

JONUSO RADVILOS PALACE MUSEUM RECONSTRUCTION INTERNATIONAL OPEN ARCHITECTURAL PROJECT COMPETITION

EVALUATION JURY REPORT

Jury's meeting dates: October 6th-8th 2021

Chair of the meeting: Arūnas Gelūnas

Participating members of the Evaluation Jury: dr. Arūnas Gelūnas (Chair of the Evaluation Jury, director of LNMA), Mindaugas Pakalnis (Head of the Chief City Architect's Department of Vilnius City Municipality Administration (Chief City Architect), architect), Rolandas Palekas (architect „Paleko ARCH studija“, Lithuania), Jan Belina Brzozowski (architect „BBGK Architekci“, Poland), Siiri Valner (architect „Kavakava“, Estonia), dr. Lolita Jablonskienė (Head of the National Art Gallery of the LNMA), Jolanta Jurašienė (Deputy Director for Exhibitions and Education of the LNMA), Aurimas Sasnauskas (architect „A2sm“, Lithuania; Alternate member), Mindaugas Staniūnas (Chief Architect, Strategic Planning and Investment Division, LNMA).

Secretary of the meeting: Rūta Leitanaitė

Guests: Matas Šiupšinskas (Technical Committee), reviewer Sigita Bugeniene

1st STAGE. Presentation of the 1st protocol of the Public Procurement Commission and the review of the Technical Commission. Decision on the projects, submitted by the suppliers, compliance with the requirements set out in the competition terms and with the assessment of their acceptance.

DECISION (unanimous):

No.	Participant code CVP IS	Motto code of the participant	Decision	Reason
1.	Participant 38	112112	Accept	
2.	Participant 67	HBB021	Accept	
3.	Participant 47	C6YW75	Accept	
4.	Participant 74	ACTMNT	Discard	Not all of the material, indicated in the Competition Brief and necessary for the evaluation, is submitted.
5.	Participant 66	VIL729	Accept	
6.	Participant 61	XIDIGJ	Accept	
7.	Participant 46	814395	Accept	
8.	Participant 34	BPS93I	Accept	
9.	Participant 51	NFRAME	Accept	
10.	Participant 52	INSERT	Accept	
11.	Participant 43	FENRKT	Accept	
12.	Participant 31	33HXW	Accept	
13.	Participant 62	LIGHTS	Accept	
14.	Participant 4	LNDMRR	Accept	

15.	Participant 35	AFB912	Discard	Not all of the material, indicated in the Competition Brief and necessary for the evaluation, is submitted.
16.	Participant 50	DH1382	Accept	
17.	Participant 65	RCOZ21	Discard	Not all of the material, indicated in the Competition Brief and necessary for the evaluation, is submitted.
18.	Participant 3	RRUMAI	Accept	
19.	Participant 68	110811	Accept	
20.	Participant 70	J2R4M8	Accept	
21.	Participant 16	GRUL7C	Accept	
22.	Participant 60	Z240620	Accept	
23.	Participant 44	TJLJAA	Discard	Not all of the material, indicated in the Competition Brief and necessary for the evaluation, is submitted.
24.	Participant 71	SHJJHH	Accept	
25.	Participant 42	SM9915	Accept	
26.	Participant 41	91B2T8	Accept	
27.	Participant 56	No Motto	Discard	Not all of the material, indicated in the Competition Brief and necessary for the evaluation, is submitted.
28.	Participant 27	JVN021	Accept	
29.	Participant 54	ELMNTS	Accept	
30.	Participant 20	J04J21	Accept	
31.	Participant 57	ZDJZSH	Discard	Not all of the material, indicated in the Competition Brief and necessary for the evaluation, is submitted.
32.	Participant 73	000VNO	Accept	
33.	Participant 69	2HB361	Discard	Not all of the material, indicated in the Competition Brief and necessary for the evaluation, is submitted.

2ND STAGE. Analysis, discussion and ranking of the Projects that had not been discarded. The reviewers had presented to the Jury the solutions, proposed in every Project (that had not been discarded), and their accordance to the Competition requirements. The reviewer Sigita Bugenienė participated in person, and the written reviews of the reviewers Vytautas Lelys, Martynas Marozas, Martynas Mankus were presented to the Jury by the Secretary. The reviewer Sigita Bugenienė participated in the session without a right to vote. There was a discussion among the Evaluation Jury members about the compliance of the proposals of each Project to the Criteria*.

* **Competition Brief Point 58:** Evaluation criteria (criteria are not listed in descending order of importance):

- 58.1. general architectural concept, it's architectural expression and quality;
- 58.2. quality of urban solutions;
- 58.3. functionality of the building complex, rational layout of the programme;
- 58.4. preserving and revealing its historical and cultural value;
- 58.5. potential to implement the project within the planned budget in the proposed stages.

Decision on the Preliminary rank of the Projects (unanimous)

No.	Participant code CVP IS	Motto code of the participant	Points* (1-100)	Rank
1.	Participant 38	112112	55	8
2.	Participant 67	HBB021	54	9
3.	Participant 47	C6YW75	75	3
5.	Participant 66	VIL729	40	18
6.	Participant 61	XIDIGJ	36	20
7.	Participant 46	814395	49	13
8.	Participant 34	BPS931	34	22
9.	Participant 51	NFRAME	26	26
10.	Participant 52	INSERT	86	2
11.	Participant 43	FENRKT	51	11
12.	Participant 31	33XHXW	33	23
13.	Participant 62	LIGHTS	46	14
14.	Participant 4	LNDMRR	59	6
16.	Participant 50	DH1382	37	19
18.	Participant 3	RRUMAI	94	1
19.	Participant 68	110811	44	16
20.	Participant 70	J2R4M8	45	15
21.	Participant 16	GRUL7C	62	5
22.	Participant 60	Z240620	53	10
24.	Participant 71	SHJJHH	31	24
25.	Participant 42	SM9915	35	21
26.	Participant 41	91B2T8	50	12
28.	Participant 27	JVN021	42	17
29.	Participant 54	ELMNTS	57	7
30.	Participant 20	J04J21	70	4
32.	Participant 73	000VNO	29	25

* **Competition Brief II.15. Grounds for rejection of project offers**

84. The Public Procurement Commission shall reject the project offer, if:

84.7. if the sum total of the points awarded to the architectural design by the Evaluation Commission is less than 50 points.

EVALUATION JURY'S REPORT ABOUT THE EVALUATED COMPETITION PROJECTS

Rank: 8

Motto: 112112

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 1

Participant code CVP IS: 38

The project is thoughtful, polite and leaning to the safer side, what rises the doubt whether this is an image that a contemporary art museum expects. The architectural language is simple and pure, and anonymous. There's a lack of innovation in architectural concept, and the overall idea doesn't bring much added value to the site.

The proposal suggests to complete the composition of the Palace and transform the backside into a museum courtyard. The completed U shape defines the square of the museum. The open façade on the ground floor and the art terrace connects inside and outside spaces of the museum.

All existing trees on the site are to be preserved except for the ones above the new basement, however the proposed layout of the new trees lacks a coherent vision or as mentioned in the proposal, a 'grid'. Thus, the idea of an open boundary is not supported enough leading to a lack of definition for the public space in front of the museum; it seems very unorganised. The courtyard in the backside is quite small and might not provide enough lighting to be usable as an outdoor space.

The terrace in the courtyard is in conflict with the historical layout.

The architectural idea offers circulation around a simple backbone structure - the Palace Gallery, which connects all buildings within the museum. Three new Pavilions are proposed with a unified expression. The Administration Pavilion allows for a flexible office layout with both cell offices and open offices.

The three volumes each have their own unique detailing of window openings and compositions based on the different functions. Continuity of exciting elevation is discussed yet not visualized enough.

The new volume has a coherent architectural expression moulded in the new brickwork that matches the colours of the existing buildings. The pavement pattern gradually changes from smaller tiles to large scale tiles on the square providing a gradual shift from the building exterior to the open space.

The principal U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored, leaving the western side of the former courtyard open. Attributes of the complex are preserved and integrated, as well as some other buildings located in the eastern part of the territory (A) (former Sports Hall). In the western part of the territory (A), in the place of the former courtyard, the square is formed; the tree-lined part of the area (B) highlights the boundaries of the square. The restoration of the former Palace structure is slightly improvised: the attribute - place and volume of the former North Southern Pavilion – is altered. In the southern part of the square, the new terrace is proposed, leaning against the remains of the Southern building (No. 6), changing the perimeter and character of the former courtyard.

When planting trees in area (B), their potential negative impact on the archaeological heritage should be assessed.

Restoration of the volumes of historic structures' is planned. The new volumes are proposed in the style of modest contemporary architecture. Materials proposed: reinforced concrete, brick masonry, glass; a neutral colour palette is proposed. Volumes of the proposed new structures, the shape and structure of the roofs do not comply with the VOPR (Vilnius Oldtown (unique code in the Register 16073) Protection Regulation) and the characteristics of the area (zone).

Protected buildings to be integrated into the proposed development. The 2- story structure of the First Eastern wing (No. 4) is to be restored. The building No. 11 is kept and integrated into the complex. The other buildings are suggested to be demolished. In the place of the historic building No. 12, the new building of the bigger volume is proposed and that does not comply with general regulations. An underground floor is proposed under the restored buildings No.7 and No. 8 and after the southern part of the square. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer. Additionally, underground construction would be very complicated and expensive because of the present underground city infrastructure.

Adaptive reuse of an old building is an advantage. The proposal includes a clear division of functions both in relation to visitors and staff but also between exhibition and non-exhibition spaces. However, the pragmatic layout creates a weak narrative for functional zoning. Furthermore, functional zoning schemes lack clarity due to poor colouring.

The logistics proposed are functional and solved, however, it needs more elaboration. An entrance from Liejyklos street is proposed, however, the ground floor plan suggests another entrance from the square into the docking space which raises more questions than answers hence, a further detailing of art handling and logistics is needed.

Rational design in terms of cost-related design decisions. The building No. 11 is kept, the underground part is limited.

Additional remark: The graphic material lacks clarity, schemes should provide information easy to understand, there are some inconsistencies between the 3D renderings and plan drawings.

Rank: 9

Motto: HBB021

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 2

Participant code CVP IS: 67

The original U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored. The attributes of the complex are integrated. However, the proposals damage too much the heritage and don't bring an adequate value to the site. The main gesture – the glazed structure - is oversimplified and the historical richness of the site is not enhanced.

The main area of the former Palace courtyard is proposed to be covered with glazed structure (to strengthen the connections and to prolong seasonality) that forms a new volume in the place that had been historically open. Additionally, the space will not be instantly approachable by all the citizens, which is a disadvantage. The large-scale proposed glazed construction will obscure the layout of protected buildings and the perception of the structure of the historic Palace. The transparency of glass as material is very difficult to get and is more a manipulation than a real result to be achieved.

