RÁKOSRENDEZŐ
PROJEKT

RÁKOSRENDEZŐ MASTERPLAN
URBAN AND PUBLIC SPACE DESIGN COMPETITION

FINAL REPORT

26 MARCH 2026

RÁKOSRENDEZŐ
PROJEKT

INVITATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION

RÁKOSRENDEZŐ MASTERPLAN
URBAN AND PUBLIC SPACE DESIGN COMPETITION

Contracting Authority:

Budapest Capital Asset Management Centre Private Limited Company (BFVK)

FINAL REPORT

Budapest, 26 March 2026

RÁKOSRENDEZŐ PROJEKT

CONTENTS

RÁKOSRENDEZŐ PROJEKT

FINAL REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

BFVK Budapest Capital Asset Management Centre Ltd., as the Contracting Authority (**BFVK or Contracting Authority**), has announced a restricted, two-phase architectural competition **(Design Competition)** for the planning of the investment project aimed at the development of Rákosrendező (**Investment Project** or **Rákosrendező**).

Within the framework of the Design Competition, technical proposals were sought for the creation of a modern district in keeping with the spirit of contemporary, liveable and sustainable cities, capable of serving the required functions to the highest possible standard and meeting the evaluation criteria set out in the Competition Brief.

The submitted entries clearly demonstrated that announcing and conducting the Design Competition was the right decision for defining the development and design concept for the new Rákosrendező district. The international design teams brought many new ideas and fresh solutions that can enrich the professional discourse about brownfield developments. Each of the entries selected for awards and purchase is, in some respect, a valuable, feasible work that creatively fulfills the stated objectives.

One can rightly trust that, through the further development of the first-prize-winning entry, Rákosrendező – reborn over the course of two decades – will become a model for the renewal of brownfield sites in the capital with its high-quality architecture, services offering a high quality of life, climate adaptation solutions, and near-zero emissions; its approach and applied solutions will gradually become integrated into domestic practice and shape public opinion in a positive direction regarding the urban way of life.

2. BASIC INFORMATION, EXACT ADDRESS, OBJECTIVE, SUBJECT AND NATURE OF THE COMPETITION

2.1. Contracting Authority

Budapest Capital City Asset Management Centre Private Limited Company (BFVK)

1013 Budapest, Attila út 13/A.

www.bfvk.hu

2.2. Legal expert and legal administrator of the competition

Sirály és Társa Law Firm

1011 Budapest, Szilágyi Dezső tér 1.

Dr Katalin Sirály, Solicitor, Accredited Public Procurement Consultant

www.drsk.hu

2.3. Exact title of the competition

Title (name) of the competition: **Rákosrendező Masterplan, Urban and Public Space Development Competition.**

2.4. Subject and purpose of the competition

The Contracting Authority has launched **a restricted Design Competition** for the planning of the Rákosrendező masterplan, Urban and Public Space Development.

The Contracting Authority has announced a two-stage, single-round international architectural competition to develop the building concept (M**asterplan**) necessary for the implementation of a comprehensive urban development project involving the regeneration of the Rákosrendező brownfield site, and, derived from this, the plans for the public space network of the new district (**Public Space Development Plans**).

The Masterplan defines the future structure of the area, its development density, fundamental architectural character, potential functions, green space system, transport system, utility network and public institution infrastructure. It is a comprehensive urban development concept plan covering all sectors, setting out the technical framework and requirements for further specialist planning and preparatory tasks – such as the internal utilities, public spaces, public green spaces and public institutions to be established – and breaks the investment down into realistically achievable phases, includes the design documentation for the necessary town planning instruments, and also establishes its economic and financial framework.

The Public Space Development Plans set out the planning tasks for the internal public space network of the new district – in particular, but not exclusively, the new urban park, the public

space elements of green and blue infrastructure, the utility network, and certain elements of the motor vehicle, pedestrian and cycle network (road network) – which may be commissioned, in accordance with public procurement rules, during the further planning process, either broken down by area or by planning phase, in part or in full, or on a phased basis.

The Contracting Authority, within the framework of the Design Competition expected proposals that exploit the potential inherent in the area, aim to realise a new urban district, result in a high-quality natural and built environment during the design process, and are prepared in the spirit of environmental and social sustainability; such proposals must be capable of meeting the evaluation criteria specified in the competition notice (**Call for Entries**) and the Competition Brief (**Documentation**), and which are suitable for further development; furthermore, the selected designer must be capable of achieving the objectives set by the Contracting Authority to a high standard.

The Contracting Authority's aim was to use the competition to select a design team that

- is prepared to undertake the tasks involved in preparing a complex, large-scale project;
- views the site's characteristics as a source of creativity;
- is capable of turning visionary ideas into reality with engineering precision;
- is able to draw on a wide range of expertise;
- possesses the knowledge and ambition required to design an exemplary neighbourhood;
- combines an innovative approach with respect for tradition;
- their expertise covers all sub-fields and scales of urban, architectural, landscape and technical design.

The aim of the competition was to ensure that, following the competition procedure, the provisions of Section 9(2) of Government Decree 310/2015. (X. 28.) on **design** competitions (**Design Competition Decree**) – the negotiated procedure and, on that basis, the design contract aimed at preparing the masterplan and the Public Space Development Plans be concluded, provided that, with regard to the above design tasks, the selection of the designer and the performance of the design tasks may take place in accordance with the conditions set out in the Invitation to Tender and the Documentation.

2.5. Form and nature of the competition

Form of the competition procedure: a restricted competition with a value exceeding the EU threshold. Nature of the competition: confidential.

2.6. Brief description of the conduct of the competition, its timeline and milestones

Participation Phase of the Competition Publication of the call for entries, availability of the Competition Brief and start of registration	26 September 2025
Deadline for submitting questions regarding the Participation Phase	9 October 2025
Deadline for responses	22 October 2025
Deadline for submission of applications	4 November 2025
Announcement of the results of the participation phase	18 November 2025
Announcement of the second, Design Phase of the competition	18 November 2025
Site visit	28 November 2025
Deadline for submitting questions regarding the Design Phase	2 December 2025
Deadline for responses	16 December 2025
Deadline for submission of entries	10 February 2026
Date of announcement of the competition results	31 March 2026

2.7. Competition regulations

The competition was conducted in accordance with the following regulations:

The relevant legislation in force in Hungary, in particular

- Part One of the Public Procurement Act (Act CXLIII of 2015 on Public Procurement);
- the Competition Decree (Government Decree No. 310/2015 (X. 28.) on competition procedures);
- Government Decree No. 424/2017 (19 December) on the rules of electronic public procurement;
- Act C of 2023 on Hungarian Architecture;
- Government Decree No. 281/2024 (30 September) on building authority procedures and inspections;
- Government Decree No. 266/2013 (11 July);
- Government Decree No. 126/2025 (4 June) on the designation of construction projects related to the mixed-use property development of the Rákosrendező station area as priority projects and of administrative matters related to such priority projects as matters of priority significance;
- Documentation and the Call for Tenders.

3. SUMMARY EVALUATION OF THE COMPETITION RESULTS

In the first, Participation Phase of the competition, a total **of 43 applications** were submitted by the participation deadline of 12:00 on 4 November 2025, of which the Contracting Authority declared **38 applications valid** and **5 applications invalid**.

In accordance with the ranking criteria set out in Section 3.1.3 of the Documentation, the Evaluation Jury selected **16 suitable** applicants, corresponding to the quota, and invited them to submit competitions on 18 November 2026.

By 12:00 on 10 February 2026, **14** of the 16 invited competitors **had submitted their competitions** electronically, and 14 competitions were also submitted in hard copy.

The Evaluation Jury examined *the 14 entries* received for the competition in detail after reviewing their, seeking the opinions of the contributing experts, and deemed the competition successful on the basis of the evaluable solutions.

The Contracting Authority has deemed the competition a success, based on the number and quality of the entries received, as well as the diverse solutions developed in line with various approaches to architecture, urban planning and landscape architecture. However, with regard to the entries received, it can be said that, despite their diversity and often noteworthy proposals, none of the entries fully met the Contracting Authority's stated intentions. Consequently, even regarding the winning entry, the Evaulation Jury has made recommendations for further design.

The Evaluation Jury identified a total of 8 entries and deemed them suitable for the designers to receive an award, a purchase, or a priority purchase.

During the evaluation, the Evaluation Jury's aim was to select the entry that best meets the requirements set out in the Design Programme for the competition. (See the evaluation criteria in Chapter 4.1!)

3.1. General summary of the entries

The 14 entries received demonstrate an extremely broad spectrum of contemporary thinking in urban design, landscape architecture, and sustainability. The field included coherent urban structural proposals, imaginative green infrastructure solutions, and innovative energy systems, as well as highly conceptual or form-based designs that, while exciting, are less applicable to urban development on such a large scale.

Most of the entries responded sensitively to the complex characteristics of the site—the presence of railway infrastructure, the potential of the Rákos-patak, the ambitious goals of the design programme, and the challenges of long-term urban development. At the same time, there were marked differences in how each entry managed to shape all of this into a coherent, functional, and economically realistic urban district.

Key strengths of the entries

- Most entries recognized the importance of soft mobility, green space-oriented development, and climate-adaptive urban planning.
- The logic of neighborhood-based planning appeared in several designs, supporting the creation of livable, short-term viable neighborhoods.
- Most entries proposed integrated, diverse, or at least complex blue-green infrastructure.
- Many entries sought to ensure that the neighborhood's identity was based not only on functionality but also on urban aesthetic and community values.

Typical shortcomings of the entries

- Several plans were characterized by excessive formalism or showpiece architecture, which overshadowed the city's functionality, livability, or economic realities.
- In transportation systems, connectivity – particularly connections over the railway tracks – was either missing or completely inadequate in many plans.
- Social sustainability – particularly the housing mix, average apartment size, and institutional network – remained underdeveloped in numerous entries.
- Sustainability considerations were often conceptual, lacking an engineering foundation.
- Several proposals suggested unrealistic or overly costly architectural and transportation structures.

Lessons from the leading entries

The highest-quality proposals – particularly RR-13, RR-01, and RR-09, supplemented by the strong green network and mobility elements of RR-04 – provided a clear model of what makes a new urban district simultaneously livable, sustainable, economical, and rich in identity:

- clear structural logic,
- a differentiated, human-scale hierarchy of public spaces,
- a genuine, not formalist green network,
- soft, pedestrian- and bicycle-focused mobility with well-organized rail transit,
- dense but not overcrowded development,
- diverse housing and community-centered ground-floor functions,
- realistic phasing and feasibility.

