping.

The project proposal for the building of the Exposition Centre could be realized using standard and publicly available building technologies, which implies the use of standard construction equipment and machinery, except for the implementation of the grassy green roof, whose smooth operation will require the development of special details and the use of specialized materials for reliable waterproofing, drainage system, etc., as well as the vague materials and workmanship of the facade panels. Apart from this, the materials included in the project proposal are natural and generally available so that local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. Excavation works extend to the entire property but grassing and afforestation of the property is foreseen after completion of the construction works. The project proposal offers a good percentage of green areas, including high vegetation, mainly by using part of the roof for this purpose.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5509** receives 4 points.

#### **Total points received for the building concept of the Exposition Centre: 18**

---

#### **Project No. 5912 - 13th place – 48 points total**

##### **Rating criterion No.1:**

##### **Functional solution, zoning, and stage construction - 1 pts.**

The development of the town centre is proposed to take place in three stages. The territory of the New Town Centre is divided into upper (for construction) and lower (for park) zones. The stages do not fully correspond to the proposed zoning as the construction of the park in the western part of the territory does not appear in any of the described phases. The first stage envisages the construction of the Exposition Centre and several other buildings with public functions without any proposal for their financial provision. The next two stages envisage the construction of sites which, just the opposite of the first stage, can provide revenues for the municipality to be invested in public infrastructure. I.e. the stage is not economically justified but is given only in terms of the volumetric spatial and artistic solution of the future centre. No proposals have been made for the specific location of most of the sites under item 11 of the territory assignment but part of the project buildings and open spaces can be adapted for the purposes of the second stage of the implementation of the Integrated Urban Reconstruction and Development Plan. The building parameters and the recommended structure for function distribution have been respected.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 1 point.

### **Rating criterion No.2:**

#### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 4 pts.**

In a transport-communication aspect, the urban development concept gives priority to the pedestrian and bicycle movement. The roundabout street and the street in the central longitudinal axis are kept for car traffic, forming a quadrant in which the construction is concentrated. Under the newly designed buildings, an underground parking lot is offered with the access to the locations designated for it available from these streets. It is unclear whether the planned parking spaces will be sufficient for the functioning of the New Town Centre and whether they can solve the problem of parking and garaging in the central town part. There is no proposal for a street to drive the traffic from the town centre to the right bank of the river, Sveta Gora Park, the Rectorate of the University of Veliko Tarnovo, and Sveta Gora residential area. A roundabout bicycle lane is proposed to be built. A proposal is also made for a pedestrian crossing over the southern road junction to the zone of concentration of transport functions where the railway station is located. There is an interesting proposal for underground pedestrian crossing under the circular junction of Hristo Botev Street, which will facilitate the pedestrian access from Marno Pole Park, from where a larger flow is expected. A radial pedestrian network is developed in the lower zone, whose centre is exactly this underground pedestrian crossing. One of the streets is proposed to be a shared space, without information through what techniques.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No.3:**

#### **Volumetric spatial and artistic solution - 4 pts.**

The urban development concept has taken into account, in a very clever way, the natural relief, the terrain, the historical development, the construction in the contact areas, and the natural resources. The western part of the territory is designated as a park where sports playgrounds, water mirrors, and low volumes the type of pavilions are located. The solution is very relevant in terms of avoiding a visual and functional conflict with the existing construction on the left side of Hristo Botev Street. It also enables larger masses of people coming from the Arch of the Generals or from Marno Pole Park. From the circular junction in the southeast direction, the construction of a street is planned, ending with an above-ground panoramic ground overlooking the meanders of Yantra River and Tarnovo heights. The construction-free strand allows the physical linking of the existing urban parks and the transformation of the New Town Centre into a distribution core of the green system. The construction, which is concentrated on the periphery of the territory, makes reference to the shapes and volumes of the former barracks. It is not very high and in the spaces between the buildings there are additional squares and green areas. The Exposition Centre and the library are bigger but semi-dug, which makes them part of the existing construction consisting of the building of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the Regional Administration, and, at the same time, do not interfere with the New Town Centre's visual links with the picturesque historical area over the meanders of the river. There is no construction proposed that is different in volume, shape and colour to mark the location of the New Town Centre. The preservation of the Arch of the Generals is envisaged as well as that of Belyanka, with the latter being transformed into a Museum of Bread. There is no proposal for exposing the fence.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.4:****Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 7 pts.**

The urban development concept proposes the creation of a new park area at the heart of the future New Town Centre, which satisfies the demands of the citizens and takes into account the results of the last architectural competition for the future of the territory. Minimal removal of tree vegetation is envisaged and, as compensation, planting of such vegetation is planned in the newly planned green areas and square spaces. The project development is located at a distance from the existing and project buildings, which will guarantee the natural aeration of and sunshine on the territory. There is no interference in the area with river-bank vegetation.

Proposals have been made upon the realization of which very good and effective final results can be achieved.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.5:****Innovative public-space solutions - 4 pts.**

The solution for a planned park located partly on the territory of the former stadium is a good one. Several panoramic grounds, square spaces, and pedestrian crossings are envisaged, which can be a good environment for organizing and conducting events.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.6:****Solution sustainability - 1 pt.**

The proposal provides for the preservation of the existing buildings. The landscaping is largely compliant. The results of the sociological survey and the last architectural competition have been taken into account.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 1 point.

**Total points received for the urban development concept: 21**

---

**Rating criterion No.7:****Original vision and volumetric spatial solution of the building - 7 pts.**

The building meets the conditions set in the assignment. The project proposal has an interesting concept and vision. The volumetric spatial solution is consistent with the scale of the surrounding construction and provides a segmented structure of cubic elements separated by "light wells". In an efficient way, the segmentation of the building achieves the effect and impact of an architectural ensemble rather than of a monotonous volume, which is in line with the architectural traditions of Veliko Tarnovo.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.8:**

**Situating and fitting the building into the urban environment - 7 pts.**

The polygonal shape is fit into the contour of the boundary lines specified in the assignment. The building does not conflict with the surrounding construction. The segmentation of the volume corresponds to the buildings on the other side of the street as well as to the scale of the buildings in the old part of the town. The fan-shaped form of the building from the northeast is a good and interesting solution, which contributes to the use of the building as a place for observation of the old part and other characteristic buildings of the town's silhouette. The planned building is divided into sectors that are oriented towards the existing territory and the old town part, and this division is also carried out in the internal organization of the building.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.9:**

**Functional solution - 4 pts.**

The project proposal offers a good functional solution that meets the requirements of the contracting authority. Sufficient entrances to the hall are provided, except for the second level of the main foyer, which, along with the lack of ramps, makes the evacuation cumbersome, with long ways to the exits of the building. A weakness of the project is that the entrance to the underground levels is positioned from northeast in the direction of Stambolov Bridge, which is pedestrianized and will create a conflict between the different transport flows.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.10:**

**Originality of the GRAND HALL transformation solution - 1 pt.**

The project envisages transformation of the hall that meets the conditions set but the solution implies the formation of smaller halls of irregular shape, and there is also no information on the way in which the division will take place.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion No.11:**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 7 pts.**

The foyer functionalities meet the requirements of the assignment. The access to it takes place through two separate entrances, with the possibility of simultaneous and independent events taking place inside. The participant has provided the possibility to accommodate a bookstore and a souvenir shop in the foyer. There is an effective combination of several features that, in the most rational way, allow the use of the functionalities. Good and efficient is the solution of the vertical communications at both levels of the foyer, the connection between them being a panoramic spiral staircase. At the first level, there is also an additional area /hall/ for autonomous events.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.12:****Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 1 pt.**

The project proposal for the building of the Exposition Centre offers an energy-efficient solution, which uses the area of part of the façade panels for installation of thermal insulation systems. A disadvantage in this regard is the high percentage of glazing, which implies higher energy consumption for air conditioning.

The project proposal for the building of the Exposition Centre could be realized using standard and publicly available building technologies, which implies the use of standard construction equipment and machinery. The materials set in the project proposal are natural and generally available so that local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. The excavation works extend across the property. A weakness of the project is that scarce landscaping is planned with only low-grass vegetation.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **5912** receives 1 point.

---

**Total points received for the building concept of the Exposition Centre: 27**

---

**Project No. 2707 - 12th place – 51 points total****Rating criterion No.1:****Functional solution, zoning, and stage construction - 4 pts.**

The principle underlying the urban development concept is based on the idea of the territory being viewed as a palm with five fingers. The fingers are green corridors that conditionally divide the territory into six parts. In accordance with this division, it is proposed to gradually implement the project ideas for the New Town Centre, for which purpose the territory is united in 3 clusters, the first of which consisting of two parts. At each stage, its corresponding green corridor is built so that the centre always looks complete. In the first part of the first cluster, the construction of the Exposition Centre as well as of buildings and open spaces with sports, educational, administrative, hotel, and commercial functions is envisaged. The sites with public functions predominate but some form of cooperation with private investors may be found. In the second part, the construction of an administrative building is proposed as well as of sites with sports and commercial functions. Within the scope of the second cluster is the construction of the town square, which, according to the idea of the palm and fingers, coincides with one of the green corridors, so in practice at this stage two of the corridors will be built. In addition, mixed-purpose sites, including residential ones, are planned to be built. In their building and operating, it is expected that revenue will be generated for the municipality. In the last of the clusters, which is located in the southernmost part of the territory of the New Town Centre, mainly sports facilities are planned. The building parameters and the recommended structure for function distribution have been respected. There is a proposal for the specific positioning of some of the sites under item 11 of the assignment but in the urban development concept proposals have been made for open spaces and buildings, which can be adapted for the purposes of the second stage of the Integrated Urban Reconstruction and Development Plan.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.2:****Transport and communication solution and parking - 1 pt.**

The transport and communication solutions in the urban development concept are based on the basic principle of the palm and fingers. The prevailing part of the street network is preserved as in the Detailed Development Plan but, at the same time, there are proposals for a diagonal to the territory green corridor and a town square starting from the circular junction on Hristo Botev Street. In the

central longitudinal axis, a main street crossing the green corridors is proposed. Its entrance from the north is illogically determined to be from Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street, which traditionally has more pedestrian traffic as it ends with the pedestrian Stambolov Bridge over the river. The southern part is dead near the existing block of flats, which calls into question its functional role. In a ring around the main street, secondary streets are formed. Below the central square, the construction of a large underground parking lot with a capacity of about 300 parking spaces is proposed. Together with the above-ground parking, enough seats will be provided for the normal functioning of the New Town Centre and for solving the parking and stationary problem in the central town area. Priority is given to the pedestrian and bicycle movements, the routes of which are combined in the gauges of the green boulevards. There is no proposal for a street to quickly take the traffic from the town centre to the right bank of the river, Sveta Gora Park, the Rectorate of the University of Veliko Tarnovo, and Sveta Gora residential area. There is a bus stop and a taxi stand planned.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 1 point.

### **Rating criterion No.3:**

#### **Volumetric spatial and artistic solution - 4 pts.**

The project envisages a volumetric spatial and artistic solution in accordance with the relief, the terrain, and the existing construction. The majority of the project buildings have volumes that are commensurate to the volumes of the buildings of the 5th Corps of the University of Veliko Tarnovo, the Regional Administration, and the Administrative Court. The spaces between them also have dimensions corresponding to the scale and style of the architecture. Using the idea of the fingers, physically free of construction and richly planted corridors have been left in the direction of the natural treasures - the river with its meanders, the Tarnovo Heights, and Sveta Gora Park. Each of these corridors ends with panoramic grounds. The strongest axis is the central transverse axis where the town square will be located. By means of additional landscaping in the area of Marno Pole Park, the park is connected with Boruna and Sveta Gora Parks, and the New Town Centre appears as a distributing point. The solution to place cultural sites on an axis that swings past a new park of arts is an interesting one. Thus, the qualities of this part of the New Town Centre as a place of recreation are enhanced. In the northwest, open space is left in front of the building of the University of Veliko Tarnovo, which is a suitable solution having in mind where the traditional pedestrian approach to the territory starts from. The Arch of Generals and the fence are preserved. The minimum requirements of the assignment are upgraded.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No.4:**

#### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 4 pts.**

The urban development concept proposes a park in place of the river-bank vegetation zone where the exposition of different types of arts is possible. This park can be reached by green corridors, which are richly landscaped streets serving bicyclists and pedestrians as a priority. They start from the greener Marno Pole Park, which connects several town parks into a larger system. Divided this way, they will allow fresh air inside the town. The corridors themselves are designed as a rainwater capture system. In the spaces adjacent to the project buildings, there are also green areas.

Partial removal of the existing tree vegetation is envisaged but, as compensation, areas with high vegetation are planned.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.5:**

**Innovative public-space solutions - 7 pts.**

It is an original solution to create green corridors that, apart from being public spaces, have the functions of rainwater purification facilities. Interesting is the proposal to create a museum promenade in combination with a park of arts, where there are conditions for organizing and conducting unique events and for getting to know the town in an interesting way.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.6:**

**Solution sustainability - 4 pts.**

The proposal provides for the preservation of the existing buildings, the Arch of Generals and the fence, the public water supply and sewerage measures implemented as well as part of the high-tree vegetation. Some of the projections of the Detailed Development Plan have been transferred to the urban development concept. The results of the sociological survey and the last architectural competition have been taken into account.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 4 points.

**Total points received for the urban development concept: 24**

---

**Rating criterion No.7:**

**Original vision and volumetric spatial solution of the building - 1 pt.**

The vision of the building is not aggressive; it fits into the urban environment but has no original features and could hardly be seen as a marker building of the future New Town Centre. The facades envisaged, literally following the boundary lines, are too long and segmented only in height, which reinforces this disadvantage. The volumetric spatial solution offers the opportunity to hold different events both in the exterior and in the interior. The project offers different in scale and proportions spaces to provide different types of events.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 1 point.

**Rating criterion No.8:**

**Situating and fitting the building into the urban environment - 4 pts.**

The project proposal offers a well-situated solution placing the building on the boundary lines in accordance with the competition conditions. The volume solution of the building as well as its shape and the materials used for the construction do not conflict with the surrounding construction. The main entrance of the building is well situated from the side of the New Town Centre and the car access to the underground parking level from the side of Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street /north-northeast/. The non-segmented long facades of the building create a new kind of scale and vision that is not characteristic for the environment. Despite the planned landscaping of the roof, it can only be seen from bird's eye view.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment



Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.9:**

**Functional solution - 7 pts.**

Functionally, the project offers a good solution providing a good functional scheme. The main foyer is located on the ground floor of the building. At this level, the other functional areas are located, namely the grand hall, the administrative and service areas. The vertical communications are precisely positioned and provide a good connection between all levels through stairways and elevators, but are particularly inadequate especially to the underground parking level. The Grand Hall is designed with sufficient height providing good visibility and possibility of realization of an acoustic ceiling that will improve the present hall characteristics. The functional solution of the hall is good and provides easy access and evacuation to and from anywhere, the required number of entrances/ exits as well as evacuation ones are also envisaged and at different locations. For the evacuation of the Grand Hall, the authors propose an exit directly to the terrain, which is a good solution. The roof is usable for visitors and provides great opportunities for panoramic views of both the old part of the town and the future New Town Centre. The project proposal offers an underground level for parking, which offers good functionality of the transport-communication scheme. The other requirement of the competition programme is met, namely to allow for different events in the exterior spaces of the usable roof of the building as well.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.10:**

**Originality of the GRAND HALL transformation solution - 7 pts.**

The project proposal for the building of the Exposition Centre offers a simple scheme for transforming the grand hall into smaller halls using the entrances and exits of the hall so that each individual part has access and evacuation respectively. In addition to the 6 small halls requested under the programme, the proposal provides for the division into 2, 3, 4 and 5 halls. The functional capabilities of the halls divided under this project proposal are excellent. The project proposes an innovative technical solution for the transformation of the hall by hiding the partition walls in the ceiling, which is of sufficient height, and for the realization of the lighting, sound, and acoustics of the hall.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.11:**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 4 pts.**

The functionalities of the foyer meet the requirements of the assignment. The access to it takes place from the south - from the territory of the New Town Centre through a well-established main entrance; and in it, it is possible to carry out, simultaneously and independently, different events. It is II-shaped and encompasses the grand hall from three sides. Short evacuation routes are provided as well as connections to the other functional zones of the building.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.12:****Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 4 pts.**

The project proposal for the building of the Exposition Centre offers a good energy-efficient solution considering the possibility of installing thermal insulation systems on the majority of the façade boards, where the shape and the materials allow for the use of passive protection during changes in the weather conditions. The project proposal for the building of the Exposition Centre could be realized by using standard and publicly available building technologies, which implies the use of standard construction equipment and machinery, except for the execution of the grassed part of the roof, whose smooth operation will require the development of special details and the use of specialized materials for reliable waterproofing, drainage system, etc. Apart from this, the materials included in the project proposal are natural and generally available so that local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. The excavation works also do not extend to the whole property but are limited to the boundary lines of the construction. The project proposal meets the requirement of the competition programme for green areas, including high vegetation.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **2707** receives 4 points.

**Total points received for the building concept of the Exposition Centre: 27**

---

**Project No. 1344 - 11 th place – 51 points total****Rating criterion No.1:****Functional solution, zoning, and stage construction - 7 pts.**

The urban development concept proposes that the realization of the New Town Centre be carried out in four stages, the first of which envisages the building of the Exposition Centre, for which there is certain funding, and also of a terraced square for public events and an underground public parking lot, for which there is no provided public funding. The second stage comprises two parts of the territory of the Old Military School, one of which is located along Hristo Botev Street in the section to the roundabout, and the other around the buildings of the Regional Administration and the Administrative Court. At this stage, the construction of business and office buildings, bus station, sports facilities, more underground parking lots with wide access as well as of part of the pedestrian boulevard in the central longitudinal direction is envisaged, the character of management of which implies the application of forms of public-private partnership. The third stage concerning the most southern part of the territory, the north-western part, and part of the zone with river-bank vegetation proposes the construction of a trade complex, a spa hotel, a flower market, and residential buildings. A public-private partnership will enable the implementation of the fourth stage, which covers the central and south-eastern parts where the construction of public cultural sites and residential buildings is envisaged. The construction parameters and the recommended structure for function distribution have been respected. Specific locations for the realization of the second stage of the Integrated Urban Reconstruction and Development Plan, as indicated in item 11 of the assignment, have been proposed.

Proposals have been made upon the realization of which very good results can be achieved.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **1344** receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.2:****Transport and communication solution and parking - 4 pts.**

The project proposes the release of the territory from car traffic in the central longitudinal axis, taking advantage of the natural relief and the terrain, with the street in this direction being underground but having unjustified entrance and exit. It starts from Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street, which is traditionally used as a pedestrian one, having in mind its end with Stambolov Bridge over the river, along which driving is not allowed. The underground street has a limited-gauge outlet between the block of flats and the National Military Historical Archive. The pedestrian and bicycle movement is encouraged, with the second one being organized around the periphery of the New Town Centre. Some of the streets under the Detailed Development Plan are kept for car traffic and parking but parking is developed mainly underground, with access from the underground street. Above it, a wide pedestrian boulevard is formed on which the flows of visitors to the New Town Centre can easily move from the northernmost to the most southern part of the New Town Centre. A new pedestrian bridge over the river is proposed starting from a stepped square located in the central transverse axis where there is also a pedestrian boulevard. The proposal is not sufficiently researched and technically justified as the pedestrian street can be crossed at one level with the transport lanes, the latter being part of a European transport corridor. Stairs to Stambolov Bridge are formed for quicker access from the square in front of the Exposition Centre to Boruna Park. The building of a gas station and a bus station is proposed as well as of a pedestrian promenade in the area with river-bank vegetation. There is no proposal for a street for transit traffic from the town centre to the right bank of the river, Sveta Gora Park, the Rectorate of the University of Veliko Tarnovo, and Sveta Gora residential area. On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment. Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **1344** receives 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No.3:**

#### **Volumetric spatial and artistic solution - 4 pts.**

The territory is resolved in a raster along which the public spaces of green areas and square spaces are distributed. In the same raster, construction is formed consisting of groups of buildings that resemble the existing buildings of the 5th Corps of the University of Veliko Tarnovo, the Regional Administration, and the Administrative Court, but they are segmented so as to be closer to the scale of the visitors to the New Town Centre and to allow greater physical access from the centre to the periphery and vice versa as well as more points for visual observation of the natural resources and town sights. It is supposed that the new pedestrian bridge over the river will be greatly attended as a strategic observation point. The solution is in line with the relief and the terrain, with multiple staircases envisaged in the open spaces making reference to the urban development in the historic town zones. The steps are present in the architectural vision of the Exposition Centre as well. The solution to leave the north-western part of the territory construction-free is considered to be appropriate since the pedestrian approach traditionally starts from there due to the location of the New Town Centre, with limiters such as the southern road junction and the river. Along Hristo Botev Street, low-rise construction is proposed, which will not conflict with the existing one on the left side of the street. As a distinctive marker indicating the location of the New Town Centre, the shopping centre and the spa-hotel in the southern part of the territory can be accepted, which will be excellently approached from the southern road junction. A disadvantage is the absence of a vertical component in the solution; construction of the same height is proposed and thus the territory is more like a peripheral urban structure not suitable for a New Town Centre.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment. Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **1344** receives 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No.4:**

#### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 4 pts.**

With the implementation of the project, a significant part of the available tree vegetation will be preserved and, as compensation, such is envisaged in the scope of the project green areas and square spaces. The zone with bank-river vegetation is prepared for use. The project buildings are situated at a distance from each other and from the existing construction sufficient for the natural sunshine and aeration of the territory.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents good solutions that meet the requirements set in the assignment

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **1344** receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.5:**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions - 7 pts.**

The urban development concept proposes interesting solutions for the public spaces that include the stepped squares and courtyards to the project buildings thanks to their volume segmentation. Interesting solutions have been made in the central zone of the territory where glazed pedestrian streets are proposed providing the opportunity to accommodate visitors to the New Town Centre in bad weather conditions.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition, for this rating criterion project proposal No. **1344** receives 7 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.6:**

##### **Solution sustainability - 4 points**

The proposal envisages the preservation of the existing buildings, the Arch of Generals, the implemented water supply and sewerage systems improvement measures, and some of the tall tree vegetation. Part of the provisions of the Detailed Development Plan has been transferred to the urban development concept.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.**1344** receives 4 points.