In order to complete the original footprint of the complex symmetrical composition, two volumes are planned that include the new functions that the complex lacks, the loading dock area and the auditorium, educational area and restoration space. The scale of the proposed volumes of the complex will overshadow the existing ones.

The flat roof shape of new buildings does not comply with VOPR regulations and the characteristics of the area (zone). References are made to other international examples, but, e.g., The British Museum or the Rijksmuseum have covered courtyards, not the open entrance spaces to the main façades; the same is for the Tate Gallery and the Louvre: the scale of the new structures do not change the character of the main space. Demolition of other structures in the eastern part of the territory (A), except No. 12, is proposed and a garden is to be installed. A square is proposed in the territory (B). Greenery is being designed in the square.

The restoration of the former Palace structure is improvised: the attribute - place and volume of the former structures is altered not following the lines and the volumes of the former structures. In place of the buildings No. 7 and No. 8 one big volume is proposed. The glazed structure will form the new layout and transform the boundaries of the built-up area. The structures that due to their scale and place alter and cover the attributes of the site are prohibited following the general regulations and do not comply with the VOPR. According to VOPR the building density for the site is – 60% (and proposed building density - 72%).

When planting trees in area (B), their potential negative impact on the archaeological heritage should be assessed.

Protected buildings to be integrated into the proposed development. In some of the premises the protected interior wall structure is proposed to be altered. The building No. 12 is preserved and integrated into the complex, which is commendable, but the sloping roof is replaced by a flat one, which is not typical of the area.

An underground floor is proposed under the territory (A), except under the protected buildings and the Southern Pavilion. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

Gardens are recovered both in the exterior and interior of the palace which gives continuity to the historical tradition of internal courtyards of the old town. The landscape includes plant barriers with diagonal paths that create a visual separation from the Vilnius Street. However, the layout of the landscape does not provide a clear idea for the shapes of the plantings.

The proposal raises an interesting idea that the lack of knowledge of the new artistic currents that will be developed in the future commits to creating “a space free of limits” and successfully achieves it. However, the entrance for the art loading seems out of place as it is positioned in the main facade and does not benefit it.

Small architecture and lighting solutions as well as material selection based on heritage requirements provide additional depth to the proposal.

The Project includes the analysis of existing exhibition spaces in Vilnius. The functional layout of the complex is clear, but not rational nor balanced. The glass volume is too big in proportion with the underground functions. The solution of the main exhibition hall underground is unrealistic. Instead of locating the necessary functions above the ground, the authors give the priority to the atrium space, which makes the solution irrationally expensive to implement.

The maintenance of the glazed surfaces would be too expensive too.

The space beneath the glazed surfaces would get attractive daylight, but if it is to be used as an exhibition space, then it would create a need for additional covering from the daylight.

The loading dock location seems out of place. While freight traffic and entrance through the square might be used only once in a few months, it interferes with the pedestrian space with questionable benefits of such entrance positioning.

Rank: 3rd Prize

Motto: C6YW75

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 3

Participant code CVP IS: 47

The project belongs to the group of proposals that take a restoration / interpretational approach as a basis. Among other projects of this kind this one stands out due to its explicitness and rational simplicity while retaining and bringing back the spirit of the place.

This attitude manifests integrally: from the suggested structure of the whole complex, including functional solutions, to the building

and finishing materials. The lightness of new added volumes (towers and the front gallery/ pergola) proposes a rather non-intrusive presence of the new besides the old.

The original U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored, leaving the western side of the former courtyard partly open. The unprotected historic buildings No. 11 and No. 12 are suggested to be integrated into the museum complex. The historic structures are restored following the volume and scale. The former courtyard wall has been interpreted by the pergola – structure, a border between public (B) and semiprivate (Palace courtyard) spaces (A). The canopy is not just a formal mark of the previous wall, but gives some functions, although the architectural image lacks creativity. The courtyard's solution could potentially activate both sides - street and courtyard, which is positive. Canopy and glass pavilions create urban, casual and inviting atmosphere. Overall impression of courtyard is timeless and chic. Attractive semi-private spaces are created in front of the museum, connecting the complex to the city. But, the proposed structure in place of the courtyard's wall, is likely to obscure the views towards the layout of the protected buildings and could dominate the main layout of the ensemble.

Courtyard, planted with trees, is not characteristic to the period. When planting trees in area (B), their potential negative impact on the archaeological heritage should be assessed.

Restoration of the volumes of historic structures' (in places No. 7, 8, 9) is planned. Materials proposed: light decorative plaster, flat bricks, concrete and glass; a neutral colour palette is proposed. Protected buildings to be integrated into the proposed restoration project. The historic buildings are kept and integrated into the complex. Conservation and adaptation works would be specified during the further stages of the project development after the further detailed research.

An underground floor is proposed under the restored buildings and the building No. 11, as well as in the western part of the territory (A), between the Western and Southern Pavilions. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer, especially in the western part of the territory due to rich archaeological layer (following the Act).

The landscape solutions in zone B of the competition are rather pragmatic. The public space in zone B creates a pedestrian path rather than a public space.

The architectural language is generic, outdated (more of 80-ies or 90-ies) and doesn't create an inspiring image of a contemporary art institution. Subdued and clearly articulated facades with large glazing and vertical divisions, balanced by solid wall surfaces are used. The window layout does not relate to the existing facades. The roof structure in front of the palace hosts two pavilions - a café and a kiosk.

A pathway leading to the central pavilion divides the Museum courtyard into two areas and the whole courtyard is complemented by an alley of formed trees providing shade for the café visitors.

The proposal includes a clear path through the exposition on the ground floor. The entrance to the lobby is properly organized, but the offices are very small. The cloak rooms and transfer to the big hall at the back is quite narrow, therefore the access should be more generous. The space between the exposition hall in the backyard and the existing volumes seems too small to be usable and does not provide any function.

There are no separate premises for education proposed.

Function-wise, the solution to dedicate the sports hall building to temporary exhibitions, locating the conference hall below is fine, but allocating the big hall at -2 level would augment the expenses irrationally. Only one entrance for all the functions is not functional: two separate entrances would work better and activate the city more, providing a possibility to host several big events at once.

The art handling and loading solutions are solved making the delivery entrance is in the courtyard. The Project respects the idea of delivery and corresponds the technical requirements.

The solution to connect the two towers through the basement would be complicate and expensive, because of the underground city infrastructure.

Overall, the project is rationally designed. There are additional difficulties, costs and time-consuming process building under the hall at the back of the quarter. The underground parts of the project should be reduced and thought out.

Rank: 18

Motto: VIL729

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 5

Participant code CVP IS: 66

The Project lacks clear vision and argumentation.

The new buildings in the front of the Palace mimic the existing buildings yet the backside volume falls out of context, thus the proposal juxtapositions itself by both following the historic layout of the building but also suggesting a rather unique looking volume in the backside. While the front side volumes are in scale the proposal loses the suggested symmetry of the existing Palace by adding additional volume to the building out of the scope of the competition by the Liejyklos street.

The landscape solutions do not provide a clear vision either. The placement of the pond in the front yard is rather questionable as it limits the use of space for gatherings or outdoor cinema as discussed in the explanatory note. Furthermore, zone B limits the access to the territory through a single path and lacks argumentation for the grid planting of the trees.

The main staircase as a connecting element of the space serves an iconic object yet the positioning of the staircase shifts the entrance to the side creating inconsistencies in the pedestrian routes. The elevations do not provide a clear message as the window placement follows only some of the elevation heights however completely ignores the others.

While the skylights over the museum hall provide the needed indirect daylight, the size of the skylights seem to be out of scale and lack visual connection to the rest of the proposal.

Due to the limited access through the public space in zone B, the pond and the entrance on the front right side of the main facade the pedestrian paths are inconsistent. The restaurant is placed over several rooms without any proposal for outdoor seating and limited outdoor lighting. Furthermore, the proposed observation deck is questionable as the height of the building might not provide the wanted results. Thus it can be concluded that the functional layout lacks logic.

The original U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored, leaving the western side of the former courtyard open. The protected buildings to be integrated into the museum complex. The other structures in the eastern part of the territory (A) to be demolished (or reconstructed) except for the building Nr. 12. In the western part of the territory (A), in the place of the former courtyard, the square is formed; the tree-lined part of the area (B) highlights the boundaries and the functional zoning of the square.

Volume of the proposed new structure in place of the former historic buildings, as well as the shape and structure of the roof, does not comply with the VOPR (restricted regime set for the territory (A)) and the characteristics of the area (zone). When planting trees in area (B), their potential negative impact on the archaeological heritage should be assessed.

Restoration of the volumes of historic structures' (in places No. 7, 8, 9) is planned. Protected buildings to be integrated into the proposed development; the other buildings are proposed to be reconstructed, adapted for the functions of the museum. An addition is planned to the Southern Wing (No. 6). Materials proposed: white concrete, glass; for interiors – wood, marble. The roof construction and active form proposed for the building No. 11 does not comply with the VOPR and the characteristics of the area (zone) and is supposed to be forming the new silhouette of the Palace ensemble. (VOPR: the level of the cornice and roof ridge shall not exceed the level of those of the surrounding buildings). The altitudes of the buildings are missing in the drawings. (22,91 m - according to the text file).

Protected buildings to be integrated. In some of the premises the protected interior wall structure is proposed to be altered. Altering of some of the attributes of the site could be expected though the current drawings are quite abstract.

An underground floor is proposed under the reconstructed buildings and the building No. 11, as well as under the territory (A). It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer, according to the Act and archaeological research.

The historical part and the complement to the historical U layout are cost effective. However, the demolition of building No. 11 was assumed and a new part that seems to be scaled up in terms of interference with the layout of historic buildings as well as investment costs. The underground part is too big.

Additional remark: the visual material is of rather of poor quality.

Rank: 20

Motto: XIDIGJ

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 6

Participant code CVP IS: 61

The Project has an attractive lightness and bravery to play with the composition of the new and the old. However, the architectural approach is not original, rather "poppy" – it's not the image the Museum expects.

The Project proposes a U-shaped volume of the palace with a landmark object for the lobby settled in the middle of the front courtyard. The spherical see-through shape of the lobby creates an image which highly contrasts to the existing layout and creates a modern public space. However, amber as an inspiration for the volume does not seem to provide connection to the storyline of the place. The shapes of the green patches in the courtyard do not seem to be connected to the context, even though one of the elevated green patches is used to hide the technical loading entrance.