Lessons from the weaker entries

The less strong proposals fell short of the winning entries primarily for the following reasons:

- an urban structure that was either too homogeneous or overly fragmented,
- a lack of spatial identity or overly graphic design concepts,
- inadequate handling of the railway's dividing effect,
- an incomplete transportation system,
- a lack of community and institutional services,
- deterioration in housing quality (small apartments, poor ventilation),
- unsustainable or overly costly technical solutions,
- program or capacity flaws.

The most important common lessons from the entire field

- The key to the success of a new, metropolitan-scale development is a cohesive yet distinctive spatial structure.
- A green network functions effectively only if it is not merely spatially expansive but also ecosystem-like, technically sound, and usable.
- Mobility is a central issue: where the dividing effect of railways is mitigated and genuine cross-sectional connections are created, the neighborhood functions as an integrated whole.
- Social sustainability is not merely about the number of housing units, but also the quality of housing, diversity, and the adequacy of the institutions.
- Feasibility is essential: a good concept is only viable if it holds up both economically and structurally.

Brief conclusion

Based on the 14 entries, the development of Rákosrendező emerges as a complex, multidimensional, long-term urban deisgn task in which strategic thinking, the integration of green and transportation systems, and social and economic sustainability collectively determine success.

The standout entries clearly point the way forward: a modern, livable, sustainable, and community-focused neighborhood can only be created if the urban structure, green infrastructure, mobility, housing structure, and feasibility are in harmony with one another.

3.2. Summary by evaluation criteria

The strongest proposals (RR-13, RR-01, RR-09, RR-04) offered a complex urban structural logic, a well-functioning green network, well-thought-out mobility, and realistic feasibility. The weaker proposals were mostly based on formal or overly conceptual solutions, as well as underdeveloped programs and transportation systems.

It can be stated that a new, city-scale development can only be successful if urban structural integration, operation-based management of green infrastructure, fixed-track connections, social sustainability, and economic reality are all achieved simultaneously.

1. Urban Quality – spatial coherence, identity, scale

The entries were extremely heterogeneous in urban planning terms. The strongest entries (RR-13, RR-01, RR-09, RR-04) worked with a well-structured, polycentric urban fabric, where neighborhood units, district axes, and public spaces form a clear hierarchy. These designs were able to combine the traditions of Budapest's urban architecture with contemporary solutions, creating a distinctive yet human-scale spatial structure that provides a genuine identity for a new urban district.

The entries located in the middle quality group – such as RR-02 or RR-11 – present a strong urban design concept (e.g., a new boulevard, converting the M3 motorway into a main urban artery), but in many cases these concepts lack sufficiently detailed spatial or fabric-level support. A typical shortcoming is the inconsistent quality of the functional provision of centers and sub-centers, as well as the uncertainty regarding the hierarchy of internal connections and public spaces.

The weaker designs (RR-03, RR-05, RR-06, RR-12, RR-14) adopted either an overly formalist approach or a monotonous, identity-deficient development from an urbanist perspective. A common problem is the unjustified dominance of large-scale, block-like forms, the emergence of a suburban or housing estate character, and the lack of sub-centers and elements that generate urban life. These entries failed to present a structured, differentiated urban environment that would constitute a competitive alternative in the long term.

Conclusion: The key to success was the triad of a neighborhood system + a distinctive urban axis + human-scale public spaces. Most of the entries fulfilled only one or two of these three elements at a time.

2. Quality of the green network – park structure, blue-green elements, ecological network

Proposals for green spaces generally represented a strong point of the field. The best designs (RR-01, RR-04, RR-05, RR-13) created complex, multi-level blue-green infrastructures that served the urban microclimate, water retention, recreation, and ecological continuity alike. Several entries consistently applied the sponge city principle, featuring well-designed SuDS systems, rain gardens, green roofs, and water management parks.

However, there were significant differences among the solutions proposed for the revitalization of the Rákos-patak. While some proposals are exceptionally valuable (RR-04, RR-05, RR-07), others (RR-09, RR-11, RR-12) the management of the stream is technically questionable and included interventions that are contrary to the call for proposals or ecologically harmful (e.g., enclosed channels, excessive backfilling, oversized structures).

Typical flaws in the weaker entries:

- green spaces are fragmented and do not form a hierarchical system,
- the park is oversized or has an unfavorable geometry,
- the criteria of the 15-hectare urban park is not realized or remains merely formal,
- issues regarding the maintenance and operation of green spaces have not been thoroughly considered,
- it does not account for the partial preservation of existing greenery; intensive landscaping or the public park's design assumes a complete tabula rasa..

Conclusion: The truly strong green network concepts offered technical realism, a landscape-oriented approach, and usability alike; however, few of these were realized.

3. Transportation – mobility network, rail transit, interoperability

The greatest variation was evident in the transportation sections. The strongest plans (RR-02, RR-04, RR-09, RR-11) examined the region at the network level, prioritized fixed-track connections, approached the integration of the metro, rail, tram, and metro with a good sense of proportion, and consistently applied the principles of sustainable mobility.

However, a lack of cross-cut connections was characteristic of the entire field, particularly regarding connectivity over of the railway line. Only a few entries effectively addressed the railway's isolating effect, while most plans performed poorly due to the scarcity or functional deficiencies of these connections.

Notable transportation weaknesses include:

- excessive dominance of car traffic (RR-06, RR-10),
- internal cul de sac systems (RR-07),
- elevated structures lacking practical use (RR-08, RR-12),
- parallel fixed-track elements that undermine each other (RR-09),
- poorly located or underdesigned public transit hubs.

Conclusion: The transportation system was functional when it simultaneously ensured connectivity, network logic, and priority for pedestrians and cyclists based on actual urban routes.

4. Environmental Sustainability – energy, water, climate adaptation

The sustainability work packages reflect significant effort, but technical soundness was often lacking. The most forward-looking approaches (RR-01, RR-04, RR-05, RR-13, RR-14) consistently employed

- sponge city-based stormwater management,
- decentralized energy model,
- renewable energy sources,
- consistent climate analysis

At the same time, in many plans, sustainability elements appeared only in a symbolical or declarative manner. Typical shortcomings included:

- absence of capacity assessment for energy systems,
- overly ambitious or risky technologies (deep geothermal energy RR-05, ground-source heat storage RR-08),
- incomplete presentation of water utility connections,
- mention of the circular economy only in passing (RR-02, RR-03, RR-11, RR-12).

Conclusion: Sustainability performance was outstanding where engineering soundness, an ecological approach, and climate adaptation were present together—this was true of only a few entries in the field.

5. Social Sustainability – housing mix, institutional system, community life

This category showed the greatest variation among the entries.The strongest proposals (RR-01, RR-13) featured

a diverse housing typology,

- a life-cycle-based housing supply,
- active ground-floor zones,
- inclusive public spaces,
- and a well-located network of public institutions.

However, a significant portion of the field still fell short in their planning, even with good urban design foundations:

- institutional capacities (RR-09, RR-10, RR-12, RR-14),
- the housing mix (RR-02, RR-07, RR-11),
- average apartment sizes (too small in many designs),
- public space identity and community-building elements (RR-05, RR-07).

The living spaces in the weaker entries often consisted of apartments with internal corridors that could not be ventilated (RR-05, RR-12), which fundamentally impaired the livability of the neighborhood.

Conclusion: Social sustainability was strong when housing and institutional elements not only met standards but also represented a long-term community vision.

6. Feasibility and Economic Viability – phasing, market, costs

There were marked differences among the entries in terms of feasibility.

Strong performance (RR-13, RR-01, RR-09):

- rational phasing,
- marketable mix of functions,
- development management proposals,
- integration of renewable energy that is also commercially viable.

Common risks:

- extreme construction and infrastructure costs (RR-08, RR-09),
- low initial-phase revenues (RR-02),
- unrealistic development densities (RR-05, RR-06, RR-12),
- premature and overly large-scale development of public spaces or utilities (RR-06),
- uncertain phasing (in numerous plans).

Conclusion: Urban districts developing in an economically viable and phased manner clearly performed better, especially when development was based on market logic and realistic technical capacities.

7. Design Programme – requirements, capacities, functions

Compliance with the design programme was a critical dividing line among the entries. In this regard, the best entries were RR-13, RR-01, and RR-09, with a high degree of programme compatibility and well-thought-out capacities.

Recurring errors:

- under-planning of the institutional network,
- disregard of the size requirements for the urban park,
- discrepancies in housing mix and unit sizes,
- design of the rail network deviating from the programme,
- poor spatial distribution of functions.

Conclusion: The fulfillment of the program showed a close correlation with urban and economic quality: where the program was not fulfilled, the functioning of the neighborhood was also impaired.

Summary

Based on the assessment outlined above, the Evaluation Jury deemed the Competition to be successful and decided to select the winning design entry which, that best meeting the above criteria – taking into account the Evaluation Jury's recommendations – can be refined during further planning, while its implementation offers the greatest benefits for Budapest.,

4. DETAILED EVALUATION OF THE ENTRIES

4.1. Evaluation criteria

The Evaluation Jury assessed the submitted entries as a complex whole, in terms of their quality, examining the highest possible level of combined fulfilment of the complex set of requirements set out in the Documentation Brief, with particular attention to the following areas:

1. Urban quality
2. Quality of the green network
3. Transport
4. Environmental sustainability
5. Social sustainability
6. Feasibility and cost-effectiveness
7. Design programme

Urban quality

The Evaluation Jury has given a positive assessment if the planned district:

- can contribute significantly to mitigating or reversing the suburbanization straining the spatial structure and functioning of the Budapest metropolitan region;
- is able to meet the different functional requirements of of each sub-area in a differentiated manner;
- fits organically into the structure of the city as a whole and the neighbouring districts, as well as their green and blue infrastructure networks;
- is able to provide all the services necessary for everyday life to its residents and visitors at a high level, minimizing conflicts of interest and applying realistic technical and financial solutions;
- meets 21st century expectations with its smart technological solutions;
- is able to provide a high-quality urban living environment through its streetscape, public spaces and services;
- its townscape and architectural character are innovative, easily recognizable, and comparable to the best contemporary examples in Central and Western Europe.

Green network quality

The Evaluation Jury has given a positive assessment if the planned district:

- includes a system-wide network of green infrastructure that makes use of existing green spaces and creates new ones, providing a wide range of urban ecological and recreational services for a broad range of users;
- contributes to the enhancement of biodiversity, offers a diverse habitat for plant and animal species, and provides adequate green space, taking into account the existing vegetation;
- relies upon successful international examples of green infrastructure design and cost-effective operation;
- uses green network elements of varying scales (bioswales integrated into street cross-sections, rain gardens, pocket parks, green spaces in open areas, urban parks, etc.) that can cover a wide range of user needs and attitudes;
- pays special attention to integrating the Rákos-patak (stream) into the green network
- and provides feasible and environmentally friendly proposals for its revitalisation.

