



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 8 September 2005 (13.09)
(OR. fr)**

12078/05

IMM 2

INFORMATION NOTE

from: General Secretariat of the Council
dated : 8 September 2005
to: Antici Group

Subject : Renovation of block A of the Residence Palace building
- Result of the European architectural design competition

1. At its meeting on 25 and 26 March 2004 the European Council "agree[d] to the proposal by the Belgian Government that it uses block A of the Residence Palace building for its meetings, after it has been refurbished, on the basis of the general framework approved by the Council concerning the financial, logistical and legal aspects of the project" (7358/04).

Further to that agreement, the General Secretariat of the Council launched a European architectural design competition in August 2004 (Official Journal 2004/S151-130351).

In January 2005 a committee consisting of representatives of the International Union of Architects, the Belgian public buildings administration (Régie des Bâtiments) and officials of the General Secretariat of the Council scrutinised the applications and drew up a list of 25 teams of architects and engineers authorised to take part in the Competition.

Also in January 2005, the Deputy Secretary-General of the Council drew up the rules of the Competition and appointed the Selection Board, consisting of members nominated by Member States, representatives of the Belgian federal, regional and communal authorities and representatives of the International Union of Architects and the General Secretariat of the Council.

2. The first stage of the competition (ideas competition) ended on 27 May 2005 when, from among the 22 proposals submitted to it anonymously, the Selection Board chose the 7 teams authorised to take part in the second stage (project competition).

The seven proposals for the second stage of the competition were submitted by their authors on 16 August 2005.

A preliminary technical assessment of these proposals was carried out by a committee consisting of representatives of the Régie des Bâtiments, quantity surveyors and officials of the General Secretariat of the Council. The Selection Board then examined these designs from 31 August to 2 September 2005, ranked them and awarded prizes (see the report in Annex).

When anonymity was lifted, the winning design was found to have been produced by a temporary partnership between Samyn and Partners (BE), Studio Valle Progettazioni (IT) and Buro Happold (UK).

3. The General Secretariat of the Council intends to advise the Antici Group shortly of the main features of the winning design and how the Residence Palace dossier should now be taken forward.

Annex



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 2 September 2005

(final version)

ANNEX

GENERAL SECRETARIAT

Directorate-General A II

Buildings division

Ref : IMM-2005/8125-JB-nf

**EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE
AND DESIGN COMPETITION
"RESIDENCE PALACE"
SECOND STAGE OF THE COMPETITION**

**MEETING OF THE SELECTION BOARD
FROM 31 AUGUST TO 2 SEPTEMBER 2005
IN BRUSSELS
ASSESSMENT REPORT**

1. PRESENCE

Members with voting rights

M. VIKAS - Chairman
M. MARATHEFTIS
M. VARGA
M. GOERGEN
M. CROUWEL (31.08 & 02.09)
M. LENART
M. PELKONEN
M. EVENEPOEL
M. DE SMEDT-JANS
M. LHOAS
M. STEGEN
M. MORITZ

Substitute Members

M. ELLIS
M. ULRICH
M. COOK

M. ALVER (31.08 & 01.09)

M. GINEFRI

M. BOSSUT
M. GENARD
M. LEHEMBRE
M. SIMON

M. KUECKER - Observer of the International Architects Union
M. BURGERS - Professional and Technical Advisor

2. QUORUM

Given that twelve members of the Selection Board with voting rights, of whom at least five were architects, participated in the assessment and voting procedures, the results of the Selection Board are valid according to the Competition Rules.

3. ADMISSIBILITY OF THE PROJECTS

- a/ At the start of the meeting the Selection Board noted that it had seven projects to assess, i.e. all seven authors of the projects which were selected at the end of the first stage of the Competition had submitted a proposal at this second stage of the Competition. These proposals were numbered from 1 to 7 by the Procurement Coordination Unit (PCU), responsible for the reception of dossiers and the guarantee of anonymity.
- b/ The Selection Board first took note of the report set out by the PCU regarding the anonymity of the projects, the deadlines for their submission and the composition and presentation of each project dossier. It considered that all the proposals were sufficiently in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Rules.