**For the urban development concept the project proposal receives 30 points total**

---

#### **Rating criterion No.7:**

##### **Original vision and volumetric-spatial solution of the building - 4 points**

The project proposal for the Exposition Center building has an original vision and concept for the shaping and the voluminous spatial solution. The volume of the building is of one shape located in the property along the natural slope of the terrain. The project has a light vision thanks to the transparency of its completely glazed portion. The effect is further enhanced also by the vertical breakdown of the glazing through a rather slim metal structure. Using the natural slopes of the terrain, the authors shade the expression of the volume and scale of the building by hiding the most part of it from the view of the visitors of the New City Center, turning their roof into vast observation and contemplation grounds accessible directly from the terrain. The vision of the building is not aggressive, is well-suited to the environment and has original features. The voluminous spatial solution offers the opportunity to host various events, both indoors and outdoors, autonomously from the events in the building. The disadvantage is that the outdoor events may interfere with those conducted indoor. The project offers a fully usable roof - in the form of an open platform above the building, starting from the terrain and gradually rising in height to the north. Namely here appears to be some confusion because the panoramic views of the old town are to the east, and the authors offer us to look to the south, where the new city center is located. The facade of the building from the north (Alexander Stamboliyski Street) is cleverly resolved by its concept of "approach to infinity" and

contrasting with a dense, unbroken plane of the dismembered facade of the existing Veliko Tarnovo University building.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.1344 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.8:**

##### **Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 4 points**

The envisaged building is located within the boundary lines set in the competition program.

The stepped slabs and pavements around the building, in one with its stepped roof, create the feeling of a non-typical for the city architectural vocabulary and scale, which however do not create aggressive conflicts with the surrounding buildings.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.1344 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.9:**

##### **Functional solution - 4 points**

The proposed functional scheme is insufficiently well revolved in terms of vertical communications and evacuation routes, which is particularly noticeable at the underground level, where the requirements for accessible environments are heavily neglected. The two escalators can not compensate for the lack of more than one lift, as well as for the evacuation or any other staircase in the public areas. On the other hand, the requirements for the distribution of the areas between the different functional areas, as well as for the built-up area and the total floorage of the building are met. Two main entrances are envisaged to the foyer, one from the northeast to a large hall, and the other one from the south with access from the ground area of the new city center, which complement its functional possibilities for organizing and conducting various kinds of events, expositions and measures, and also the main lobby can be opened to the large spatial area in front of the building entrances. The proposed large hall complies with the competitive conditions, providing 1234 seats, but with a poor solution with respect to the acoustics. There are 122 parking spaces fully at the underground level. The project provides for different spaces as a scale and proportions, offering different types of events. The roof is fully usable, with a pedestrian access from the terrain and provides panoramic grounds for viewing the old city area, transformed in an original way in an open-air scene. It is also possible for these events to interfere with each other, due to their general visual connection with each other, such as "siphon spiral". On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.1344 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.10:**

##### **Originality of the GRAND HALL transformation solution - 4 points**

The space of a large hall with 1234 seats is nearly square in plan, divided into six sections, with three identical pairs but organized in a different way: the first two areas are a moving scene; the second ones have seating areas with a flat floor, and the third ones have seating areas with sloping floor for better visibility. The hall has a good height proportional to its dimensions, but with a flat ceiling, which is not the best solution from an acoustic point of view. The project offers a good solution for partitioning a Grand Hall, including an option for its transformation into 2,3,4,5 and 6 smaller halls. The transformation is quite successful given the absolute autonomy of the smaller halls and the sufficient (according to the competition program) entrances and exits provided, but no attention is paid to the technical side of the division - it is not clear how it will be realized, and where the partition elements or systems will be stored.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.1344 receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.11:**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 4 points**

The main foyer is located on the ground level in the north-eastern part of the plan, clearly marked (according to the requirements of the competition program) in the exterior and interior of the building. This project proposal offers a rich glazed atrium space which, unfortunately, is without envisaged sun protection. Its functional structure is cleared and includes a common space commensurate with the volume of the building, on two levels with a large total height, each of which has well-defined entrances (one from the northeast at the level of a large hall and the other one from the south with access from the ground space of the new city center), which complement its functional possibilities for organizing and conducting various types of events, expositions and measures, and in addition, there is an opportunity to open the main lobby to the big voluminous space in front of the building entrances. Functional roads and links to other levels and areas of the building are short and logical. The character of the spaces is mainly expositional, so it is a good idea to have the second gallery level with a café / buffet and exposition spaces above the lower level of the lobby, providing other viewpoints on the expositions. Only this part of the main lobby located just above the volume of a large hall has the possibility to realize events with a special lighting regime and also allows its multifunctional use without obstructing the functioning of the rest of the building.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.1344 receives 4 points.

**Rating criterion No.12:**

**Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 1 point**

The project proposal for a building of the Exhibition Center does not offer a good energy-efficient solution in terms of sun protection, both for the volume of the main lobby and the roof above the rest of the building - fully usable but with a technically complex thermal insulation and waterproofing.

The building could be realized by using standard and publicly available building technology, which implies the use of standard construction equipment and equipment, except for the use of the fully usable roof, which trouble-free operation will require the development of special details and the use of specialized materials for reliable waterproofing, thermal insulation and coating. Apart from this, the materials included in the project proposal are natural and generally available, and therefore, local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. Excavation works also do not extend over the whole property, but are limited to the limiting lines of construction.

The project offers landscaping in the property, including high vegetation, but does not upgrade the minimum requirements of the competition program.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this rating criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.1344 receives 1 point.

**For the building concept the Exposition Center receives 21 points total**

**Project No.2927 - 10 th place – 51 points total**

**Rating criterion No.1:**

**Functional solution, zoning and stage construction - 4 points**

The implementation of the concept is proposed to take place within four stages, during the first of which the Exhibition Center is to be built and during the second one - a summer theater. For the Exposition Center it is clear wherefrom the municipality will provide funds for designing and construction. A disadvantage is considered that no proposal is made wherefrom or in what form of cooperation funds for the realization of the summer theater will be provided. It is also questionable, is such theater necessary, given that another theater is already built at a very close distance. The second

stage envisages the construction of the northern central zone, where objects of mixed character - a business center, a military history museum, a municipal library, offices, shops and an administrative building are concentrated, which makes it possible for the realization to happen in some form of a public-private partnership. The third stage proposes the implementation of urban development measures in the southern central zone. There is envisaged the construction of school buildings and dormitories, hotels, leisure sites and facilities, as well as sports playgrounds. Some of the sites can also bring revenue to the municipality to invest in the construction and maintenance of public sites. In the final stage, similarly to the third stage, the construction of buildings with a mixed character is envisaged. The construction parameters specified in the Assignment are respected. The recommended structure for the distribution of functions is complied with. Proposals have been made for the particular positioning of some of the sites under item 11 of the Assignment for the area.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No.2:**

#### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 7 points**

The urban development concept largely preserves the street network provided for by the urban development plan as directions, making changes in individual sections in order to improve the traffic organization, secure the participants in it, introduce a new bicycle network for the city, provide the necessary places parking, conducting the auto traffic in the most efficient way from the city center towards Sveta Gora Park, the Rector's Office of the Veliko Tarnovo University and Sveta Gora, etc. Using the terrain features after the implementation of the water cycle project, it is proposed that the street in the central longitudinal axis be almost entirely underground. On the underground level, the same will cross the street in a central transverse axis, thus freeing the core of the territory for pedestrian traffic. Access to the underground parking lots will be available from the underground and by-street. Besides them, the parking is also regulated. The number of parking spaces is sufficient for the needs of the new city centre and for solving the serious problem with the parking and garaging in the central part of the city. It is proposed to build a separate bicycle ring along the streets permitted for traffic. Above the underground street is planned the construction of a wide pedestrian boulevard, whose trajectory passes almost the entire length of the new city centre. A pedestrian crossing over the roundabout on Hristo Botev Street is proposed, which will avoid the conflicting points between the intensive pedestrian and automobile streams. A pedestrian network is also being developed within the area of coastal protected plantations.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 7 points.

### **Rating criterion No.3:**

#### **Volumetric-spatial and artistic solution - 7 points**

The proposed voluminous-spatial and artistic solution takes into account in a very delicate way the natural relief and the construction in the contact area. The project volumes have a height and area being increased to the core of the new city center and decreased to the periphery so as not to create a visual and functional conflict with the construction on the left side of Hristo Botev Street and in the historical part above the river. The design solution does not dominate the existing building height and density. With the location, shapes and breakdown of the project buildings, the new city center is well-suited to the urban environment, while emphasizing the representative function of the territory. A proposal is made to keep the Arch of Generals; "Belianka", which is transformed into an entertaining retro complex; as well as one of the chimneys of the former steam plant. Several approaches to the site are offered, which are highlighted by richer street landscaping. For the pedestrian boulevard, wood flooring has been proposed, differing from that of the other streets in the area, to highlight the

backbone of the new city centre. No tag is provided to indicate the location of the future centre. The chimney and the pedestrian bridge above the circular junction may be considered as such to some extent. The construction is organized among green areas through which a pedestrian network is built. There are no specific sites for panoramic observation, but in sufficient places it is foreseen that the pedestrians can reach the eastern periphery freely and observe the picturesque historical part of the city, the river meanders and the Tarnovo heights.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides effective solutions better than the minimum requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.4:**

**Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 7 points**

Within a radius of 500 m measured from the beginning of the pedestrian boulevard at the Exhibition Center, several city parks are located, and the link to them has been strengthened by means of solutions for improvement the traffic organization and securing the pedestrian one. The new city centre develops as a green system core in the central city area. The most of the tree vegetation is preserved, which is complemented by separating new park areas for each of the design buildings. Using natural materials is proposed in the design of the territory.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides effective solutions, better than the minimum requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.5:**

**Innovative public-space solutions - 7 points**

The project proposes the construction of a pedestrian boulevard along the central longitudinal axis - spacious and with an interesting vision and whose area can be used for conducting regular and unique events. In an extremely appropriate and effective way, the public spaces, organized by the project through landscaping, flooring and furnishing, intersect the exhibition center, being a key element in the project development. On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.6:**

**Solution sustainability - 4 points**

The proposed decisions are consistent with the buildings functioning on the territory, and the implemented water supply and sewerage infrastructure. The Arch of Generals and „Belyanka“ shall be preserved. An exception is the property with the state Military Historical Archives building, which is state-owned and a wide public access is envisaged to it, but given the conceptual design level in the competition procedure, this should not be taken as a disadvantage. Many of the predictions of the current Detailed Development Plan have been adopted. Some of the existing vegetation is planned to be removed by the building proposals in the area of the former factory.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 4 points.

**For the urban development concept the project receives 36 points total**

---

**Rating criterion No.7:**

**Original vision and volumetric-spatial solution of the building - 4 points**



The project proposal for the Exposition Center building has an interesting concept with respect of shaping of the voluminous spatial solution. It is composed of two heterogeneous by material and size elements, as if there are two completely different buildings located one above the other. The one, smaller in volume is richly glazed, with horizontal breakdown into three parts, alternating density (wood) and air (glass) in a pleasant ratio and synchronization. Its dimensions are proportionate and, despite the few sharp edges and tilts on its facades, it sits well in space and on the territory of the future new city center. The other, significantly larger part of the building is dug entirely in its southern part and revealed in its full volume from the north and northeast, due to the natural displacement of the terrain, representing a monolithic, slightly indented, horizontal volume, with non-corresponding proportions, not only with the rest part of the building (of the main foyer and the exposure levels and spaces), but also with the surrounding building and urban ambience. The volumetric composition is made of these two, different in material, density and large shapes, placed one above the other, but their location in the property is precise, using the natural slope of the terrain. With the approach to the main lobby of the building - from the new city centre, the vision is very open, transparent and ethereal, and here the beautiful landscapes and merits of the voluminous spatial solution are developed to the fullest extend.

The airiness of the glazed ground floor, looking eastward, provides the necessary "air corridors" to the old city and makes the feel of building and thickness weaker and unobtrusive. On the contrary, with the other facades, especially with the northern one (Alexander Stamboliyski Str.), large jumps in the levels are observed at the car parks and the entrances to the underground approaches caused by the displacement of the terrain (including the underground street between the Exposition Center and the 5<sup>th</sup> campus building of the Veliko Tarnovo University). The facade has a linear appearance and the presence of the main entrance to the large hall is difficult to notice, clear marking is lacking and the effect is further enhanced by the proportions of the dense part with disproportionate height and width, typical of the supporting walls and technological openings. A disadvantage of the project is that the main entrance to the building looks like a hole in a retaining wall, being not sufficiently exposed, and the pedestrian access is after a ramp and parking.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.8:**

##### **Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 4 points**

The project proposal offers a well-situated solution, placing the building on the limiting lines according to the competitive conditions. The volumetric composition, as well as the shape and materials of which it is built, do not conflict with the surrounding buildings. On the contrary, the ease of its voluminous-spatial solution to the main foyer, the landscaping around it and the wide air corridors it provides, allow the adjoining buildings - the 5<sup>th</sup> campus building of the Veliko Tarnovo University and the Regional Administration, to be able to express themselves amidst the newly designed urban space. The appearance of the building from the newly designed city space is extremely ethereal and light, built almost entirely of glass and clad in "wooden" lining flying volumes, unlike in the northern area, where the elegance of the vision is replaced by the intrusive dense, unbroken and disproportionately larger volume of the ground part. Walking approaches to the building are resolved on different levels and are functionally divided, from the southwest to the main foyer and the exhibition spaces, and to the north to the large hall. The car access to the underground parking level is also from north /Alexander Stamboliyski Street/.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.9:**

### **Functional solution - 1 point**

In the functional aspect, the project proposes a solution providing a functional scheme on three basic levels and three partial levels, namely: the first ground level from the south - the main foyer and two more partial levels above it - exhibition areas and administration area; the first ground level from the north - the large hall and the lobby to it, as well as other service premises, as well as a partial level - a gallery, an underground level - a parking lot for 80 cars. The main foyer is located on the ground floor and offers access to indoor and outdoor café-terraces, whose spaces allow for various events such as open-air chamber concerts, lectures, talks, etc. Vertical communications are grouped and functionally separated, sufficient for the building capacity and provide a good connection between all levels through stairways, lifts and escalators. The project proposal for the Grand Hall is for a capacity of 1,735 seats, with the floor being mostly flat except for the most lateral and back rows with a slight slope, and the choice of shape of the hall ensures good visibility on the stage. The ceiling is also flat, but the height of the hall is enough to be split by acoustic panels, which will improve its acoustic performance. A technical and installation ceiling is also envisaged in the spatial-bar system of the coating. The functional decision of the hall is not good enough due to the concentration of the entrances/exits in the back of the hall, which will lead to an extremely dangerous gathering of people in front of the two of them in case of evacuation. In front of the hall, the project provides a wide foyer with access to sanitary facilities sufficient for the hall capacity and to the partial gallery at an upper level. The roof is partially landscaped, and the other part is covered with decking and is entirely usable. This solution is effective, but extremely difficult to maintain and inadequate for the local weather conditions. The project proposal offers an underground parking level that provides 80 parking spaces as well as an above-ground parking. Another requirement of the competition program is also fulfilled, namely to ensure the possibility of conducting various events in the exterior spaces around the building (in this case, on the roof of the grand hall), providing good opportunities for conducting different events outdoor /chamber concerts, performances, lectures, exhibitions, etc.). As regards the areas, the project proposal fulfills the requirements of the competition program. The jury identified differences and inconsistencies between plans and visualizations, which implies ambiguity and contradiction of the proposed solutions.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this rating criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 1 point.

### **Rating criterion No.10:**

#### **Originality of the GRAND HALL transformation solution - 1 point**

The project proposal for the Exposition Center building offers a vague and unnecessarily complex scheme for transforming the grand hall into smaller halls, forming a corridor system that makes the orientation difficult and the evacuation confusing. The proposed separation does not offer a variation of 2, 3, 4 or 5 halls, on the contrary, the newly formed spaces are "hard", functionally their shapes are with broken, irregular and sharp corners, the entrances and the exits of the halls are not properly positioned, thus creating problematic evacuation. The technical system for the realization of the division itself is also unclear.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this rating criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 1 point.

### **Rating criterion No.11:**

#### **Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 4 points**

The main foyer is located on the ground floor on the entire covered area and has good opportunities for conducting exhibiting events, by offering a single volume space with sufficient "air" and light clearance. The main disadvantage of this proposal is the lack of a sun protection solution. Taking into account the large area of glazed facades, the jury considers that the solving of this problem will

dramatically change the proposed vision, especially since a very large percentage of exposures require a special lighting regime and exhibition perimeter. Issues that would hardly be fulfilled without making major changes to the project and the proposed vision. The foyer offers an access to an indoor "atrium" and outdoor café-terraces, whose spaces allow for conducting various events, such as outdoor chamber concerts, lectures, talks, etc.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.12:**

##### **Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 1 point**

The project proposal for the Exposition Center building does not offer a good energy-efficient solution, especially for the levels of the main foyer and the exhibition areas. For the rest of the building, the shape and materials allow the use of passive protection in changes in the atmospheric conditions, in this case, thermal isolation of the entire dense volume of a large hall. The project proposal for the Exposition Center building could be realized with standard and publicly available building technologies, which implies the use of standard construction technique and equipment, except for the execution of the grassed part of the roof, whose smooth operation will require the development of special details and the use of specialized materials for reliable waterproofing, drainage and dewatering systems, etc. Apart from this, the materials included in the project proposal are natural and generally available, therefore local suppliers and manufacturers can be engaged. Excavation works also do not extend to the whole property, but are limited to the construction limiting lines. The project proposal fulfills the requirement of the competition program for the green areas, including also high vegetation.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this rating criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.2927 receives 1 point.

**For the building concept the Exposition Center receives 15 points total.**

---

**The projects with No.2927, No.1344 and No.2707 have equal number of points, and in view of the provisions envisaged in the Assignment, in the case of equality, priority shall be given to the project whose urban development concept has received a higher number of points, therefore, at the 12<sup>th</sup> position is ranked the project No. 2707, at the 11<sup>th</sup> position is the project No. 1344, and at the 10<sup>th</sup> position is the project No.2927.**

---

#### **Project No.9552 –9 th place – 54 points total**

##### **Rating criterion No.1:**

##### **Functional solution, zoning and stage construction - 4 points**

The project solution proposes the realization of the new city centre to be implemented in 4 stages. Each stage covers approximately equal parts of the territory, at the core of which are located the sites - development accelerators. In the first stage, the Exposition Center and the central square are set to be these activators. The underground street with an entrance between the 5<sup>th</sup> campus building of the Veliko Tarnovo University and the Exposition Center is of a key importance. All of them are sites that require public investment, but only for the Exposition Center is clear wherefrom to provide funding. The second stage envisages the construction of sites located in the northern central area, a large percentage of which are commercial sites. They are located on the ground floors and above them are proposed to be placed sites with cultural functions, among which are a library, a cultural center and a research center, which allows the implementation of a public-private partnership. At this stage, it is also planned to build a square as well as a pedestrian promenade with a shelter. In the third stage is proposed the improvement and building of the southern central zone, where commercial, residential, hotel, educational, cultural, and administrative and sports sites are shown for realization.