Modern architectural language is used for the central 'tower', however the new block on Liejyklos street lacks identity as it follows the existing block but loses the historic charm. The courtyard of area A is divided into an inner courtyard and an outer courtyard. The front courtyard is organised in a semi enclosed manner. The renaissance style backyard provides an interesting and contextual image of space.

Additional guides and advertising services for tourists are organised in the front courtyard which benefits the program. On the right side of the courtyard the cafe provides the opportunity to open the complex to passers-by. The two "corners" enclose into a circular event venue creating a small amphitheatre; however, the scale of the amphitheatre seems rather small in comparison to the lobby and the palace building around it.

The landscape program does not interact with the proposed triangle shapes. The general lobby space is iconic and flexible enough to hold meetings, events, and performances, yet the whole functional layout seems unfinished. Two exhibition halls are suggested on the higher levels on the opposite sides of the building without any functional connections between them. In some scenarios such layout could work however, it lacks versatility for adapting to different needs of expositions.

The proposal to dedicate the building No. 11 to a future space for the design doesn't correspond to the needs of the Museum.

The solution to locate many functions underground would augment the expenses substantially.

The loading area and technical entrance is covered, thus, even though it is organised in the front the technical entrance is hidden behind the raised landscape.

The original U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. The other buildings in the eastern part of the territory (A) proposed to be demolished except for the historic building No. 12. In the western part of the territory, design of the square comprising pavilions (small structures) and greenery is proposed. In the eastern part of the territory the courtyard with the added corridor along the facades of the historic buildings is designed. The proposed installation of the pavilions in the square does not convey the information about the historical building locations here; on the contrary, it divides the space, changes the terrain character of the place.

The proposed new structure of active design and colour, in the former Palace's courtyard, looks intrusive in the protected historic environment. Courtyard, planted with trees, is not characteristic to the period.

Restoration of the volumes of historic structures' (in places No. 7, 8, 9) is planned. Materials proposed: colourful concrete tiles, organic glass, natural stone, textured paint, Dutch brick. The level of the cornices and roof ridge of the reconstructed volume of the North-eastern Pavilion is proposed higher, exceeding the level of the surrounding buildings; the decision is not supported by the research data. The organic glass is not recommended material; stone – not characteristic for roof covering.

Protected buildings are to be integrated into the structure of the complex, but the third floor of the First Eastern Wing (No. 4) is not in the drawings, nor is there any information as to whether the number of floors in this building has been reduced.

An underground floor (9 m.) is proposed under the territory (A), except for under the protected buildings. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer, according to the Act and archaeological research.

Rank: 13

Motto: 814395

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 7

Participant code CVP IS: 46

The Project suggests an intriguing idea in a theoretical way, but the final result is far from satisfying. The concept of creating an uncomplete, broken, unbalanced image is interesting as an alternative way of thinking of an art institution. However, the solutions are a collection of impossible things. The current structure of the territory is proposed to be developed, not restoring the valuable Palace ensemble. The protected buildings are preserved; the other buildings - No. 11 and No. 12, in the eastern part of the territory (A), are proposed to be reconstructed. In the western part of the territory the open space – the square has been proposed; a parking lot is planned in the representative part of the square.

The type of the building, which is not characteristic to the zone, is designed. When installing stairs, the relief of the territory is visually changed. Protected buildings No. 5 and No. 6 are not integrated into the museum complex.

A new large-scale building is being designed in the area. Material proposed: concrete. Proposed new design for the territory: volumes, roof type and form, materiality doesn't comply with the regulations for the site and characteristics of the area. Protected buildings are to be integrated into the structure of the complex, except for No. 5 and No. 6. In some of the premises of the buildings No. 2 and No. 4 the protected interior wall structure is proposed to be eliminated, which makes alterations in a heritage protected site.

The building No. 12 is integrated into the complex, the building No. 11 is proposed to be reconstructed, but the proposed design does not comply with the VOPR and the characteristics of the area (zone): volumes, roofs, and materiality.

An underground floor is proposed under the territory (A) and the newly designed structures. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer, according to the Act and archaeological research. It would also augment the expenses of implementation of the Project.

The staircase to an observation deck is used as an iconic object and attraction point. However, the stairs have no clear destination, and an unwelcoming space under the stairs is created. The slope created by the stairs visually divides the palace structure into two separate units. The small size of the proposed building is lost in the overall composition of the palace. Furthermore, the usability of the viewing dock is questionable due to the low elevation, surrounding buildings and trees there might not be much to see. Even though in the explanatory note it is suggested that the staircase extends the public space further there seems to be no visual evidence for such a statement. Furthermore, there seems to be no interaction between the public space and the building whatsoever.

In the renderings, the exposition hall seems small with low level ceilings. The café and the bookshop under the plaza would not work functionally.

The whole complex is cut from the Vilnius street by a parking lot that does not create any architectural value. The pedestrian connections throughout the space are not provided. Functional layout does not have connections between different spaces either. Exposition halls have separate entrances and are not connected in the interior. The functional program is of low quality.

Additional comment: the Proposal does not provide the necessary information and overall is unfinished to be fully evaluated. Half of the explanatory note is used for general indicators.

Rank: 22

Motto: BPS93I

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 8

Participant code CVP IS: 34

The Project misses the important connection with Vilnius old town as a heritage site and does not benefit the public space or the existing buildings.

The Project suggests a semi-closed layout of the buildings. The volume structure completely ignores the existing and the historic layout and is set as a contrasting volume for the context. The front building divides and covers the existing palace with a contrasting glazed facade. The new building divides the public space into two spaces that are too small in regards to the scale of the building height. The small courtyard limits the possible functional uses of the space as well as ruins the clarity of the entrance to the complex. The architectural idea behind the facade structure is unclear as the window grid seems pragmatic and does not provide a clear message. The bright red oval shape of the auditorium draws attention; however, the reasoning of such shape is not clear and does not support a coherent message behind the vision.

The new glazed facades do not represent the museum function. Furthermore, the steel structures used in the glass facades are in high contrast to Vilnius old town as a heritage site.

The oval shaped auditorium has separate entrances which can provide functionality for the hall as a unit. However, the suggested loop of the exposition is lost between the different floors of the building.

Car and freight traffic and the location of the logistics seems unreasonable. Car traffic is suggested through the pedestrian part of Vilnius street and the front courtyard with already limited space is used for loading which can lead to conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.

The main concept of the project – design of the new urban space. Also, the creation of a new museum space by integrating protected parts of the Palace complex. All the other buildings in the eastern part of territory (A) are proposed to be demolished and a new intense construction is being proposed. In the western part, a large new volume is being designed, dividing the currently open space into two parts. Priority is given to the conservation of the existing trees. **The project does not meet the main condition – restoration.** A new urban structure is proposed to be developed, and the valuable recognized structure of the former U-shaped plan of the Palace is not being restored. Although valuable parts of the complex are preserved, the newly designed building volumes do not reflect the former valuable character of the ensemble. New buildings are being designed on the site of other buildings, competing on their scale, and obscuring the cultural heritage objects in the territory, in violation of the restricted use regime established for the VOPR territory (A).

New large-scale buildings are being designed in the area. Materials proposed: metal frame construction, glass facades. Proposed new design for the territory: volumes, roof type and form, materiality don't comply with the regulations for the site and characteristics of the area. The height of the designed new buildings may exceed the regulated height (VOPR) – 2 floors with an attic.

Protected buildings are to be integrated into the structure of the complex but no detailed information is provided on their adaptation. All the other buildings are proposed to be demolished; a new building is designed in their place.

An underground floor is designed under the proposed buildings and under the western part of the territory (A), connecting the Western Pavilion (No. 1) and the Southern Pavilion's remains (No. 9). It is proposed to preserve and exhibit archaeological remains. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer, according to the Act and archaeological research.

Building no. 11 was planned to be demolished. In this place, large new parts with large areas on underground floors were proposed. Maintaining the investment costs under these assumptions is unlikely.

Rank: 26

Motto: NFRAME

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 9

Participant code CVP IS: 51

The main concept of this project is to create a new Vilnius city icon, a new city symbol. An organic leaf-shaped structure is proposed in the place of the former historic buildings.

The Project does not offer a proper connection to the existing buildings or the site in general. The elevation heights nor the volume are defined making it impossible to discuss the object in regards to the whole complex. The landscape solutions are underdeveloped.

The proposal suggests pedestrian access to the leaf structure, but does not explain how the structure is accessed. Architectural concept lacks evidence to support the leaf idea. The main access is hidden. The whole layout only includes exposition spaces without any additional function. Thus, the functional program is not developed.

The explanatory note tells that the new structure will connect the protected parts of the Palace complex. The zoning of the western square remains similar: part of the territory (A) is planted with grass, the tree growing here is preserved, territory (B) is covered with a hard surface and adapted for temporary parking. The courtyard on the east side, the former built-up area, is designed as a park.

The project does not meet the main condition – restoration. A new urban structure is proposed to be developed, and the valuable recognized structure of the former U-shaped plan of the Palace is not being restored. Although the valuable parts of the complex are preserved, the newly designed volume does not reflect the former character of the Palace ensemble. Unforeseen functional connection with parts of the complex - buildings No. 5 and No. 6, although the new building covers their facades. New large-scale buildings are being designed in the area. Materials proposed: wood constructions. Proposed new design for the territory: volumes, roof type and form, materiality don't comply with the regulations for the site and characteristics of the area. Protected buildings to be integrated into the structure of the complex, but no detailed information is provided on their adaptation. All the other buildings are proposed to be demolished; a garden is designed instead. The visualizations depict building No. 12, so it is unclear whether it is proposed to be demolished or not.

An underground floor is designed under the western part of the territory (A), but it's impossible to evaluate it because of the lack of information.

Due to the insufficient detail of the design, the costs cannot be assessed. The underground part is too big.

Additional comment: the Project lacks information needed for a full evaluation (plans, sections, etc.). Some of the project drawings do not match.

Rank: 2nd Prize

Motto: INSERT

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 10

Participant code CVP IS: 52

The Project's concept is very successful - a juxtaposition of the new and old, artificial and natural. It amplifies both worlds and creates some kind of friction and in a surprising effect, as giving one a new glasses. The authors create a rich world with very small gestures. The respect for the heritage is evident, and minimalistic approach of the new additions is harmonizing. The complex is organically integrated into an urban fabric.

The Project suggests reconstruction of historical fragments such as structures, volumes, and pavements together with original restoration of existing buildings. The restored buildings are complemented by abstract new volumes and internal courtyards. The new, very simple volumes are lifted on the columns – that means less touching the heritage ground and more possibilities to enliven the city life. However, the spaces behind the colonnades can be dark and unwelcoming – a further elaboration on how to enlighten those spaces is needed.