Transport

The Evaluation Jury has given a positive assessment if the planned district:

- is served based on the consistent primacy of soft mobility and public transport;
- has a street network and internal transport environment that is accessible, everyone can safely and independently use it, especially the most vulnerable road users;
- is integrated into the transport network of Budapest;
- its internal transport infrastructure is characterized by efficient, cost-effective technical solutions that provide high-level service, with the smallest possible land use and is optimized for low land-use transport modes (both for moving and parking);
- is compatible with the relevant mobility strategies and major infrastructure investments that define the project environment, treating the rail-based infrastructure as an integral part of the urban fabric;
- it does not significantly further burden the transport network of the surrounding districts or the wider urban area.

Environmental sustainability

The Evaluation Jury has given a positive assessment if the planned district:

- significantly improves urban climate, including climate-adaptive solutions, and its cost-effective operation is ensured in the medium and long term, even under changing climatic conditions;
- its energy supply is designed in line with the PCED concept, based on renewable, local emission-free heating and cooling networks and sources, and reliable technical solutions;
- it can be built and operated with minimal energy and building material consumption in accordance with the principles of circular economy, and its waste management system is adapted to this;
- consistently applies the principles of the sponge city concept in terms of rainwater management, integrating blue-green and related gray infrastructure into a system based on this principle;
- its water supply concept is in line with existing network conditions and development trends;
- it contributes to improving urban noise and air quality (e.g. traffic calming, creation of pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly spaces, utilization of green spaces and tree-lined avenues to reduce dust and pollution, use of low/zero-emission transport and facility management solutions);
- applies solutions that reinforce the sustainability mindset of residents and visitors alike.

Social sustainability

The Evaluation Jury has given a positive assessment if the planned district:

- offers a range of housing options to meet different needs, with an emphasis on affordable housing;
- has a network of public spaces and green areas that are attractive and safe for all age and social groups and encourage interaction and community activities;
- meets local educational, social and health needs to the greatest extent possible through its public institutions;
- is able to adapt to demographic changes in the long term due its housing supply and public services;
- is capable of accommodating services that increase the liveability and attractiveness of the surrounding neighbourhoods;

- has a distinctive identity that sets it apart from other districts of Budapest based on its urban design solutions, planning approach or other project elements.

Feasibility and cost-effectiveness

The Evaluation Jury has given a positive assessment if the planned district:

- has an economical land use and includes sub-areas suitable for real estate development ensuring the viability of the project;
- enhances the real estate market value of its surroundings;
- can be implemented, operated and maintained in an energy and resource efficient way;
- can be phased in a reasonable manner, depending on the urban structure, infrastructure and real estate market conditions;
- has a resilient programme that can be flexibly adapted to changing expectations and conditions;
- applies innovative and imaginative technical solutions, that are feasible in the Central European context and ensures sustainability through well-thought-out planning;
- can be designed in a cost-effective way, covering all realistic costs in accordance with professional standards.

Design programme

The Evaluation Jury has given a positive assessment if the entry

- complies with the requirements of the design programme;
- presents its proposals in a clear and understandable manner;
- contains proposals that are consistent, well thought out in relation to the complexity of the task, and can be applied together
- presents urban and landscape architectural solutions that are well-developed and of high quality at all relevant scales.

4.2. Detailed evaluation of the entries

Entry No. RR-01

This entry is one of the strongest and most balanced proposals in the entire field.

It demonstrates high standards of urban planning, landscape architecture and design, and overall envisages the creation of a well-organised, liveable and sustainable neighbourhood. It creates a generous spatial structure in which public park areas provide the organising force. The logic of the development is clear: it creates nine distinct yet organically interconnected neighbourhood units, each of which independently embodies the 'five-minute city' principle. These units can be implemented in phases, are self-contained in terms of timing and execution, and can possess an autonomous character.

The block structures restore the continuity of the urban fabric, blend into the environment, and are on a friendly, liveable scale. The metropolitan piazza created around Rákosrendező station, along with the well-placed local centres, are strong elements of spatial organisation. The housing supply covers a wide range, and the mix of market-rate, affordable and alternative housing allows for a diverse social composition, although the proportion of homes suitable for larger families is lower than desirable. Thanks to the spatial structure a large number of valuable flats with park views – though the frontage of the blocks hugging the railway line is less attractive. The building density is high, land use is efficient, and the energy solutions are innovative.

The green space system is one of the entry's greatest strengths: two large, protected public parks and a comprehensive, interconnected green network are created, which also links well with the neighbouring districts. The landscape architecture solutions are of high quality, the recreational functions are rich and well-layered, and the rainwater management is presented as a promising, sponge city-based, decentralised system.

Internal logic of the transport system is convincing, particularly regarding priorities for pedestrians and cyclists, and the integration of the millennial metro line is also forward-looking. However, there are serious shortcomings in external connections: crossings along the circular railway and the Railway Heritage Park are scarce, and the cycle network is fragmented in several places. Relationship between the railway and residential areas is ambivalent.

From a sustainability perspective, the entry builds on several ambitious elements: renewable energy sources, geothermal heat utilisation, solar parks and decentralised energy systems. In terms of the microclimate, the extensive green spaces are beneficial, but this cannot be said of the blocks situated alongside the railway. In the area of social sustainability, the housing programme is well-thought-out and detailed, featuring valuable innovations. The placement of educational institutions) is exemplary, and the district centres are well-defined and functional.

The plan's proposal to ensure a uniform density of built-up areas across the entire site is debatable. By the railway station it would be justified to raise building heights and to increase density striving to create the urban sub-centre designated in the design programme. Apart from this, in terms of feasibility, the plan is well-structured; its four compact development phases are self-sufficient, and even the first phase provides a liveable urban environment. However, the entry does not account for pre-use, and the low proportion of the financial return saleable areas weakens it. The economic model for the phases would have required further development.

Regarding the entry as a whole, architectural solutions, transport network, water management system, blue infrastructure and the utility network would have benefited from further elaboration. Overall, the entry is an extremely strong, professional and comprehensive proposal, representing high quality in all key design areas. It is recommended that the proposals presented in the concept be evaluated and utilised during further design work.

The Evaulation Jury awarded the entry the second prize in recognition of its indisputable merits.

Entry No. RR-02

The entry is based on a strong, distinctive urban design concept that links the entire area via a new boulevard. This boulevard functions not only as a structural framework and a transport management system, but also, by its very nature, as a key reference point to Budapest's identity. The concept is both large-scale and coherent, yet many of its details would have required further elaboration. The structure created by the boulevard organises five districts with distinct characters into a unified whole, responding effectively to diverse social and functional needs, as well as phasing considerations. Abundance of services and institutions in the central area – including the introduction of a district library – creates a strong local hub, thus laying a suitable foundation for the development of an active, well-functioning neighbourhood.

At the same time, closed, impenetrable block structures appear in several places, posing risks from an urban, microclimatic and public space perspective. The scale and location of the central park are generous, but it is more difficult to reach from certain parts of the city, and the green space system is not sufficiently varied. The residential buildings within the park, which focus on the elderly, may also lead to an imbalance in the area's values. At the same time, the blue-green infrastructure built as part of the revitalisation of the Rákos-patak is one of the most outstanding elements of the proposal: the consistent application of sponge city solutions, the complex operational logic of the water retention system, and the near-natural stream and pond structure demonstrate a high level of professional quality. Although the operational requirements of the green space system are higher than average, they are conceptually well-founded.

The transport component is one of the strongest pillars of the entry. The boulevard's role in shaping the city, the priorities given to pedestrians and cyclists, and the innovative expansion of the public transport network – particularly the idea of bringing the millennial metro line to the surface and operating it as a tram – reflect a forward-looking, network-based approach. The radial and ring connections integrate the new district well into the capital's mobility network. Critical comments primarily centre on the weak connection towards Városliget, the tram route's excessively winding alignment, and the complexity of phasing.

In terms of environmental sustainability, the entry contains several strong elements – such as a decentralised approach to energy or soil reuse – but the proposed heat pump system lacks a solid foundation, the capacities are not sufficiently detailed, and the circular construction economy approach is only mentioned in passing. The rainwater management concept is a step in the right direction, but cannot be fully assessed due to the lack of actual capacity studies.

Regarding social sustainability, the housing supply meets the requirements in terms of quantity, but the average apartment size falls short of the prescribed values, and the housing mix is not sufficiently developed to ensure social diversity in the long term. The institutional and service network is extensive, though it would have been useful to verify the alignment of capacities with the population size through further studies. The strength of the proposal lies in the creation of neighbourhood identities and 'landmark' elements; however, closed blocks and excessive density may come at the expense of the diversity of public spaces.

In terms of feasibility and cost-effectiveness, although the building density and the proportion of marketable functions are appropriate, several critical factors emerge: initial development phases entail significant costs whilst generating little revenue; the number of parking spaces is higher than required; the proportion of land allocated to public institutions is over-planned; and in many places, the phasing and the economic model are not aligned. At the same time, the entry offers valuable ideas for the organisation of the development and the decentralisation of the energy network.

Overall, the proposal is conceptually outstanding, particularly in terms of urban structure, green infrastructure and transport; however, in its current form, it poses significant risks in terms of urban planning, housing, energy and feasibility. The concept is of high value, but its further development would require comprehensive fine-tuning across multiple areas.

The Evaulation Jury awarded the entry a priority purchase.

Entry No. RR-03

In the Evaulation Jury's assessment, the entry does not offer the kind of urban planning, landscape architecture, transport, environmental or social quality that would make it suitable for further development.

The fundamental conceptual direction of the plan – the 'urban villa' development applied uniformly across the entire site – defines the entire entry's character and results in a homogeneity that is incapable of creating the functional and spatial diversity needed for a new, functioning urban district. The monotonous, grid-like development is alien to both the character of Budapest and European architectural traditions; it fails to create a strong and recognisable urban identity, cannot generate appeal on a regional or urban scale, and does not create the differentiation required to serve different lifestyles.

Although the green space system is generous in terms of quantity, it is not sufficiently well-thought-out in terms of quality and organisation. The central green area is split by the railway line and further fragmented by the large lake and the artificial hill, thus failing to create a well-functioning, coherent urban park. The system of smaller-scale green spaces is underdeveloped; on-site provision for rainwater retention is not always justified or substantiated, and recommendations regarding plant selection and habitats are also lacking. Although the concept recognises the potential for recreational use of the areas along the railway line, the overall green network does not form a coherent, hierarchical system.