Among the public ones are an art center, a photographic school, a photography museum, a scientific research laboratory, a youth center ("Belyanka" building). The sites with commercial features are located on the ground floor or underground. In addition to the ability to implement a public-private partnership, by the variety of features can be achieved a "24/7 active" environment. The final stage includes the realization of the southernmost part of the new city centre, where the building intensity rate is the highest. There are 3 towers marking the location of the new city centre, as well as a military museum and a large percentage of sports facilities. It can hardly be said whether the building parameters specified in the design assignment have been met. The concept complies with the recommended structure for the functions distribution. Proposals are made for the specific positioning of the second stage sites in the Integrated Urban Recovery and Development Plan described in item 11 of the Assignment. The Arch of Generals is preserved. Some of the fence panels have been moved and exposed at the beginning of the promenade in the northern part of the territory. A disadvantage of the project is that in the first stage are not provided facilities with features that allow economic return and the residential buildings are concentrated mainly in one zone, which compromises the idea of a "24/7 active" environment.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.9552 received 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No.2:**

#### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 4 points**

The project solution offers a good distribution of the road, pedestrian and bicycle traffic on two levels in some areas. The street network remains in line with the predictions of the effective Detailed Development Plan in most of its sections. In the central longitudinal axis, in the northern part of the new city center is proposed the street along which the traffic will be conducted to be built as an underground street, and on the above-ground level to be formed a square. In its northern part, the road traffic is generally reduced, with a priority given to the cyclists and pedestrians. The solution is very appropriate in terms of the volume of pedestrians and cyclists entering the core of the new city centre from the Arch of Generals. The underground street crosses at the ground level another street located on a central transverse axis through a circular junction. Parking is being developed at ground and underground levels, with the largest underground parking area situated in the northwestern part of the territory. The street parking is provided within the ring road and on the streets in the south of the new city centre. The cross street starts from the project circular intersection at Hristo Botev Street. The jury identified some differences and inconsistencies between the plans and visualizations, which implies the ambiguity and contradiction of the transport-communication solutions. Continues the construction of a new bridge over the river connecting the city center with the Rector's Office of the University of Veliko Tarnovo, Sveta Gora Park and Sveta Gora Quarter, along which the transit car traffic will be conducted. The pedestrian network is denser in the northern part of the new city centre and less tight to its southern. It is proposed to build alleys in the area of the coastal protection zone. An interesting feature of the pedestrian network is a promenade with a shadow frame. Separation of a bicycle network is proposed. Another disadvantage of the project is the eclectic form of the bridge, which, unjustifiably economically and technically is winding over the river Yantra, imitating the style of Calatrava.

The project proposal presents solutions that build on the minimum requirements in the assignment.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.9552 receives 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No.3:**

#### **Volumetric spatial and artistic solution - 4 points**

By the project proposal, special attention is paid to the locations where the contact areas of the new city centre can be observed, as well as the markers indicating the territory as a center. The decision to

preserve the open space in the northwestern part of the territory is appropriate, given the preservation of the main entrance of the new city centre from the Arch of Generals and the predicted accumulation of large masses of people in this area for certain events. The project buildings have volumes corresponding to those of the existing buildings of the 5<sup>th</sup> campus building of the Veliko Tarnovo University, the District Administration and the Administrative Court, the scale of which “smashes” the surrounding territories building, as evidenced in the section with the Military Historical Archives. The shading structure of the pedestrian promenade is designed in natural materials. Concepts for furnishing the public spaces with lighting fixtures, water sites, landscaping and recreation areas are provided. A disadvantage of the project is the use of equal volumes and heights, typical for a peripheral city structure but not for a new city centre.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds on this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal provides good solutions to the requirements set in the Assignment.

According to the terms of the competition on this rating criterion, the project proposal No.9552 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.4:**

##### **Landscaping and public amenities concept - 4 points**

#### **Rating criterion No 4:**

##### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 4 p.**

The data about the geodetic survey and the evaluation of the tree vegetation were taken into consideration at the development of the town planning proposal, and the available high vegetation was preserved to the maximal degree. The green system is finally developed with proposals for differentiation of new green areas in the internal district spaces, the planting of single trees in the newly proposed pedestrian and square spaces, as well as the use of the roofs of the project buildings for additional green areas. It is anticipated to assemble solar panels on a part of the buildings. There are proposals also for elements of the urban furnishing which should collect and transform the solar energy into electricity. The main weak side of the concept for landscaping is the proposal of “hidden” visually internal gardens which do not offer broad public access. Although landscaped roofs were anticipated, they are also not visible for all the users of the New Urban Center.

Solutions are given with the concept leading to results which exceed the minimally required ones in conformity with the Terms of Reference.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 9552 obtains 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No 5:**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions - 4 p.**

A proposal is made with the project solution for the differentiation of two squares and a pedestrian promenade, with whose urban furnishing the idea for alternative production of energy and ecology-friendly way of life is popularized. The requirements with regard to the Terms of Reference are also covered and superstructured with the developed concept.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 9552 obtains 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No 6:**

##### **Solution sustainability - 4 p.**

The preceding measures for urbanization of the territory are reported in a correct manner in the Project Solution. The buildings functioning as of this time with the properties associated with them were preserved, as they are not the ownership of the Municipality and no town planning interferences

in them should be anticipated. The property with the building of the State Military Historical Archives and the residential block whose borders increase and the access to the archives remains open make an exception. The routes of the water supply and sewerage networks horizontally are conformed to the project solution. The available on the terrain valuable vegetation is preserved to a maximal degree. The natural terrain and the terrain particularities are used in the transportation-communication solutions in an effective manner. The preservation of the building of the former flour factory Belyanka is proposed as well as its transformation into a youth center. The Arch of the Generals is preserved as location and a part of the enclosing murals are exposed at the beginning of the pedestrian promenade with a shading structure.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No **9552** obtains 4 points.

---

**In total for town planning concept it obtains 24 points.**

**Rating criterion No 7:**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 4 p.**

The Project Proposal for a building of the Exposition Center has a clear and to a certain degree known concept for the shape formation of the voluminous spatial solution from the design of several pavilions in Milan, the more famous of which is the Slovenian realized during the period 2014-2015. The volume of the building was built up of a categorical shape skillfully located in the property, making use of the natural gradient of the terrain, so that its perception is different depending on the point of view but the feeling for a building and flesh is aggressive and intense, regardless of the airiness of the glazed ground floor. The Project attains monumental vision and minimalistic cleanness of the shapes and the materials. This effect is unsuccessful as it is intensified additionally also by the absence of segmentation and composition of the volume providing the feeling for the homogeneous entirety of the rock and the stone, elevated on a small number of metal columns, disproportionate as dimensions with the mass from above. Making use also of the natural gradient of the terrain, the authors deliberately build up visual imbalance of the shape in space, through emphasizing the gradient and creating exaggerated perspective, the shape becomes bigger, heavier and “comes down” towards its lower end /from Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street/. At the main approach to the building – from the New Urban Center, the vision is much calmer preserving the monumental language and materials and here the good sides and the advantages of the voluminous spatial solution are demonstrated to a full degree.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No **9552** obtains 4 points.

**Rating criterion No 8:**

**Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 4 p.**

The Project Proposal offers a well situated solution locating the building along the limitation lines in conformity with the competition conditions. The deployment of the shape and the volumes and not so much of the materials which it is built up with, come into conflict with the buildings of the surrounding construction, most of all with its emphatically big-size scale.

The 5<sup>th</sup> corpus of Veliko Tarnovo University and the residential buildings in the street will cohabit with such a monumental volume in their proximity with difficulty. On the other hand there is no such a problem with the building of the Regional Administration, even on the contrary – there is an interesting dialogue and cohabitation available at hand but the distance between the two buildings is sufficient for the purpose, which once more proves that more space and “air” are needed for the monumental vision. The perception of the building from the side of the newly designed urban space is good and significantly lighter. The pedestrian approaches to the building are solved from south,

southwest, with the exception of the automobile one to the underground level for parking. It is from northwest – from the newly designed street at an underground level between the building of the 5<sup>th</sup> corpus of Veliko Tarnovo University and the future Exposition Center, by which good functional possibilities are provided.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 9552 obtains 4 points.

**Rating criterion No 9:**

**Functional solution - 7 p.**

Functionally the Project offers a good solution providing a functional scheme at four main levels and a partial one, to wit: ground level – a main foyer and a big hall; an overground (partial) level – technical and administrative zones and two levels – underground parking.

The main foyer is located at the ground level and comprises almost the entire perimeter of the building with the exception of the section to Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street from the north and has excellent possibilities for conduct of exposition events offering a unified voluminous space with sufficient height and “air”. The foyer is richly glazed and its volume smoothly passes into amphitheatric shape in its eastern part, allowing for the conduct of various events as chamber concerts, theater performances for a small stage, lectures, chats and so on. The vertical communications are grouped and functionally divided, providing a good connection amongst all the levels through staircases, elevators and are sufficient for the capacity of the building. The Project Proposal for a Big Hall is with capacity 1200 seats and the flooring is even, but the shape of the hall is skillfully selected so that it should provide good visibility of the stage. The ceiling is also even but the height of the hall is sufficient to get segmented by acoustic murals which will provide good acoustic properties. A technical and installation ceiling (level) is also anticipated in the spatially-rod system of the coating, something exceptionally important and practical. The functional solution of the hall is good, providing easy access and evacuation to and from each seat, the needed number of entrances/exits was anticipated as well as evacuation such and they all are appropriately distributed. The Project anticipates an elongated foyer in front of the hall with access to a coffee-bar, a bookshop and so on, and sanitary units are anticipated at its ends which are insufficient for the capacity of the hall. The roof is richly landscaped and partially usable by visitors in a comparatively small part of its area, a photovoltaic installation is anticipated in the remaining part. The Project Proposal offers three underground levels for parking, which provides 150 parking spaces as well as a good transport-communication scheme. The other requirement of the competition programme for conduct of various events also in the exterior spaces around the building /in the event to the southeastern façade/ providing good possibilities for conduct of various events /concerts, performances, exhibitions and so on/ also in the open air is satisfied as well. With regard to the areas the Project Proposal satisfies the requirements of the competition programme. The solution is efficient at which premises (depot) are anticipated for the partition panels serving for transformation of a big hall as well as the anticipated cabins for simultaneous interpretation and technical personnel.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents efficient solutions, better than the minimal requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 9552 obtains 7 points.

**Rating criterion No 10:**

**Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 4 p.**

The Project Proposal for a building of the Exposition Center offers a comparatively simple scheme for transformation of a big hall into smaller halls making use of the entrances and the exits of the hall in such a manner that each separate part should have a provided access, respectively evacuation. Further to the required in conformity with the programme 6 small halls, the proposal provides also division into 2, 3, 4 and 5 smaller ones. The functional possibilities of the halls obtained at the

division in compliance with this Project Proposal are good, but the geometric discrepancy between the shape of the hall and the orthogonal raster of the division is a visible disadvantage. Following the radial structure of the rows it becomes clear that there is a more logical and practical division of the hall even into more than 6 parts, at that with different sized and shapes.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 9552 obtains 4 points.

**Rating criterion No 11:**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 7 p.**

The main foyer is located at a ground level and comprises almost the entire perimeter of the building with the exception of the section to Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street from the north and has excellent possibilities for conduct of exposition events offering a unified voluminous space with sufficient height and “air”. Further to that it is clearly designated /in conformity with the competition programme/ in the exterior and the interior of the building through the material of the façade – glass as opposed to the stone (the rock) in the remaining part of the building. This Project Proposal offers rich glazed space of the atrium type which does not need solar protection in its bigger volume due to its dense upper part. Its structure is complicated with various in shape and volume spaces, which supplement its functional possibilities for organization and conduct of various kinds of events, expositions and functions and the already described satisfaction of the other requirement of the competition programme is in addition to that, to wit, to provide possibility for conduct of various events also in the exterior spaces around the building /in this event to the southeastern façade/ offering good possibilities for the conduct of various events /concerts, performances, exhibitions and so on/ also in the open air, through opening of the amphitheatric part of the main foyer to the big open and plantigrade area in front of the façade.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents good solutions, better than the minimal requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 9552 obtains 7 points.

**Rating criterion No 12:**

**Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 4 p.**

The Project Proposal for a building of the Exposition Center offers a good energy efficient solution, making use of the roof area for location of a photovoltaic system in unison with the requirements of the European Union for zero consumption of energy for heating and lighting of the public buildings.

The shape of the building also allows use of passive protection at the changes in the weather conditions, in this event heat insulation of the entire dense volume. The Project Proposal for a building of the Exposition Center could be realized with standard and popular construction technologies, which assumes the use of standard construction technology and equipment, excluding the execution of the grassed green roof, whose unproblematic functioning the development of special details and use of specialized materials for reliable waterproofing, drainage and dewatering system and so on will be needed for. The combination of a photovoltaic system and the green roof is as a disadvantage of the Project Solution – it is known from practice that this combination is difficult for realization and maintenance, as well as impossible in most events due to the unfavorable “side” effects of this type of installations. Excluding this the materials input in the Project Proposal are natural and popular so that local suppliers and manufacturers may be used. The excavation works also do not spread out onto the entire property but are limited to the limitation lines of the construction. The Project Proposal also offers a good percentage of green area, including high vegetation.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents good solutions of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.



In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 9552 obtains 4 points.

Total for a concept of a building – **Exposition Center it obtains 30 points.**

---

## **Project No 5877 – 8 PLACE – Total 57 points**

### **Rating criterion No 1:**

#### **Functional solution, zoning and stage construction - 4 p.**

It is proposed by the Project Solution that the realization of the New Urban Center should be made in 5 stages which are well combined with the functional zoning of the territory. The construction of the exposition center as well as of several sites with commercial functions and a multitude of open-air public spaces is included in the first stage. The construction of the core of the New Urban Center is anticipated at second stage and the main part of the buildings with commercial (underground), residential (overground) and hotel functions will be included in it, as well as a new cultural center with a big underground parking lot. A form of a Public-Private Partnership (PPP) may be applied with regard to the implementation of both stages. It is indicated that the most southern part of the territory should be executed in the third stage, where the construction of hotel, residential and commercial sites is offered as well as a smaller district cultural center. The central western part and the pedestrian network in the zone with shore protective vegetation in the area of Stambolov's Bridge is indicated in the fourth stage. The construction of new administrative and educational buildings is offered in the proximity of the crossroads of Hristo Botev Street, and it is possible to provide funds for its execution in the preceding stages. The construction of a pedestrian network in the southeastern part of the zone with shore protective vegetation and the construction of some more residential, commercial and administrative buildings in the northwestern part of the New Urban Center are anticipated in the last phase. The categorical location of sites input as functions in the second stage of the implementation of an Integrated Plan for Urban Restoration and Development (IPURD) is not indicated in the Project Solution, but a part of the Project Sites and Spaces may be adapted for these purposes. Several open-air public spaces, sports sites and new park areas were offered, by which the public expectations to the New Urban Center are covered. Preservation of the fencing is anticipated. The solutions anticipated in the Project cover the minimally set up requirements and superstructure them in a good manner.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents a good solution of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 5877 obtains 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No 2:**

#### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 4 p.**

Efficient distribution of the automobile, the pedestrian and the cycling flows at two levels is offered by the Project Solution, and the automobile traffic and the parking will be realized at an underground level, and predominantly pedestrian and cycling connections will be developed at an overground level. Further to that the differentiation of a new bus tourist line is offered, whose beginning will be in the area of the crossroads with Hristo Botev Street, as well as of a cab-rank. New spaces for parking will be created at the implementation of the Project, by which the problem with parking in the central part of the city of Veliko Tarnovo will be alleviated. The Project Proposal provides solution for a transport-communication connection of the New Urban Center with the other parts of the city, and the transit automobile traffic from the center of the city in the direction of Park Sveta Gora, the University Administration of Veliko Tarnovo University and the district of Sveta Gora is input partially under the ground in the core of the territory. The improvement of the zone with shore protective vegetation with a well developed pedestrian network is anticipated. It is a weak side of the Project that transport access for cars is anticipated through Stambolov's Bridge, which is pedestrian

and is prohibited for motor vehicles as well as the main automobile approach to the territory from Hristo Botev Street.

The solutions anticipated in the Project cover the minimally set up requirements and superstructure them in a good manner.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents a good solution of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 5877 obtains 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No 3:**

#### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 1 p.**

A solution for entry of the New Urban Center into various in vision and nature urban zones in conformity with their historical development is provided by the Project Proposal. Investigation of the silhouettes of the street construction was conducted, which was not quite correctly dated. The construction is in rows or with a big frontal part, by which referral is made to the historical designation of the territory of the New Urban Center (Military School). The entrances of the bigger part of the buildings are orientated to the east or to the west and in length they follow the particularities of the relief and the terrain facts. A green buffer to the new construction as well as a wide sidewalk is anticipated in the northwestern part where residential construction is available from the left side of Hristo Botev Street. It is relevant that the proposal for the northern part of the territory should remain with bigger open-air spaces as it is expected that they will undertake bigger public masses taking into consideration the fact that the first and main entrance to the New Urban Center will be realized from the north due to location of the sites functioning as of this time, the future exposition center and the location of the New Urban Center with regard to the Yantra River, South Road Junction and these historical and administrative centers. The construction of a watchtower is offered in the southern part, which will remind that the territory was used for training of military men, but the tower will be used for a gallery for temporary exhibitions. The selection of the place for higher construction is correct because the southern part does not border directly on residential districts and is panoramically located above South Road Junction. The construction will be noticeable from South Road Junction, by which the Project fulfilled the recommendation in the Terms of Reference with regard to the anticipation of a marker, indicating the location of the New Urban Center. The differentiation of three panoramic sites with view to the picturesque historical center, Park Sveta Gora and Tarnovo Heights is offered, which a visual connection from the New Urban Center to the city will be created by. The predominant part of the buildings on the territory of the entire New Urban Center will not be high and will be in conformity with the scale of the visitors but the feeling for a center may be lost.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal covers only the minimal requirements of the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 5877 obtains 1 point.

### **Rating criterion No 4:**

#### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 4 p.**

The data with regard to the geodetic survey and the evaluation of the tree vegetation were taken into consideration at the development of the town planning proposal, and the available high vegetation was partially preserved by the solution. The green system is finally developed with proposals for differentiation of new green areas in internal district spaces and the planting of single trees in the newly proposed pedestrian and square spaces. The Project offers well thought out solutions for improvement of the territory including pavements with various materials and segmentation, park furnishing, street lighting commensurate with human scale. On the other hand the arranged tree vegetation creates allusion to the former function of this territory.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents a good solution of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 5877 obtains 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No 5:**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions - 4 p.**

A proposal is made by the Project Solution for the differentiation of diversified as a shape and functions open-air public spaces at level terrain, by which the requirements with regard to Terms of Reference are covered and superstructured. The Project Proposal provides a good innovative solution of the public spaces, in particular the anticipation of decking pavement in the main pedestrian lane, which in an interesting manner assumes the possibility for conduct of events. On the other hand comfort is created in the exterior space, which in a delicate and unobtrusive manner predisposes the visitors and creates sense for home atmosphere.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents a good solution of the requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 5877 obtains 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No 6:**

##### **Solution sustainability - 1 p.**

The preceding measures for improvement of the territory are taken into consideration in the Project Solution. The functioning as of this time buildings with the properties associated with them were reported by the Project. The routes of the water supply and sewerage networks horizontally were taken into consideration by the Project Solution. A part of the available on the terrain valuable vegetation was preserved. The natural relief and the terrain particularities after the realization of the water cycle were used, and the development of the New Urban Center in two levels and specific segmentation in the architectural volumes are anticipated with the Project.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal covers only the minimal requirements of the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 5877 obtains 1 point.

**Total for the town planning concept it obtains 18 points.**

---

#### **Rating criterion No 7**

##### **Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building – 7 p.**

The Project Proposal for a building of the Exposition Center has an original vision and concept for the shape formation of the voluminous spatial solution. The volume of the building is fully dug up into the terrain so that there is no building from the side of the New Urban Center. Making use of the natural gradient of the terrain the authors shade the manifestation of the volume and the scale of the building through its concealment from the looks of the visitors to the New Urban Center, turning their roof into spacious square spaces also for observation and contemplation accessible directly from the terrain. The vision of the building is not aggressive, it fits into the environment and has original characteristics. The voluminous spatial solution offers possibility for conduct of various events both in the interior and of external manifestations in the open air, autonomously from the events in the building. The Project offers a fully usable roof – in the shape of an open-air square space above the building including also the colonnade of the 5<sup>th</sup> corpus. An intelligent concept and a skillfully balanced vision at the façade of the building from the north /from Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street/.

The solution is interesting with possibility for conduct of various events both in the exterior and in the interior.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal presents efficient solutions, better than the minimal requirements set up in the Terms of Reference.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 5877 obtains 7 points.

### **Rating criterion No 8**

#### **Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment – 10 p.**

The Project Proposal offers a well situated solution, locating the building along the limitation lines, in conformity with the competition conditions. The deployment of the volumes as well as the shape and the materials it was built up with do not come in conflict with the surrounding construction, on the contrary – it provides maximal manifestation of the buildings in the neighborhood – the building of the 5<sup>th</sup> corpus of Veliko Tarnovo University and of the Regional Administration, providing them with possibility for maximal manifestation in the newly designed urban space. The idea of youth living and functional urban center with well landscaped pedestrian lanes, square and park spaces is present everywhere here. The digging up of the volume of the building into the terrain creates the feeling for a smaller building observing it from the north and northeast along Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street, which contributes to the exposition center being commensurate in scale to the existing construction from the other side of the street. The approaches to the building were solved from the north. The automobile approach to the underground level for parking is from northeast /Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street/. The anticipation of the building is innovative, original and in a manner, intensifying the visual impact of the building of the 5<sup>th</sup> corpus of Veliko Tarnovo University, in parallel to which the solution for the underground street located between the Exposition Center and the 5<sup>th</sup> corpus of Veliko Tarnovo University is original and unobtrusive as well as the inclusion of the inner courtyard of the University Building to the network of the public spaces.