The main entrance is also used as a sculpture garden. Furthermore, the suggested U shape of the complex plan is complemented by an archaeology garden with integrated remains and public space elements. Main public space doesn't offer any content in order to avoid visual clutter, thus providing more pedestrian traffic possibilities. The landscaping design ensures movement of service and special vehicles.

The old volumes are set for original reconstruction and demolition of later-designed supplemented volumes. As for the new volumes the scale, materiality, and colour are taken from the surrounding architecture, highlighting simplicity and monumentality. **The materiality of the new volumes is important**; however, it is not described explicitly. The proposed terrazzo panels should be connected by visible joints, and the renders show a seamless surface. The concept proposes two worlds brought together – very abstract new and a very detailed old. It needs to be worked out perfectly to be understandable, therefore the quality and appearance of materiality is very crucial.

The landscape concept additionally opens up rich historical layers. The front public space opens up the remains of basements on the pavement and creates the contrast with new granite surfaces. The solution of the main entrance, when two different layers of landscape go to the entry is original and appealing, it creates the entrance space without strict wall.

The functional layout of the building is clear and easy to follow. Furthermore, the layout is flexible and hence, provides several exposition scenarios. The main entrance is planned on the site of the former central pavilion through a spacious arrival lobby connecting all functional areas. Although it would be favourable to have separate entrances in order to organize separate events, it is not the biggest issue.

The proportions of the underground conference hall space are not harmonious – the ceiling is too low. However, there's a possibility to move the main hall above the ground and to improve the proportions. It would also help to reduce costs (the overall construction cost of the project would be rational, even with the quality material for the new facades).

The public space is dedicated to pedestrian and bicycle traffic generating easy to follow flow paths. The functional diagram includes the possibility to integrate the newly renovated building on Liejyklos street.

The cargo scheme lacks some solutions to make it functional.

The U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. The historic buildings in the eastern part of the territory (A) are to be integrated into the museum complex. A square is designed in the western part of the territory, with a colonnade designating the former location of the historic courtyard wall. Greenery is designed for the square. Places of the former historic building are marked on the square floor. The restoration of the former Palace structure is slightly improvised: the attribute - place and volume of the former structures - is altered. The architectural design of the square's floor divides it visually regardless of the historical functional zoning.

Restoration of building volumes in the places of the former structures of the Palace is proposed. The proposed volumes are formed in an abstract contemporary architecture. Materials used: reinforced concrete, terrazzo panels; a neutral colour solution is proposed. The height of the parapets - "cornices", of the proposed buildings exceeds the historical ones; flat roofs are formed: uncharacteristic roofing and roof construction does not comply with the VOPR and the characteristics of the area (zone).

The protected buildings are to be integrated. In some of the premises of the buildings No. 2, 3 and 4 the protected interior wall structure is proposed to be changed. The altitudes and plans of the floors do not match in the drawings: The First Eastern Wing (No. 4) is 3 storeys, but its height match the 2 storey Northern Wing (No. 2). The altitude of its third floor cannot coincide with the altitude of the Northern Pavilion (No. 3) because the heights of the floors differ. In the visualization, the building no. 4 is depicted as 2 storeys.

An underground floor is proposed under the reconstructed buildings and the building No. 11. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

Rank: 11

Motto: FENRKT

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 11

Participant code CVP IS: 43

The Project is a rather successful proposal - it is modern and historical at the same time, recognizable as an art institution. But the authors are not interested in a public space, treating it as a leftover space. The architectural idea, although suggesting modern interventions, lacks identity and violates heritage protection regulations.

The project uses a requested historical "U" shape complex plan, which frames the main public space and holds newly built museum spaces covered on the backside. Architects provide few scenarios for multifunctional, integrated use of the public space, when it is used both for city celebrations and local activities. However, the general design and aesthetic value of the square is quite standard and lacks identity for the place. Also, no inner courtyards as additional are proposed.

Provided transport scheme is integrated into the Vilnius traffic scheme. However, the drop off zone of the art pieces through the main entrance hall could function only when the museum is closed, which is a disadvantage.

The general architectural concept is based on introducing a variety of architectural materiality, highlighting new contemporary volumes and preserving historical buildings. New volumes show a completely different palette and expression from surrounding elements. Existing buildings are partially reconstructed and incorporated into newly built architectural volumes.

In the interior spaces, triple-height open spaces and atriums are proposed, expanding the height of the newly built spaces. As the complex integrates old buildings into the interior, historical materiality of the facades plays an important aesthetical role in interior spaces between new solutions and old traces. The Central pavilion uses a transformable walls system which provides multiple configurations for different art performances allowing full or partial enclosure from the sunlight. Sustainable construction materials - cross laminated timber for interior, paving from local quarries are introduced along with preliminary scheme for the Central pavilion. Movement scheme between exposition halls shows a fluent circular connection between both newly designed spaces and historical volumes.

Differently from most of the projects, architects choose to detach the museum cafe-shop from the main lobby and expose it separately on the corner, creating a strong connection with Liejyklos str., while still keeping the connection to the Southern wing pavilion.

The basement floor is used mostly for additional visitors functions such as conferences, preservation studies and educational workshop spaces.

The original U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. The new buildings are designed in the eastern part of the territory (A). In the western part of the territory, a square of symmetrical layout with greenery is designed.

The large scale of the new building proposed for the eastern part of the territory would alter the silhouette of the Palace and likely be in violation of the restricted usage regime established by the VSAR for territory (A) and the regulated building density - up to 60% (proposed building density (coverage) - 62%).

In the eastern part of the territory (A), new large-scale building is being designed, rising above the protected parts of the complex and partially integrating them. Restoration of building volumes in the places of the former structures of the Palace is proposed. The volumes are formed in the style of contemporary architecture. Materials proposed: wood, glass, stone. Proposed new design for the territory - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations for the site and characteristics of the area. The height of the designed new buildings (20 m) may exceed the regulated height

(VOPR) - 2 floors with an attic. E.g., the height of the historic 2 storey Northern Wing is 14.88 m.

An underground floor is designed under the proposed buildings and under the part of the square. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

Building no. 11 was planned to be demolished. In this place, large new parts with large areas on underground floors were proposed. Keeping the investment costs with the above assumptions is not realistic.

Rank: 23

Motto: 33XHXW

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 12

Participant code CVP IS: 31

The volume itself is of rather big scale and does not have a clear connection to the existing urban layout of Vilnius old town. The Project suggests two symmetrical courtyards in the inner structure of the complex. Additional details for the public space and the landscape design are not provided. In general, the landscape design of the proposal is poor. The proposal uses prefabricated structure which has no visual or empirical connection to the Vilnius old town and the surrounding buildings. The facades do not follow any existing elevation heights or divisions. Based on the renderings, the interior spaces seem rather small with the roof construction occupying a big portion of space which seems as a rather irrational decision. The facades are inactive and lack an important connection with Vilnius Street.

Exhibition spaces are organised in two separate volumes without any internal connections. Hence, such layout does not provide a fluent connection of spaces. The freight diagram suggests using the pedestrian part of Vilnius Street for freight traffic, furthermore loading is organised in the inner courtyards creating conflicts with pedestrians and dividing the museum into separate blocks. The functionality of space is not further detailed. Therefore, the functional layout is perceived as poor.

The main concept of this project – the creation of a new urban space following the tradition of spaces in Vilnius Old Town could not be justified. A new museum space is being created, integrating valuable parts of the Palace complex, with a strong focus on the architecture of the new buildings.

The valuable U-shaped structure of the Palace is not restored. The other in the eastern part of the territory (A) are proposed to be demolished; a new building and a green space is designed instead. In the western part, a large new volume is designed - the former courtyard of the palace will be built-up; intended route for service transport is planned. **The project does not meet the main condition – restoration.** A new urban structure is proposed. Although valuable parts of the complex are preserved, the newly designed building volumes do not reflect the former valuable character of the ensemble. The proposed building does not meet the place of later historic development either. The new building exceeds the scale of the historic buildings, and obscure the cultural heritage objects in the territory, violating the restricted usage regime and building density of 60%, established for the VOPR territory (A) (proposed building density (coverage) - 66%).

New large-scale buildings are designed. Materials proposed: metal structure, metal sheets, glass facades. Proposed new design - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations and character of the area.

Protected buildings are to be integrated, other buildings are demolished. Underground floors are not designed. Protected foundations of Southern Pavilion are to be exhibited.

Small underground storey. Building no. 11 was planned to be demolished. The building is homogeneous in terms of its structure. Foreseeable construction costs, however, due to the scale of the new building, the costs seem difficult to keep.

Rank: 14

Motto: LIGHTS

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 13

Participant code CVP IS: 62

The Project has populist elements and tells a story, which is, however, incompatible with the real history and heritage and reality (there's a moment of manipulation, regarding the transparency and plan of the new Southern volume).

The U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex; The other historic buildings in the territory are integrated as well. In the western part of the territory, a multifunctional square is being designed. Its layout and selection of greenery are presented in detail. The places of the historic gates to the courtyard are marked by complementing structures. Proposed building density (coverage) - 76% (as indicated), violating the restricted building density of 60%, established for the territory by VOPR. The proposed "active" aesthetics and program of the square can have a negative impact on the integrity of the cultural property. Courtyard, planted with trees, is not characteristic to the historic period. When planting trees in territory (B), their potential negative impact on the archaeological heritage should be assessed.

Restoration of building volumes in the places of the former structures of the Palace is proposed. North-eastern Pavilion (No. 7) and Southern Pavilion (No. 9) are designed of wire mesh and glass, which is uncharacteristic materiality. Moreover, the materiality is not clear. Overall, the project needs further development to fully reveal its potential or lack of potential. There is a lack of information about the principles and materials of other restored and reconstructed buildings.

The protected and historic buildings are to be integrated. In some of the premises of the building No. 4 the protected interior wall structure is proposed to be changed. There is a lack of information about the adaptation of the existing parts of the complex, integration into a single structure.

An underground floor is designed under the former courtyard and the western part of the territory (A). It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer, according to the Act and archaeological research.

The choice of urban landscape design is questionable, as the green garden shapes neither suggests the traditional design of gardens, nor suggest an innovative urban landscape design which is competing with palace buildings. Moreover, suggested small scale architectural elements in terms of shape are questionable and seems out of the context to the palace and old town landscaping.

Courtyard solutions are explained to be a flexible multifunctional space, but the main versatility is shown by placing a concert layout on top of the cargo trucks road. This shows that the authors do not plan that courtyard activities could happen at the same time while loading or unloading the exhibits of or to the museum reception.

In general proposal misses the innovative urban approach, but chooses a rational scenario, close to restauration.