The transport concept is contradictory in many respects. The question of the millennial metro extension remains unresolved; public transport does not offer an attractive alternative in several directions; the cycle network is either incomplete or overly complicated; and motorized traffic in the inner areas remains heavier than it ought to be. Pedestrian and cycle connections are forced into an overly schematic, rigid grid system, which does not facilitate natural urban movement nor allow for organic spatial development. Several transport-critical junctions – such as the Marchegg delta – remain unresolved.

In terms of environmental sustainability, the proposal presents a mixed picture: some elements (a complex rainwater management system, water utility connections, compact development) are forward-thinking, whilst other details are underdeveloped or not technically sound. The energy concept contains several innovative elements, but the operability and capacity of the overly centralised heating system are questionable. The principles of climate adaptation are not systematically incorporated, and the closure of the wind tunnel has a distinctly adverse effect. Circular economy considerations are addressed with limited depth of content, appearing more at a conceptual than a technical level.

In terms of social sustainability, the quantitative aspects of the housing programme meet the design programme; however, the differentiation of the housing mix, the diversity of housing types and the integration of different forms of housing are not effectively realised. The uniform development of detached houses does not allow for the formation of a socially mixed

residential neighbourhood, and the public spaces do not offer strong community-building potential either. From the perspective of urban identity, the public spaces are unremarkable, and the neighbourhood as a whole has a monotonous character.

In contrast, the Evaulation Jury positively assessed the proposal by the land bank and the urban development agency, the modular structural proposals, and certain innovative elements of the energy system. The economic model is novel, partially sustainable and potentially viable, but due to the concept's fundamental urban planning and transport shortcomings, these positive aspects cannot offset the problems affecting the plan as a whole.

Entry No. RR-04

Entry RR-04 is comprehensive, ambitious and delivers outstanding performance in several areas, whilst also setting out clearly defined development directions.

The design's strengths lie in the gradual opening up of the denser urban centre developing by Szegedi út, the building pattern that can be interpreted as a 'two-way undulation', and the linear green structure running alongside the railway. A significant proportion of the residential areas have direct access to green spaces; the range of functions is rich overall, and the programme of public institutions is generous. The development is accompanied by innovative architectural solutions and a variety of housing typologies, which offer good flexibility for different household types. The development phasing is logical: even in the first phase, all key institutions that will strengthen the new district's functionality are already in place.

The green space concept is outstanding: the green corridors flanking the railway on both sides widen into an urban park on the western side, while the revitalisation of the green areas and the Rákos Stream creates a complex ecosystem. Blue-green infrastructure, based on retaining rainwater locally, is detailed and integrated, consciously applying the sponge city principle. The proposed „bathing lake" does not appear feasible due to sustainability and capacity issues.

From a transport perspective, the entry is one of the strongest: most of the area is car-free, with pedestrian and cycle traffic dominating, and the integration of railway stations is exemplary. However, important ring connections are lacking, internal public transport is inadequate, and the extension of the millennial metro line along the railway serves the linear parks rather than the built-up areas.

In terms of environmental sustainability, the entry works with detailed water and energy balances, employs innovative technologies, and places great emphasis on rainwater retention. Although the circular economy is mentioned, several elements are only referred to

in principle. The tall buildings partly form a favourable noise barrier, but certain volumes impair air flow.

From a social perspective, the strengths lie in the high housing capacity, the varied building typologies, the abundance of public facilities, and the multitude of active ground floors that support everyday community life. However, there are shortcomings in the detailed development of the housing mix, the placement of care facilities for the elderly, and the coherence of the public space hierarchy.

From an economic perspective, the building density in this entry is among the highest, whilst the proportion of marketable functions is lower than desirable; nevertheless, the project appears to be viable. The schedule is well-structured, and the technological concept is ambitious, albeit costly.

Overall, the entry is a well-thought-out, technologically forward-looking proposal with a particularly strong focus on green infrastructure; however, it would have required a refinement of the transport network, a strengthening of the hierarchy of the public space system, clarifying the housing and institutional concepts, and rethinking elements that are overly complex or unsustainable (e.g. the lake).

The Evaulation Jury awarded the entry a shared third prize.

Entry No. RR-05

The design is a strongly ecology-focused, regenerative plan, the central element of which is the creation of a large, linear urban park and an extensive blue-green infrastructure. The system of green spaces is meticulously designed to achieve a high level of biodiversity and habitat revitalisation; it aims to retain 100% of rainwater on-site and creates a comprehensive system of greywater recycling, green roofs, rain gardens and adaptive water management solutions. In terms of environmental sustainability, it outlines a complex and innovative energy system that applies the PCED logic at the neighbourhood level, although the proposal for the Eavor-loop deep geothermal power plant is too risky and unrealistic.

Moreover, the plan is unconvincing from an urban planning perspective: the fragmented, disjointed building masses fail to create a coherent urban fabric, and because of the large park, there is a lack of smaller-scale, intimate spaces, organised centres, well-functioning streets and inner courtyards. The public space system lacks character and is underused in many places; the urban identity is weak, and the spatial structure evokes the image of a modernist housing estate. The Kapagyár (Hoe Factory) area and the proposed waste collection site there are poorly integrated into the fabric; the railway's dividing effect remains significant; there are few east–west crossings; and the integration of public transport is, in places, under-dimensioned or results in parallel systems. The millennial metro route does not connect to dense development, and several transport axes lead 'nowhere'.

In terms of social sustainability, the number of apartments is low, the housing mix is unknown, and affordable housing is not provided, while majority of the dwellings presented are not ventilated. The institutional network is under-planned, the mandatory capacity of the library is not met, and sports and recreational facilities are lacking. The structure of public spaces does not support active community life, and the system of private and semi-private spaces is underdeveloped. In terms of feasibility, the phasing is uncertain, the road infrastructure is ill-conceived, the proportion of office functions is too high, and in the initial phases the institutional burden would fall on other parts of the city. Although some of the economic calculations are sound, many of the planned innovations appear to be high-risk and difficult to finance.

Overall, the entry is a technologically and ecologically forward-looking, thought-provoking concept that ranks among the best in the field in terms of green infrastructure and sustainability solutions; however, it falls short from the perspectives of urban design, social considerations and feasibility, and does not create a functional, well-organised and long-term sustainable district.

The Evaulation Jury awarded the entry a purchase.

Entry No. RR-06

The design proposal presents a striking concept with a strong formal language, but one that integrates poorly with the urban fabric and functional context. The scale and structure of the development are alien to the Budapest environment: it is excessively dense, featuring large blocks and bold formal gestures, whilst the balance between green space and built-up area is disrupted. The vast, formalist park and the dense residential neighbourhoods do not complement one another; the everyday usability of the green space is limited, and the maintenance of the park is likely to be costly. In the absence of urban centres, vibrant public spaces and service hubs, the district cannot function to its full potential; residential functions dominate, while education, healthcare and social services are not given sufficient emphasis.

The transport system is underdeveloped in several respects: key structural links are missing (Városliget, Szőnyi út, Railway Heritage Park), the positioning of metro stations is unfavourable, internal car traffic is heavy, and the area is not protected from through traffic. The pedestrian and cycle network is overly formalistic in places, whilst external connections are lacking. Although the number of overpasses over the railway is adequate, the proposal as a whole does not create a coherent environment that prioritises soft mobility.

Environmental sustainability solutions are conceptual but lack detail. Rainwater management is spectacular but not well-founded; there is no presentation of waterworks and utility capacities; climate-adaptive elements are poorly developed; and the block structure impairs ventilation. The PV, energy and circular economy solutions remain sketchy. From the perspective of social sustainability, the lack of cross-ventilation, central-corridor flats,

excessively small floor areas and semi-private spaces cause serious liveability issues. Institutional capacities – particularly school provision – fall far short of what is required, and the range of services does not ensure an attractive neighbourhood that functions well in everyday life.

In financial terms, the project is feasible due to the high ratio of marketable floor area; however, the scale of development is misguided, the first phase (public park and utilities) cannot be financed, and the energy and structural solutions and their costs cannot be justified. The design programme is incomplete in several respects, and the architectural and landscape architectural details do not form a coherent whole.

Entry No. RR-07

The entry's landscape-organised structure, consisting of urban islands, and its development concept based on green spaces are a promising starting point; however, ultimately it fails to create a genuine, coherent urban fabric. Development structure is fragmented, lacking in identity, and in places exhibits a suburban or housing estate character; urban structural connections are haphazard in several places. The system of central spaces and axes is not clear, the hierarchy of public spaces is not organised, and the green corridor functioning as a pedestrian axis is unable to fulfil the role of a major urban thoroughfare.

The design of the green space system is of a high standard in certain elements – particularly the proposal for stream revitalisation – but the geometry of the central park, the excessively large lake surface and the land reclamation along the railway lead to unfavourable conditions in terms of use and ecology. The fragmentation of the green spaces and the resulting imbalances on the eastern side further undermine the area's liveability.

The transport structure is based on the principle of prioritising soft mobility, but the organisation of the network lacks coherence: the railway, the underground and the bus services operate in parallel, thereby undermining one another. The circular flyover system of the intermodal hub, placed above the railway, is a self-serving, dysfunctional solution that leads to poor pedestrian connections, detours and underutilised spaces. The cycle network is practically non-existent, and the residential areas, developed in a pocket-like manner, also weaken internal connections. The proposed density is too low to justify rail-based developments.

Environmental and sustainability concepts are sophisticated in several areas; for example, the circular architectural principles and the integrated approach to the rainwater management system are outstanding. At the same time, numerous technical elements are missing or appear only at a conceptual level, such as the energy requirements for heating and cooling, detailed solutions for the water supply system, or the technical soundness of the PCED model. The microclimate analyses are also partly lacking in data.

The assessment of social sustainability is significantly more favourable: the housing typology system is detailed, modularity and functional flexibility are strong features, institutional provision is comprehensive, and the range of community services is also extensive. Despite all this, the average apartment size does not meet expectations, and the low building density is not ideal from a housing perspective either. The public spaces are varied, but the spatial organisation and character are not strong enough to create a genuine urban identity.

In terms of feasibility, the design proposal outlines a flexible, phased development in many respects; its strength lies in the modular building and housing structure, which can function in multiple ways. However, the building density is low, the proportion of residential use is small, and the pedestrian overpass around the railway station is economically questionable. Estimated costs of the engineering structures and other infrastructure elements are not always realistic either.

Overall, the entry contains numerous valuable partial solutions, as well as sensitive landscaping, circular architectural, and social elements; however, due to shortcomings in urban structural connections, transport integration and the architectural character defining the overall image, it ultimately fails to create a new district on a metropolitan scale with a coherent and strong identity.

The Evaulation Jury awarded the entry a purchase.