On the basis of the grounds described hereinabove with regard to this rating criterion the Selection Committee decided that this Project Proposal satisfied and superstructures the requirements in the Terms of Reference in the most efficient and original manner.

In conformity with the conditions of the competition under this rating criterion Project Proposal No 5877 obtains 10 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.9:**

#### **Functional solution – 7pts**

The project offers different spaces, in both scale and proportions, to provide different types of events. Good solution to acoustics and illumination. A good solution to the building's functional scheme. Short terrain evacuation paths are provided. The requirements of an accessible environment have been met. An underground parking level is provided. The area distribution requirements between the different functional areas are respected. With the planned English courtyard in the south of the building, a good and efficient functional solution is given, allowing the building's functions to be expanded and enhanced. Effective and rational is the decision to use the height of the main foyer for two-level regrouping, where it is possible to run events independently of each other, thereby expanding its functionality. The project offers a visual link between the two levels in several different locations, one at the spiral staircase of the main foyer and the other in the diametrically located corner.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal No. 5877 receives 7 points.

### **Rating criterion No.10:**

#### **Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution – 7pts**

The space of a large hall is consistent of one capacity, including a balcony. The project proposal offers a good solution for partitioning a Grand Hall, including variation, where it is transformed into 2,3,4,5 and 6 smaller halls. Transformation is interesting and relatively easy to accomplish, due to the possibility of unilateral barriers in the balcony and sub-space. An inconvenience is the overly elongated form of one of the small halls, obtained by dividing a large hall into 6 parts. Given the complex shape of a large hall in the building, the solution for transformation into smaller halls is extremely efficient and efficient, using rational space on the balcony and sub-floor. The remainder of the partition remains at a double height, which implies the existence of halls of varying heights, which allows for events of different nature.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 5877** receives 7 points.

### **Rating criterion No.11:**

#### **Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER – 1pt**

The project envisages the main lobby as a separate volume but, by nature, spaces are insufficient as a useful area with the possibility of separation and partitioning, which limits the possibilities for conducting different events, in practice only the minimum requirements of the assignment for this space are covered.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 5877** receives 1 point.

### **Rating criterion No.12**

#### **Environmental and energy-efficient solutions – 7pts**

The project proposal for the Exposition Center building offers a good energy efficient solution, providing the possibility of passive protection against temperature changes, by the introduction of heat insulation systems and the use of natural heat exchange between the terrain and the building in the excavated part. The project offers a rational solution that makes it effective for building the building and using natural terrain to achieve this effect. The building could be built with standard and generally available building technologies, which implies the use of standard construction equipment and equipment, excluding the use of the fully usable roof, whose smooth operation will require the development of special details and the use of specialized materials for reliable heat and waterproofing. Apart from this, the materials included in the project proposal are natural and generally available, so local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. Excavation works extend almost to the entire estate, not just to the limiting lines of construction, which means the project to a lesser extent preserves existing trees. The project offers landscaping in the property as well, including high vegetation.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 5877** receives 7 points.

**Total for Conception of a building - Exposition Center receives 39 points.**

---

### **Project No. 9177 - 7 PLACE - total 60 points**

#### **Rating criterion No.1:**

##### **Functional solution, zoning, and stage construction – 7pts**

The project proposes an original solution whereby the implementation of the New City Centre is carried out in as many steps as the design buildings. The proposal is that the vision and value of each building in the New City Centre be determined as a result of a competition. This will ensure that the territory develops as an attractive and appealing centre and the best balance between vision and financial value will be sought. The design decision specifies the categorical location of sites that are assigned as functions in the second stage of implementation of the Integrated Urban Recovery and Development Plan. Several open public spaces, sports facilities and new park areas are offered to meet the public expectations of the New City Centre. It is foreseen to keep the Ark of Generals and of Belyanka.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 9177** received 7 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.2:**

##### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 4pts**

The project solution develops pedestrian and bicycle connections as a matter of priority and provides multiple underground parking spaces, which is very important for the proper functioning of the New City Centre. The pedestrian network is well developed in the area of coastal vegetation, consisting of specially differentiated alleys and density at the core of the territory thanks to the unoccupied spaces between the design buildings. It is proposed to change the route of the bus line, which should have a stop in the north-western part of the territory. The project proposal does not provide a solution for the transport-communication connection of the New City Centre with the other parts of the city by taking the transit motorway from the city centre towards Sveta Gora Park, the rectorate of VTU and Sveta Gora.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No.9177** received 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.3:**

##### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution – 1pt**

The project proposal gives a decision to enter the New City Center in different urban areas according to their historical development. A survey was conducted on the neighbourhood structures of urban development, the conclusions of which were adapted to the project development. New buildings are planned not to be of high height, to have stone facing and highly articulated elements, which is in line with the scale of the visitors. It is wrong to conclude that traditionally roofs of buildings can be flat and highly usable. The proposal is feasible with more funds, but is more suitable for softer weather conditions and a country with different customs. More intense construction is envisaged in the western part, which could be in violation of the sanitary conditions of living in the buildings on the left side of "Hristo Botev" Str. There are two large-scale buildings in the northern part of the New city centre, making a visual connection with the existing buildings of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the District Administration. The central longitudinal axis envisages a lower construction, whose dissected shapes can be referred to the architectural style "Deconstructivism", which is opposed to the style in which the buildings of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the District Administration were

built. On the roofs of buildings in this direction it is proposed to separate small gardens. Their height is gradually increasing in the southern direction, where two towers visible from the Southern junction and other parts of the city are planned to meet the recommended requirement in the assignment to find a distinctive marker. With the opportunity to use the roof spaces, it provides views of the picturesque historical centre, Sveta Gora Park and Turnovo Heights, creating a visual link from the New City Center to the city.

The concept meets the minimum requirements for a job.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 9177** received 1 point.

#### **Rating criterion No.4:**

##### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept – 4pts**

When drawing up the town planning proposal, data on geodetic surveying and assessment of tree vegetation were considered, with the decision partially preserving the high vegetation available. The green system has been further developed with proposals to create new green areas on the roofs of most of the design buildings. It is envisaged the establishment of a park with sports playgrounds in the south-eastern part of the territory.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 9177** received 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.5:**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions – 1pt**

The draft decision proposes the establishment of small green areas on the roofs of buildings designed for a narrower range of users. 1 p. The concept meets the minimum requirements for a job.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 9177** received 1 point.

#### **Rating criterion No.6:**

##### **Solution sustainability – 4pts**

The project solution considers the previous developments in the development of the territory. The project has been properly accounted for by buildings currently in operation with their adjacent properties as they are not the property of the municipality and no urban development interventions should be envisaged. With the design solution, the routes of the water supply and sewerage networks are considered horizontally. Preserved part of the valuable vegetation available on terrain.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 9177** received 4 points.

**Total for City Planner concept receives 21 points.**

---

#### **Rating criterion No.7:**

### **Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building – 7pts**

The Exposition Centre building's proposal has an original and interesting concept that creates a new "fantasy" reality using the features of the field topography. Visually, the proposal is dangerously bordering on the puppet set-up, but the border is yet not crossed. Using the large displacement of the terrain, the artists conceal the building under a sculptured roof imitating a highly hilly terrain, richly landscaped, with access from the big square to all New City Centre visitors, including disabled people. From the north the building has a different look and looks like a medieval bastion. The roof structure will be made of steel beam supporting a curved concrete ceiling, usable with pedestrian access. The bulky spatial solution is good, offering the possibility of different events, both in the exterior and in the interior. The project offers different spaces, such as scale and proportions, to provide different types of events.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 9177** received 7 points.

### **Rating criterion No.8:**

#### **Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 4pts**

The building is located in the boundary lines given in the task. It does not create conflicts with the surrounding space and the existing building. The peculiarities of the terrain and the approaches to the building towards the street level are respected. The author uses a local stone for the facade and this is a clear signal of the quality of the building and the significance of this new construction, the symbolic beginning of revitalization and respect for building traditions.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 9177** received 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No.9:**

#### **Functional solution - 7pts**

The project offers a clear functional scheme with different spaces, such as scale and proportions, to provide different types of events. It gives a good solution for acoustics and illumination. It offers short escape routes, as well as servicing areas in the building. The requirements of an accessible environment have been met. 108 parking spaces are provided in underground parking. 21 places are provided in an over-ground parking lot. The area distribution requirements between the different functional areas are respected. The hall offers 1,200 seats. The requirement for built-up and unfolded built-up area of the building is complied with. The proposal for the foyer and the hall to be on one level is extremely efficient because, due to the short connections between them, there is a possibility of symbiosis between the spaces in connection with the holding of a certain type of events and the opening of the hall is allowed to increase its capacity.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal **No. 9177** received 7 points.

### **Rating criterion No.10:**



### **Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 4 points;**

The hearth of the building is the big oval hall. The flexible structure of the hall after the transformation allows simultaneous use of up to six different spaces. The project offers a good solution for dividing the Big Hall, including the option for 2,3,4,5 and 6 small halls. It offers a good solution for acoustics and lighting of the hall. Each of the 6 separate halls has separate entrances and evacuation exits. The Hall has a large comfortable backstage with all the necessary dressing rooms and sanitary premises.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents a good solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.9177 receives 4 points.

### **Rating criterion No.11:**

#### **Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER – 7 points;**

The main foyer is easily recognisable, as a location, both from the exterior and from the interior of the building. External pedestrian and transport access to it is provided, including from car parks through elevators and staircases. It has a separate and representative entrance/exit. The foyer has enough area and space for organizing and conducting various events. It has direct connections to vertical communications - staircases, lifts and ramps. Natural lighting with the necessary sun protection measures and equipment is provided. The interior of the area in an especially efficient way fits into the overall concept of the author, as in an interesting way, through the shape of the ceiling, the arches of the 5th building of the University of Veliko Tarnovo are repeated. With the stairs planned in the big foyer overflowing and in the external environment, the condition of the competition program is fulfilled for the possibility of simultaneous conducting of events by opening the building to the surrounding space. The big foyer connects the northern and southern entrances with reception area, information area, cloakroom and sanitary premises. There are two restaurants - one accessible from a lower level, and the second - from the upper level and the roof, and it has an open-air terrace. The premises for the administration are located in an efficient way, helping for the fast and quality service of the building.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions that are better than the minimum requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.9177 receives 7 points.

### **Rating criterion No.12:**

#### **Environmental and energy-efficient solutions – 10 points;**

The building is designed in accordance with the principles of sustainability and energy efficiency. The shape of the building is compact. The whole building is planned to be ventilated naturally using roof windows located at the top of the roof, which also perform an additional role for the chimney effect. The entire roof of the building is designed to be green and to function as a large public garden. The green roof reduces the heating of the building during the summer, as well as shading by the high vegetation. Effective and original is the solution where the green roof ensures rainwater retention and natural filtration, which increases its usefulness, for example for flushing toilets and watering the plot. The vegetation on the roof provides additional protection for the waterproofing, which increases the durability of the entire roof. The green roof significantly improves the balance of the biologically active surface and contributes to the creation of a healthy microclimate. The energy concept of the building is based on the renewable energy sources - geothermal heat pump.

The building is fully accessible for disabled people. It is planned in the project to preserve the maximum number of the existing trees. For the construction of the building will be used environmentally friendly, durable materials that can be obtained from local producers such as stone, concrete, reinforced concrete, heat-insulating glass. The planned solution is original in nature and it builds up the requirements set out in the terms of reference in the most efficient and original way,

using innovative techniques, methods and technologies and entirely green solutions, the realization of which reduces the expenses related to the operation of the building.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal fulfils and builds up the requirements set out in the terms of reference in the most efficient and original way.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.9177 receives 10 points.

**Total for the concept of the building - Exposition Centre receives 39 points.**

---

### **Project No.4134 – 6th PLACE – total 69 points**

#### **Rating criterion No.1:**

##### **Functional solution, zoning, and stage construction - 7 points**

The project corresponds to the relief of the territory. The new city centre is designed as a network of various construction to the west, and a green square inclined towards the Yantra River, offering panoramic views east to the old city area. Through three new entry arteries in the west-east direction, the project allows free access to the entire territory, the public spaces and the square, and the raised pedestrian way leads the visitor across the trees and to the Yantra River. The main route runs along the terrain from the exposition centre on the north to the library on the south, combining different sites and three public parks. A big pedestrian corridor crossing the area west-east leads to the central square of the New City Centre. The main square is designed to have an adjustable artificial landscape - hardscape. A system of rails allows the "wagon benches" to be situated anywhere in the space or to be stowed at both ends and to allow large crowds of people to gather in the square during concerts or larger public events. The project proposal offers a scheme developed in detail for staged construction of the territory which is economically and socially compliant with the competition requirements.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions that are better than the minimum requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 7 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.2:**

##### **Transport and communication solution and parking – 4 points**

The streets according to the Detailed Development Plan are preserved. The project offers a proposal for the development of the pedestrian network, zigzag type, in the area with vegetation for coastal protection and a proposal for a pedestrian connection between the New City Centre and the transport area. It also proposes the creation of a new bus route and a bus stop in the interior of the New City Centre. The author also plans three road arteries that pass from East to West, set up with public and small commercial areas, ending on three squares ready for public use. Underground parking lots are planned to be built on two levels underground, in preparation for the residential and commercial functions that will be carried out in the future on the territory. The proposal offers a dislocated situation of the entrances/exits to and from the territory, which in itself is good, but given the terrain features and the intensive traffic on Hristo Botev Street, it will be difficult to use it. The transport solution for the territory is determined by one-way streets, including on an underground level.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents a good solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.3:**

##### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 7 points**

The proposal offers underground and over-ground construction. The underground construction has commercial functions and the majority of the above-ground construction has residential, office and hotel functions, which is not in contrast to the existing building in the historical centre and along the Hristo Botev Street. The southernmost part of the terrain, following the formed cultural axis along the

entire terrain, becomes an area with luxurious first-class buildings with mixed functions - residential and commercial. New restaurants and hotels make the place a gastronomic destination in the region. The alley at the southeast end allows local residents and city tourists to explore the boundary of the site with Yantra and views of Sveta Gora. Restaurants near Hristo Botev Street as well as a football field unite the public beside the university, and a tourist centre and exhibition of outdoor photography connect the Marno Pole Park with the main pedestrian alley of the site. The planned construction is sufficiently distant from the existing one, which meets the requirements for natural lighting, direct sunlight and ventilation of the area. The pedestrian routes are planned to be in zig zag way. The project offers the creation of three squares with visual links to the historical centre, the Tsarevets hill and the South junction. It also proposes to preserve the building of the Belyanka factory and to renovate it in an art residence. The construction of a new library for the completion of the cultural axis and further activation of the southern end of the site is among the supporting points for attracting the cultural flow in this part of the territory. Once the parking is settled on underground levels in the western part of the terrain it is planned to construct buildings with various functions, with larger projects being planned where there is no planned underground parking lot, namely in the eastern part of the terrain.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions that are better than the minimum requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 7 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.4:**

##### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept – 7 points**

Minimal removal of existing tree vegetation is planned. Careful selection of existing and newly planted trees will allow people to walk around and enjoy the paths covered with greenery. The project plans that after completion and implementation of all future programs, free spaces will be turned into a series of yards linked together to stimulate the community and allow and encourage the cultivation of fruit trees. A series of basketball, tennis courts and playgrounds become powerful attractive centres and places to communicate, build and develop a sense of community.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions that are better than the minimum requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 7 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.5:**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions – 7 points**

The first step the authors are making is the New City Centre to connect with the city's pedestrian and transport network and stimulate public flow through it. The former Belyanka factory is designed for an artistic residence, and the former barracks building becomes an art gallery. The Expo Centre is built and designed in such a way as to activate and be a focal point of the cultural axis. Interesting and innovative is the solution for the zig-zag design of the pedestrian routes in the territory with coastal protection function. The eastern part of the site offers panoramic views of the Yantra River, Sveta Gora, Trapezitsa and Tsarevets. It is for this reason that the project offers a very good solution, with raised pedestrian paths for passing through the dense vegetation in this area. The proposed free spaces are united in yards where various public events can be organized, such as outdoor lessons and others. The proposed open spaces offer a safe environment for parents and children without cars.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions that are better than the minimum requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 7 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.6:**

##### **Solution sustainability - 4 points**

A dense concentration of sites is planned, the realization of which and the operation of which can provide an economic return. Integrated in a good way are the preceding measures for spatial development - water cycle, landscaping, functioning buildings, relief, etc. The design solution is in line with the built water supply and sewerage network. The street east of the property is preserved for an exposition centre. The project has taken into account the buildings that are functioning right now with the adjoining properties. In an efficient and easy way, the vegetation for coastal protection has been used to create recreation areas and pedestrian zones for residents of the city and its guests.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents a good solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 4 points.

**Total for the city-planning concept receives 36 points.**

---

**Rating criterion No.7:**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building – 7 points**

The solution for the façade to be made of visible brick masonry is interesting and original. It is inspired by local architectural traditions and used building materials. On the other hand, the brick façades are represented as curtains of different lengths and recesses in the plan. The recess in each of them increases, along with the increase in the floor. The roof of the building is usable, offering a stepped space forming square with partial landscaping. The project has taken into account the peculiarity of terrain.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions that are better than the minimum requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.8:**

**Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment – 7 points**

The project cleverly overcomes the terrain peculiarities for the situating of the building, so it does not create conflict with the surrounding building. The building is situated in the boundary lines given in the terms of reference. Its main façade is made of glass and overlooks the Sveta Gora.

The main entrance of the main foyer is from the north, and the project also plans additional entrances from the east. The visible brick masonry offered by the project as a basic element of the façades is a common traditional technique in the revival architecture of old town of Turnovo, including in the work of Master Kolyo Ficheto. Towards the new city, the building opens with a glazed exhibition space on the ground floor, which is in line with modern architecture. The main entrance of the building is from Alexander Stamboliyski Street on the north. The solution offers rich landscaping in the property, including high vegetation.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions that are better than the minimum requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion No.9:**

**Functional solution – 4 points**

The requirements for the built-up area of the building, respectively for the floorage area, are satisfied. The solution for the functional scheme of the building is good, it offers the option for conducting different events, both in the exterior and in the interior, due to the spaces of different scales and proportions. The solution for acoustics and lighting is good. The requirements for spatial distribution between the different functional areas have been complied with. There is an entrance at the level of Alexander Stamboliyski Street, as space becomes a public square, under which there is a parking lot with direct access from the street. The open space in front of the building welcomes visitors in the new building and allows the events to take place outside, as well as to take part people from surrounding areas and neighbourhoods. Taking advantage of the topography of the plot, the roof of

the building is slanted. Seamlessly merges with the terrain and expands the space around, forming a large public square with cinema, outdoor furnishings and views of the old town and neighbouring hills. The western part of the exposition centre is connected with the natural slope of the terrain, expanding one of its internal spaces - a foyer to the exterior, forming an outside terrace and an alternative entrance point to the building. The program of the exposition centre is divided into two functional components: 1. a hall that requires full protection from light and sound but accessibility from all sides; and 2. an administrative component that manages and maintains it. Each of these programs requires maintenance, thus occupying separate but adjacent positions in the site. Parking is entirely underground, allowing free use of space in front of the exposition centre.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents a good solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.10:**

##### **Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 7 points**

The hall offers 1291 seats. The project offers a very good solution for dividing the Big Hall. It consists of a large space that can be divided into six smaller zones, including options for 2,3,4,5 and 6 small halls, each of which can function separately and different events can be organized simultaneously. The moving walls can separate the halls of different sizes - from 100 to 250 square meters.

The lack of fixed seats, combined with a height-adjustable floor allows the space to be suited to different events and allows a completely free planning. The volume of the large hall is surrounded by a group of service spaces. At the top level, there is a technical floor that includes control rooms, audio equipment, interpretation booths and projectors. The ceiling is made of steel construction, which allows the installation and management of artistic lighting and sound in all 6 areas of the hall. Halls with the smallest area are located at the far end and far away from the foyer and therefore the largest hall is closest to the communications and the foyer because it is planned for the gathering of large numbers of people. At the same time, the hall is organized in a way that when it comes to welcoming and hosting major events, thanks to its flexible and movable floor, it can become flat. The movable floor allows the six halls to be raised simultaneously and to be organized in one space, which is useful for events focused on the stage.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents efficient solutions that are better than the minimum requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 7 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.11:**

##### **Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER – 4 points**

The internal organization of the building consists of two uneven spaces separated from each other so that the space of the main foyer is formed between them. On the one hand, the Big Hall with the service premises to it, and on the other, the volume of the administrative area including the vertical connections, the sanitary premises with public access on the first level. On the second level there is a bar-restaurant and on the third - administrative premises. This solution visually stretches the shape of the building, leaving space for other events. Additional public spaces such as a cafe and a bookstore are located below the stairs and foyers on each floor outside the main exhibition hall. The foyer is well organized, activating the space around the building - an open square to the north, as a place for performances and art exhibitions, as well as a café and bookstore in the south-eastern part in the direction of Sveta Gora.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents a good solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 4 points.