The proposal strengthens the recommended U shape plan and transport scheme. The Technical specification suggested competitors to propose closure and tightness of the load receiving area to be ensured by auxiliary means. This proposal does not take this into account, which is a significant loss, since visitors and service paths can cross both visually and physically.

Cost effective solutions of the aboveground part. The underground part under the front courtyard is not realistic in terms of costs.

Additional comment: overall quality of drawings is average, additional attention should be taken to the quality of section and plan drawings.

Rank: 6

Motto: LNDMRR

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 14

Participant code CVP IS: 4

The Project suggests a refreshing but very arrogant approach: it is pure architecture with its beliefs and aims, and it doesn't need any context.

The proposal is professional, the concept is clear. It is one of the few proposals that don't restore the old pavilions but give a modern form and contrast between the old and new. There's a clear division between the inner yard and public space in the street. Original approach to the southern pavilion suggests marking the corner instead of designing cubic pavilion.

The proposed urban idea is based on the former historic building remnants, U-shaped semi-open perimeter is being restored by adding three pavilions (Northeast, Second East and the South Pavilion). The Project proposes an underground recessed space, creating the public space with lawn on top of it. The South Pavillion, is carefully placed to mark the south corner but at the same time, creating distance to the historical building and thus emphasizing the new and old inside the Complex.

The urban landscape shows a strong concept to divide spaces into two zones: urban plaza in the courtyard and the ecological greenery space. The strength of the proposal is the clear division of zones A and B where two projects can be divided and managed in separate steps already. At the same time, rational connections for pedestrian paths, and integral design between two zones should be taken in the account.

The proposal clearly shows the flexibility of space by having an open space for open Museum and city events.

In general proposal shows the reasonable placement of the new volumes, urban spaces are designed with purpose, green space and open public space are reasonably planned.

The proposal uses U shape plan, whereas new additional volumes mainly add required 500 seats hall in the back of the palace and new exhibition spaces are created in both current palace buildings and new underground volume.

The solution to put the main exhibition hall underground is complicated regarding the fire safety issues, additionally, it would augment the expenses significantly.

The decision to push the building back and to put entrance underground is a mistake and is unsolvable. It also creates much higher costs than the other entries that build overground. A proposal to destroy the building in the back, and dig for the technical and storages in the front area is not cost efficient.

The service by cargo trucks is organized as recommend in the technical specification. The proposal tries to challenge the issue of service by placing the wall dividing the public space from cargo area visually. However, the trucks road and pedestrian flow from the south have a physical intersection which is a major challenge of the whole competition agenda itself.

The difference between the floor level and the truck trailer is solved by a large elevator (3m x 6m). All the technical service areas are located in the underground.

The principal U-shaped structure of the Palace is partly restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. New volumes are being designed in the place of the former valuable historic building. Demolition of other structures in the eastern part of the territory (A) is proposed, except No. 12. A new building is designed in their place. A square is formed in the western part of the territory. The new boundary is being designed in place of the historic courtyard wall. Functional parts of the historic square are distinguished by different designs of coverings and landscape elements. The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored using the method of interpretation and the tools of contemporary architecture. A massive volume is being designed in the eastern part of the territory. When planting trees in territory (B), their potential negative impact on the archaeological heritage should be assessed. The new volumes in the places of former valuable structures proposed to be constructed. Laconic, restrained contemporary architecture is used in separating the old from the new. Materials used: reinforced concrete, wood, finishing - stone

slabs. A restrained colour solution is proposed. The height of the parapets - "cornices", of the proposed buildings exceeds the historical ones; flat roofs are formed: uncharacteristic roofing and roof construction does not comply with the VOPR and the characteristics of the area (zone).

An underground floor is designed under the proposed buildings and under the former courtyard. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

Additional comment: the weak point of the Project is architectural graphics – dark, grey, not appealing.

Rank: 19

Motto: DH1382

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 16

Participant code CVP IS: 50

The urban analysis is made of mapping the tourist bus road and Vilnius street commerce and basically concluding, that the project territory is neither on the map of tourist route or gives a particular influence to the street activity. This conclusion seems rather limited for a competition proposal urban analysis, as it does state the obvious findings, the museum is not using its full potential, and is not on the many tourists' map.

Therefore, the design itself is made of lifted gallery closing the courtyard from the open public space. This creates not the ordinary U shape design, but a broken O shape. The inner courtyard is framed by new tower volumes and with steep pitched roofs. The gallery itself seems more like an urban design ambition – rather than functional expression to connect both ends of the palace. However, argumentation in terms of urban design of the gallery can be challenged, as the argumentation is missing.

Behind the palace in the recessed zone, the 500-seating hall placed might be reasonable decision, considering level difference, if the functionality was solved well.

The architectural concept is readable in terms of showing what is new, and what is old. The new volumes are created out of the steep pitched roof and low cornice (5 m). In theory, this should allow to build pitched roof volume, that can accommodate more efficient inside layout while keeping the low cornice. However, the problem is that in Vilnius old town – especially visible in closest surroundings height of cornice is at least at 2-3 floors height (starting from 7-10 m). Thus, the design of the volume raises questions if this new architecture actually fits with the surroundings, as it visually seems out of the scale, and missing the argument for such a low cornice height.

The corner architectural façade detail is rather complicated. Considering that the neighbouring palace design requires precision and intelligence in details – this proposal does not suggest one.

The proposal does not challenge the service road to the museum. Design is adapted as the raised ceilings up to +5.00 m of the ground floor and connection gallery floors relatively allows the truck to enter the courtyard. Similar problem is visible as in many proposals – visitors using the same courtyard as service trucks. Functionality of the truck roads is highly questionable also inside the buildings. The floor plan drawings show the main service rooms in the lowest altitude requires industrial elevator which connects ground floor with the underground level -2. Floor plans raises questions open: how the service goods actually reach service/storage rooms and the lowest level from the courtyard. Another threat is that the courtyard will become the parking lot for trucks.

The former structure of the Palace is only fragmentarily restored. The proposed new buildings are designed in place of the Eastern Pavilion (No. 5) and the Southern Pavilion (No. 9). In the eastern part of the territory (A), in the place of the former historic building, the relief of the territory is to be changed - excavated, and a new building of a large volume is proposed. The public (B) and semi-private (former palace courtyard) spaces (A) are designed in the western part of the territory. Improvised restoration of the former. a courtyard fence, forming a static and semi-open entrance to the courtyard. The historic courtyard wall is improvised by forming a new structure and semi-open entrance to the courtyard. The new volumes of the Palace's structure are freely interpreted without preserving the boundaries and scale of the former buildings. The height of the new building (17.00 m) designed on the eastern part would exceed the height of the historic buildings and tower over the heritage objects, violating the restricted usage regime established by the VOPR. The attribute of the site – the type of terrain, would be altered by change in relief. The designed new structure in place of the historic courtyard wall would interfere with the views towards the property and would dominate the main layout of the ensemble. Courtyard, planted with trees, is not characteristic to the period. When planting trees in territory (B), their potential negative impact on the archaeological heritage should be assessed.

The new volumes of the historic complex are freely interpreted. A new building is being planned in the eastern part of the territory. Materials proposed: wood, metal, glass. Proposed new design - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations and character of the area.

Protected buildings are to be integrated, but the solutions are not clear enough: the floor altitudes of the 3-storey Northern Pavilion (No. 3) and the 3-storey First Eastern Wing (No. 4) should not physically overlap – the plans do not match the sections.

An underground floor is designed under the proposed buildings (2 storeys) and under the territory (A). It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

A large, difficult and expensive excavation at the back of the plot in the immediate vicinity of historic buildings. Building No. 11 has been demolished. The above assumptions were assessed as economically ineffective.

Rank: 1st Prize

Motto: RRUMAI

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 18

Participant code CVP IS: 3

The Project is professional, sensitive, refreshing, it offers a harmonious relationship between the old and the new. It is respectful to the heritage, and grows out of the meticulous understanding about the Palace. The Project doesn't prioritize any single golden moment from history, but instead notices and draws inspiration from different memories from the site. It could be described as naked, authentic, revealing all valuable things without judging them. It leaves a lot of breathing space, as the new architecture sets back. The Project manifests the deep knowledge of the authors about contemporary heritage issues and contemporary art institutions.

The proposal is based on a U shape plan, by using new and old volumes. The Project as many others emphasizes the courtyard by the Palace. The urban design between the museum courtyard and Vilnius Street level is solved via grand non symmetrical concrete geometrical stairs and ramps. Open spaces of both A and B zones have a high percentage of hard materials and could be complemented with some soft material.

The architectural concept of the proposal is clear and readable: a central symmetrical U shape composition is made by adding new volumes.

Appearance of the pavilions declare the successful, contextual and not formal game with the scale of the Old town windows' frames and one can really find that the old palace has such frameworks of the windows.

The functionality of the spaces corresponds to the declared paradigm of the Museum – to prioritize multifunctional exhibition, artistic activity and educational spaces.

The Project demonstrates the deep understanding of how a museum works, e.g. a solution to interconnect conference hall with educational classes and cafeteria would be very comfortable and attractive.

The authors smartly offer alternative separate entrances to the conference hall, the educational premises, etc., that would prevent the crowds from clustering. However, a small disadvantage of the Project is the lifted main entrance. The Jury would recommend to make a bigger opening towards the temporary exhibition hall for sake of better feeling of space.

The functions, located at the ground level create an attractive content for the visitors and citizens. The distribution of the functions and the links between them are very convenient.

The track in and cargo lift looks like the authors understand the functionality of the museum. The cargo lift goes through all the floors.

Regarding the heritage protection requirements, the Projects demonstrates deep understanding of these. New volumes are designed in the place of historic buildings while maintaining basic proportions. The project respects the construction of all periods: the other buildings in the eastern part of the territory (A) are preserved. In the western part of the territory, an open space with clear zoning is proposed: territory (A) - the courtyard of the Palace, and territory (B) – formed as a city square. Proposed building density (coverage) 66% could be easily adapted to the required 60%.

The former elements of the historical structure of the palace are restored through interpretation, the roofs of non-traditional forms are proposed. When planting trees in area (B), their potential negative impact on the archaeological heritage should be assessed.

The principal volumes in the place of historic buildings would be reconstructed (Nos. 7, 8, 9). The new buildings proposed of contemporary design. Materials proposed: reinforced concrete, metal, aluminium, glass, concrete. A restrained colour palette is suggested. Protected buildings are integrated. 2 storey structure is proposed to be restored in the building No. 4. Preserved, moderately reconstructed existing buildings in the eastern part of the territory (A) would be integrated.