Entry No. RR-08

The overall vision of the design is based on a concept comprising a series of ring-shaped pedestrian walkways, which, although visually striking, face significant challenges in terms of functionality, urban structure and operation. The plan's key elements – the monumental, elevated walkway system – do not enhance but rather hinder pedestrian and cycle traffic, and are at odds with actual user routes and the need for public space connectivity. The scale of the proposed structures is financially unrealistic, whilst the quality of the public spaces is unclear and the natural hierarchy of streets and squares is not evident. Development is confined to the periphery of the area, the central park is oversized, the east-west disparity between the two parts of the neighbourhood is disproportionate, and a genuine urban spatial sequence and functioning urban fabric are barely emerging.

The design of the residential areas falls short of expectations in both quantity and quality. The number of apartments is significantly lower than required, the average unit size is notably small, and from a layout perspective, there are many solutions with internal corridors that cannot be ventilated. Community housing is placed at the junctions of the rings, where its community-shaping role cannot be fulfilled. The design places childcare facilities within formalist buildings, which are inadequate in terms of both spatial connections and accessibility (and are likely to encounter operational problems), just as the placement of healthcare and social care facilities is also unfavourable. Several key functions are forced onto

busy arterial roads, while the library and the specialist clinic are situated in a location that is difficult to access and isolated from the urban fabric.

In terms of the green network, the plan's core concept – the system of elevated walkways – is ecologically unjustified and misguided. Although a large green area appears on the western side of the railway, the green network is underdeveloped, the revitalised Rákos-patak is underused, and the drainage system ensuring natural water retention is sidelined. Tall structures and enclosed building blocks impair the microclimate, reduce air circulation in the area, and increase the risk of the heat island effect. At the same time, several elements of the water utility system and stormwater management are forward-thinking; the hierarchical SuDS approach, the three-tier water utility configuration and the utilisation of wastewater heat are particularly valuable concepts.

The transport system is ambitious but flawed in its functionality. The pedestrian walkways increase travel distances, and the structure does not favour soft mobility, meaning that car traffic becomes dominant in many places. Although the public transport network is, in principle, dense and rich in connections (the Tatai út tram, multi-directional trolleybuses, main cycle routes), these connections are not efficient due to the excessive role of the ring structure. The continuity of cycle and pedestrian routes is interrupted in places; the accessibility of crossings over the railway is unclear; and they are difficult for public space users to interpret.

From the point of view of cost-effectiveness and feasibility, the plan also carries significant risks. The excessive cost of the mega-structures, the difficult-to-justify use of the utility tunnel, the unrealistically high design fees and the risky timetable all undermine the project's viability. The development phases are not sufficiently aligned with the housing market phases and entail high pre-financing requirements. Although the energy system is innovative and forward-looking (low-temperature geothermal loop, hybrid control, wastewater heat recovery), the lack of photovoltaic energy generation and the risks associated with ground heat storage are serious shortcomings.

Overall, the entry consistently follows through on its own basic concept, but this is precisely what becomes its main weakness: the formal concept is so dominant that it overshadows several fundamental urban planning, transport, social and economic considerations. The plan's urban structure and public space system is not viable; the development and functional network do not support everyday use, and the resulting environment is alien to the character of Budapest in many respects. Although the entry features numerous partial innovations and good intentions, these cannot compensate for the concept's fundamental structural weaknesses.

Entry No. RR-09

The entry presents a comprehensive and coherent urban design concept that connects five clearly defined neighbourhoods through a network of parks and pedestrian-friendly public

spaces. One of the plan's greatest strengths is that it creates a distinctive unit with a local identity by integrating existing features – the Kapagyár (Hoe Factory), the railway deltas and the area's historical elements. It combines a contemporary architectural toolkit with block structures rooted in Budapest's traditions, thus offering solutions that are authentic and meaningful from an urban landscape perspective. Each of the five micro-districts has its own character and a small park, resulting in a good, human-scale environment, while at the same time linking the entire area with a strong network. The car-free inner neighbourhoods, the consistent prioritisation of soft mobility, and the high-quality public transport elevate the design to one of the strongest mobility concepts.

The proposal for the green space system is ambitious in terms of both quantity and quality: spacious parks, tree-lined urban spaces and recreational features form a coherent network, which is well integrated with SuDS-based stormwater management and the 'sponge city' approach. However, the plan requires adjustments in several areas. The proposal for a closed-channel diversion of the Rákos-patak and its proposed route defy the design programme and are suboptimal from both ecological and transport perspectives. The Construction of an embankment alongside the railway as a noise barrier is costly, involves the felling of existing vegetation, and renders the planned pedestrian and cycle route along the stream unfeasible. The oversizing of the lakes, as well as the role and cost implications of certain green bridges, are also of dubious feasibility; however, taken together, these do not annull the concept's fundamental merits.

From a transport perspective, this is one of the strongest entries: the leading role of public transport, the high-capacity routes, the good integration with surrounding networks, and the clear definition of the railway platform-end route all reinforce this. The internal car-free zones, main cycle routes and pedestrian links are well-structured, but certain oversized structures – particularly the wide green bridges over the railway – would require significant downscaling. Further problems include the parallel route of the tram along the district's central axis and the millennial metro line, which is not justified in the long term, the lack of cross-sectional connections in the northern area, and the weaker connections to the Városliget.

The sustainability concept is also bold, integrating the circular economy approach, the use of certification schemes and a low-energy building stock across multiple levels. At the same time, the entry remains at a conceptual level in many respects regarding energy; the excessive proportion of air-source heat pumps carries technical risks, the issue of utilising district heating and cooling heat remains unclear, and the necessary hydraulic, soil and capacity studies are also missing.

From a social perspective, the entry features a strong housing concept and an excellent public space system, but the provision of institutional facilities is severely under-planned: the capacity of primary schools and cultural facilities falls short of demand, sports and recreational areas are not designated, and healthcare is not given sufficient weight.

From an economic perspective, the competition entry has high development potential, with significant property market value, a flexibly configurable building structure and good scheduling potential. At the same time, the engineering works, landscaping and lakes are costly, the design fees are excessive, and the parallel development of the sub-areas is completely unrealistic in terms of phasing, as it would require the advance construction of the infrastructure networks and would cause continuous disruption during the project's construction.

Overall, the entry is a well-developed, high-quality design built on a strong underlying concept, which excels in terms of the urban spatial structure, the green space network and the transport system. The identity of the planned neighbourhoods, the quality of public spaces and the development structure project a high-quality urban landscape. Its weaknesses lie in the Rákos-patak and the blue-green networks, transport, public institution capacities, phasing and energy system solutions.

The Evaulation Jury awarded the entry a shared third prize.

Entry No. RR-10

Judging by the overall impression of the design, a proposal emerges that is ambitious and employs sensitive approaches in places, but is fundamentally uneven and lacking in terms of urban structure and functional cohesion. The planned district does not form a coherent, well-functioning structure, and due to the lack of detail, it is unable to offer a genuine alternative to either the wider metropolitan area or other development areas in Budapest.

The urban design concept, which draws on historical models, is at odds with the environment in several respects; the references do not merge into a coherent – or even historically authentic – character, while public spaces, street networks and functional connections remain underdefined. Although the proposed metro extension through the western part of the area, the campus and certain details of residential areas point in a positive direction, they cannot compensate for the fundamental structural shortcomings. The lack of detail regarding pedestrian connections over the railway, the unsustainability of the „floating plot" solutions, the uncertainty regarding the location of services, and the lack of integration with the green network all contribute to the entry being ranked lower.

On the one hand, the green space system is valuable because the revitalisation of the Rákos-patak is well-conceived and ecologically promising. At the same time, the central park is oversized, formalistic and poorly designed in terms of landscape architecture, whilst the green corridors do not connect with the urban fabric. The structural weaknesses of the park system, the lack of connection to the Railway Heritage Park, and interventions harmful to the existing vegetation (e.g. landfilling) further undermine the implementation of environmental considerations.

The transport concept is similarly controversial: although the access routes connect well to the wider network in theory, the internal system is overly car-centric, cycling infrastructure is lacking, there are few ring connections, and the route of the metro line is not justified either technically or economically. The rail line's disruptive effect is not significantly reduced; public transport connections are distant and patchy, whilst the scale of the high-capacity road network is also misguided.

The entry performs best in the area of environmental sustainability: it incorporates the sponge city concept, an extensive blue-green network, the idea of energy communities, as well as some data-driven elements (e.g. simulations). However, the energy concept is not coherent, numerous details are missing, and data-driven planning is lacking. The water supply system is only presented at a basic level, and several key technical issues remain unaddressed.

Social sustainability aspects are also less well addressed: the housing mix is contradictory, the apartment sizes do not meet the programme, the network of public institutions is under-planned and their locations are not advantageous, and the system of public spaces fails to provide a genuine community focus for the district. Although the design promises human-scale massing, the neighbourhood spaces and coherent spatial hierarchy necessary for the development of a genuine urban identity are lacking, meaning the planned quarter cannot establish an independent urban character.

From an economic perspective, the project is theoretically viable, although numerous risks reduce its feasibility. The extremely low average flat size, the lack of floor plans, the costly route of the metro line, and the fragmentation of the green spaces all undermine feasibility. The development schedule is logical but very long-term, and several key elements are not sufficiently substantiated. The design programme contains several fundamental numerical and conceptual errors; the technical description remains vague in many places and lacks genuine technical depth.

Overall, the RR-10 proposal presents a number of valuable ideas and, in some respects, promising solutions. However, these do not come together to form a coherent, liveable and feasible plan. The structural, transport, green network, institutional and housing issues are systemic; the concept for public spaces and urban design is insufficient; and the genuinely valuable sustainability proposals are not sufficiently developed to offset the shortcomings.

Entry No. RR-11

Taken as a whole, the entry presents an ambitious and generous urban architectural vision which, in the Jury's assessment, is based on strong conceptual foundations, yet requires further refinement in several respects.

A fundamental strength of the plan is that it examines the area in a complex, multi-scaled manner, approaching the task by focusing on urban structural connections, the creation of a

liveable environment and mixed-use functions. Based on the evaluations received, the proposal to convert the urban section of the M3 motorway approach into an urban artery road is particularly noteworthy; from the perspectives of transport, landscape architecture and urbanism, it is a striking, bold and forward-looking suggestion. The direction of the metro extension and the established urban axes demonstrate a good sense of proportion; overall, the plan is well-suited to offering a competitive alternative to suburbanisation.