#### **Rating criterion No.12:**

### **Environmental and energy-efficient solutions – 4 points**

The solution offers landscaping in the property, including high vegetation. The project proposal for an Exposition Centre building offers energy-efficient solutions for this type of building. The roof is usable with pedestrian access directly from the terrain, space is formed as a square with partial landscaping.

The other major advantage of the project is the compact volume of the building. The project proposal for an exposition centre building is relatively easy to execute. Building technologies through which the building project can be realized are standard and generally available, which implies the use of standard construction machinery and equipment. The materials are natural and generally available, so local suppliers and manufacturers can be used.

On the basis of the above-mentioned reasons for this rating criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presents a good solution to the requirements set out in the terms of reference.

According to the terms of the competition under this rating criterion the project proposal No.4134 receives 4 points.

**Total for the concept of the building - Exposition Centre receives 33 points.**

---

### **Project № 2082 - 5 PLACE - total 69 points**

#### **Rating criterion No.1:**

#### **Functional solution, zoning, and stage construction - 7 pts.**

This project considers the location of the new city centre and takes into account the terrain specificities. The vision of the author and his model of the city as an open process become clear from the conceptual solution. The creation of a new central place is not just about building new structures, but much more about initiating and managing flexible development. The free, central spaces without cars create the backbone of a new city centre. The territory is organized to condense social, commercial and labour activities, as well as some of the living spaces (hotels and apartments). The invaluable ecosystem around the river is connected with the city, crossing its backbone through a series of green corridors. The authors decide in a very elegant and discreet way the phasing and the gradual realization of the territory. The construction of the main cross streets is necessary to connect the new zones with the existing city. Consequently, they define the boundaries of the different phases, according to which the new field can be easily developed. It is proposed to saturate with implementation objects that provide economic returns.

The project proposal presents effective solutions that are better than the minimum requirements in the task.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 7 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №2:**

#### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 7 pts.**

The design solution meets the specified parameters in the job. The project is designed to provide automotive access via two of the streets laid down in the detailed development plan. The central longitudinal axis becomes a pedestrian and wide street and the two streets pass underground underneath it. This solution solves the problem of road traffic and, in a very delicate and seamless way, allows cars to pass through the developed territory without creating conflicts with pedestrian routes. In parallel, with the main so-called "backbone" of the territory, there is an alternative road traffic offered around the ring road, which provides silence in the central parts of the territory. Bypassing the entire territory of the New City Center, the central backbone, filled with commercial, hotel and cultural functions, is left free of cars. The Mobile intersection is located at the entrance where it is possible to exchange between cars, public transport and bicycles. Finally, three pedestrian paths link the greenery along the river to the urban environment. Under the newly conceived building

construction are proposed underground parking lots. The series of underground garages are proposed to be built under the buildings as well as under the pedestrian central area. In this way the proximity of vehicles can be increased. The number of parking spaces offered meets the minimum requirements. The role of urban planning is to define a flexible / mobile footprint for the urban manufacturing process. The aim is to create a controlled framework of freedom in which as many and varied participants as possible can corespond and reproduce the city. In this task, the author has succeeded in identifying minimal qualities and structures from which he can develop a truly diverse urban fabric. Fabric that will provide a framework for future development and transformation to significantly increase the sustainability of the basic urban concept.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 7 points.

### **Rating Criterion №3:**

#### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 7 pts.**

A new development is planned, the height of which is to increase in the direction of the river and the South Road Junction, and along the broad pedestrian street, the building is connected to a middle floor and imitates the building on the existing commercial streets in the city. The height and intensity of construction are logical for the functions of a new city center. The proposed high-rise building on the periphery of the New City Center on the South Road Junction performs the functions of a marker designating the location of the New City Center. A set of rules are used in the project design to regulate the height of the buildings offering flexibility, considering the nature of each area, the width of the streets and the distance. The decision clearly recognizes that it is not necessary for all buildings to look similar in order to reach some order in urban fabric. On the contrary, the authors propose to define a clear framework of rules that have as many different architectural styles as possible, which greatly enriches the urban landscape. The author uses single elements that contribute to creating a bond in urban fabric and to strengthen centralism. This is the case of the hotel and the Exposition Center at both ends of the central backbone, which determine the tissue structure and visibility. The author decides the connection between the new city center and the existing urban landscape with a flexible and porous structure that mediates between the existing residential streets and the backbone of the new central spaces. In the same way, it solves the connection with the green corridor along the river.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 7 points.

### **Rating Criterion №4:**

#### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 4 pts.**

The proposal proposes partial removal of the available tree vegetation. Compensation offers street landscaping and low vegetation on rooftops and balconies. Interesting is the decision to build terraces that reduce the relative scale of architecture and free enough room for free spaces and natural biodiversity. They also contribute to mutual exposure and interaction between internal and external spaces. A series of transverse green corridors intersect the area, increasing its permeability to

surrounding areas, uniting the entire territory with the rest of the nearby green areas. They bring a greenery in the city and make the area of the river accessible for both pedestrians and cyclists. The comparatively low roof area around the central part of the site plays the role of the so-called "fifth facade" of the project. It is qualified as a green space in the project and is scheduled to be programmed in coordination between several individual plots.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference that go beyond the minimum requirements.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 4 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №5:**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions- 10 pts.**

Conceived is a connecting construction along the wide pedestrian street, and in the sections where the routes of the water and sewerage networks are laid, the construction is console raised. The intended transit traffic is underground and will not hinder the operation of the site as a New City Center. The author uses various tools to create a coordinated urban image. For example: the height of the ground floor, the visual continuity of the plinths and the crown elements, key to achieving the image of the public space and activating it. The authors' proposal for a different spatial identity, which is adapted to changing contextual circumstances, is very interesting. The functions of the public space - recreation, sport, green, games, etc. can be summarized in such a way as to become interchangeable, mobile, flexible and sustainable. The project proposes that parking spaces be built as adaptable structures that can adopt alternative programs such as cultural, social or commercial activities, given that in the future, cars as we know them have already disappeared.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 gets 10 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №6:**

##### **Solution sustainability – 7pts.**

A good strategy for building the new city center has been proposed. Time, not just space, is an essential element of urban production. In this sense, coordinated management of events in the area is as important as the very construction of physical space. The author describes a set of rules for the development of urban space without determining the outcome. The focus is on processes and associated levels of architecture to transfer as many levels of planning freedom as possible. In this way, the author aims at maximizing the diversity and adaptability of the city. While the territory being developed contains more strategic merit, this set of rules is obviously tactical. It consists of protocols, operations, policies, relationships and qualities that guide planning and configure urban structures. To drive success in the development and sustainability of retail space, the author uses the concentration method. All retail outlets are concentrated around the center - the "backbone" - to reach the "critical mass" for its activation and to generate relevant centralization in the city. The project does not affect the available infrastructure and construction thus to be retained.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.



Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 7 points.

**Total for city-planning concept receives 42 points.**

---

**Rating Criterion №7:**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 4pts.**

The Exposition Center plays a decisive role in the urban structure, acting as a closing element of the spine in the territory at its northern end.

The high volume of the building adapts to the surrounding elements and the peculiarities of the terrain by visual adjustment along the roof edges by decreasing its height. In this way, it adapts the scale to that of the university building, while the facade to the river and the old town remains above the tops of the trees, and the facade of the building towards the square is designed as an information wall that can display news, advertising, screenings of events and etc. The solution offers a visual breakthrough on the ground level providing a visual corridor to the old city part, which has made the height of the building necessary. The materials are metal and ceramics, which breaks the monotony of the building at the entrance and between the surrounding buildings with classical strict architecture.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 4 points.

**Rating Criterion №8:**

**Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment – 4 pts.**

The building is located in the boundary limits given in the assignment. It does not create conflicts with the surrounding space and the existing building. The peculiarities of the terrain and the approaches to the building towards the street level are respected. In volume terms, it corresponds to the neighboring buildings, and the proposed facade stands out as a marker for the future city center. Despite the above, we believe that the building has an inadequate height, which is not an effective solution.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 4 points.

**Rating Criterion №9:**

**Functional solution - 4pts.**

The project offers different spaces, such as scale and proportions, to provide different types of events both inside and outside the building. There is a clear functional scheme. The requirements of an accessible environment have been met. There are two underground parking levels as well as ground parking. The requirements for the distribution of the areas between the different functional areas have been complied with. Vertical communications are provided through elevators, escalators and staircases of sufficient capacity. Evacuation routes are relatively short. The proposed functional allocation builds on the minimum requirements for a job.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 4 points.

**Rating Criterion №10:**

**Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 7pts.**

There is a large hall meeting the requirements of the competition, in view of the positioning of the seats and the ceilings and provides a good solution for the acoustics and illumination of the hall. The entrances to and from the hall are 8 in number, well positioned and provide good evacuation and good opportunities for transformation. The flexible structure of a large hall allows the simultaneous use of

up to six different spaces / small halls /. In four of these, it is provided that both the terraced and the flat / flat spatial configurations are provided by retractable seats. In the other two there is a flexible flooring system that allows conventional space use as well as a more sophisticated configuration. With the proposed variations of seats and floors, an effective solution is foreseen, in which it is possible to carry out simultaneously and without conflicts different events in character and content.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 7 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №11:**

##### **Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 7pts.**

The main lobby has an easily recognizable location both from the exterior and the interior of the building. External pedestrian and transport access is available, including car parks. It has a separate and representative entrance / exit from the south, including six openings. It has enough space and space and height for organizing and conducting different events. There are direct connections to the other functional areas through vertical communications - staircases, elevators and ramps sufficient for the building's capacity. Natural lighting with the necessary sun protection measures and facilities is provided. Thus, the solution builds upon the minimum requirements in the job without presenting effective and original ideas. The first-level visual breakthrough of the building is linked directly to the main lobby areas where it is possible to perform free lighting events, while the lower level of the lobby allows for the holding of exhibitions and events with controlled lighting mode.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 received 7 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №12:**

##### **Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 1pts.**

The project proposal for an Exposition Center building offers a standard energy efficient solution for this type of building, using the option of installing facade thermal insulation systems, including a double façade built of steel or ceramic elements. The project proposal for a building of the Exposition Center is relatively easy to implement. Building technologies with which the building can be realized are standard and generally available, which implies the use of standard construction equipment and equipment. The materials are natural and generally available, so local suppliers and manufacturers can be used.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal №2082 receives 1 point.

##### **Total conception of a building - Exposition Center receives 27 points.**

---

**Projects numbered 4134 and 2082 have an equal number of points, with priority being given to the project, whose city-planning concept has a higher number of points, so that in the 6th place is project № 4134, and on 5 places is Project No 2082.**

---

**Project No. 3222 - 4 PLACE - a total of 72 points**

#### **Rating Criterion №1:**

##### **Functional solution, zoning, and stage construction - 7pts.**

The project solution proposes the realization of the New City Center to be carried out in two stages - underground and aboveground. On the underground level will be part of the streets, car-carriers, as well as the underground parking lots without which it is impossible for the New City Center to function properly. There is no suggestion how to financially ease the assignor in the realization at this

stage. The second stage is further divided into 4 phases. In the first one is proposed to build the exhibition center. The second and the third inventive way is the realization of two-sided construction along the pedestrian boulevard in the longitudinal direction consisting of multifunctional objects that attract the interest of the people to the NCC and provide revenues for the contracting authority for the realization of the public spaces in the different phases of development. Lower building is scheduled to happen in the earlier phase. Functions of new buildings include recreation and sport, developing on the roofs of the lower bodies. As a final stage, the construction of educational and sports facilities near Hristo Botev Str. The project decision does not specify the categorical location of sites assigned as functions in the second stage of implementation of the Integrated Urban Recovery and Development Plan, but part of the project sites and spaces can be adapted for these purposes. There are many open public spaces, sports facilities and new park areas to meet the public expectations of the New City Center. It is planned to preserve the building of the former "Belyanka" flour factory without a specific function. The proposed solution is logical as a realization but is not appropriate for the current economic capacity of the contractors.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 receives 7 points.

### **Rating Criterion №2:**

#### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 7pts.**

The design solution offers a very good distribution of the car, pedestrian and bicycle streams on two levels, with underground parking and parking, and pedestrian and bicycle connections will be developed aboveground. In addition, it is proposed to create a new bus line with stops in the area of the exhibition center and in the heart of the territory. New parking spaces will be created during the project, which will alleviate the problem of parking and parking in the central part of Veliko Tarnovo. The project proposal does not provide a solution for the transport-communication connection of the New City Center with the other parts of the city by conducting the transit traffic from the city center towards Sveta Gora Park, the rectorate of VTU and Sveta Gora.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 receives 7 points.

### **Rating Criterion №3:**

#### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 4pts.**

The project proposal provides a solution for the integration of the New City Center into the existing urban environment. The open public spaces are terraced, making an interesting reference to the historic center. It is also planned to build buildings with a modern vision in the amalgam with the existing building in the surrounding territories. The project buildings are with highly dissected shapes, allowing the visual connections of the New City Center with the other parts of the city. The roofs of the low bodies are turned into small gardens, creating a green link between "Marno Pole" Park and Sveta Gora Park. With the possibility of using the roof spaces, you will also have a view of the picturesque historical center, Sveta Gora Park and Turnovo Heights, creating a visual connection from the New City Center to the city. It is very right that the proposal for the northern part of the territory should remain with larger open spaces as they are expected to take on larger public masses, given that the first and main pedestrian entrance to the New City Center will take place from the north because of the location of the currently operating facilities, the future exhibition center and the location of the New City Center to the Yantra River, the South Junction and the current historic and administrative centers.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 received 4 points.

**Rating Criterion №4:**

**Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 7pts.**

In the preparation of the city planning proposal, data on the surveying and geodesic evaluation of the tree vegetation were considered, with the decision preserving the prevailing part of the high vegetation available. The green system has been further developed with proposals to create new green areas on the roofs of most of the design buildings and the planting of new trees in the newly built pedestrian areas.

Concepts have made proposals, the realization of which would result in very good and effective results.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 receives 7 points.

**Rating Criterion №5:**

**Innovative public-space solutions - 4pts.**

The draft decision proposes the creation of small green areas on the roofs of buildings designed for a narrower range of users as well as large open public spaces, located terraced on the example of the existing ones in the historical part, thus being presented an effective solution. There is a good solution in connection with the provision of a new city square located in the northwestern part of the territory.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 received 4 points.

**Rating Criterion №6:**

**Solution sustainability – 1pts.**

The project solution takes into account the previous measures for landscaping - landscaping, plumbing cycle and existing building. The project has considered the currently functioning buildings with their adjacent properties.

With the design solution, the routes of the water supply and sewerage networks are considered horizontally. Preserved part of the valuable vegetation available on terrain. On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal only covers the minimum requirements of the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 received 1 point.

**Total city-planning concept receives 30 points.**

**Rating Criterion №7:**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 7pts.**

The project proposal for an Exposition Center building offers an interesting volumetric solution, offering a prismatic shape with a non-large height with many breakthroughs. The choice of colors, shapes and materials sharply contrasts with the two existing buildings to such an extent that it manages to unite them by opposing themselves with them. The scale involved in the size of the holes contrasts with the size of the building and creates an illusion for a smaller building. The volume is concentrated in a dominant shape cleverly located in the property using its natural slope. In general, we can define this solution as a suggestion of contrast, contrast in form, contrast in materials and colors, and so on.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 receives 7 points.

#### **Evaluation Criterion №8:**

##### **Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment – 7pts.**

The building is located in the boundary lines given in the assignment and does not create aggressive conflicts with the surrounding building. Its volume is similar in size to the existing buildings of the 5th Corps of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the District Administration, but in contrast to them the selection of materials and colors creates a positive contrast and enriches the city's ambience. The heart of the building is made up of warmer, lighter colors and materials, with which there is again a game of contrast, but this time between the interior and the exterior. The internal stairs in the building, apart from contrasting with their shape with the facade, allude to the characteristic and memorable stairs of Interhotel Veliko Tarnovo.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 receives 7 points.

#### **Evaluation Criterion №9**

##### **Functional solution - 7pts.**

The proposed concept of Exposition Center building includes several main features: a multifunctional hall, spaces for temporary expositions with public places for relaxation, communication and entertainment, including coffee, a bookstore at the new city center, a roof garden, a panorama platform and a small square space for outdoor activities at the level of Alexander Stamboliyski Street. The solution offers the opportunity for different events, both in the exterior and in the interior. The project offers different spaces such as scale and proportions. The condition of the competition program for the possibilities of opening the building to the surrounding area is fulfilled if necessary for different types of events. A good solution for acoustics and illumination. The functional scheme of the building is good and clean. Short escape routes. The requirements for an accessible environment are met. The peculiarities of the terrain are considered and the approaches to the building are aligned with the street level. The requirements for the distribution of the areas between the different functional areas have been complied with. The requirement for a built-up area of the building, respectively for the Expanded Built-up Area, is complied with. The functional solution is good and effective without having any original features.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 receives 7 points.

#### **Evaluation Criterion №10:**

##### **Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 10pts.**

The good positioning of the main hall in the plan, and the variety of configurations of smaller spaces in transforming it, allow for excellent flexibility and opportunities to hold different events. Envisioning a large hall in a space appropriate to the pitch provides the opportunity to separate 6 smaller halls, including the option of being configured in many different ways. The project envisages differentiation and variation in the transformation of small halls and the space of the balcony, where smaller events can be realized in an extremely efficient and economically advantageous way. All of these solutions are extremely original and effective and enable the use of a large hall in the most

rational way. The solution has been developed with attention to detail by providing pockets / depots for separating movable panels.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 receives 10 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №11:**

##### **Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 7pts.**

The main lobby is well-exposed and visible in the exterior of the building and from far places, thanks to façade breaks and contrast, which is one of the main requirements for the competition program. The lobby has a representative vision, offering a good connection between the external and the internal functional zones. This also helps with the transition, filter area around it, consisting of open spaces alternating with dense areas of the main shell. The way the façade is designed also plays a sun protection function against the main lobby, thus providing energy-efficient protection. The main foyer is of sufficient size, short links to individual functional areas, except sanitary facilities, with good opportunities for different events to be held by separation.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 receives 7 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №12:**

##### **Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 4pts.**

The solution offers landscaping in the property, including high vegetation, as well as a roof garden. The project proposal for an Exposition Center building offers energy-efficient solutions for this type of building. Balance in the building façade, between glass and openings is a good prerequisite for low energy consumption of air conditioning systems. The other major asset of the project is the compact volume of the building, as well as the anticipation of a facade that dresses and protects the interior in an efficient way. All this gives the building a good potential for high energy efficiency. The project proposal for a building of the Exposition Center is relatively easy to implement. Building technologies with which the building can be realized are standard and generally available, which implies the use of standard construction equipment and equipment. The materials are natural and generally available, so local suppliers and manufacturers can be used.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 3222 received 4 points.

#### **Total for concept of a building - Exposition Center receives 42 points.**

---

#### **Project № 3200 - 3rd place - a total of 81 points**

##### **Rating Criterion №1:**

##### **Functional solution, zoning, and stage construction - 7pts.**

The project solution proposes that the implementation of the NFC be carried out in 2 stages, which are well timed in combination with the functional zoning of the territory. A natural divider is the pedestrian promenade of Marno Pole Park through the Boruna Park to the historic part of the city. The first stage includes the construction of the exhibition center, two more public and residential buildings in the northwestern part of the territory. One of the public buildings is included in the second stage of the implementation of the Integrated Urban Recovery Plan and can be called for under Operational Programs. The realization and the functioning of the residential buildings will provide financial resources that can be used in the implementation of the second stage of the New

City Center. In the southern part of the territory there are concentrated public sites, for which some form of Public Private Partnership can also be found. The project decision does not specify the location of the specific objects assigned as functions in the second stage of the implementation of the Integrated Urban Recovery and Development Plan but proposes buildings and spaces that can be easily adapted to the objectives. There are numerous park areas, playgrounds and a network of pedestrian and square spaces, which maximally cater to the public expectations of the New City Center.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3200 receives 4 points.