The Board then examined the report of the Technical Committee regarding the composition and presentation of each project dossier. It considered that all the projects were sufficiently in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Rules.

Consequently, all project teams are entitled to the reimbursement of costs as foreseen by article 5.1.b of the Rules.

- c/ The Selection Board was informed by one of its members that he had found in his office a fax, with the header showing the name and the fax-number of an architects office and in which the name of a competing project ("Chrysalide", project number 4) is mentioned several times. Concerning the content, the fax develops a case in favour of certain design options, which are indeed taken into account solely by this project.

On basis of these elements, the Selection Board decided unanimously to reject project n° 4:

- for breach of the anonymity obligation as foreseen by the 4th indent of article 1.11. of the Competition Rules;
- for breach of the prohibition to contact a member of the Selection Board, as specified under the 6th indent of article 1.11. of the Competition Rules;

subject to confirmation by the PCU, which has duly done so, that the "Chrysalide"-project belongs indeed to the team whose name is mentioned in the fax, and:

- for having flagrantly exceeded the maximum authorised height DNG 107, by proposing a project that could not be reasonably reduced in order to respect this limit, without changing it substantially, and thus benefiting from a competitive advantage compared to the other six competitors, who did respect this provision.

Following the exclusion of project n° 4, the Selection Board did not proceed to the examination of said project.

4. METHODS FOR AWARDING MARKS TO THE PROJECTS

Before starting the detailed examination of the projects, the Selection Board established a method for awarding marks. In doing so, it took into consideration :

- its experience of the first stage of the competition;
- the relative value of the four evaluation criteria.

The Selection Board thus decided that each of its members should use, for the evaluation of criteria a), b) and c), mentioned in article 4.6 of the Rules, the same range of marks for the ranking of projects.

For criterion d) of article 4.6 of the Rules, the Selection Board agreed to follow the calculation method drawn up by the Technical Committee (cf. Annex 1), in which 5 points are awarded to the project whose fees are nearest to the average of all the fees proposed; for the other teams the mark is determined as a pro-rata of the difference of their fees compared to the average fees.

5. EXAMINATION OF PROJECTS

The Selection Board carried out the assessment of projects as follows :

- the members of the Board first examined all projects on an individual basis;
- the Board then took note of the report of the Professional and Technical Advisor regarding the preliminary examination carried out by the Technical Committee and the rating awarded by this Committee on the different technical aspects of the projects (in particular criteria 4.6.b and 4.6.c of the Rules);
- finally, the members of the Board examined collectively all of the projects, noting, for evaluation criteria 4.6.a, 4.6.b and 4.6.c, the positive, weak and negative aspects of each project.

Subsequently, the Selection Board decided to vote on the marks to award to each project for evaluation criteria 4.6.a, 4.6.b and 4.6.c, and to add the marks for criterion 4.6.d (cf. table in Annex 2).

After the vote the Selection Board drew up the following ranking order of projects according to their merits :

first prize	project n° 2	82,87 points
second prize	project n° 5	81,04 points
third prize	project n° 7	79,66 points
fourth place	project n° 1	79,36 points
fifth place	project n° 3	78,26 points
sixth place	project n° 6	76,40 points

The Selection Board thus awarded the prizes as foreseen by the Rules.

For these projects, the main appreciations and recommendations of the Selection Board are the following :

Project n° 1

Very traditional design, but urban expression too neutral and not in line with the purpose of the building

Interesting structural concept which could have contributed to the architectural strength of the project.

Oppression of the Residence Palace by the new building, without offering a solution for the connection between both buildings.

Interior atrium not successful, neither from the outside nor from the inside.

Project n° 2

Appreciation

- Good combination of the glass façade with the historical part of the Residence Palace, and good integration in the urban environment.
- Very clear concept for the different functions in the building : secretariat/delegations/meeting rooms.
- Good and generous lay-out of the entrance hall with clear access to the elevators and the restaurant.
- Good interior symbolism with may be seen from outside through the transparent facade.
- Adequate shapes for meeting rooms, grouped in one homogeneous and identifiable volume.