The proposed development is fundamentally diverse, employing a variety of block and building typologies, which can help foster social diversity and the emergence of flexible forms of housing. The use of the inner courtyards as partly private, partly semi-private communal spaces is a modern approach that is justified from an urban planning perspective. The cultural quarter organised around the Kapagyár (Hoe Factory) is a clearly defined urban core that could play an identity-shaping role in the future. The plan places particular emphasis on the needs of children and the elderly, and an approach that supports community life is clearly evident in the design of public spaces. At the same time, the architectural landscape, which embodies the diversity of the city's character, raises questions of feasibility and coherence in several respects: the heterogeneous development logic could pose a significant risk during implementation, whilst excessive variety also weakens the legibility of the spatial order.

In the case of the green space system, the concept is based on valuable principles: the large central park, the network of smaller public gardens, and the differentiated layering of parks and squares fit well with the expectations of a modern urban district. The integrated approach to blue-green infrastructure – for example, the intention to retain and infiltrate rainwater locally – is forward-looking and makes the green space network an important pillar of urban resilience. Despite all this, the plan deviates from the design programme about the of the Rákos-patak's crossing, which can be regarded as a serious technical shortcoming: neither the revitalisation is presented in an appropriate form, nor is the connection between the two sides of the stream ensured. Several elements of the green space hierarchy remain underdeveloped, and the lack of connections over the railway further reinforces the isolation of the two sub-areas.

The transport section is, in many respects, one of the strongest elements of the proposal. The antry dares to challenge traditional constraints and proposes several network modifications that not only improve the accessibility of the area but also enhance its integration into the surrounding urban fabric. The dense network of cycle and pedestrian routes, the new route for the metro, the connections at the end of the platforms, and the rationalisation of road junctions are all elements that are truly capable of creating a new quality. Nevertheless, the plan only partially resolves the rail line's dividing effect, nor does it provide effective solutions for cross-directional connections. In several inner areas, the dominance of motor vehicles remains, which undermines the principles based on soft mobility.

In the area of environmental sustainability, the competition entry's intentions are forward-looking, but the level of detail in their elaboration falls short of the desired standard. The

rainwater management concept is comprehensive and ambitious; however, the presentation of sustainable energy systems is somewhat sketchy, energy calculations are missing, the PCED model is unfounded, and the proposals relating to the circular economy are not solid.

In terms of social sustainability, the entry takes a sensitive approach to housing, community and institutional needs. The diverse housing typology, the varied system of communal spaces, and the well-considered placement of public health and education facilities are key strengths of the plan. However, its weaknesses include the low average apartment size, the lack of quantification of the housing mix, and the limited institutional capacity.

When examined from an economic perspective, the proposal underperforms in several respects: the building density is among the lowest, the absolute value of marketable functions is low, and the economic viability of several building elements is questionable. The volume of residential functions is insufficient, the size and marketability of the dwellings are weak in certain areas, and the energy strategy also needs to be reconsidered.

Overall, this entry is a strong, inspiring proposal featuring numerous forward-thinking ideas, which is outstanding in several aspects, yet – particularly from the perspectives of green infrastructure, energy and cost-effectiveness – it would require significant rethinking; in its current form, it can be regarded more as a promising urban planning vision that is not yet fully developed in its details.

The Evaulation Jury awarded the entry a priority purchase.

RR-12

This entry is based on a strong graphic concept – a green axis featuring a leaf motif running alongside the railway line – which, however, is not in itself capable of serving as the organising principle for a functional, liveable district. The plan is consistent in that the dominance of the formal concept overshadows urban planning, transport, social and sustainability considerations.

The development is extremely dense, built around large-scale blocks that lack distinctive sub-centres, smaller-scale communal spaces and identity-forming elements that fit in with the residential neighbourhoods. Given the lack of structure in the urban fabric, it is questionable whether, at the level of everyday life, the design is capable of creating a realistic, liveable residential environment that offers a genuine alternative to suburban areas. The details of the public spaces are underdeveloped, and the layout of metro stations and public transport links does not support the emergence of natural neighbourhood centres. This is further reinforced by the fact that the green corridor, intended as a central gesture, does not actually integrate with the surrounding development, appearing separated from it by a distinct break.

In the case of the landscape architecture system, the dominance of the leaf motif results not only in excessive formalism but also in direct functional shortcomings. The park areas are fragmented; the contiguous urban park of at least 15 hectares written in the design programme is not realised. The park's pathways are unproportional and exaggerated; their maintenance is likely to be difficult, while the proposal for the surface routing of the Rákos Stream is technically questionable and costly. The concept of green bridges and crossings is visually interesting, but technically oversized and difficult to justify.

Within the transport system, the organic, meandering layout of the internal pedestrian and cycle routes is aesthetically pleasing, but impractical for everyday use. Several routes force users to take detours, thereby hindering clear and unobstructed movement. The management of motorized traffic is contradictory: although the plan promotes soft mobility, the access roads extending into the inner areas and the numerous car parks continue to make car use the preferred option. The metro extension does not integrate properly with the network, its endpoints are not functional, and cross-cut public transport links remain inadequate.

From a sustainability perspective, the proposal contains numerous declarations but few solid details. Solutions to improve the microclimate are underdeveloped; whilst green roofs are a positive feature, they are not sufficient on their own to reduce ground-level heat stress. The commitments regarding the energy system are vague: there is no energy demand estimate, the local energy generation system is not outlined, and the principles of circular construction are entirely absent. The idea of utilising wastewater heat is forward-thinking, but it remains unexplained, and the entry takes the capacity of the existing water supply network for granted without justification.

From a social perspective, one of the greatest shortcomings is the complete lack of detail in the housing concept. Although the entry proposes the highest number of apartments among the competitors, it provides no substantive information regarding their types, distribution, financing or the diversity of housing forms. The floor plans presented show flats with internal corridors and poor ventilation, whilst the renderings, in contrast, suggest a rather high-prestige residential environment. Placement of public facilities is scattered; in many cases, they are far from the residential areas, and healthcare and care for the elderly are practically undeveloped.

From a feasibility perspective, the competition entry's high building density and large number of underground car parks entail significant costs and risks. The 'leaf park' is spectacular but impractical, whilst its maintenance is expected to be costly. The proposed schedule would sensibly launch the project from the city centre, but it underestimates the costs of developing public transport and utilities.

Overall, the entry is based on a graphic rather than an urban planning concept, and is therefore unable to offer convincing solutions that work on an urban scale. Behind the spectacular gesture, there is a lack of appropriate urban structural logic, a realistic transport

system, a housing strategy, environmental and energy sustainability, as well as a functional system of public spaces and community functions.

Entry No. RR-13

This entry is one of the most coherent and high-quality proposals in the entire field, characterised by clear structural thinking, rich content development and a strong, distinctive urban architectural vision.

The planned district is divided into six distinct quarters, each with its own sub-centre, which not only creates a logical and liveable structure in a spatial sense, but is also capable of responding to diverse and changing life situations, household types and user needs. The public space network along the circular promenade is unified and clear, and creates a distinct identity that is further reinforced by consistent architectural design and the thoughtful use of materials. The quality of the public space system and green areas is one of the design's greatest strengths: the trio of the railway park, the forest park and the sports park, along with the north–south green corridor connecting them, forms an exemplary urban green structure. The social acceptability of the 90-metre-tall tower blocks (and their impact on the cityscape) is questionable, so their scale should be reconsidered. The park included in the proposal is less than 15 hectares in size, and the intensive development along the Railway Heritage Park is poorly served.

The transport concept of the entry is outstanding in several areas, particularly with regard to the transport links at Rákosrendező railway station and the management of cycling infrastructure. The pedestrian-friendly street network, shared-use streets, adequate connectivity and the well-designed gateway concept are all forward-looking elements. At the same time, a critical shortcoming is the lack of cross-cut public transport links, as well as the underdesigned pedestrian and cycle connections, which only partially mitigate the dividing effect of the railway. The construction of multi-storey car parks and the lack of bike-and-ride facilities run counter to the expectation of a car-free district.

Based on an assessment of sustainability criteria, the proposal is based on an ambitious and, in part, well-substantiated environmental concept – particularly in the areas of energy supply, application of PCED principles, climate studies, the 'sponge city' approach, and the integration of blue-green infrastructure at neighbourhood level. At the same time, several key areas raise questions: the water utility concept is incomplete, the management of rainwater quality is unsatisfactory, and the mitigation of the heat island effect is unclear due to the dense development and the block structure that hinders air movement. The waste management proposal remains merely a mention. It is not advantageous that the plan, disregarding the possibility of district heating, would essentially base supply on air-source heat pumps.

The development is also exceptionally strong in terms of social sustainability. Alongside a high number of homes, it provides a diverse and inclusive housing mix, and pays attention to

housing options that span the life cycle. The inclusivity of public spaces, the incorporation of participative design, the active ground-floor zones and the rich programme offering all indicate that the entry genuinely aims to create a people-scale, socially sustainable neighbourhood, and its creators possess significant practical expertise in this field. At the same time, a significant shortcoming is the lack of detailed plans for the health and social care facility network, as well as the under-provision of sports and recreation.

In terms of cost-effectiveness and feasibility, the plan performs exceptionally well. The building density is reasonable, the mix of functions is valuable and marketable, and the phasing is logical, taking into account coordination with external developments. The conscious utilisation of roof surfaces, the concept aiming for renewable energy, and the proposal to establish a development agency provide a solid foundation for the project's long-term viability. At the same time, the plan does not merely outline the final physical state, but also makes proposals for managing the process; its recommendations for pre-use, phasing logic and the 'Handbook of Change' demonstrate a high level of professional awareness.

The Jury considered the entry to be exceptionally strong; its graphic presentation, the documentations's level of detail and the coherence of the technical description clearly placed it among the very best in the field. Overall, it is a high-quality, strategically well-thought-out proposal that is coherent on an urban scale and offers directions that can be developed effectively during further design. Its main strengths lie in its urban structure, its vision of a liveable residential environment, and the exceptional quality of its public space system. The most important areas for development are increasing the size of the urban park, strengthening the public transport network, elaborating the environmental and water utility concept in detail, and fully defining the network of social and healthcare services.

The Evaulation Jury awarded the entry first prize in recognition of its high design standard.

RR-14

Overall, the entry is sound and undoubtedly contains forward-looking proposals regarding sustainability and energy efficiency; however, in terms of the urban landscape and structure, it does not offer a distinctive, striking vision that would present a genuine alternative for establishing the identity of a new urban district.

One of the fundamental problems is that the overall effect of the development is excessively monotonous, resembling a housing estate. No distinct neighbourhoods, well-functioning sub-centres or smaller-scale spaces emerge whose community-building power could define the identity of the entire district. The large park is concentrated in a single unit in the northern part of the area, so green spaces do not weave through the urban fabric, and the park's accessibility and internal organisation remain underdeveloped. Although the revitalisation of the Rákos-patak and the expansion of the floodplain are valuable ideas, on the eastern side the development along the stream is too close to the watercourse, weakening the function of

the ecological corridor. The smaller green spaces are also insufficiently developed, so the overall effect is fragmented rather than network-like.