### **Rating Criterion №2:**

#### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 7pts.**

The draft decision proposes to preserve the structure of the street network provided by the Detailed Urban Plan and the service in this regard is improved by distributing the two-level pedestrian, bicycle and car traffic flows. It is used in a very efficient way the natural relief and the existing terrain, with the street in the central longitudinal axis of the territory to be underground and the ground level to be released entirely for pedestrian and bicycle movement. From the underground street will be accessed the parking areas, which are also underground and which with their area will guarantee the good functioning of the New City Center and will alleviate the problem of parking and stationing in the central part of Veliko Tarnovo. Access to the underground street and parking lots are provided in several places on "Hristo Botev" Str., whereby the northern contact zone will be unloaded from the motorway. A proposal has been made to optimize public transport by creating a new bus stop and a taxi stand in the area of the roundabout on Hristo Botev Str. The project is very ingenious for the construction of a new pedestrian bridge over the roundabout, which will facilitate the pedestrian access to the New City Center and will protect the pedestrians, as Hristo Botev Street is a carrier of serious traffic and will have a very complex a traffic organization with the realization of the roundabout and the planned multiple entrances to the underground level of the New City Center. The construction of a second pedestrian bridge over the Yantra River is envisaged, and the decision on a Detailed Urban Plan for a street which transits the automobile flow from the city center to the right bank of the river, the rector of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and Sveta Gora is not adopted. The proposed direct pedestrian directions are 2 - from "Maika Bulgaria" square, through the existing entrance to the VTU hull, to the heart of the New City Center and to the Marno Pole, through the pedestrian bridge over the roundabout on "Hristo Botev", to Boruna Park and Sveta Gora Park. They are very well appreciated with regard to where it is expected to generate pedestrian flows and in which direction they will move. In the longitudinal axis, the pedestrian traffic is organized along winding park lanes, which is very well thought out given the expectations that pedestrians and cyclists traveling throughout the New City Center are aiming for recreation. From the center of the area where it is proposed to build a square, it is possible to reach the city attractions within 5 or 10 minutes. In the zone with the coastal vegetation, the development of a pedestrian network with panoramic sites is envisaged, which improves an unusable area in the center of Veliko Tarnovo. The weakness of the project is that traffic access is expected for cars through the Stambolov Bridge, which is pedestrian and is forbidden for motor vehicles.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3200 receives 7 points.

### **Rating Criterion №3:**

#### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 7pts.**

With the design decision, the territory of the New City Center is extremely resourceful so that it does not have to confront with volume, color decisions and forms over the historical and modern administrative center and at the same time be an intermediate point of the existing city parks. The building of the exposition center and most of the new buildings are designed in the same style (semi-dug and green usable roofs), which offers a New City Center to develop as a single organism. The residential buildings in the northwestern part of the territory are proposed as a continuation and connection with the residential area on the left side of Hristo Botev Str. They are stylistically resolved as unifying the vision of the existing buildings of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the District Administration (Modernism) and the new ones planned in the southern part of the territory (High Tech). The proposed pedestrian network in the area of coastal vegetation, consisting of panoramic playgrounds, bridges and alleys, has been repeatedly ideologically as an artistic element in the interior of the exhibition center, which is a natural extension. In the longitudinal direction, the center is developed in a single plane, which emphasizes more of its functions as a city park than a commercial and business center or a city center as a whole. The periphery of the territory is also very smartly "perforated", which underlines the specificity of the natural topography and hint at the borders of New City Center. The pedestrian crossing over the roundabout on the street. "Hristo Botev" will be distinctive marker for the location of new urban centers, which have been met and the recommended requirements in the job. In the south-eastern part of the territory, a hotel with a conference center is planned to be built, although the building is not very high, it is significantly different from the majority of the newly-built semi-dugged buildings and will be visible from the southern road junction. In several places, glass roofs of underground exhibition areas and museums are provided on the ground level, which, in addition to ensuring their natural lighting, can also be made attractive to visitors. With the planned panoramic sites, visitors to New City Center will be visually connected with the picturesque historic center, the dynamic junction on the South Road Junction and the beautiful natural sights around the city.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3200 receives 7 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №4:**

##### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 10pts.**

The design solution proposes the creation of multiple green spaces. In a very efficient way, it is intended to use the natural relief and existing terrain as a result of the implementation of the water cycle, most of the design buildings being half-dug at 1 or 2 levels, and the roofs are organized as gardens. Along the street "Hristo Botev" is offered trees, which will act as a buffer for noise and harmful emissions, which will guarantee the quality of the recreation environment in the New City Center. According to the project, the target area is planned to be an intermediate link between Marno Pole Park and Boruna Park or Sveta Gora Park. It is proposed to plant additional tree vegetation in the central longitudinal axis. The low construction and the many green areas will not prevent the fresh air from entering the central city area, contributing to the creation of a very good microclimate and ecological living conditions. On the roof of the tall building in the southeastern part of the territory is proposed the installation of solar panels.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3200 receives 10 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №5:**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions - 7pts.**



The design solution focuses on open public spaces, transforming the ground level of the New City Center into a city park. Interesting are the solutions for illuminating the underground exposition areas. It can be said that the implementation of the New City Center will promote the environmentally friendly and environmentally friendly way of life, because pedestrian and bicycle crossings are visible and the vehicles and infrastructure are hidden deep underground. The majority of the roofs are usable for recreation or for alternative energy production.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3200 receives 7 points.

#### **Rating Criterion №6:**

##### **Solution sustainability – 4pts**

The project solution has been adopted and integrated the previous measures for development of the territory - water cycle, landscaping, functioning buildings, relief, etc. In the southern part are provided sports playgrounds which, despite their location, do not compromise the operation of the implemented water supply and sewerage network. The proposal does not provide for effective and original solutions to ensure that public development measures are already in place. Much of the available tree vegetation is preserved.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3200 receives 4 points.

#### **Total city-planning concept receives 39 points.**

---

#### **Rating Criterion №7:**

##### **Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 7pts.**

The project proposal for a building of the Exposition Center has a clear and original concept for the shaping of the volume-spatial solution. The volume of the building is made up of two in-one shapes, cleverly located in the property using the natural slope of the terrain, so its perception differs depending on the point of view. The project achieves a minimalist vision with a game of density and density, using the volumes of the two roof panels and the airiness of the glazed facades. The effect is further reinforced by the vertical alignment of the glazing through rather slender metal profiles. Utilizing the natural slopes of the terrain, the authors create a visual balance between gravity, through the appearance of the volume and scale of the building, and the ease of hiding much of the building from the eyes of visitors to the New City Center, turning their roof into vast observation and contemplation playgrounds directly from the pitch. By approaching the building of the New City Center, one cannot feel the real volume and size of the building on the contrary, it is revealed with its comparatively smaller volume - a minimalist style representative building with a modernistic vision and spirit around which the authors offer a richly landscaped and usable roof over the main building, starting from the terrain and gradually unfolding in the northeastern direction, creating the opportunity for incredible views, walks and panoramas to the old town. With the approach to the building from the north / Alexander Stamboliyski Street / the vision is built with the same means of expression and the only difference is the scale. Here the beautiful aspects and the merits of the space-based solution are fully developed. The weakness of the project is the anticipation of the building in a way that deprives it of the necessary representativeness, approaches and vision of the New City Center.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal №3200 receives 7 points.

**Rating criterion №8:****Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 7 pts.**

The proposed design project offers a well situated solution by laying out the building along the border lines as specified in the terms and conditions of competition. The arrangement of units coupled with the shape and materials of which it would be constructed do not conflict the surrounding buildings, but quite on the contrary, the different outlook and the light appearance of its spacious arrangement solution, the landscape of abundant vegetation and the vast clear aerial spaces allow the adjacent buildings, namely the 5<sup>th</sup> campus of Veliko Tarnovo University and the County Administration, the possibility for optimal display in the newly designed urban space. The choice of a shape and materials and most of all the choice of a façade articulation give the impression of a smaller and lighter building than it would actually be, which makes the scale of exposition center compatible with the buildings situated on the opposite side of Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street. It was decided the building to be approached mainly from the northern-northeastern side, except for the entrance to the box office, the reception office and the café that will be a pedestrian area approached from the southwestern side. There will be two motor vehicle driveways providing access to the underground level of the building to be used as parking lot, the main driveway will be from the northeastern side - Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street, and the auxiliary one – from the western side – the newly designed street at the underground level between the 5<sup>th</sup> campus of Veliko Tarnovo University and the prospective Exposition center, providing for good functional capacities.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №3200 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №9:****Functional solution - 7 pts.**

In functional respect the design project offers a functional layout solution arranged in four levels, as follows: underground parking lot, a ground level to comprise the main foyer and the big hall, a partial level to comprise the technical and administrative areas and fourth (also partial) level to comprise the separate box office, the reception office and the café, surrounded by the accessible roof terrace.

The main foyer shall be situated on the ground level facing Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street. It shall offer the perfect conditions for organizing and conducting exposition events by using its compact large and vast built-up area with sufficient height and “roomy” impression. The built-up space shall be lavishly glazed to ensure penetration of indirect sunlight shining from the North, which is the ideal solution for expositions. The vertical communications in the building are well grouped and arranged on functional basis to ensure good communication between all the levels of the building through staircases, elevators and ramps, nevertheless they were found to be insufficient in terms of the building capacity. The proposed design project provides the Big Hall capacity to be 1200 seats, the floor being divided in two areas: the floor in the first area will be slightly inclined towards the stage whereas the floor in the second area shall have step-like rows of equal height and depth to ensure good visibility of the stage, on the other hand this solution would not be very suitable when transforming the big hall into smaller rooms. The ceiling will also be inclined and articulated by acoustic panels that will ensure good acoustic properties. The functional solution for the room is an apt one as it ensures easy access and emergency exit, the design includes the required number of entrances/exits situated at different places scattered inside the building, which is important for evacuation purposes, the design also includes rooms for simultaneous translation, lighting control and sound control rooms, etc. The designed restrooms have sufficient capacity and are conveniently situated on both sides of the room. The design project also provides apt functional layouts in other areas too. The roof will have abundant vegetation and will be freely accessible from the outside, providing for wonderful panoramic views to the old town area and the prospective New Town Center. The proposed design project offers the whole underground level to be used as a parking lot, covering the whole underground area of the land lot (end-to-end zoning lines), providing for 150 parking

places and good transport-communication connections. The other requirements of the competition was also complied with, namely the design project to provide the possibility for organizing and conducting diverse events in the exterior spaces around /and in this case on the top of/ the building, by allowing the conduction of various events /such as concerts, performances, exhibitions, etc./ on the lawned and fully accessible roof. With regard to the areas, the proposed design project satisfies the requirements of competition.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №3200 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №10:**

**Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 7 pts.**

The proposed design project for building an Exposition center offers a solution for transforming the Big Hall into 6 smaller rooms, each equipped with its own entrance/exit. In addition to the required 6 smaller rooms, this design project provides for division of the Big Hall into 3, 4 and 5 rooms of different size and height. The functional capacities of the smaller rooms resulting from such transformation offered in this design project are good, except that the inclined floor of some rooms will not allow the conduction of events with specific requirements.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №3200 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №11:**

**Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 7 p.**

The main foyer shall be situated on the ground level facing Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street. It offers good possibilities for expositions in a compact spacious area of sufficient height and “roomy” impression. It is equipped with irregular spirally shaped ramp going through the entire size and height of the foyer and ensuring good viewpoints at the expositions. The built-up space shall be lavishly glazed to ensure penetration of indirect sunlight shining from the North, which is the ideal solution for expositions, therefore sun protection means will not be needed. The shape and size (volume) of the built-up space provide for good functional capacities to organize and conduct events of different nature, expositions and activities, which is additional aided by the combination of the winding ramp and the balconies situated at two of the room exits. The functional connections with the other levels and areas in the building are logically and conveniently devised to ensure viewpoints at the expositions, vertical ones included.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №3200 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №12:**

**Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 7 pts.**

The proposed design project for building an Exposition Center offers a good energy-effective (energy-saving) solution by making use of the natural properties of the land lot and the spatial orientation of the building to protect and insulate it. Buildings of this type need first of all passive protection from the changes in weather conditions since this would lower the cost of air-conditioning in half than usual both in the warm and the cold months of the year, whereas the provision of all day round artificial lighting and a reliable fresh air (conditioning) installation is absolutely a must. Considering the functional purpose of the building, this will be obligatory and necessary one way or another. The proposed design project for building an Exposition Center can be constructed using standard and commonly available building technologies, which supposes the use of standard building

machines and equipment, except for the construction of the lawned accessible roof, for whose function it will be necessary to develop special details and to use specialized materials to ensure reliable impermeability protection, drainage system, etc. Except for the above-mentioned things, the materials conceived in the proposed design project are all natural and fully available, therefore the services of local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. The excavation works will be deployed on the entire land lot, therefore when it is fully completed the proposed design project will offer a big share of green areas, including high vegetation, many times more than the minimum requirements set down for the competition, which makes this project extraordinary environment friendly.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №3200 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

**The conceptual design of the building– Exposition Center – scored the total of 42 points.**

---

**Project № 2685– 2 PLACE – total score - 93 points**

**Rating criterion №1:**

**Functional solution, zoning and stage construction - 10 pts.**

This proposed design project offers the construction of the New Town Center to be completed in 4 stages, all of which are well coordinated in time with the functional zoning plan of the terrain. They are conditionally exposed in four quadrants outlined by the crossing of two boulevards – Cardio Maximus and Decumanus Maximus. The first stage covers the construction of an exposition center and a pedestrian zone in the area of coastal vegetation along the river banks. At the same time the construction of two boulevards will be launched starting from Hristo Botev Street and the exposition center and ending at their cross point, thus guaranteeing the successful function of the New Town Center. The second stage covers the continuation of the boulevard leading crosswise the terrain to eastern direction and the building of a new bus trop and an information center. Absolutely fairly, the project provides the components in the first and second quadrants to be built after the transport-communication connections are already in existence. The components will have different functions but the prevailing part of them will be stores, shops and hotels. The building and the function of those components is expected to generate income for the municipality. Then it will be possible to commence the construction of public buildings in the same quadrant. The third stage covers the continuation of the boulevard leading crosswise the terrain to the bridge over Yantra River, the furtherance of the parallel boulevard in southern direction and the building of a street running diagonally from the circular cross section on Hristo Botev Street to southeastern direction. This same stage covers also the construction of buildings in the triangle formed by the diagonal street, the crosswise and the parallel boulevards and along the parallel boulevard. It will have mixed functions and its construction is expected to attract great interest considering the existing and operating northern part of the New Town Center and the planned infrastructure in its southern part. The last stage covers the construction of a residential development, which is expected to offer luxury living conditions and to generate a lot of income for the municipality being so close to the already operating New Town Center. The same stage also covers the construction of public educational and sport infrastructure. The proposed design project includes instructions on the situation of specific building units, whose functions have been specified in the second stage of implementation of the integrated plan for urban reconstruction and development. A series of sport facilities have been designed and a network of pedestrian walks and green areas, which have the potential to satisfy to the greatest extent possible the public expectations relating to the New Town Center. The Belyanka building has been included in the construction plan. It is planned to conserve and expose the Arc of Generals and the fencing of the National Military University.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies and increments the specification requirements in most effective and original manner

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 10 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №2:****Transport and communication solution and parking - 10 pts.**

This proposed design project offers to keep the existing structure of street network as it is shown in the Detailed Site Development Plan, and the services in this respect will be improved by introducing very realistic from financial point of view “soft measures” - parking will be arranged in the periphery of the terrain and in the underground level, the speed will be limited naturally by means of the pavement characteristics and vegetation, vertical traffic signs and allowing access to the central area of the terrain only to electric-driven vehicles. The boulevard going in southwest–northeast direction will begin with the construction of a transport center to accommodate ground parking lots for both motor vehicles and bicycles, a taxicab stop and a bus station for the public urban transport. Ground crosswise parking will be possible in some of the streets with appropriate size and the underground parking will be arranged under the exposition center and in Boruna Park. The streets will be paved and will have narrow roadways and large green isles. The project dares to propose Yantra River to be used for traffic, by constructing a wharf close to the railway station, which would be reachable by a scenic bicycling alley running right above the Southern road junction. The project also provides for the construction of pedestrian walks along the coastal vegetation area, which is absolutely inaccessible at this time.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies and increments the specification requirements in most effective and original manner

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 10 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №3:****Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 10 pts.**

This proposed design project offers a very good solution for embedment of the New Town Center into urban areas of completely different appearance and nature – the historical town center, the administrative town center and the transport area, and turning it into a terrain bringing all urban parks into one. This solution is based on the idea of building a “New Bridge uniting the town” where the connections between the historical town center, the modern administrative center and the transport concentration area will meet according to the Roman urban development rules in the range of New Town Center. The gate to the New Town Center will be situated along the Decumanus Maximus axis, and the wide pedestrian boulevard allows the traffic to run to the direction of the right bank of Yantra River, Sveta Gora Park and the Chancellor’s headquarter of Veliko Tarnovo University. Along the Cardo Maximus axis it would be possible to construct a second pedestrian boulevard, conditionally crossing at right angle Decumanus Maximus, starting from the exposition center and ending to the direction of the railway station and the river wharf reachable by bicycling alley running above the South road junction. Both boulevards will be abundantly planted with vegetation to emphasize the New Town Center significance as ensuring a natural connection for the existing urban green areas. There is a number of uniquely designed buildings to be situated in the New Town Center in terms of shape and size so that they can serve as markers showing the directions to reach the Center from the South road junction and the other urban districts.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies and increments the specification requirements in most effective and original manner.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 10 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №4:****Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 7 pts.**

This proposed design project offers to conserve the partially available wood vegetation but to include new plantation along the two crossing main boulevards, in the interior sections of residential developments and also on the roofs of new buildings. The coastal vegetation area will be ameliorated with pedestrian area. The two pedestrian boulevards and the diagonal street will serve as a natural connection between Marno Pole Park, Yantra River, Boruna Park and Sveta Gora Park, thus

improving the environmental conditions and the microclimate in the town center. The design also includes a number of water facilities as urban furnishing. Although the proposed solution for territory landscaping and cultivation was found to be effective, it lacks any features of originality.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №5:**

**Innovative public space solutions - 7 pts.**

This proposed design project offers the construction of a transport and communication network that will be regulated by “soft measures” and to equip it with the complete set of required means to ensure the movement and traffic of motor vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians, the quality of recreational conditions for visitors and of working and living conditions for the people inhabiting the New Town Center.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №6:**

**Solution sustainability - 4 pts.**

This proposed design project perceives and integrates in a very suitable manner the previous public works on the terrain such as the water cycle, the landscaping, the functional buildings, the terrain relief, etc. The currently functioning buildings and the relevant land lot properties were taken into consideration because they are not municipal properties, therefore no urban development interventions could be planned for them. The southern part of the design includes some sport playgrounds, which do not compromise the operation of the existing water supply and sewerage system despite their location. The proposed design project does not provide any effective and original solutions to stabilize the existing public works in the terrain.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides good solutions to the specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 4 points under this rating criterion.

**The conceptual design for urban development scored the total of 48 points.**

---

**Rating criterion № 7:**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 7 pts.**

This proposed design project to build an Exposition center offers an interesting and original voluminous spatial solution rising smoothly from the natural gradient of the terrain and forming a sort of a visual “springboard” to the Old Town. The space of the building is concentrated into one dominating shape, which has been aptly positioned in the land lot making the best use of its natural gradient, so that it could be perceived differently depending on the location and the viewpoint. Approaching the building from the New Town Center it is nearly unperceivable, except for the delicately indented to the terrain entrance to the Big Hall designed to give venue for special events, instead it offers a lawned and accessible roof, starting from the very terrain level and rising gradually to northeastern direction. This roof “lawn” combines the green park surroundings with the urbanized density of town, by providing at the same time the possibility for incredible views and panoramic scenes to the old town, bringing them unnaturally close to each other and eliminating the distance and aerial perspective between them, a method known since the ancient Japanese miniatures. This visual connection between the past and future of Veliko Tarnovo, joining the old town with the exposition center and respectively with the New Town Center inspires respect with the lightness of its perception and its direct messages. When approached from the north /from Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street/ the appearance and spatial solution for the building is totally different. The combination of the

glazed “corrugated” façade and the compact size of the hall lined with dark wood, vertically articulated into wide lamellas gives the impression of a large hall floating above the earth. Centrally situated in it lies a compatible in size window/screen/media of unique function, displaying the stage in real time on one hand and on the other hand exposing the old town as a décor for the spectators inside the big hall, thus interchanging one’s perception of inside/outside and shaping up a new type of public space. This uniting element provides the possibility for reciprocal perception of the interior and the exterior, a sort of a spatial “Yin and Yang”. A weakness of this project is that the designed building is missing the due representative appearance, approaches and vision facing the New Town Center.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

#### **Rating criterion №8:**

##### **Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 7 pts.**

The proposed design project offers a well situated solution by laying out the building along the border lines as specified in the terms and conditions of competition. The arrangement of units coupled with the shape and materials of which it would be constructed do not conflict the surrounding buildings, but quite on the contrary, it gives “a breath of fresh air” and abundant vegetation between the larger adjacent buildings, namely the 5<sup>th</sup> campus of Veliko Tarnovo University and the County Administration, allowing the possibility for optimal display in the newly designed urban space. The idea of building a green town center with lavishly plant-ornated boulevards, pedestrian walks, playgrounds and parks is present here and acting in full force and literary build up and surrounds the Exposition Center.