Recommendation for the continuation of the study :

- Rework the main public entrance, in order to make it more visible from the street.
- Rework the VIP entrance to encompass the importance of the purpose of the building, even if its location is good from a security point of view, while respecting the property limits that will be defined.
- Make sure the façade is transparent during day-time in order to accentuate the symbolism of the meeting room volume.

- While using window frames originating from different Member States is an interesting approach, it is not necessary to treat the entire facade in this way; in any case the practicality of this idea should be checked from a security prospective.

Project n° 3

Very functional project, with good integration between new and historic parts of the building

However, the overall expression towards the outside is that of an office building; lack of representative strength required by the function of the building.

Regrettable absence of poetry in the expression and weak spatial quality of the main functions.

Due to the fact that certain functions are supported by the railway tunnel, the project is considered to be only moderately satisfactory from a security point of view.

Project n° 5

The Selection Board appreciated the contemporary architecture (relationship between the different volumes as well as their nature and urban expression), which seems adequate for this part of the city and the symbolic ambition of the building.

However, it is of the opinion that in this project too much emphasis is given to the platform and to the access ramp for VIPs' vehicles, even if the latter is an efficient measure to ensure compliance with the requirements of the competition.

The main entrance is without doubt too discreet; although such an approach accentuates an important aspect of the requirements, the project nevertheless becomes too inward looking.

The Board regretted that the historic non-listed parts of the Residence Palace would be demolished.

Project n° 6

This project is too complicated and muddled and it mixes different functions. Therefore, security and readability of space is not successful. The scale and formal elements do not succeed in achieving a dialogue between the old Residence Palace and the proposed extension.

Moreover, internal links and circulation of VIPs' vehicles are not well implemented

Project n° 7

The Selection Board appreciated the quality of the project, regarding :

- security : location of the building independent from the underground railway station.
- internal organisation.
- respect of the site limits.

However, it thought the architecture not sufficiently contemporary nor convincing in its symbolism.

The Selection Board regretted that this project demolishes a listed part of the facade of the Residence Palace.

Moreover, circulation of VIPs' vehicles is not well implemented.

Details of the appreciations and recommendations are attached to this report (cf. Annex 3).

6. AFTER THE VOTING

After signature of this report by all members of the Selection Board, by the Observer of the International Architects Union and by the Professional and Technical Advisor, the latter invited the representative of the Procurement Coordination Unit to lift anonymity in presence of the Board and to attach the list of participants to this report (cf. Annex 4).

Done at Brussels, 2 September 2005,

the Professional and Technical Advisor

the Chairman of the Board

Johan BURGERS

Anastassios VIKAS

Annex 5 : images of the winning project

**CALCUL DES POINTS POUR LE CRITERE "HONORAIRES"
CALCULATION OF THE MARKS FOR THE CRITERIUM "FEES"**

Contra(c)t (1) Calendrier long Long timetable	Numéro UCA PCU number	Honoraires proposés Fees requested	Δ (Hon. moy. - Hon. prop.) (Fees aver. - Fees req.)	Δ Valeur absolu Absolute value	Points (MAXIMUM 5)
	1	14,47	1,55	1,55	3,98
	2	12,00	-0,92	0,92	4,46
	3	12,70	-0,22	0,22	5,00
	4	13,50	0,58	0,58	4,73
	5	13,35	0,43	0,43	4,84
	6	11,95	-0,97	0,97	4,42
	7	12,50	-0,42	0,42	4,85
	Moyenne-Average			Minimum	
		12,92		0,22	