The transport system is similarly problematic: the internal collector road cuts the green spaces off from one another, disrupts the 'park city' character, and does not support the development of pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly transport. There is a lack of connections to the surrounding neighbourhoods, particularly within the cycling network, while the dividing effect of the railway is not sufficiently mitigated. By the railway stations, the scale of the development is either too grandiose or poorly organised, thus failing to create central hubs.

In the housing programme, the block typology is flexible and well-considered, allowing for the integration of different housing types; however, the housing mix is poorly balanced, the number of apartments is below average, and community and social facilities are significantly underplanned. The provision of cultural, leisure and sports facilities falls short of the requirements, which is a significant shortcoming from the perspective of social sustainability. The public space system lacks a clear hierarchy, and the architectural character is not strong enough to define the identity of a new urban district.

In contrast, the sustainability concept is a definite positive aspect of the entry: the rainwater management system based on sponge city principles, the multi-scale blue-green network, data-driven energy management, and flexible connection to the existing district heating network are all forward-thinking ideas. Although the energy section is somewhat contradictory in places, the foundations of the concept are sound. In terms of feasibility, the plan is well-structured, can be phased, and does not employ extreme or risky solutions, although the details are lacking in several places.

In summary, the entry is a coherent design that performs strongly in certain areas, yet it is not sufficiently distinctive from an urban planning and social perspective. It lacks the distinctive conceptual vision and innovation that would be capable to establish the identity of a new district and to strengthen its connection to the surrounding urban fabric. The sustainability and economic elements are noteworthy, but they are not sufficient on their own.

5. RANKING OF ENTRIES

5.1. Rules for awarding prizes

Total budget available for prizes (prize money and purchase of entries) from competitions	HUF 141,000,000 gross
Maximum prize amount (1st prize)	HUF 18,000,000 gross
Minimum purchase price	HUF 3,000,000 gross
Invitation prize per Competitors:	HUF 5,000,000 gross

The Evaluation Jury determine the amount of the prizes and purchases within the above limits based on the quality of the entries received.

The invitation prize is due to a maximum of 16 Applicants selected from among the Applicants during the Participation Phase, corresponding with the quota number. The Competitors are entitled to the invitation prize only if they have submitted their valid entry in accordance with the Design Competition Documentation.

The prize money and purchase sums are gross amounts, which include tax and all other public charges payable under current Hungarian legislation. The prize money and purchase sums shall in all cases be paid against a duly issued invoice or other accounting document.

The Competitor is required to issue an invoice in Hungarian forint, which the Contracting Authority will settle in Hungarian forints by bank transfer.

In the case of a foreign company, value added tax (**VAT**) will not be paid to the Competitor; the Contracting Authority will pay the amount directly to the Hungarian tax authority, thus obviating the need for the foreign partner to register as a VAT-registered entity with the Hungarian authorities.

The Contracting Authority shall not reimburse the Competitors for any costs incurred in connection with the preparation and submission of the entries.

The winning entries and those selected for purchase (priority purchase) shall become the property of the Contracting Authority, who may use them without any further consideration beyond the competition prize or purchase fee, in compliance with the provisions regarding copyright protection. By submitting their entries, the authors of the winning and purchased entries grant an unlimited, exclusive licence for the use of the work, covering all forms of use—including the right to adapt the work—which may be transferred to third parties and is valid in all territories, in accordance with the detailed provisions of the usage agreements to be concluded with them. In accordance with applicable legislation, the Contracting Authority may use the winning and purchased entries, in whole or in part, for promotional, reproduction and exhibition purposes. The Contracting Authority reserves the right to reproduce the

winning and purchased entries for promotional or exhibition purposes, whilst respecting the personal copyright of the creators and without further remuneration to the creators , provided that the creators of the entries are credited.

5.2. Awards and purchases

In accordance with the legal expert's recommendation, the Evaluation Jury deemed all 14 submitted entries to be valid and in compliance with the formal requirements; consequently, it awarded the **invitation prize** of 5,000,000 HUF (gross), as specified in the Documentation, to each of the Competitors who submitted an entry.

The Evaluation Jury assessed the entries received on the basis of the criteria set out in the Documentation, and **awarded prizes** amongst the Competitors who submitted valid entries, **and selected entries for purchase (priority purchase) as follows**.

Only the winning entries and those selected for purchase were identified; the Evaluation Jury did not rank the other entries, but listed and evaluated them in this Final Report.

According to the Documentation, the Evaulation Jury determined the amounts of the prizes and purchases based on the quality of the submitted entries, taking the above thresholds into account. After awarding the invitation prizes, the Evaulation Jury distributed the total remaining amount for prizes and purchases among the Competitors.

Based on the assessments described in Section 4, the Evaluation Jury has awarded prizes to the following entries:

First prize goes to:	Entry No. RR-13
Second prize goes to:	Entry No. RR-01
Joint third prize goes to:	Entry No. RR-04
	Entry No. RR-09

Based on the assessments outlined in Section 4, the Evaluation Jury has further decided to purchase the following entries in accordance with Section 7 of the Competition Regulations, designating two of them as entries to be purchased on a priority basis:

Awarded special recognition (priority purchase):

- Entry No. RR-02
- Entry No. RR-11

To be purchased:

- Entry No. RR-05
- Entry No. RR-07

5.3. Distribution of prizes and purchases

The Evaluation Jury has determined the amounts to be paid to the prize winners as follows, taking into account the total budget available for prizes:

1st prize:	HUF 18,000,000 gross;
2nd prize:	HUF 17,000,000 gross;
3rd prize:	HUF 10,000,000 gross

The Evaluation Jury has determined the purchase prices to be paid for the entries selected for priority purchase and for purchase as follows:

Priority purchase:	HUF 5,000,000 gross
Purchase:	HUF 3,000,000 gross

The Evaluation Jury did not award any entries with a non-monetary commendation or any other form of commendation.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE METHODS AND POSSIBILITIES FOR UTILISING THE COMPETITION

The Evaluation Jury declares the competition **to be valid and successful** and concludes that **the entry awarded first prize in the competition is suitable for the Contracting Authority to invite the Competitor who prepared it to submit a tender in a negotiated public procurement procedure to be conducted without the publication of a notice for the procurement of design services**. In accordance with the rules governing negotiated procedures without prior publication, the public procurement procedure may be initiated and the contract for design services may be concluded on the terms and conditions set out in the procurement documentation, in accordance with the following recommendation of the Evaluation Jury.

The Evaluation Jury – in accordance with the Invitation to Tender from the Contracting Authority, the Competition Brief and Section 25(3)(k) and Section 26(2) of the Competition Regulation – recommends that **only** the designer of the entry awarded **first prize** be invited to tender in the public procurement procedure following the competition.

6.1. Recommendations for the further design process

The Evaluation Jury has formulated the **following recommendations** regarding the further design of the winning (first-prize) entry:

1. As highlighted in the Design Programme, the project is to create at least 25 hectares of public green space (public parks, green corridors, public gardens, tree-lined public spaces) by utilising existing vegetation and carrying out a phased ecological conversion; within this, the requirement for a contiguous urban park area is at least 15 hectares. The parks situated on either side of the railway line cannot form a contiguous urban park despite the ecological diversion of the Rákos-patak; therefore, the spatial structure of the north-western quarter of the area should be reviewed. When defining the boundaries of the park, ecological conditions, the existing valuable tree population and soil contamination have to be taken into account. The structure of the urban park's pedestrian network should be organically linked to the entry points of the Railway Heritage Park; the layout, functionality, and operation of the two areas should be synergistic.
2. When redeveloping the north-western quarter, provision should be made to replace the public facilities and marketable floor space lost in the process, taking into account both feasibility considerations and the requirement for differentiated development density.
3. In general, efforts should be made to create a differentiated, varied network of green spaces of local significance and other green areas that can be established within the

blocks, which is interconnected not only ecologically but also in terms of rainwater retention and pedestrian traffic.

4. On the south-western side of the development area, the green space should be designated in such a way that it is suitable for the creation of a wetland habitat or a stormwater retention area, taking advantage of the area's high moisture index.
5. In restoring the Rákos-patak to a near-natural state and creating its channel and surface forms, it is recommended to draw on the experience of recent wetland rehabilitation projects in Western Europe.
6. During further design, it is recommended to draw up a habitat management plan covering the gradual renaturalisation of the stream, the integration of the spontaneously established forest stand in the north-western area into the landscape architecture concept, as well as the temporary land use prior to development, and is consistent with the schedule for remediation and recultivation tasks.
7. In order to improve air quality, or at least maintain the current status, efforts should be made to preserve the size and structure of the existing wind tunnel (air corridor). A layout is required that, supported by flow modelling data, is capable of ensuring the best possible ventilation and airflow parameters.
8. Rákosrendező's identity is defined by the railway line running through the area; this should not be concealed but properly integrated into the urban fabric. Urban design is paramount in the vicinity of the railway crossings and in the strip between the bult-up area and the railway area. The railway operational zone can be further reduced compared to the entry's solution, and the green space between the railway and the built-up area can be extended there.
9. It is necessary to mitigate the dividing effect of the railway between the two sub-areas; therefore, it is recommended to create additional crossings over the railway by increasing the density of the pedestrian and cycle bridges shown in the competition entry. These can improve access to public transport stops and green spaces, whilst also helping to enhance connectivity currently lacking between neighbouring districts. As visual elements, these engineering structures can also strenghten the district's character. The bridgeheads of pedestrian and cycle structures should be designed to be barrier-free, through the targeted adjustment of the level of the surrounding terrain and built-up area.
10. The functional separation between the two platform-end exits at the railway station is fundamentally sound: while the southern exit primarily serves intermodalty and transfers to connecting public transport services, the main role of the northern exit is to open up the Rákosrendező district and provide access to the district centre – and the jobs and services established there. Central piazzas of the eastern and western sub-areas can be naturally organised around this exit. It is worth further strengthening

this functional cluster by enriching the northern cross-connection of the railway station with retail and service spaces.