An underground floor is designed under the buildings No. 7 and No. 8. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

The Project is reasonable in terms of costs, because the excavation is very small in comparison to other projects. The garage and the building at the back are minimal. The authors used the existing at the maximum and added reasonable new elements. The buildings in Liejyklos street are incorporated logically.

Rank: 16

Motto: 110811

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 19

Participant code CVP IS: 68

The Project lacks clear urban idea. U shape plan is added by non-symmetrical new volume for hall, creating the southern part of courtyard the space for visitors and service flows. This leaves the negative space for visitors and multipurpose 3.60 m recessed event zone. This division lacks motivation and argumentation. Although, the authors try to convince about their choice with a pedestrian flow diagram with people coming from all possible directions, but it seems vague.

The general strategy of not exceeding the height for new volumes and strengthening the U composition is acceptable, however, the new volume creates an alien structure towards the palace buildings.

The urban landscape is made of one grand gesture and proposes a solution from few decades back, it does not consider smaller urban scale and does not go too much in detail. Also, the stairs alarms for the lack of universal design thinking, what could be addressed later in the detail phase. However, the proposal should suggest some ideas at the current phase already.

The proposal does not give details regarding main architectural solutions (material, details and etc.) Therefore, it is difficult to compare this proposal with others.

The layout on one hand is reasonable – the lobby at the entrance is meandering with the main exhibition hall and creates a potentially spacious and tall space at the entrance. However, the proposal lacks detailing, the plans are very schematic, there are many zones, that are not planned. Lack of detailing, shows, that project is very sketchy. No indexes are submitted, which indicates that the project further development would raise too many questions.

The service of the museum is not solved like many other aspects required in the technical specification.

Heritage protection aspects. The original U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. New volumes are designed in the place of historic buildings. The other buildings in the eastern part of the territory (A) are preserved. In the western part of the territory, an open space of unified design, which comprises part of the territory (A) and the territory (B) and is formed as a city square. The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored using the method of interpretation; the historic buildings' perimeters and volumes are altered: in place of the buildings No.7 and No.8 the massive volume is designed. Changing the relief of the square (attribute) is proposed while uncovering the basements of protected buildings, installing glass partitions, entrances, and new premises. When planting trees in area (B), their potential negative impact on the archaeological heritage should be assessed. Proposed building density (coverage) - no indicators.

The new volumes of contemporary design in the place of historic buildings (Nos. 7, 8, 9) are proposed. Materials proposed: metal, concrete, sandstone, glass. Uncharacteristic roof covering and construction; uncharacteristic materiality of the facades. Protected buildings are to be integrated. Alteration of part of the bearing walls in the protected buildings is proposed as well as the parts of the foundations' constructions.

An underground floor is designed under the buildings No. 7 and No. 8 as well under the historic buildings in the eastern part of the territory (A). It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

Uncovering the palace basement may mean the need for structural reinforcements. Similarly, in the case of hall 11, the introduced solutions seem to be questionable in terms of rationality and economic efficiency.

Rank: 15

Motto: J2R4M8

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 20

Participant code CVP IS: 70

The proposal is based on the U shape plan. This concept is strengthened by a linear visitors' flow, as the main entrance remains at the current museum location. This solution though, does not allow to use its full potential of the courtyard. The courtyard remains disconnected from the museum itself. Most visitors will avoid going to courtyard, as is missing the function and seems designed for service, with the garden around the truck road.

Therefore, the proposal urban solutions are questionable, regarding the courtyard use and integration with the museum volumes.

The architectural intervention is covered by materials that has red coloured Vilnius old town roofs like composition of amber glass, red granite, and copper. On one hand it seems like a logical choice, but the application is questionable as the existing museum buildings are kept with both blue and red roofs. Consistency in the solution is missing.

The project functionality is questionable. The Project tries to apply linear movement scheme inside the building. This allows to use courtyard for technical entrance around the building, which is questionable, as in the visual material courtyard is used outside terraces for café or cafes. Moreover, the main visitor flow is designed so that users would need to move vertically and horizontally at the same time, with an IKEA like structure. This requires additional attention to many elevators to fit universal design agenda. But this decision seems underdeveloped. The Project has visible drawbacks in terms of rationality of layout.

Heritage protection aspect. The original U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. New volumes are designed in the place of historic buildings No. 7, No. 8, and No. 9. In the eastern part of the territory (A), other structures to be demolished, except for buildings No. 11 and No. 12. An open, unified architectural space – a square - is designed, comprising the western part of the territory (A) and the territory (B). The historic Palace courtyard is marked by planting. Proposed building density (coverage) - 89 (exceeds the allowed density drastically, but it could be a calculation error). The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored using the method of interpretation; the historic buildings' No. 7 and No. 8 perimeters and volumes are altered.

The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored while interpreting: the historic buildings' perimeters and volumes are altered. Materials proposed: not specified, but amount of glass or another shiny surfaces could be observed. Proposed new design - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations and character of the area.

Alteration of the bearing walls in the protected building First Eastern Wing (No. 4) is proposed. The third floor of the First Eastern Wing (No. 4) is not in the drawings, nor is there any information as to whether the number of storeys in this building would be reduced.

An underground floor is designed under the buildings No. 7 and No. 8. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

The proposed solutions are economically rational and seem feasible within the assumed budget.

Rank: 5

Motto: GRUL7C

No of the Project in the CVP IS: 21

Participant code CVP IS: 16

SPECIAL MENTION. For an innovative approach towards an Arts institution's architecture.

The Project proposes a very different approach of a Museum as an event space and a Museum as a city space. It is a contemporary approach, thinking from the user's perspective. The overall attitude is that a Museum is a living space, something that is not fixed in time, and change during the time. The authors suggest to deliver this temporary feeling through the interventions. The complex might look a bit like ruins, unfinished – it is the intention of the Project, inviting to explore, that people come and have a lot of questions. The solutions of the Plaza design, the uncertain boundaries between the inside and outside is about giving possibilities, instead of a static situation.

The Project is drastic with the most valuable part of the palace, the central building – it is conserved inside the glazed walls (which is a formal solution, as the glass is not that transparent).

However, as long as it does not exceed the current building heights, this idea can create a strong identity for the cultural institution.

This would support the idea for interior design, too.

Another aspect, the proposal tries to develop, is using the courtyard not only for excavation but rather for functions. This idea could be reasonable for the courtyard itself and most probably in terms of economy, but, additionally, the project proposes underground for hall. Therefore, the urban idea remains an unfulfilled attempt.

The proposal demonstrates a priority for the interiors – and it shows a great skill illustrating it. Meandering between interior and exterior of the building architecture should give the strong identity for the project itself.

The curtain wall, seems very light and translucent but the roof is covered with closed material. As well, comparing to old town roofs – the proposal does not even try to show it as pitched.

The original U-shaped structure of the Palace is partly restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the complex. The new volume is designed in the place of historic buildings No. 7 and No. 8. The newly proposed structure covers also the First Eastern Wing (No. 4). The protected buildings - the Eastern Pavilion remains (No. 5), and the Southern Wing remains (No. 6), are not integrated into the complex. The place of Southern Pavilion (No. 9) is left empty and not marked. The buildings in the eastern part of the territory (A) are integrated into the complex. An open space – a square - is designed in the central - western part; two functional zones corresponding to the former historical areas could be distinguished. The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored using the method of interpretation; the historic buildings' perimeters and volumes are altered. The proposed large-scale building exceeds the scale of the historic ones, violating the restricted usage regime established by the VOPR for the territory (A) and is not characteristic for the area, also could be obscuring the views towards the protected buildings' facades. The structures designed in the square unreasonably divide the historical courtyard space, and likely would obscure the views of the complex.

Proposed building density (coverage) - no indicators.

The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored while interpreting: the historic buildings' perimeters and volumes are altered. Materials proposed: wood, glass. Proposed new design - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations and character of the area.

Protected buildings to be integrated. Alteration of the bearing walls in the protected buildings Nos. 2, 3, 4 is proposed. The historic buildings are integrated into the museum complex while keeping the main volumes. An underground floor is designed under the proposed new structure and the Palace courtyard. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

Functionally, the circulation is very well done. The interior organization is one the strongest point of the Project.

The Project proposes big spaces and you can find your own way, even if it is premeditated by the curators, but the visitors would feel that they experience the museum their own way. The visitors are active participants, and not passive subjects, pushed through the museum.

Also, what discerns this Project from the others, is that the authors give much more space for activities in between the exhibition spaces.

However, the Project proposes a huge amount of underground premises, which makes the Project very expensive.

The service by cargo trucks is organized as recommend in the technical specification. The proposal tries to challenge the issue of service by blocking with on of the functional buildings in the plaza. But the full transportation way is not shown in plans well, which indicates the issue might not be well thought.

The exhibition is received underground. The truck goes into the ground floor, it is unloaded, all the good go down to the basement and are distributed. Manipulating with the truck is difficult, because there's no way to turn around.

Rank: 10

Motto: Z240620

No. of the Project in the CVP IS: 22

Participant code CVP IS: 60

Architecturally the Project offers an interesting solution, but it doesn't create any value for the public space. Also, the Project exceeds the height limits, and, if the height is minimized, there's a doubt whether the composition, and the program could preserve the main qualities.

The main idea is a recreation of disassembled U-shaped plan, where the new volume is hidden in the back side of the palace. The southern block is recessed, as a reminiscence of the previous symmetrical urban structure, as a contrast to many other proposals remains only underground.

The proposal is based on the modern urban/architecture solutions that are in a dialogue within the context creating the structure along with heritage preservation. Likewise, the new volume is reasonably placed behind valuable historic buildings that needs restoration.

Proposal also tries to create connections with yards behind. But it not goes into more detail about it. The authors should consider also the current/previous uses of the neighbouring plots, e.g. Evangelic cemetery. What is a bit surprising, that the authors suggest demolishing the neighbouring residential buildings in order to create visual connection to the green backyard via new planned translucent lobby. This might be attractive idea in theory, but in practice – it is impossible. Therefore, what is shown in the elevations – beautiful back door garden visible in the main plaza, might be difficult to achieve.

Plaza itself shows a flexible urban space. Although, the space itself does show a minimum greenery.

Bus parking is not shown, but following the huge scale of the hard pavement to place a bus parking should not be an issue in this proposal.

The general architectural concept is a well thought volume, that modestly adds the value to the historical palace complex by creating a physical gap between new and old.

The architectural concept is clear and reasonable, but the issue to consider is the roof – which on one hand adds a functional contrast with the roof without slope creating a terrace, e.g., on the other hand, doesn't correspond to the heritage requirements (that require sloped roof).