Contra(c)t (2) Calendrier réduit Short timetable	Numéro UCA PCU number	Honoraires proposés Fees requested	Δ (Hon. moy. - Hon. prop.) (Fees aver. - Fees req.)	Δ Valeur absolu Absolute value	Points (MAXIMUM 5)
	1	15,19	1,78	1,78	3,74
	2	12,00	-1,41	1,41	4,02
	3	13,50	0,09	0,09	5,00
	4	13,50	0,09	0,09	5,00
	5	12,75	-0,66	0,66	4,58
	6	13,15	-0,26	0,26	4,88
	7	13,75	0,34	0,34	4,81
	Moyenne-Average			Minimum	
		13,41		0,09	

Moyenne des deux contrats Average of two contracts	Numéro UCA PCU number	Contra(c)t (1) Calendrier long Long timetable	Contra(c)t (2) Calendrier réduit Short timetable	Moyenne points (1) & (2) Average points	Points attribués/awarded Titre/Title I - 4.6.d. (MAXIMUM 5)
	1	14,47	15,19	3,86	3,86
	2	12,00	12,00	4,24	4,24
	3	12,70	13,50	5,00	5,00
	4	13,50	13,50	4,86	4,86
	5	13,35	12,75	4,71	4,71
	6	11,95	13,15	4,65	4,65
	7	12,50	13,75	4,83	4,83
				Maximum	
				5,00	

FORMULE DE CALCUL - CALCULATION FORMULA					
5 x	1 -	2 x	$\frac{(\text{Honoraires moyennes} - \text{Honoraires proposés}) - \Delta_{\text{minimum}}}{\text{Honoraires moyennes}}$		
5 x	1 -	2 x	$\frac{(\text{Fees average} - \text{Fees requested}) - \Delta_{\text{minimum}}}{\text{Fees average}}$		

Concours européen Architecture et Projet
2ème phase - Concours de projet

2/09/2005
(Ref UCA - 217/04 - Ref PCU)

European Architecture and Design Competition
2nd stage - Project Competition

Classement final établi par le Jury Final classification made by the Selection Board		POINTS OCTROYES - AWARDED MARKS					TOTAL
		Titre I - Titre I 4.6.a	Titre I - Titre I 4.6.b	Titre I - Titre I 4.6.c	Titre I - Titre I 4.6.d	Honoraires proposés Fees requested	
		Critères urbanistiques, esthétiques et culturels Town planning, aesthetic and cultural criteria	Critères fonctionnels et de sécurité Functional and security criteria	Critères techniques et budgétaires Technical and budgetary criteria			
CLASSEMENT CLASSIFICATION	Numéro UCA PCU number	MAXIMUM: 30 MINIMUM: 20	MAXIMUM: 25 MINIMUM: 25	MAXIMUM: 40 MINIMUM: 20	MAXIMUM: 5	100	
	2	27,17	28,08	23,08	4,24	82,57	
Deuxième prix Second prize	5	24,50	27,75	24,08	4,71	81,04	
Troisième prix Third prize	7	25,00	28,08	21,75	4,83	79,66	
4	1	26,17	27,00	22,33	3,86	79,36	
5	3	23,67	28,17	21,42	5,00	78,26	
6	6	23,50	25,92	22,33	4,65	76,40	

Bruxelles, le 02 septembre 2005		LE JURY - THE SELECTION BOARD		Brussels, 02 september 2005	
Membres avec droit de vote			Members with voting rights		
Membres suppléants			Substitute members		
L'observateur de l'Union Internationale des Architectes : The International Architects Union observer :	Le Conseiller Professionnel et Technique : The Professional and Technical Advisor :	Le Président - The Chairman :			
 W. KUECKER	 J. BURGERS	 A. VIKAS			

**EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN COMPETITION
RESIDENCE PALACE PROJECT**

Second stage of the Competition - Report of the Selection Board

PROJECT NR 1

1. Article 4.6.a of the Rules - Townplanning, aesthetic and cultural criteria

- Very traditional architecture with a lot of attention; interesting structural concept.
- Interesting entrance spaces.
- Quality interior gardens.

However :

- Anonymous and neutral project without real architectural strength.
- Oppression of the historic part of the Residence Palace; a part of the historic facade is hidden; poor link between the old and new parts.
- Absence of dialogue with the outer public space.
- Atrium not successful, neither from the outside nor from the inside.