11. On the western side of Rákosrendező railway station, a clear, sufficiently proportioned approach is required to the linear park to be developed along Dévényi utca, which can also form the north-south pedestrian axis of the district centre.
12. On the road sections connecting to the Szegedi út overpass, particularly along Teleki Blanka út, efforts should be made to ensure that the road is flanked by development on a metropolitan scale; where possible, active façades and ground floors of buildings should face the main road.
13. It is worth considering to incorporate the concept of a 'boulevard' – a pedestrian and cycle route with a unified appearance – that reinforces the identity of the Rákosrendező area, and also serves as the quarter's main street.
14. The placement of high-rise buildings is recommended only in a way that does not disrupt cityscape.
15. It is recommended to further loosen up the closed-frame development, open it up, and generally strive for a more varied massing and the use of different building typologies.
16. It is recommended that the selection of designers for certain buildings – that can be identified during the masterplanning process – that are significant for the cityscape within the district centre area, as well as for the public institutions to be established within the project, be carried out through architectural competitions.
17. During further design, it is advisable to concentrate basic care facilities into larger campuses, which will allow for the flexible reallocation of capacities and functions at a later stage.
18. Where possible, urban rail services should be situated along the north-south axis of the core area. This reinforces the justification for the tram branch line running along the internal axis of the western area, as set out in the individual design proposals, as opposed to extending it along the light rail line away from the main axis. It is therefore conceivable that the terminus of the millennial metro line (M1) could remain at Rákosrendező railway station in the long term.
19. In addition to the railway and urban rail networks, it is recommended that more cost-effective and flexible solutions be considered for the development of the entire area. This could involve extending the region's bus and trolleybus network and routing it through the area, as well as smaller vehicles designed for public transport, such as self-driving minibuses that can operate frequently in a largely car-free environment.
20. In order to ensure that the network of public spaces within the development area is truly car-free, the location of the multi-storey car parks serving each sub-area needs

to be reconsidered. In this context, it is recommended that the alignment of the north-south collector roads also be reviewed.

21. Tatai út should be designed with a generous cross-section, ensuring adequate separation from the neighbouring residential blocks in District XIII and providing appropriate spatial proportions.

22. During further design, it is essential to ensure that the mobility needs of the new district are met in a manner that is integrated into the capital's transport system, relying primarily on public and active modes. Particular attention should be paid to ensure that mobility needs generated by the new district can be met without placing a disproportionate additional burden on the road network of the surrounding districts – particularly the immediately adjacent District XIII.

23. It is proposed that the northern cross-cut road be developed as an urban, inter-district collector road, linking the Csáktornya park area and the vicinity of Kámfor utcain Angyalföld, thereby connecting the north-eastern quarter of the development area through the two railway deltas. This will make the interior of the Marchegg railway delta accessible and suitable for development.

24. Contrary to earlier concepts, the intermodal hub at the Marchegg Bridge should be regarded as a compact, locally significant public transport interchange, in order to ensure connectivity with the surrounding neighbourhoods, promote network integration and reduce vulnerability to disruption. In line with the above, the interior of the delta – in addition to sports facilities complementing the urban park's services – could also be suitable for housing campus-style, more enclosed institutions, as well as maintenance facilities serving the new district. To this end, it is necessary to ensure pedestrian and cycle access to the Marchegg delta from the proposed urbanpark on the western side of the design area, the north-eastern quarter, and the residential areas of Pestújhely. Costly technical solutions that involve covering of the railway or its vertical realignment, or extensive civil engineering works, should be avoided.

25. The multifunctional service and car park buildings can also function as decentralised energy hubs for the individual sub-areas (implementation phases).

26. It is important that the energy infrastructure supports future flexibility through energy storage solutions, integration of e-mobility, low-temperature energy distribution systems, a significant reliance on a renewable energy mix, and smart demand management. The widespread use of air-to-air or air-to-water heat pumps is not recommended; instead, solutions that do not involve local noise emissions are preferred. In general, when planning the district's energy supply, it is advisable to aim for the greatest possible flexibility in line with the Positive Energy District (PCED) concept, taking into account technological developments and the differing needs of individual sub-areas.

27. It is worth investigating the possibility of an underground, piped waste collection system, as well as the space-saving, grouped installation of utility lines.

Management of other sub-areas within the design area:

28. Pedestrian and cycle access to the Városliget railway junction should be ensured from all three directions, and road access from at least one direction. The area will thus be suitable for functionally supplementing the scarce (or even non-existent) institutional, recreational and green spaces in the surrounding neighbourhoods: for the establishment of sports grounds or even the expansion of the Budapest Zoo.

29. In keeping with the nature and scale of the intermodal hub, partial overbuilding of the underground depot site at Mexikói út with a superstructure can be feasible and realistic. .

30. In the case of the strip of small plots along Szőnyi út, it is of paramount importance to ensure appropriate scaling and to harmonise functions and building character of the adjacent development area with the existing milieu of detached and small-scale apartment blocks. Efforts must be made to ensure that the street grid and amenities of the eastern sub-area support the gradual transformation of the Szőnyi út neighbourhood.

31. Traffic calming on the approach section of the M3 motorway and its conversion into a main urban road is an important step towards integrating the Rákosrendező area with the residential areas of District XIV. As a minimum programme, it is justified to rationalise transport infrastructure, create more accessible pedestrian and cycle crossings than at present, extend the revitalisation of the Rákos-patak to the south-eastern side of the M3, and supplement the currently inadequate noise barriers.

32. It is recommended that the traffic engineering design and land use of the M3 approach – Nagy Lajos király útja junction be reconsidered so that, by healing the fragmented, excessively transport-oriented urban fabric at the junction, blocks of land suitable for non-residential development with a metropolitan character can be created, thereby establishing the gateway area of the development site from the Zugló side.

33. Should the MÁV track maintenance depot be realised within the design area, it is recommended that it be located in the Esztergom railway delta. This is a less valuable plot that is more difficult to integrate into the urban fabric, whilst road access can be adequately provided from the northern cross-cut road.

7. FINAL PROVISIONS

The Evaluation Jury calls upon the Contracting Authority to conclude contracts regarding the transfer of usage rights for the winning and selected entries, in accordance with Section 27(4) of the Competition Regulations!

Finally, the Evaluation Jury draws the Contracting Authority's attention to the fact that, at the time of drafting this Final Report – as a document recording the professional assessments – the details of the authors of the submitted entries had not yet been disclosed by the custodian of the confidential information.

The Evaluation Jury notes that the identification of the Competitors who submitted the entries will take place following the Jury's approval of this Final Report, after the relevant IT operations have been carried out by the electronic service provider of the competition. The table containing the competition identification numbers, serial numbers, results, the actual identities of the Competitors and the designers, to be prepared following the identification of the Competitors, will subsequently be attached to this Final Report as Annex 1.

The members of the Evaluation Jury submitted their contributions to this Final Report in electronic form in accordance with the working procedures of the Evaluation Jury and the panel of experts.

Members of the Evaluation Jury:

Karácsony Gergely Elnök	Vitézy Dávid Társelnök	Lánszki Regő	Erő Zoltán
Bardóczi Sándor	Binó Beáta	Massányi Katalin	Andreas Trisko
Petr Hlaváček	dr. habil Benkő Melinda PhD	dr. Árendás Gergely	Barts J. Balázs
Dományi Bálint	Mészáros János	Rab Judit	Albrecht Ute

dr. Kocsis János Balázs

Budapest, 2026. március 26.

ANNEX

Appex 1: Table containing competition identification numbers, serial numbers, results and designers, prepared following the identification of the Competitors:

EVALUATION ID (SERIAL NUMBER) ASSIGNED BY THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY TO THE COMPETITION ENTRY	IDENTIFICATION CODE OF THE COMPETITOR GENERATED BY THE COMPETITOR	RANK	COMPETITOR
RR-01	BESZ_519744	2ND PRIZE	**ASTOC ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS GmbH** ARCHI-KON Kft. RMP Stephan Lenzen Landschaftsarchitekten
RR-02	BESZ_379812	PRIORITY PURCHASE	**4 plusz Kft.** Korényi és Társai Építész Kft. IDEFIX landscape architecture VOIDS
RR-03	BESZ_458821		**Atelier Kempe Thill Architects and Planners** DOGMA Architects Mókembé (Kft.) NART Építész Műterem Kft. Bollinger + Grohmann Engineers Kft. Periféria Közpolitikai és Kutatóközpont Kft. Újirány Tájépítész Kft.
RR-04	BESZ_450710	SHARED 3RD PRIZE	**Superwien urbanism zt gmbh** Építész Stúdió Kft. Objekt Tájépítész Iroda Kft.
RR-05	BESZ_993739	PURCHASE	**MCXVI Kft.** Czirják Szabó Kft. StudioVlayStreeruwitz ZT-GmbH 4D Tájépítész Iroda Kft. LAND LAB, laboratorio de paisajes SLP con.sens verkehrsplanung zt gmbh Mobil City Bt.
RR-06	BESZ_199116		**ESTUDIO LAMELA S.L.P.** EZQUIAGA ARQUITECTURA, SOCIEDAD Y TERRITORIO S.L. SZÁNTÓ & MIKÓ Építészek Kft. Grant Partnership Limited
RR-07	BESZ_049064	PURCHASE	**Urban Agency Aps** Lépték-Terv Kft.
RR-08	BESZ_590997		**S.B.ARCH. STUDIO BARGONE ARCHITETTI ASSOCIATI** GUBAHÁMORI Kft. RJZS Architects Kft. Soóki-Tóth Gábor Csaba egyéni vállalkozó

EVALUATION ID (SERIAL NUMBER) ASSIGNED BY THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY TO THE COMPETITION ENTRY	IDENTIFICATION CODE OF THE COMPETITOR GENERATED BY THE COMPETITOR	RANK	COMPETITOR
RR-09	BESZ_749287	SHARED 3RD PRIZE	**CHYBIK + KRISTOF s.r.o.** Arup Group Limited NAUTES Építészműterem Kft. Architekten Tillner & Willinger ZT GmbH Gumuchdjian Architects LLP HMBCJ GmbH (Demografik)
RR-10	BESZ_256018		**Fernezelyi Kft.** Clément Blanchet Architecture Gustafson Porter + Bowman LLPs
RR-11	BESZ_396223	PRIORITY PURCHASE	**MUTABILIS PAYSAGE & URBANISME** LAN S.A.R.L D'ARCHITECTURE
RR-12	BESZ_517595		**Bjarke Ingels Group A/S** Vikár es Lukács Építész Stúdió Kft.
RR-13	BESZ_299434	1st PRIZE	**Coldefy ET ASSOCIES ARCHITECTES URBANISTES** CITYFöRSTER | Brehm Hansen Niehüser Nolting Richter Seidel Sobota Partnerschaft mbB Architekten Sporaarchitects Kft. TREIBHAUS Landschaftsarchitektur Hamburg Marko and Placemakers s.r.o.
RR-14	BESZ_511103		**MICA Architects Limited** W X Y + architecture + urban design

RÁKOSRENDEZŐ
PROJEKT

RÁKOSRENDEZŐ
PROJEKT