The partial sinking of portion of the building under the terrain gives the impression of a smaller building looking at it from the north and northeastern side on Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street, which makes the scale of exposition center compatible with the buildings situated on the opposite side of Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street. It was decided the building to be approached mainly from the northern-northeastern side, except for the entrance to the big hall which is to be used for the conduction of special events and approached from the southwestern side. The motor vehicle driveway providing access to the underground level of the building to be used as parking lot will be from the northern side - Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street, but the type and location of the ramp is not functional enough due to the difficult entrance and exit from the ramp from Aleksandar Stamboliyski Street, where it is makes a turn at 90 degree angle.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

#### **Rating criterion №9:**

##### **Functional solution – 7 pts.**

In functional aspect this proposed design project offers a solution, providing a well-developed functional layout in three main levels as follows: main foyer level, big hall level and underground parking level. The main foyer shall be situated on the ground level to offer the perfect conditions for organizing and conducting different events by using its diversified areas in terms of size, height and proportions. The foyer shall be lavishly glazed to ensure penetration of indirect sunlight shining from the North, which is the ideal solution for expositions, by means of “corrugated” glazed façade, offering the options to open up the space when it is necessary so as to include also the larger entrance space in front of the building. The vertical communications in the building are well grouped and arranged on functional basis to ensure good communication between all the levels of the building through staircases and elevators, nevertheless they were found to be insufficient in terms of the building capacity. The proposed design project situates the Big Hall on the second floor right above

the main foyer and provides the Big Hall capacity to be 1200 seats. It has an evenly inclined floor ensuring good visibility of the stage. The ceiling will also be inclined and articulated by acoustic panels that will ensure good acoustic properties to compensate for the elongated rectangular shape in 3/1 proportion. The functional solution for the room is an apt one as it ensures easy access and emergency exit, the design includes the required number of entrances/exits situated at different places scattered inside the building and leading directly to the terrain in front of the building, which is especially important for evacuation purposes. In front of the big hall the design provides for an elongated corridor-like foyer with access to a lobby-bar and a buffet, including a restroom at the end of it which is though insufficient for the big hall capacity. The roof will have abundant vegetation and will be freely accessible from the outside, providing for wonderful panoramic views to the old town area and the prospective New Town Center. The proposed design project offers one underground level to be used as a parking lot, providing for 121 parking places and good transport-communication connections. The other requirements of the competition was also complied with, namely the design project to provide the possibility for organizing and conducting diverse events in the exterior spaces around /and in this case on the top of/ the building. One such option is the above-described possibility to open up the main foyer to the large terrace in front of the building entrance, and the other option being the possibility to conduct various events /such as concerts, performances, exhibitions, etc./ on the lawned and fully accessible roof. With respect to the areas, the proposed design project satisfies the requirements of the competition but offers no originality.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

#### **Rating criterion № 10:**

##### **Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 7 pts.**

This proposed design project to build an Exposition Center offers a simple plan to transform the big hall into smaller rooms. The division of main area of the big hall along its shorter side is the most economical and practical solution, moreover the entrances and exits of the big hall can be used in such a way as to provide each smaller room with an access, and respectively emergency exit. In addition to the required 6 smaller rooms, this design project provides for division of the Big Hall into 3, 4 and 5 rooms of different size and height. The functional capacities obtained as a result of dividing the big hall into smaller rooms under this proposed design project are good but due to the floor gradient their use may be hindered and needs to be adjusted by step-like floor platforms and structures.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

#### **Rating criterion №11:**

##### **Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 7 pts.**

The main foyer shall be situated on the ground level in the northern portion of the plan. It is clearly marked /as required by the competition program/ in the building interior and exterior. This design project offers lavish glazing of the atrium space of northern orientation, therefore sun protection means will not be needed. It has a complex structure in terms of shapes and sizes (volume) adding to its good functional capacities to organize and conduct events of different nature, expositions and activities, which is additional aided by the above-described option to open up the main foyer to the large area before the building entrance. The functional connections with the other levels and areas in the building are short and logically devised. The characteristics of the spaces is mainly expositional, therefore the appearance of the flying portion of the lobby-bar and the buffet in the atrium space of the foyer is an extremely good idea, providing for different viewpoints at the expositions, including from the prolonged foyer before the big hall. The spaces in the main foyer situated immediately under



the big hall provide the possibility to conduct events requiring special lighting effects. A weakness of the project is the lack of a clear and outlined marking of the main foyer in the building exterior. For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project provides better effective solutions than the minimum specification requirements.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 7 points under this rating criterion.

**Rating criterion №12:**

**Environmental and energy-efficient solutions - 10 pts.**

The proposed design project for building an Exposition Center offers a good energy-efficient (energy-saving) solution by making use of the natural properties of the land lot and the spatial orientation of the building to protect and insulate it. Buildings of this type need first of all passive protection from the changes in weather conditions since this would lower the cost of air-conditioning in half than usual both in the warm and the cold months of the year, whereas the provision of all day round artificial lighting and a reliable fresh air (conditioning) installation is absolutely a must. Considering the characteristics of the building, this is more of an advantage than a shortcoming because the functional requirements for the bog hall demand exactly such particularities. The proposed design project for building an Exposition Center can be constructed using standard and commonly available building technologies, which supposes the use of standard building machines and equipment, except for the construction of the lawned accessible roof, for whose function it will be necessary to develop special details and to use specialized materials to ensure reliable impermeability protection, drainage system, etc. Except for the above-mentioned things, the materials conceived in the proposed design project are all natural and fully available, therefore the services of local suppliers and manufacturers can be used. The excavation works will be deployed on the entire land lot, and will be restricted to a comparatively small area and amount. When it is fully completed the proposed design project will offer a big share of green areas, including high vegetation, many times more than the minimum requirements set down for the competition, which makes this project extraordinary environment friendly.

For the above reasons considered in the light of this rating criterion the board of appraisers decided that this design project satisfies and increments the specification requirements in most effective and original manner

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition, proposed design project №2685 is awarded 10 points under this rating criterion.

**The conceptual design of the building– Exposition Center – scored the total of 45 points.**

**Project proposal № 1800 - 1st PLACE - a total of 102 points**

**Rating Criterion № 1:**

**Functional solution, zoning and stage construction implementation - 10 points.**

The project proposal solution proposes to realize the implementation of construction execution of The New City Center in 5 stages, which are very well combined due to the terms of the implementation and execution of the project proposal with the functional zoning of the territory. The first stage includes the construction execution of the exhibition center and several other buildings with public and cultural functions, for which the municipality can provide funds under operational programs. The second stage envisages the execution of the construction of the core of the New City Center, which will include the main part of the buildings with commercial and hotel functions. At this stage, it is envisaged that revenue will be generated for the municipality and to be able to realize the third stage, which envisages the construction execution of administrative and sports facilities in the Northwest. The fourth stage envisages the construction execution of mixed type of designation buildings. Only in the last phase it is envisaged for the construction execution implementation of a residential neighborhood, which with its proximity to the already working the New City Center is expected to be luxurious and to carry many times more revenue to the municipality. The inclusion in the structure of the New City Center of residential functions in buildings is also in line with the requirement to provide 24-hour life in its premises, and it is not to be allowed to depopulate it during the night hours of the day as well. The design project proposal solution specifies the location of specific construction

sites, already assigned as functions in the second stage of the implementation of The Integrated Plan for Urban Regeneration and Development for the city of Veliko Tarnovo. There are many park areas, the construction of a new sports hall, playgrounds and a network of pedestrian areas put forward, which maximally satisfy the public's requirements and expectations of the New City Center. Belianka's area building has been included in the construction of the building system around which a stepped square with a view of Sveta Gora Park and Turnovo Heights is going to be formed.

On the basis of the abovementioned grounds, under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the project assignment in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion this project proposal **1800** receives 10 points.

#### **Rating Criterion № 2:**

##### **Transport and communication solution and parking - 7 points.**

The design project proposal solution proposes an efficient distribution of road, pedestrian and bicycle flows on two levels, with underground level, where a vehicular traffic is to be put into practice and parking as well, and pedestrian and bicycle connections are developed on the ground level. In addition, it is proposed to set up a new bus line and a busstop for public transport, while the mass transit of the mass transport will be underground and the entrance for the stop will be at the level of the terrain. It is proposed to create a new pedestrian entry in the southern part of the territory, as well as taxi rank stopping places. In the realization of the project proposal, 47,496 square meters of new parking places could be created, which will provide the successful operation of the New City Center and will considerably alleviate the problem of parking and put into a garage in the central part of Veliko Tarnovo. The project proposal provides a solution for the transport-communication connection of the New City Center with the other parts of the city, but its implementation is not going to solve the problem to the full extend of traffic from the city center towards Sveta Gora park, The Rectorate of The University of Veliko Turnovo and Sveta Gora residential area.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion, project proposal № **1800** receives 7 points.

#### **Rating Criterion № 3:**

##### **Voluminous spatial and artistic solution - 10 points.**

The project proposal gives a very good solution for entering a New City Center in the opposite of the vision and character of the urban areas - the historical center; the administrative center; transport area and green areas. Exceptionally original is the proposal to release the ground floors of buildings from functions and thickness, so that visual corridors beneath them are to be created, implementing the idea of a continuous green environment and a visual connection between the different parts of the city. The building of the exposition center corresponds in size and height to the surrounding buildings of the 5th Corps of The University of Veliko Tarnovo and the Regional Administration, although it opposes their formal characteristics. With its plastic but simple outline in their design, the building fits as a part of an ensemble in the context of the two existing volumes, balancing and "reconciling" their massiveness and withstanding.

In the north-west periphery the new building is selected in height and front, so as not to overshadow or "smash" the already existing one on the left side of "Hristo Botev" street, among which there are residential buildings with artistic elements and historical value. It is of the utmost exceptional importance that the project proposal for the northern part of the territory should remain with larger open spaces as they are expected to take on larger public masses, given providence, that the first and main pedestrian entrance to the New City Center will take place from the north because of the location of the currently operating facilities, the future exhibition center and the location of the New City Center to the Yantra River, the Southern junction and the current historic and administrative centers. In the southern part, a higher density building is proposed with a low density and orientation, following the outline of the territory, which is a very appropriate solution as the southern part does

not directly adjoin residential areas and is situated panoramic over the Southern junction. The choice of high-rise building is suitable for a territory that will perform functions of a new center. The construction in the southern part will be noticeable from the southern road junction, with which the project fulfilled the recommendation in the assignment regarding the provision of a marker indicating the location of the New City Center. The high building is situated among rich greenery, raised on pylons, which, in combination with the street from the circular junction of "Hristo Botev" street in the southeast direction, creates a physical and visual connection between Marno Pole park, river, Sveta Gora park and Tarnovo heights. There is a similar corridor in the northern part, with the beginning - the existing entrance to the The University of Veliko Tarnovo building and is reaching the first panoramic site. The facades of the buildings in the southern part and the building of the exposition center are solved in the same style, with which the project proposal design skillfully unites the two parts of the New City Center. It is proposed to create two panoramic grounds overlooking the picturesque historical center and Sveta Gora Park and Turnovo Heights, creating a visual link from the New City Center to the city. The buildings in the southern part are not only high, they alternate with lower bodies, the lower ones are located in the frame of a pedestrian walkway as well and as they are in line and correspond with the size of the visitors themselves. On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal № 1800 receives 10 points.

#### **Rating Criterion № 4:**

##### **Territory landscaping and cultivation concept - 10 points.**

The design solution of this project proposal proposes less building density of building construction and higher heights, which is allowing a significant portion of the New City Center's territory to be upgraded and enobled with square spaces, green areas and sports grounds. The elaborated town planning project proposal is in line with the data from the geodesy surveying and evaluation of the tree vegetation, as with the decision is to to be kept the maximum possible preservation of available high vegetation as well. The green system is upgraded and developed with proposals for new green areas, both at the ground level and on the floors and on the roofs of the project proposal buildings. With the construction of the site and the concentration of vegetation, the New City Center will be as a natural extension of the Marno Pole Park towards the Yantra River, the Boruna Park and the Sveta Gora Park and will be improved the ecological conditions and the microclimate in the city center.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 1800 receives 10 points.

#### **Rating Criterion № 5:**

##### **Innovative public-space solutions - 10 pts.**

The project proposal solution proposes the creation of public spaces, except at terrain level, but also at heigh level - on the floors of the project buildings and on their roofs as well. Most of the proposed open-plan terrace spaces are classically designed as gardens. Innovative also is the proposal to release the ground floors of the buildings from functions and density, so that visual corridors beneath them are created, which ones are realizing the idea of a continuous green environment and a visual connection between the parts of the city as well as concentration of the areas in height releasing a terrain space for other features. The project proposal solution proposed by the author, solves more than two problems with the functioning of the territory.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 1800 receives 10 points.

**Rating Criterion № 6:**

**Solution sustainability - 4 pts.**

The project proposal solutions have been very well integrated with the previous measures for spatial development - water cycle, landscaping, functioning buildings, relief, etc. The project proposal has taken into account the buildings that are functioning right now with their adjacent properties as they are not the property of the municipality and no urban development interventions should be envisaged to be implemented for execution. An exception in this project proposal is made for the property with the state-owned State Military Historical Archives building, which is a subject to extensive public access, but in view of the conceptual project proposal design level in the tender procedure, this should not be taken as a disadvantage. The project proposal design solution fully respects the water and sewerage routes in vertical and horizontal terms. The maximum value of valuable vegetation is preserved as well. The natural relief and the terrain features after the implementation of the water cycle have been used in the most efficient and original way, with the project proposal envisaging the development of a new City Center on two levels, panoramic sites and an articulation in different architectural volumes.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal represents a good solution to the requirements set in the terms of reference.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № 1800 receives 4 points.

**Total urban concept received 51 points.**

**Rating Criterion № 7:**

**Original vision and voluminous spatial solution of the building - 10 pts.**

The project proposal for an Exposition Center building proposes an elegant and original vision using minimal means of expression. The effects of efficacy, transparency and diffusion have been remarkably successfully reached, using only the vertical intersection of the facade achieved through alternation of transparency and non-transparency. The efficacy and lightness is reinforced by the suggestion of selected materials for the facades - glass and wood that form their vertical articulation, as well as by the decision of the authors to continue these elements over the building, forming a peculiar parapet that creates the feeling of continuity. The project proposal volume solution is extremely elegant and well-sized, and does not dominate the neighboring buildings, on the contrary - intelligently engaging in dialogue with them reflecting parts of their facades on their vertical glass strips. This game of reflections on the curved surfaces of the facades will make it possible for the images of the different buildings in the neighborhood as well as the views of the old city to blend together, creating different dynamics according to the point of view and movement. The volume is built in a form that is visually "detached" from the terrain, and in which there are no vertical edges, the facades "flow into" each other gradually and imperceptibly, creating the feeling of continuity and smooth movement. At the same time, the use of a lightweight wooden grid for lining has been an original connection between the building and the local traditions of building lightweight wooden structures and grids in residential and commercial construction since the National Renaissance period.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal № 1800 receives 10 points.

**Rating Criterion № 8:**

**Situating and fitting the building in the urban environment - 10 pts.**

The project proposal for a building construction of the Exposition Center proposes a solution with a flowing and nonconflict form, which with laconic means of expression fits into the urban and at the same time "park" environment, attracting the other two significantly larger objects - the building of the 5th corps of the University of Veliko Tarnovo and the one of the Regional Administration as well. The choice of shape and articulation creates the impression of a smaller building than it really is, which helps the scale of the exhibition center to be commensurate with the adjoining buildings along Alexander Stamboliiski Str. The building is located in the property according to the competitive conditions, observing the limiting lines. The approaches to the building are solved correctly, dividing the car approach to the underground parking levels skillfully using the large displacement of the terrain from the North / up from Alexander Stamboliiski Street / and the pedestrian approach from the Southwest - up from the territory of the New City Center.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal № **1800** receives 10 points.

### **Rating Criterion № 9:**

#### **Functional solution - 7 pts.**

According to the functional relation of the project proposal, the project proposal itself proposes a good solution, providing a realistic and detailed functional scheme, which suggests that the authors have experience in designing and constructing buildings with similar functionalities. The Main Foyer is located on the ground floor of the building. At this level the other functional areas are located also, namely administrative one and servicing one, which can be reduced in a subsequent design phase at the expense of more exhibition areas. Vertical communications are sufficient and precisely positioned, which is providing a good connection between all levels through stairways, elevators and ramps. The project proposal is positioning the Big Hall on the second floor above the Main Foyer, which one is designed in three step levels providing both good visibility and improved acoustic performance of the hall as well, in contradistinction from the flat floor solutions. The hall in its plan is an elongated irregular polygon, the shape of which also facilitates the good acoustic environment. The functional solution of the hall is good, providing easy access and evacuation to and from anywhere, the required number of entrances / exits as well as, evacuation ones are also diverted to different locations. For the evacuation of the Big Hall, the authors proposed a wide, panoramic ramp directly to the terrain, which one is an original solution allowing the same ramp to be used for multiple purposes, including as a separate stand alone entrance to the Big Hall as well, thus is increasing the functional capabilities of the entire Exposition Center. The roof is usable for visitors, opening great opportunities for panoramic views of both the old part of the city and the future New City Center as well. The project proposal offers two underground parking levels that provide good functionality of the transport communication scheme with elegant ramps at a slight angle, allowing easy driving and parking. The other requirement of the competition program is also fulfilled feasible, namely to provide the possibility of conducting various events in the exterior spaces around the building. One of these options is the proposed amphitheatral space under the raised volume of the building from the north. The solution itself cleverly uses the natural slope and displacement of the terrain and offers space for small stage scenes, recitals, meetings, gatherings, etc. In terms of areas, the project proposal fulfills the requirements of the competition program, but the administrative and service areas at the ground level are not sufficiently resolved, which motivates the jury not to give the maximum number of points under this criterion.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion, project proposal № **1800** receives 7 points.

### **Rating Criterion № 10:**

#### **Originality of the BIG HALL transformation solution - 10 pts.**

The project proposal for the Exposition Center building proposes a working solution for easy and fast transformation of the Big Hall into smaller halls. The project proposal solution is developed in greater details, than what is needed to conceive, which is giving greater clarity, which is demonstrating the principles of action, variance schemes in the number and size of halls, etc. Each partition retains the possibility of separate entrance / exit, maximum privacy, sound insulation, etc. The project proposes the partitioning to be implemented for execution with partition walls made up of removable vertical panels. The movement is to be implemented for execution by rail track hidden in the ceiling of the hall, beginning from special rooms storehouses - warehouses these panels have soundproofing properties. In addition to the 6 small halls requested by the program, the project proposal provides for the division of 2, 3 and 4 halls, including different sizes. The functional capabilities of the halls obtained during the split are also important as well, and these options are extremely good in this project proposal.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds under this assessment criterion, the Jury decided that this project proposal has implemented and upgraded the requirements of the Terms of Reference in the most effective and original way.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion project proposal № **1800** receives 10 points.

### **Rating Criterion № 11:**

#### **Functional capabilities of the MAIN FOYER - 7 pts.**

The Main Foyer is located on the ground level in the southwestern part of the plan, cleverly marked (according to the competition program) in the exterior of the building as well - in the vertical and in the horizontal. Various shapes and sizes of spaces supplement to its functional possibilities for organizing and conducting different types of events, expositions and events. This project proposal does not propose waste of areas and volumes, large glazed atrium spaces with problematic sun protection, on the contrary, here the areas are fully utilized, with short and logical functional connections, taking into account the expositional character of the spaces and the necessity for a special lighting regime. The Functional Zone of the Main Foyer continues on the second floor as well, where The Big Hall is located, along with a "flowing" lobby space surrounded with a cafe and a refreshment bar extension, which provides the opportunity for organizing other kind of exhibition expositions allowing a "lighter" lighting mode.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition on this evaluation criterion, project proposal № **1800** receives 7 points.

### **Rating Criterion № 12:**

#### **Environmental and energy-efficient solutions – 7 pts.**

The project proposal for a building of the Exposition Center proposes good energy efficient solutions for these types of buildings, using the dense vertical articulation of the facade, achieved by alternating transparent and non-transparent materials - glass and wood, providing a good sun protection. The balance between thickness and light achieved here is a prerequisite for lower energy consumption for air conditioning in both summer and winter months as well. The other major advantage of the project proposal design is the compact volume of the building, as well as the relatively reduced area of the facades due to the round shape of the building in plan. All this gives the building a very high potential for high energy efficiency. The project proposal for a building of the Exposition Center is relatively easy to implement for execution. Building technologies with which the building can be implemented for execution are standard and generally available, which implies the use of standard construction-equipment and equipment. The materials are natural and generally available, so local suppliers, providers and manufacturers can be used. Excavation works also do not extend over the entire

property but are limited in relatively small area and volume. The project proposal itself retains a large percentage of the existing vegetation, while at the same time proposes a rich landscaping - double the minimum requirements in the competition program. There is also partial landscaping on the roof envisaged in the project proposal.

On the basis of the above-mentioned grounds for this evaluation criterion, the jury decided that this project proposal presented effective solutions better than the minimum requirements in the assignment.

Under the terms of the competition under this evaluation criterion project proposal № **1800** receives 7 points.

### **Total conception of a building - Exposition Center receives 51 points.**

On the basis of the assessments made, the jury made the following ranking:

Project №

1. 1800 – 102 p.
2. 2685 – 93 p.
3. 3200 – 81 p.
4. 3222 – 72 p.
5. 2082 – 69 p.
6. 4134 – 69 p.
7. 9177 – 60 p.
8. 5877 – 57 p.
9. 9552 – 54 p.
10. 2927 – 51 p.
11. 1344 – 51 p.
12. 2707 – 51 p.
13. 5912 – 48 p.
14. 5509 – 39 p.
15. 3761 – 36 p.
16. 5190 – 33 p.
17. 6727 – 30 p.
18. 3079 – 30 p.
19. 3864 – 30 p.
20. 1844 – 27 p.
21. 4370 – 27 p.
22. 8930 – 24 p.
23. 8470 – 21 p.
24. 2285 – 18 p.
25. 5938 – 18 p.