2. Article 4.6.b of the Rules - Functional and security criteria

- Functional lay-out satisfactory, clear distinction of homogeneous units.

However :

- Absence of an overall security concept; rather ad-hoc solutions.
- Absence of accuracy in the organisation of the lower floors.
- Zone for official dining not adapted to needs.
- Interpretation booths and corridors not in compliance.
- Confusion between VIP vehicles and deliveries circulation.

3. Article 4.6.c of the Rules - Technical and budgetary criteria

- Valid structural scheme, without interference with the railroad tunnel.
- Technical concept : rather traditional but valid.
- Sustainable development and energy saving : rather generic description.
- Gross areas exceed objectives by more than 10%.
- Budget : correct

**EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN COMPETITION
RESIDENCE PALACE PROJECT
Second stage of the Competition - Report of the Selection Board**

PROJECT NR 2

1. Article 4.6.a of the Rules - Townplanning, aesthetic and cultural criteria

- Good combination of the new glass facade and the historic part of the Residence Palace.
- Good integration in the urban environment.
- Very clear concept for the main functions in the building : offices / meeting rooms.
- Clear identification of the meeting room volume.
- Interior symbolism may be seen from outside through the facade.

However :

- Main entrance not clear enough from the street.
- Need to redesign the VIP entrance to encompass the importance of the purpose of the building.
- Doubts regarding the real transparency of the facade.

2. Article 4.6.b of the Rules - Functional and security criteria

- Good overall design with homogeneous lay-out of functions.
- Good and generous lay-out of the entrance hall with clear access to the elevators and restaurant.
- Global security concept sufficiently integrated.
- Good integration of constraints resulting from the preservation of the historic part of the Residence Palace.

However :

- Security problem (shattering) of the large glass facade composed of recuperated windows.
- VIP-entrance and circulation need to be improved.
- Vertical circulation need to be reinforced.
- Interpretation booths and corridors should be more in compliance.
- Necessity to redesign the access ramp to the underground, taking into account the site limits.

3. Article 4.6.c of the Rules - Technical and budgetary criteria

- Satisfactory structural design, integrating measures against collapse in case of an incident; independence from the railway tunnel.
- Traditional and innovative technical solutions, but information is too generic.
- Poor description of measures regarding sustainable development and energy saving.
- Areas : correct.
- Budget : too high and probably still underestimated.

**EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN COMPETITION
RESIDENCE PALACE PROJECT
Second stage of the Competition - Report of the Selection Board**

PROJECT NR 3

1. Article 4.6.a of the Rules - Townplanning, aesthetic and cultural criteria

- Good integration and harmony between new and historic parts of the Residence Palace.

However :

- Too neutral appearance of the new facade, which looks more like an office building.
- No representative strength and absence of poetry in the expression.

2. Article 4.6.b of the Rules - Functional and security criteria

- Very functional project with homogeneous lay-out of functions.
- Project with satisfactory security solutions, inter alia as a result of the "platform" at ground floor level.

However :

- Need to improve circulation on the ground floor.
- Insufficient vertical links.
- Interpretation booths not in compliance.

3. Article 4.6.c of the Rules - Technical and budgetary criteria

- Fundamental structural problem : an important part of the building leans on the railway tunnel : not in compliance, mistake which appears to be irredeemable.
- Technical installations : traditional solutions with some innovative ideas, however without convincing arguments.
- Sustainable development and energy saving : several valuable suggestions but also some bad solutions (carpet).
- Areas : correct, compact project.
- Budget : correct.

**EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN COMPETITION
RESIDENCE PALACE PROJECT
Second stage of the Competition - Report of the Selection Board**

PROJECT NR 5

1. Article 4.6.a of the Rules - Townplanning, aesthetic and cultural criteria

- Very contemporary architectural expression; good distinction between spaces.
- Urban expression in line with the symbolic ambition of the building; good scale.
- Good quality of internal areas.