The project does not meet the main condition – restoration: the valuable recognized structure of the former U-shaped plan of the Palace is not restored. However, in the eastern part of the territory (A), in the place of the former historic structures, a large new volume is proposed, connecting all parts of the complex. The remains of the South Pavilion (No. 9) are on display. An open, unified architectural space – a square - is being designed, comprising the western part of the territory (A) and the territory (B). It is planned to plant the square with single trees. The proposed large-scale building exceeds the scale of the historic ones, violating the restricted usage regime established by the VOPR for the territory (A). The provision that the volume and height of other structures may not be increased is violated. The height of the new flat roof parapet is 24 m. Inaccurate proposed building density (coverage) indicator – 1.45. A new large-scale building is being designed on the site, rising above a valuable part of the complex. Materials: steel, alabaster, double glazing (?). The proposed new design - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations and character of the area. The protected buildings are integrated. The floor altitudes of the 3-storey Northern Pavilion (No. 3) and the 3-storey First Eastern Wing (No. 4) should not physically overlap – the plans do not match the sections.

The plans show that all the buildings are being demolished, only building no.12 being reconstructed; a new building is being built in their place.

An underground floor is designed under the new building in the eastern part of the territory (A). It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

The service by cargo trucks is organized as recommend in the technical specification. The proposal tries not to challenge the issue of service by exposing the service in very front plaza. By doing this, the proposal does not suggest any intelligent solution to the existing issue. This is visible in the site plan, where the trucks road and pedestrian flow have a physical intersection.

However, the placement of the storage in a visible location of the museum in the lobby, allows the storage to be open and visible to the lobby, like e.g., Museum Louver Lens exposes its storage to the lobby.

Central idea - spectacular alabaster skin - gives character to all new spaces.

Idea might work better with some other public building type (like concert hall). For museum, where neutral light is needed it is too overwhelming or even restrictive.

The construction of the new part of the museum has been concentrated in one place and has a clear structure. The extensive underground storey, the demolition of the building No. 11 as well as the location of the new building directly at the plot boundaries and the surrounding buildings seem to be problematic.

Rank: 24

Motto: SHJJHH

No. of the Project in the CVP IS: 24

Participant code CVP IS: 71

The spatial composition is fragmented, the public space underarticulated. Overall, the Project is sketchy.

The main feature of the proposal is at the southeast corner, where the new building additions are located. The addition is not a single volume, but two perpendicular 'shears': café on the ground level, with the perpendicularly located auditorium above it.

According to the authors, 'The vertical and the horizontal shear / displacement of the volumes therefore creates a rich relationship of outdoor and interior environment which simultaneously respects the former organizational logic of the palace while evolving its form to address the needs of the museum'. However, the new volumes make the overall composition too contrasting and messy. For instance, the new volume containing the auditorium is lifted above the ground, while exceeding the height of the existing structure nearby. It makes the main façade look clearly divided into two separate parts, which may not necessarily be the intention.

The Project lacks the description of finishing materials. Also, from the visualizations submitted it's hard to understand the idea of fenestration (possible curtain walls and windows are of the same colour as walls).

The public area in front of the building is interpreted as a continuous green 'carpet' without further details on landscape development or plans for promotional installation. Also, it is not clear how this green lawn functions: namely, is it suitable for pedestrian and even heavy vehicle access (as shown on plans and visualizations). The entrance ramp to the underground loading area undermines the idea of the green central plaza in the front.

The former structure of the Palace is only partly restored. Valuable parts of the complex are protected. In places of former valuable buildings No. 7 and No. 8 new volume is designed. In the eastern part of the territory (A) the other buildings are left and integrated into the complex. The protected buildings - the Eastern Pavilion remains (No. 5), and the Southern Wing remains (No. 6), are not integrated into the complex. An open space of unified design – a square - is being proposed in the western part of the territory (A) and the territory (B). The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored using the method of interpretation; the historic buildings' perimeters and volumes are altered.

The place of Southern Pavilion (No. 9) is left empty and not marked. The designed ramp in the southern part of the square further separates the southern part of the complex.

Materials proposed match those of the protected buildings, but the perimeters and volumes of the valuable former historic structures are not followed. Protected buildings are integrated. Alteration of the bearing walls in the protected buildings Nos. 2, 3, 4 is proposed. The floor altitudes of the 3-storey Northern Pavilion (No. 3) and the 3-storey First Eastern Wing (No. 4) should not physically overlap – the plans do not match the sections.

An underground floor is being designed under the southern part of the former palace courtyard (Territory (A)). It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

The proposed solutions are economically rational and seem feasible within the assumed budget, however, the underground part is large, which adds to the implementation costs.

Additional comment: No general indicators (in the explanatory text) and no list of areas of the building premises (on the floor plans) were submitted.

Rank: 21

Motto: SM9915

No. of the Project in the CVP IS: 25

Participant code CVP IS: 42

The Project lacks a clear idea of consolidating all the buildings in one coherent complex and make the museum a real destination.

The main feature of the proposal is a new addition (containing the main entrance) with a metaphorical connotation. The new pavilion of the Second eastern wing is interpreted as an object veiled with a (metal mesh) curtain, lifted at the point of the main entrance.

This slightly postmodern approach is understandable, but the overall result lacks integrity. It looks like a constellation of buildings belonging to different epochs, not having some common traits.

It looks as if there are not enough gallery spaces. The only addition with exhibition rooms is on the southeastern corner, other new buildings contain lobby and multipurpose hall.

The service entry for heavy vehicles seems to be incorrect. In the basement plan, it is shown as a ramp, but on the ground level, his ramp is almost fully covered.

The public part (Zone B) contains an illogically located café – it works as an obstacle for the pedestrians.

The former structure of the Palace is only partly restored. Valuable parts of the complex are protected. In places of former valuable buildings No. 7 and No. 8 new volume is designed. The protected buildings - the Eastern Pavilion remains (No. 5), and the Southern

Wing remains (No. 6), are not integrated into the complex. In the eastern part of the territory (A), in place of the other buildings, a new development is proposed. The place of Southern Pavilion (No. 9) is left empty and not marked. The proposed new buildings' heights could exceed the scale of the historic ones, violating the restricted usage regime established by the VOPR for the territory (A). The provision that the volume and height of other structures may not be increased could be violated. An open space is designed as a square, functionally, and visually separating the western part of the territory (A) and the territory (B). It is planned to plant the square with single trees. The relief of the terrain would be slightly changed.

The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored while interpreting: the historic buildings' perimeters and volumes are altered. Materials used: metal, glass, tiles. The perimeters and volumes of the valuable former historic structures are not followed. Altitudes of newly designed buildings are not provided.

Protected buildings are integrated. Alteration of the bearing walls in the protected buildings Nos. 2, 3, 4 is proposed. The floor altitudes of the 3-storey

Northern Pavilion (No. 3) and the 3-storey First Eastern Wing (No. 4) should not physically overlap – the plans do not match the sections.

An underground floor is being designed under the former palace courtyard and under the eastern part of the territory (A). It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

The underground part, planned over almost the entire plot area, in collision with the archaeological zone and underground infrastructure, generates very high costs of the project.

Rank: 12

Motto: 91B2T8

No. of the Project in the CVP IS: 26

Participant code CVP IS: 41

Conceptually interesting Project doesn't have adequate relation with the surroundings and is troublesome function-wise.

The relation of the new additions to the existing buildings in this project is decisively 'modern' – whereas new buildings are located in place of the original structure, their modern orthogonal forms are clearly expressed. The new second eastern wing and southern pavilion are designed as rectangular boxy volumes with small punctuated window openings.

The proposal went for the option of building attractive gallery spaces underground, which expands the exhibition spaces to four levels, but also augments the construction cost and is problematic having in mind fire safety requirements. The ~3 staircases might be not enough for evacuation from the underground galleries. The skylight of the galleries under the main courtyard of the Palace is organized as a system of organic forms. The skylights together with the trees form an abstract picture defining the unformal image of the courtyard space. However, this solution seems to be taken from another cultural context, e.g., Southern Europe, and it doesn't give any added value to the surroundings. Puddle shape volumes would require intense maintenance (graffiti's, cleaning).

The walls of the openings for the underground galleries exceed a man's height, which could be a visual obstacle.

Overall, the outside public space lacks scenario.

The overall functional layout follows the Competition program. The underground back-of-the-house amenities seem smaller than in other entries since the gallery spaces are also located underground.

The heavy vehicle entry through the central courtyard seems to be a challenge, present in many projects. In this entry, heavy vehicle entry is located some 50m away from the main museum entrance, in the same building block.

The principal U-shaped structure of the Palace is restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored using the method of interpretation; the historic buildings' perimeters and volumes are altered: in place of the buildings No.7 and No.8 the massive volume is designed. Materials proposed: concrete. A restrained colour palette is suggested. Proposed new design - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations and character of the area.

Protected buildings are integrated. But there's a lack of information about the conservation of them. The third floor of the First Eastern Wing (No. 4) is not in the drawings, nor is there any information as to whether the number of floors in this building would be reduced. The buildings No. 11, 12 are integrated into the complex, their main volumes remain, but there's not enough information for detailed assessment.

The project respects the construction of all periods: the other buildings in the eastern part of the territory (A) are preserved. In the central - western part of the territory, an open space is formed, which consists of a part of the territory (A) - "garden" and territory (B) - "square". The space in front of the Palace is fragmented by small structures that will potentially interfere with the overview of the valuable layout. Uncharacteristic tree planting is proposed for the former courtyard. At the site of the historic built-up area along Vilniaus Street, the installation of structures is possible in purpose of marking the former buildings – this proposal does not meet this condition. Proposed building density indicator is missing.

An underground floor is designed under the buildings No. 7 and No. 8, the "garden" and under the eastern part of the territory (A). It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

Rank: 17

Motto: JVN021

No. of the Project in the CVP IS: 28

Participant code CVP IS: 27

The Project goes for the modern approach, with the new L-shaped addition not trying to interpret the old forms and silhouettes. The new buildings encapsulate the southern and eastern wing of the complex, acting as an addition, superstructure or enclosure. However, the solutions contradict the heritage protection regulations in the site.

The projects' material of choice is pigmented facing concrete. Its pink pigmentation according to the authors, 'echoes the typical tones of the historical urban context'. The rhythm of the fenestration of the new addition is close to the rhythm of the openings of the existing buildings – that makes the overall scale of the existing and new buildings comparable.

The museum's courtyard and the public area in front of it (Zone B) are interpreted as a continuous paved surface. It definitely adds an urban feel, but one could wish for more greenery and landscape. On the other hand, the new southern wing features a roof garden.

The functional layout of the proposal is rational. The addition to the southern flank allows the continued use of the ground floor avoiding the existing building 1B3p (not of the scope of this competition). Overall, many of the new exhibition rooms are designed as continuous spaces, - easy to transform and adapt.