The Selection Committee completed its work at 17:30 hours.

The Selection Committee held an open session, at which it announced the classification made and opened the envelope containing the identity of the Tenderers.

1. № 53-2092-1/10.07.2018 - 13:46 – Casanova+Hernandez Architects;
2. № 94-CC-16737-1/12.07.2018 - 9:14 – Sung Goo Yang;
3. № 94-KK-9390-1/12.07.2018 -11:26 – Karoli Ishtvan;
4. № 53-2103-1/16.07.2018 - 16:36 – Osamu Morishita architects;
5. № 53-2104-1/17.07.2018 - 9:46 – Nauta arhitektura i izsledvane;
6. № 94-EE-5929-1/17.07.2018 - 13:55 – Eizo Nagasava;
7. № 53-2107-1/17.07.2018 -16:48 – Nomo studio architects;
8. № 53-2108-1/17.07.2018 - 16:56 – MVR International /Arenas Basabe Palacios Arquitectos SL (LTD)/;
9. № 53-2109-1/18.07.2018 - 9:33 – “Fernando Deli and Fernando Sabatini architects”;
10. № 94-ДД-14124-1/18.07.2018 - 16:07. – Diego Terna;
11. № 94-ЛЛ-3327-1/18.07.2018 - 16:11 – Lorenzo Chiku;
12. № 53-2111-1/18.07.2018- 16:51 – Rubriks architects limited
13. № 53-2112-1/19.07.2018 - 9:45 – Boliarski Murfi LTD;
14. № 94-ЦЦ-3579-1/19.07.2018 - 9:50 – Tsvetomir Tsenkov;
15. № 53-2113-1/19.07.2018 - 10:50 – Architects for urbanity
16. № 53-2114-1/19.07.2018 - 10:53 – OVO GRABCHEVSKI ARCHITECTS;
17. № 94-MM-18996-1/19.07.2018 - 10:56 – Matteo Vilavidere;
18. № 53-2115-1/19.07.2018 -11:25 – Banker Nishta;
19. № 94-CC-16748-1/19.07.2018 - 13:24 – Simona Nikova;
20. № 53-2117-1/19.07.2018 -14:29 – Interval Architects;
21. № 94-KK-9400-1/19.07.2018 - 15:29 – Kris Kornelisen;
22. № 94-KK-9401-1/19.07.2018 - 15:32 – Claudio Filipini;
23. № 94-PP-2779-1/19.07.2018- 15:34 – Rositsa Nikiforova;
24. № 53-2119-1/19.07.2018 - 15:37 – Sunday Group LTD;
25. № 94-ДД-14129-1/19.07.2018 - 15:41 – Dan Vulkers;
26. № 94-KK-9402-1/19.07.2018 - 15:45 – Claudio Nardi;
27. № 53-2120-1/19.07.2018 - 15:47 – De architekthe SIE liset mas
28. № 53-2121-1/20.07.2018 - 9:18 – NOVIZA LTD;
29. № 94-AA-11721-1/20.07.2018 - 9:20 – Atanas Nikolaev Topalov;
30. № 53-2122-1/20.07.2018 - 9:23 – Project Vitae LTD;



31. № 53-2123-1/20.07.2018 - 9:25 – Legaplan K.G;
32. № 94-MM-18999-1/20.07.2018 - 9:31 – Maya Shopova
33. № 94-ДД-14130-1/20.07.2018 - 9:33 – Desislava Lachezarova Parlapanska;
34. № 94-AA-11722-1/20.07.2018 - 9:36 – Amos Amit;
35. № 53-2124-1/20.07.2018 - 9:38 – Hiroiuki Ninno architectura;
36. № 53-2125-1/20.07.2018 -10:04 – ADA- Architectural and Design Agency AD (JSC);
37. № 53-2126-1/20.07.2018- 10:07 – Atelie 3;
38. № 94-EE-5934-1/20.07.2018 -10:11 – Eric Casar;
39. № 53-2129-1/20.07.2018 - 10:35 – The Los Angelis disign group;
40. № 53-2130-1/20.07.2018 -10:54 – Nikonsult LTD;
41. № 53-2131-1/20.07.2018 - 11:54 – NUC\_VT\_BG DZZD
42. № 53-2132-1/20.07.2018 -12:08 – Ozer Yurger Mimarlik LTD;
43. № 53-2133-1/20.07.2018 -12:18 – Am Atrium Ltd.;
44. № 53-2134-1/20.07.2018 - 13:02 – ES EN 1 EOOD (LTD);
45. № 53-2135-1/20.07.2018 - 13:21 – Stephen George International Bulgaria LTD;
46. № 53-2137-1/20.07.2018 - 13:36 – Jo Palma + partners association;
47. № 53-2138-1/20.07.2018 - 13:39 – Urbano LTD;
48. № 53-2140-1/20.07.2018 -13:53 – Image Bureau EOOD (LTD);
49. № 94-MM-19001-1/20.07.2018 - 14:00 – Maria Flaccavento;
50. № 53-2141-1/20.07.2018 -14:10 – Ten Architects EOOD (LTD);
51. № 53-2142-1/20.07.2018 - 15:03 – Institut za gradsko planirane;
52. № 53-2145-1/20.07.2018 - 15:50 – Association Solaris Studio and Orchestra Design;
53. № 53-2146-1/20.07.2018 - 15:54 – “Caps”;
54. № 01-280-1/20.07.2018 -15:56 – ELENA ARGIROVA
55. № 94-ФФ-859-1/20.07.2018 - 15:59 – Fernando Donis;
56. № 53-2147-1/20.07.2018 - 16:02 – Association Bonev and Chayka;
57. № 94-ГГ-4549-1/20.07.2018- 16:05 – Gocho Gochev;
58. № 94-CC-6457-4/20.07.2018 - 16:11 – Stanimir Vladimirov Velichkov;
59. № 94-33-79-1/20.07.2018 - 16:21 – Zdravko Rusev;
60. № 5300-292-1/20.07.2018 -16:25 – Masters LTD;
61. № 5300-2148-1/20.07.2018- 16:34 – Urbaneks LTD;
62. № 5300-2149-1/20.07.2018 -16:59 – Elina Dirba (Archigrey);

On 09.08.2018 from 09:00 hours the Selection Committee continues its work starting to consider the documents of the Tenderers pursuant to Art. 39, Para. 2 of the Implementing Regulations of the Public Procurement Act related to personal status and selection criteria in compliance with the requirements of Art. 91, Para. 5 of the Implementing Regulations of the Public Procurement Act.

At its work the Selection Committee accepted that with a view to the equality of the Tenderers and the noted down by the Contracting Authority in the announcement in Section IV.2.4) “Languages which the projects or the applications for participation may be made in”, ESPD filled up in the English language will also be adopted.

**The following conclusions were drawn at the consideration:**

**PROJECT No 2707 – Casanova+Hernandez Architects**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- ESPD.

Signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

**PROJECT No 2082 – Arenas Basabe Palacios Arquitectos SL (LTD)**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- 4 numbers ESPD.

The application for participation and the declaration are with a scanned signature in hard copy. The presented ESPDs are in Spanish language but they are signed with an electronic signature, respectively of: Luis Palacios Labrador, Enrique Arenas Laorga (personal and that of the Company as a representative) and Luis Basabe Montalvo.

The participant should present signed in hard copy or with an electronic signature as they are in an electronic variant: An application for participation and a declaration – Model forms 1 and 2. The same should be signed by Enrique Arenas Laorga in his capacity of a representative.

With regard to the presented ESPDs the same should be handed over in the Bulgarian or in the English languages, which are the two languages marked up by the Contracting Authority as admissible in the competition. The new ESPDs also should be signed with an electronic signature.

**PROJECT No 2685 – Diego Terna;**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- ESPD.

Signed .

On an electronic carrier:

- ESPD – signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

### **PROJECT No 3761 – Tsvetomir Tsenkov**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- ESPD.

Signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

### **PROJECT No 9177 – OVO GRABCHEVSKI ARCHITECTS**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration.

Signed.

On an electronic carrier:

- ESPD – signed with an electronic signature.

The participant has presented an ESPD, in which he omitted to indicate whether he satisfies the selection criteria, namely whether there is a person in the team who is a diplomaed architect. In this manner the model form is not filled up appropriately and a new such is to be presented with correctly filled up information.

### **PROJECT No 1844 – Interval Architects**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation – подписана със сканиран подпис;
- Declaration – signed with a scanned signature;

- ESPD – not signed.

The Participant does not satisfy the set up conditions and selection criteria as the Application for Participation and the Declaration are with a scanned signature. The presented ESPD is not signed.

The Participant should present a signed document in hard copy or with an electronic signature if the documents are in an electronic variant: ESPD, Application for Participation and Declaration – Model forms 1 and 2.

#### **PROJECT No 2927 – Rositsa Nikiforova**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration.  
Signed.
- Other documents.

On an electronic carrier:

- ESPD – signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

#### **PROJECT No 2285 – Sunday Group LTD**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- ESPD.  
Signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

#### **PROJECT No 9552 – ES EN 1 EOOD (LTD)**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- Additional information consultants.  
Signed .

On an electronic carrier:

- ESPD – signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

**PROJECT No 1800 – Claudio Nardi**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- ESPD.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

**PROJECT No 4134 – Association – Maya Shopova, Borislav Angelov and Don Toromanov.**

In hard copy:

- A list;
  - Application for participation;
  - Declaration;
  - Agreement for creation of an association.
- Signed .

On an electronic carrier:

- Four numbers of ESPD – signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

**PROJECT No 1344 – PIN ARCHITECTS EOOD – Desislava Parlapanska**

In hard copy:

- A list;
  - Application for participation;
  - Declaration.
- Signed.

On an electronic carrier:

- ESPD – signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

**PROJECT No 5912 – ADA- Architectural and Design Agency AD (JSC)**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;

- ESPD.

Signed with an electronic signature by Radomira Damyanova. It was established at a reference made in the Commercial Register that ADA – Architectural and Design Agency AD is represented by three persons – Radomira Damyanova, Kristiana Nikolova and Ivo Pantaleev.

The Participant does not satisfy the conditions set up as the Application for Participation, the Declaration and the ESPD ca signed only by one of the persons representing it.

The Participant should present signed in hard copy or with an electronic signature if they are in an electronic variant ESPDs also by the remaining two persons representing it.

### **PROJECT No 5509 – NUC\_VT\_BG DZZD (Company under the Obligations and Contracts Act)**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- Agreement for creation of an association;
- 3 numbers of ESPD, signed electronically by Nikolay Stoyanov and Yordan Kutev.

Signed with an electronic signature.

The Application for Participation and the Declaration are signed in hard copy and after that they are presented as a scanned copy, which is in conflict with the requirements of the Contracting Authority, in conformity with which when documents are presented in an electronic variant, they should be signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant should present an Application for Participation and a Declaration signed in hard copy or on an electronic carrier signed with an electronic signature.

### **PROJECT No 5190 – Özer Yurger Mimarlik LTD**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- A list of the team.

Signed.

On an electronic carrier:

- ESPD – signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

### **PROJECT No 3079 – Am Atrium LTD**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration.  
Signed.

On an electronic carrier:

- ESPD – signed with an electronic signature.

The electronic ESPD signed with an electronic signature is in a format which does not allow for its opening and considering its contents. The Participant should either present a new ESPD, which may be opened on a computer without special software or cooperate for the opening of the file presented providing the programme needed for the purpose or in another appropriate manner.

### **PROJECT No 8470 – Maria Flaccavento**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- Agreement for creation of an association;
- ESPD.  
Signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

### **PROJECT No 6727 – Deset Arhitekti (Ten Architects) EOOD**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- ESPD.  
Signed.

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- Draft of a Contract;
- ESPD in format Word – not signed.

The Participant should present a new ESPD in an electronic variant signed with an electronic signature.

**PROJECT No 3222 – Image Bureau EOOD**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- ESPD – printed version of an electronically signed ESPD.  
Signed.

The Participant should present the signed electronic version of the ESPD on an electronic carrier.

**PROJECT No 5938 – Association Solaris Studio and Orchestra Design**

On an electronic carrier:

- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- Agreement for creation of an association;
- Two numbers of ESPD.

The Participant has not presented a list of the documents, the remaining documents are not signed with an electronic signature. There is no ESPD for the association.

The Participant should present a list of the documents. A signed Application for Participation and a Declaration in hard copy or electronically with an electronic signature. He should present three numbers of ESPD one for the association and one for Solaris Studio and Orchestra Design on an electronic carrier signed with an electronic signature.

**PROJECT No 3200 – Stephen George International Bulgaria LTD**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;  
Signed.

On an electronic carrier:

- ESPD – signed with an electronic signature by Tihomir Kazakov.

It was established at a reference made in the Commercial Register that the Company is represented by two persons – Tihomir Kazakov and Alexander Daw. There is an electronic signature in the presented ESPD affixed only by Tihomir Kazakov but not by Alexander Daw.



The participant should present an ESPD signed by the other representative - Alexander Daw – in an electronic variant signed with an electronic signature.

### **PROJECT No 5877 – Kaps**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;  
Signed.
- Documents in Turkish language.

The participant should present a signed electronic version of an ESPD (European Single Procurement Document) on an electronic carrier. The same should be signed by the persons representing the Company. As the legal-organizational form of the participant does not become clear, the specifics at filling up an ESPD by the various kinds of legal entities and non-personified companies should be taken into consideration.

### **PROJECT No 3864 – ELENA NIKOLOVA ARGIROVA**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;
- ESPD.  
Signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant satisfies the set up conditions and selection criteria.

### **PROJECT No 3470 – Association Bonev and Chayka**

In hard copy:

- A list;
- Application for participation;
- Declaration;  
Signed.
- Agreement for creation of an association – a certified copy.

On an electronic carrier:

- 3 numbers ESPD – signed with an electronic signature respectively by Ivan Bonev and Georgi Georgiev.

## **PROJECT No 8930 – Elina Dirba (Archigrey)**

On an electronic carrier:

- A list;
- Application for participation – with an electronic signature
- ESPD – signed with an electronic signature.

The Participant has not signed and attached Declaration model form No 2. The same should be presented signed in hard copy or in an electronic manner with an electronic signature.

In conformity with Art. 54, Para. 9 of the Implementing Regulations of the Public Procurement Act within a term of **up to 5 working days** from the receipt of this Protocol the Tenderer may present to the Selection Committee a new ESPD and/or other documents which contain changed and/or supplemented information.

The deadline for the receipt of the answers expired on 17.08.2018.

On date 15.10.2018 from 10.00ч. Hours the Selection Committee continued its work for consideration of the received answers with additional documents required by Protocol No 2 of 09.08.2018.

Responses were received from the following participants:

Caps – No.5877 - dated 13.08.2018;

Arenas Basabe Palacios Arquitectos SL (LTD) 2082- dated 13.08.2018;

Elina Dirba (Archigrey) No.8930 - dated 14.08.2018;

OVO GRABCHEVSKI ARCHITECTS – No.9177 - dated 14.08.2018;

Image Bureau EOOD (LTD) – No.3222 - dated 15.08.2018

The participants:

Interval Architects – No.1844

ADA- Architectural and Design Agency AD (JSC) – No.5912

NUC\_VT\_BG DZZD – No.5509

Am Atrium Ltd. – No.3079

Deset Arhitekti (Ten Architects) EOOD (LTD) – No.6727

Association Solaris Studio and Orchestra Design – No.5938

Stephen George International Bulgaria LTD – No.3200 – the participant has sent a letter (after the expiry of the deadline for filing documents) stating that he / she will present the requested documents when requested. The Public Procurement Act does not allow for re-request of the documents after the expiry of the 5 working days. Therefore, the jury accepts that the participant has not submitted the required documents within the statutory time limit have not submitted replies within the required time

limit and the jury proposes to be removed from the competition on the grounds of Art. 107, item 1 of the Public Procurement Act.

**The jury proceeded to examine the additional documents received by the various participants.**

**PROJECT No.5877 – Caps**

The participant has applied:

ESPD in English signed with an electronic signature by the person representing the company - Pinar Actas.

The attached ESPD meets the requirements of the Public Procurement Act and the terms of the competition.

**Based on the above, the jury accepted that the participant meets the criteria for personal status and selection.**

**PROJECT No.2082 – Arenas Basabe Palacios Arquitectos SL (LTD)**

The participant has applied:

- 1. Application form, signed electronically by Enrique Laorga, representing the company.**
- 2. Declaration Form 2, signed electronically by Enrique Laorga, representing the company.**
- 3. 3 pcs. ESPD in English signed by Enrique Laorga, Louis Montalvo and Luis Labrador respectively.**

After examining the documents, the jury judged that they were in compliance with the Public Procurement Act and the terms of the competition.

The participant did not submit a fourth ESPD on behalf of the company as required by Written statement No. 2. However, the Jury considers that the participant should not be removed due to the following reasons:

The submitted ESPD shows all the information necessary to assess the status of the participant regarding personal status and selection criteria. The information is submitted with ESPD signed by the representative of Enrique Laorga. The participant has submitted an ESPD on behalf of the company together with his project, which is also in Spanish signed by Enrique Laorga and should be considered as a valid application for participation.

**Based on the above, the jury accepted that the participant meets the criteria for personal status and selection criteria.**

**PROJECT No.9177 – OVO GRABCHEVSKI ARCHITECTS**

The participant has applied:

1. ESPD in English signed with an electronic signature by the person representing the company - Oscar Grabchevski.
2. Scanned diploma for completed higher education speciality - architecture.

The attached ESPD meets the requirements of the Public Procurement Act and the terms of the competition.

**Based on the above, the jury accepted that the participant meets the criteria for personal status and selection criteria.**

#### **PROJECT No.3222 – Image Bureau EOOD (LTD)**

The participant has applied:

ESPD in Bulgarian signed with an electronic signature by the person representing the company - Velislav Dotsin.

The attached ESPD meets the requirements of the Public Procurement Act and the terms of the competition.

**Based on the above, the jury accepted that the participant meets the criteria for personal status and selection criteria.**

#### **PROJECT No.8930 – Elina Dirba (Archigrey)**

The participant has applied:

Declaration Form 2, signed electronically by Elina Dirba.

The attached declaration meets the requirements of the Contracting Authority and the terms of the competition.

**Based on the above, the jury accepted that the participant meets the criteria for personal status and selection criteria.**

**AFTER EXAMINING THE PERSONAL STATUS AND THE COMPLIANCE WITH THE SELECTION CRITERIA, THE JURY MADE THE FOLLOWING RANKING OF THE ADMITTED PARTICIPANTS:**

1. **PROJECT No.1800 – Claudio Nardi;**
2. **PROJECT No.2685 – Diego Terna;**
3. **PROJECT No.3222 – Image Bureau EOOD (LTD);**
4. **PROJECT No.2082 – Arenas Basabe Palacios Arquitectos SL (LTD) ;**

5. PROJECT No.4134 - Association - Maya Shopova, Borislav Angelov and Don Toromanov
6. PROJECT No.9177 – OVO GRABCHEVSKI ARCHITECTS;
7. PROJECT No.5877 – Caps;
8. PROJECT No.9552 – ES EN 1 EOOD (LTD);
9. PROJECT No.2927 – Rositsa Nikiforova;
10. PROJECT No.1344 – PIN ARCHITECTS EOOD (LTD) - Desislava Parlapanska;
11. PROJECT No.2707 - Casanova+Hernandez Architects;
12. PROJECT No.3761 – Tsvetomir Tsenkov;
13. PROJECT No.5190 – Ozer Yurger Mimarlik LTD
14. PROJECT No.3864 – ELENA NIKOLOVA ARGIROVA;
15. PROJECT No.4370 – Association Bonev and Chayka;
16. PROJECT No.8930 – Elina Dirba (Archigrey);
17. PROJECT No.8470 – Maria Flaccavento;
18. PROJECT No.2285 – Sunday Group LTD.

**THE SELECTION COMMITTEE CONFERS PRIZES TO THE  
FOLLOWING TENDERERS:**

**FIRST AWARD - 25000 EURO - KLAUDIO NORDI;  
SECOND AWARD - 15000 EURO - DIEGO TERNA;  
THIRD AWARD - 10000 EURO - "IMAGE BUREAU" Ltd;**

---

**First Encouragement Award - 5000 Euro - Arenas Basabe Palacios Arkitektos SL (Ltd);  
Second Encouragement Award - 5000 Euros - Maya Shopova, Borislav Angelov and Don  
Toromanov;**

**Third Encouragement Award - 5000 Euro - OBO GRABCHEV ARCHITECTS;**

**Fourth Encouragement Award - 5000 Euro - Caps;**

**Fifth Encouragement Award - 5000 Euro - "EU EN 1" Ltd.**