However :

- Almost complete demolition of the Residence Palace.
- Too much emphasis on the access ramp for VIP cars.
- Volume of the platform oversized with regards to the diagonal office block.
- Main entrance too introverted.

2. Article 4.6.b of the Rules - Functional and security criteria

- Regarding overall functionality and homogeneous lay-out of functions, this project is moderately satisfactory.
- Good project for security; the proposed design offers good solutions.

However :

- No real entrance hall for VIP's.
- Functions are too spread-out between the "platform" and the historic building (official dining rooms inter alia).
- Internal ramp in the superstructure causes functionality and security problems.

3. Article 4.6.c of the Rules - Technical and budgetary criteria

- Valid structural design concept; however, the project is not totally independent from to the railway tunnel.
- Satisfactory technical solutions which are well developed.
- Sustainable development and energy saving : interesting ideas.
- Areas : correct, compact project.
- Budget : correct.

**EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN COMPETITION
RESIDENCE PALACE PROJECT
Second stage of the Competition - Report of the Selection Board**

PROJECT NR 6

1. Article 4.6.a of the Rules - Townplanning, aesthetic and cultural criteria

- Contemporary architecture breaking the monotony of the surroundings.

However :

- Project too complicated and muddled.
- No dialogue between the new building and the historic part of the Residence Palace.
- Spaces are not easily legible.

2. Article 4.6.b of the Rules - Functional and security criteria

- Functional lay-out is not very clear, absence of links between historic and new building.
- Circulation of VIP cars is not in compliance (via the JL-building).
- Total absence of security awareness.
- Important change in underground traffic is proposed ; can not be verified because of a lack of clear plans.

3. Article 4.6.c of the Rules - Technical and budgetary criteria

- Structure : good description.
- Traditional and contemporary technical solutions.
- Sustainable development and energy saving : interesting ideas but too generic.
- Areas : difficult to check by lack of information, gross area is correct.
- Budget : correct.

**EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN COMPETITION
RESIDENCE PALACE PROJECT
Second stage of the Competition - Report of the Selection Board**

PROJECT NR 7

1. Article 4.6.a of the Rules - Townplanning, aesthetic and cultural criteria

- Symbolic and simple architecture.

However :

- Expression is not sufficiently contemporary.
- Bad transition between the new and the historic part : black box too crushing, demolition of one entire module of the listed facade.

2. Article 4.6.b of the Rules - Functional and security criteria

- Good internal organisation with clear and homogeneous lay-out of functions.
- Acceptable security inter alia concerning the main functions in the "tulip".

However :

- The organisation of VIP car circulation is not compliant.
- Not enough interpretation booths in the official dining rooms.

3. Article 4.6.c of the Rules - Technical and budgetary criteria

- Structures : good independence of the new building from the railway station.
- Valid traditional solutions for technical installations.
- Sustainable development and energy saving : proposals mainly concerning energy saving.
- Areas : gross area exceeds program by more than 15%.
- Budget : correct, but probably underestimated.

N° UCA	Identification alphanumérique	Noms des membres de l'équipe participante
1	EB 283946	Mas & Roux (FR), Arene & Edeikins (FR), Bolze & Rodriguez-Pages (FR), Technip (FR)
2	GP 241537	Samyn & Partners (BE), Studio Valle Progettazioni (IT), Buro Happold (UK)
3	LT 931751	Heinle, Wischer & Partner (DE), Origin (BE), Slaich, Bergermann & Partner (DE) et autres
4	HL 240974	Assar (BE), HPP (FR), Cooparch (BE), OTH (FR), Marcq & Roba (BE) et autres
5	RP 183746	CDG (BE), Van Acker & Partners (BE), SWK (BE), Grontmij (BE)
6	CE 314598	Altiplan (BE), Estudio Lamela (ES), Sicabel (BE), VK Engineering (BE)
7	JN 220093	Groep Planning (BE), Ingenium (BE), VK Engineering (BE), Daidalos (BE)