The functional peculiarity of the project is the design of the green court behind the building. It adds green space to the building complex while eliminating Building 11 (Sports riding hall 3U1p). Though, according to the Technical Specification, Building 11 "should aim to maintain a coherent exhibition space, without subdividing it into (possibly) smaller rooms" (paragraph 4.4.15). The project offers two courts – more public and paved in front of the building, and more private and green behind the building, though it results in the smallest total area among 32 entries (7 100 m²).

The loading area is the problem, which has challenged many projects. In case of this entry, it is positioned between the bookshop and the café (an elevator to the basement level). Heavy vehicles approaching from the public plaza seem problematic.

The principal U-shaped structure of the Palace is partly restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. 2 storey structure is proposed to be restored in the building No. 4, while eliminating the first flooring. Conservation is proposed, while changing the elements that do not meet contemporary requirements. The change of authentic elements is not recommended unless they can't be restored. Some attributes could be altered. The roof covering of the building No. 4 is removed. The intensity of use of the protected buildings while installing additions, adding floors or attics, changing the layout, etc., is prohibited by the Law.

New volumes are designed in the place of historic buildings No. 7, No. 8, and No. 9. The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored using the method of interpretation; the historic buildings' Nos. 7, 8, 9 perimeters and volumes would be different.

Materials proposed: concrete, glass. Proposed new design - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations and character of the area.

The proposed large-scale building exceeds the scale of the historic ones, violating the restricted usage regime established by the VOPR for the territory (A) and is not characteristic for the area, also could be obscuring the views towards the protected buildings' facades.

In the eastern part of the territory (A), the other buildings proposed to be demolished except for No. 12. The garden – "forest", is designed instead. An open, unified architectural space – a square - is being designed, comprising the central - western part of the territory (A) and the territory (B). Historical functional zones are not evident in the design of the square.

An underground floor is designed under the buildings No. 7 and No. 8. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

A very large underground part with the simultaneous demolition of building No. 11 seem to significantly increase the cost of the project and are cost ineffective.

Rank: 7

Motto: ELMNTS

No. of the Project in the CVP IS: 29

Participant code CVP IS: 54

The Project doesn't offer any innovation or discovery, but presents quality architecture and opts for a monumental form, which is too monumental and dominating the old part, out of scale. That could be said not only about the new Southern tower, but also about the structure at the back of the quarter.

However, the forms, and the materials, are well designed, the image of a solid art institution is formed. It represents the times when "the art was up there and the people down there". Therefore, the image of the Museum is not inviting, not democratic – it would be a place to learn, but not to spend your time.

The landscape doesn't correspond to the general idea, wide pathways are not motivated.

The solution to design premises in the basement and to erect the new structures instead of the existing buildings would augment the construction cost significantly.

The proposal completes the U-shaped building with a contemporary design. The colonnade separating Zones A and B resembles the old fence with the gates, and also acts as symbolic boundary between public space and the museum.

The colonnade is used at the front of the museum, creating a semi-closed front square. It is also used as the entry portico for the new addition. The colonnade is a nod to the history of architecture. But it also serves as a much-needed shelter for unfavourable climates. The project favours a modern approach to the design of the new buildings. Orthogonal volumes with flat roofs form a contrast to the existing buildings.

The grey-ish long and thin hand-made bricks are the authors' material of choice for the new building facades. Its materiality and color, similar to the existing façade is a solid choice.

Interior visualizations convey a spacious foyer with 'agora' and exhibition spaces. Floor-to-ceiling fenestration, shown in the visualization of one of the exhibition spaces might look problematic, but it could be solved with additional curtains.

The possible use of the courtyard for the open-air events is emphasized by the sloping green area at the south end while maintaining its coherence.

The overall functional layout seems logical and balanced. Gallery spaces are divided according to their distinct profiles. 'Gallery Now' operates as a separate entity in the Southern pavilion. It could pose a logistical problem, or it could be connected to the complex via 1B3p (museum building, which is currently being renovated and is not part of the scope of this contest).

The heavy vehicle entrance is from Liejyklos Street, leaving the public plaza at Vilniaus Street intact.

The principal U-shaped structure of the Palace is partly restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the complex. The new building is proposed in the eastern part of the territory (A). The **contemporary buildings, designed in place of the historical ones, exceed the height of the historic buildings**. The height of the designed new buildings (22.3 m) may exceed the regulated height (VOPR) - 2 storey with an attic. E.g., the height of the historic 2 storey Northern Wing is 14.88 m. The height of "cornices" of the proposed buildings is higher than the historic. Massive volumes of reconstructed and newly designed buildings in the eastern part of the territory could be potentially violating the restricted usage regime established for the VOPR territory (A). The provision that the volume and height of the other structures on the site may not be increased could be violated. Proposed new design - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations.

Protected buildings are integrated, but there's a lack of information about the conservation and adaptation of them. The intensity of use of the protected buildings while installing additions is prohibited by the Law.

A square is formed in the western part of the territory, with greenery and an amphitheatre, installed in the southern part. The proposed amphitheatre changes the relief of the territory and limits the overview of the protected buildings. A colonnade is designed in place of the historic courtyard wall.

An underground floor is designed under the new buildings in the eastern part, as well as under the southern part of the square. The preservation of the remains of the Southern Pavilion remains unclear. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

Rank: 4

Motto: J04J21

No. of the Project in the CVP IS: 30

Participant code CVP IS: 20

The Project is well designed in many layers, it's a contextual, classic and timeless solution. Which raises a question, whether this is the image – solid, ancient, antique - that a contemporary art institution expects to have.

The proportions of the volumes, elevations, detailing, and the choice of materials are well thought and create a harmonious dialogue between the old and the new. However, there is not that much known about the missing volumes of the Palace – how they were built, what was their appearance. This entry is overidealizing the history, there's an attempt to make the world perfect which is also a questionable approach.

The Project reconstructs the original spatial composition of the Palace with contextual (old) forms and new materials. According to the architects, "the new extension is a contemporary interpretation of historical structure". This entry offers a meticulous reconstruction based on historical information, restoring the planned pavilions and building wings. The entry offers a contextual selection of finishing materials: light-colored ceramic tiles, brass elements.

The project provides quite elaborate interior solutions. The strength of this entry is the detailed and convincing proposals for various interior spaces: the inner courtyards; the space between the existing and new buildings (main hall passage); exhibition rooms. The roofs provide the interior spaces with different shapes. The proportions of the interior spaces are harmonious, they have different characters and are versatile.

Separate solutions for landscaping in Zone A and B follow the Competition Brief. Although the stripped landscape in Zone B could be an asset (much-needed greenery) and a liability (an obstacle in the pedestrian thoroughfare) at the same time.

The courtyard solution has an image of a palace courtyard, but not of the yard of an art museum, or a democratic city space. It lacks versatility and offers a "frozen" situation. It would be difficult to organize concerts, events, sculptures exhibitions, fashion defiles, etc. here. Also, the zone B offers only one possibility – it's a green yard and pathways with benches.

Also, the landscape solutions don't meet the heritage protection requirements fully: an amphitheatre is designed in the courtyard of the palace, and distinctive planting is suggested for the square (which is not characteristic). Thus, the protected relief of the Palace courtyard would be slightly changed.

The overall functional layout is logical. The so-called Back of House amenities are located underground, the exhibition spaces are in the existing and new buildings. Entrance in the middle and the conference hall is very comfortable. The auxiliary services, as a shop, cloak rooms, wc, and the access to the conference hall are rationally distributed and easy to access.

One could wish for a more spacious entry zone, which is squeezed inside the volume of the reconstructed North-East pavilion containing two staircases and an elevator. The small details, such as a possibility to view the Old town from the main tower would add attractiveness to the Museum.

The requirements to protect the findings would impede the proposed Southern tower structure as it is now, as big excavation in the site of 17th century remnants is prohibited. Therefore, the Project should be altered.

Overall, the Jury had doubts about the rationality of the Southern tower, that is completely a technical space. Delivery is also proposed from the Southern tower which would be complicated, also – disrespectful to the archaeological excavations there.

The U-shaped structure of the former Palace is restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. New volumes are designed in the place of historic buildings while maintaining basic proportions. Building No. 11 is reconstructed while adding a floor (up to 13.3 m alt.), but the permissible height (up to 14.88 m) would be not exceeded.

An underground floor is designed under the Palace courtyard, in-between the remains of the Western Pavilion and the Southern Pavilion. The preservation of the remains of the Southern Pavilion remains unclear. It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

The building at the back will require no excavation, and the construction would be easy. Therefore, the Project is reasonable in terms of costs.

Rank: 25

Motto: 000VNO

No. of the Project in the CVP IS: 32

Participant code CVP IS: 73

According to the Explanatory note: "The project aims to recreate the lost in the past symmetrical 5 towers (Pavilions) of the Vilnius Jonas Radvila palace building complex connected with building wings, volumetric composition, forming U-shaped cultural public exhibition space". The original spatial composition of the Palace is reconstructed with contrasting architectural forms, finishes and details. But metal cladding (with mirror qualities) offers too much of a contrast to the context.

A strictly symmetrical approach overemphasizes the historical U-shaped plan – the Palace was never finished, so asymmetrical elements could refer to the long history of building and rebuilding. Also, adding the strictly symmetrical sunken plaza (a new element) divides the courtyard in two, and undermines its visual coherence, and contradicts the heritage protection regulations of the site.

The many functional diagrams in the project clearly show the attention of the authors to the functional layout and overall logistics. Although, some aspects should be mentioned: e.g., the main entrance lead 7 metres below ground only to take the visitors back to the ground level further on (there are no gallery spaces on the basement level).

The principal U-shaped structure of the former Palace is restored. The protected buildings are integrated into the museum complex. The former structural elements of the ensemble are restored using the method of interpretation. The proposed largescale volume of the reconstructed buildings exceeds the scale of the historic ones, violating the restricted usage regime established by the VOPR for the territory (A). The protected buildings - the Eastern Pavilion remains (No. 5), and the Southern Wing remains (No. 6), are not integrated into the complex in the western part of the territory. Proposed new design - volumes, roof type and form, materiality, don't comply with the regulations and character of the area.

Proposed building density (coverage) - 62% (60% is allowed).

An underground floor (6 m high) is designed under the reconstructed buildings in the eastern part, as well as under the former Palace courtyard, in the territory (A). It may not be possible to install part of the underground facilities due to the existing archaeological layer.

The underground part, planned over almost the entire front courtyard, in collision with the archaeological zone and underground infrastructure, significantly raises costs of the project.

Chairman of the Evaluation Jury dr. Arūnas Gelūnas

Secretary Rūta Leitanaitė