

## MINUTES OF THE EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Name of the competition: Artistic intervention for the main underpass in Trenčín  
Announcement published: <https://www.trencin2026.eu/>  
Promoter: Creative Institute Trenčín  
Mierové námestie 1/2 Trenčín 911 64  
Meeting date: 02.05.2025 09:00 and 12.05.2025 09:00

### 1. List of jury members:

Independent of the Announcer:

1. Martin Piaček – Artist and university lecturer, Academy of Fine Arts and Design
2. Jana Benková – Architect, benkobenkova studio
3. Samu Forsblom – Program Director, European Capital of Culture Oulu 2026
4. Vivien Doumpa – Urbanist, Board Member Placemaking Europ

Dependent on the Announcer:

5. Omar Mirza – City Curator – Public Space Specialist, City of Trenčín

Alternates for Jury Members:

1. Filip Ovádek – Designer and Visual Artist, Fest Art Studio
2. Peter Kohout – Architect, City of Trenčín

Expert Advisor:

1. Vladimír Beskid – Program Manager, European Capital of Culture Trenčín 2026

### 2. Course of the meeting

The jury met for the first time on **02.05.2025** by online meeting. The secretary of the competition informed the jury members about the progress of the public procurement and the reasons for the postponement of the original deadline.

**23 proposals** were delivered within the deadline for submitting proposals, 22 of which met the required requirements and were verified by the competition verifier. Verification of the competition proposals is the subject of a separate minutes of the verification of proposals.

During the meeting, the jury agreed to further evaluate proposals No. **1, 7, 13, 15, 17** and **22**, which will determine the order, and all other proposals ended up below threshold line.

On the second jury meeting on **12.05.2025** the jury proposed an overall evaluation within the **6 proposals**.

The final evaluation and final positions for all selected proposals is listed below.

### 3. Final results:

The jury evaluated the submitted proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria specified in the competition conditions. The resulting ranking of the proposals:

Number	Authors	Place
Proposal Nr. 1	Prikler atelier Ing. arch. Filip Prikler Ing. arch. Michaela Perejdová Ing. arch. Lenka Čurillová Ing. arch. Miroslav Kürth	4. – 6.
Proposal Nr. 7	Ing. arch. Ivan Kanich Ing. arch. Tomáš Danko Ing. arch. Natália Marková Ing. arch. Ivana Fabiánová	2.
Proposal Nr. 13	STUDIO BRUT Ing. arch. Simona Fischerová Ing. arch. Juraj Izrael	4. – 6.
Proposal Nr. 15	Alexander Kupko Alexander Topilin	3.
Proposal Nr. 17	Ing. arch. Roman Haviar Mgr. art. Peter Beňo	4. – 6.
Proposal Nr. 22	Büro Milk s.r.o. Mgr. art. Danica Pišteková, ArtD. Ing. arch. Tomáš Tholt, PhD. Martin Jenča Martin Péchy	1.

### 4. Evaluation of proposals

#### Proposal Nr. 22:

The concept of a strong 'organism' suspended from the ceiling serves both as an artistic installation and a solution for lighting. The transformation of space is quite immersive, creating softness and security to otherwise cold and grey underpass. An enduring design that captivates every time. In the same time it doesn't create problems with using of the space for its default crossing pedestrian function and doesn't require a special human power to manage activities connected to the proposal, it is self-sufficient.

On the other hand the proposal lacks key elements outlined in the brief, such as informational features (e.g., LCD panels) and references to the Roman inscription. The durability and maintenance of the materials is also questionable, particularly given the humidity levels in the underpass, and the safety aspect in terms of a vandal-proof solution for such a large surface area.

#### Proposal Nr. 7:

A versatile concept of a 'gateway to the city,' featuring thoughtful spatial work with architectural motifs and subtle allusions to historical vaults within a utilitarian space built in the late 20th century. The proposal successfully bridges past and present through excellent use of materials, transparency, reflection, and the interplay of revealing and concealing the original cladding to create a new visual layer. It offers particular spots for a pop up activity such as busking. The rhythmic treatment of the space and its functional organization is well-considered, fulfilling all requirements set out in the brief.

Even though the design is visually appealing, with a attractive colour scheme, there is a concern in terms of longevity of this particular design, that it might get outdated after time. Concern is also about the colouring of the stone floor, which is against the brief and if the design would still work without it. The metal mesh cladding which is accesible by pedestrians might need an extra maintenance.

#### Proposal Nr. 15:

The proposal envisions the entire underpass as a futuristic, visually compelling, immersive, and interactive audiovisual installation – turning each passage through the space into a unique experience. The conceptual link to the Roman inscription, conveyed through the title rather than through obvious visual elements, is particularly interesting. A strong point is the system's versatility, offering multiple operational modes. Works well with the underpass basic function.

However, concerns arise regarding the operation, technical reliability, durability and maintenance of the system. Special attention must also be given to the quality of implementation to ensure that the final result meets expectations and does not remain more impressive in visualizations than in reality. For some people especially with neurodivergency might be this design overstimulated.

### 5. Competition results – Prizes

According to section 17 of the competition terms and conditions, prizes and rewards will be awarded as follows:

Number	Prize	Place
Proposal Nr. 22	3000 eur	1.
Proposal Nr. 7	2400 eur	2.
Proposal Nr. 15	1800 eur	3.