

BUCHAREST MUNICIPALITY
ENDORSED
MAYOR OF BUCHAREST
Prof. Dr. Sorin Mircea Oprescu

REPORT OF THE JURY

*INTERNATIONAL DESIGN PROJECT COMPETITION FOR "ARRANGEMENT OF
GROUND SPACE UNIVERSITY PARKING: TECHNICAL PROJECT*

**PLACE: GALATECA GALLERY – CENTRAL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY,
BUCHAREST**

1. JURY

The jury members have been designated according to memorandum no. 7304/16.08.2011 of the Mayor of Bucharest, as follows:

Full members :

1. Arch. **Luigi Snozzi** (Switzerland)
2. Dr. Arch. **Luis F. P. Conceição** (Portugal)
3. Arch. **Angelo Roventă** (Austria)
4. Dr. Arch. **Zeno Bogdănescu**, representing "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urbanism of Bucharest (Romania)
5. Dr. Arch. **Nicolae Lascu**, representing the Bucharest Branch of the Chamber of Architects of Romania (Romania)
6. Arch. **Eugen Pănescu**, representing the Chamber of Architects of Romania (Romania)
7. Arch. **Gheorghe Pătraşcu**, representing Bucharest Municipality (Romania)

Deputy members :

1. Arch. **Nemeş Karoly**
2. Arch. **Diana Olteanu**

The jury was in session between **October 31 and November 3, 2011**.

It was approved that Mrs. Arch. Diana Olteanu should not participate as deputy member into the jury sessions.

The sessions were attended by the following persons without right to vote:

Arch. **Mihai Ene**, professional and technical advisor of the competition;

Arch. **Ioana Alexe**, jury's secretary;

Arch. **Mirona Crăciun**, chairperson of the Technical Commission of Project Verification;

Arch. **Monica Lotreanu**, competition manager;

Elena Bădoiu, representing Bucharest Municipality in the jury secretariat.

On November 1, 2011, at 4:30 PM, the jury invited Mrs. **Ester Gonzalez**, representing the designer of the underground parking with a view of discussing the technical solutions proposed by competitors.

2. JURY PROCEEDINGS:

Arch. **Mirona Crăciun**, chairperson of the Technical Commission delivers the Report of pre-judgment drawn up following the verification as to the way in which the competitors complied with the theme requirements and conditions stipulated in the Regulation.

There were **39** projects submitted. According to the Technical Commission, there were four projects that failed to comply, falling under the situations described at art. 2.3.4 of the Competition Regulation, as follows: projects **64, 75, 85, 88**.

Extract from the Technical Commission Report:

„Project 64

- Stamp of the participating firm on the estimate associated to project;

Project 75

- Name and logo of the firm written on the confidential envelope;
- Absence of identity symbol on the confidential envelope;
- Name of participating firm made visible on back of the drawings (not covered by black paper, name of firm instead of symbol on drawings).

Proiectul 85

- Document containing company information (statement regarding the fact that the firm belongs to small and medium size category) has not been put into the confidential envelope; the document was found among other drawings.

Project 88

- Name of the participating architect on the estimate associated to project”.

To observe the anonymity, these projects were not displayed to the jury. The Technical Commission proposed that the four projects be disqualified and the jury voted unanimously for their disqualification.

The jury members approved the pre-judgment Report of the Technical Commission.

Following the decision of the jury, 35 projects were accepted to be judged.

All members present, the jury elected a chairman. Unanimously, the jury elected Mr. Arch. Luigi Snozzi (Switzerland) as chairman of the jury.

Mr. Arch. **Nicolae Lascu** briefs on the major historic data regarding the University Square. Mr. Arch. **Mihai Ene** briefs on the technical aspects regarding the building of the new parking, emphasizing the technical characteristics of the underground which the competitors should have considered.

3. CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING THE WINNING PROJECT:

1. Compatibility between the new interventions (vegetation including), the prevailing geometry of the square and its architectural framework; enhancing the group of statues – max. 21 points.

- Compatibility with the current architectural framework, where classical elements prevail in matters of spatial and volumetric organization, dominated by the quasi-symmetry of the composition geometry – **max. 7 points.**

- Compatibility with current tall plantation following the line of sidewalks both in the semicircular exedra from Regina Elisabeta Boulevard and on Toma Caragiu St. – **max. 7 points.**

- Compatibility with the four-statue-group which follows both a rigorous position and an alignment that should be observed – **max. 7 points.**

2. A state-of-the-art architectural solution to the mandatory functions of public space – max, 25 points.

Modern solutions, in the spirit of our age are expected, in which the necessary functions of a public urban space could be found as follows:

- social function– **max. 5 points**

- playful function – **max. 5 points**

- cultural functions – **max. 5 points**

- relaxation functions – **max. 5 points**

- other proposed functions – **max. 5 points**

3. Integration of ground elements of the underground parking into the ensemble picture – max. 19 points.

The functional elements of the underground garage will be approached in harmony with the ground landscaping of the square, so as their functional character should not go against the landscape, as follows:

- treatment of ramps – **max. 5 points**

- treatment of ventilations – **max. 7 points**

- treatment of escalators and lift – **max. 7 points**

4. Creation of coherent, attractive pedestrian space through urban furniture, illumination, and plantations - max. 20 points.

Since the square is meant exclusively for pedestrians it will be “furnished” so as to offer a diversity of attractions, as follows:

- urban furniture – **max. 5 points**

- plantations – **max. 5 points**

- illumination – **max. 5 points**

- enhancing the archeological vestiges – **max. 5 points**

5. Economic rationality – max.15 points.

An estimate of the works will be submitted.

Competitors should bring arguments about the costs and benefits of their proposals.

Evaluation will be done by jury’s judgment on the relationship between the execution costs of the works and the effects on the public space, the topic of the design competition.

4. JURY’S EVALUATION:

The jury members analyze the projects according to the competition requirements and evaluation criteria drawn up in the competition documentation. Following the evaluation, Mr. Arch. Gheorghe Pătrașcu proposes the elimination of project no. **82** since it did not observe the location of the statue of Michael the Brave. The other members of the jury voted to accept the project and reducing the points at the evaluation criterion 1 – sub-criterion 4, “Compatibility with the four-statue group which follows both a rigorous position and an alignment that should be observed”.

The jury agreed unanimously to evaluate each accepted project together and in conformity with the criteria set up in the competition documentation.

Taking into account that as concerns the economic rationality the evaluation is done by the jury according to the report between the execution costs of the works and the effects on the public space, which is the topic of the solution competition, the jury decided that the score should be set starting from the evaluation of the effects of the project that got the highest score for the 1-4 criteria.

Following the evaluation of the criteria 1-4, the jury found that the best ranked project was the one that got the highest score, **55 out of 85**, that is, approximately **65%** efficiency.

At the same time, this project fits into the maximum budget of 500,000 Euro about which the competitors were informed in the document **Answers to queries and clarifications, stage I, 19.09. 2011.**”

The jury decides to grant **10 points out of 15** to the best ranked project.

The other projects were evaluated as such:

- **10 points** for projects that propose the execution costs of works by fitting $\pm 15\%$ into the budget.
- **7 points** for projects that propose the execution costs of works with up to $\pm 50\%$ derogation from budget.
- **3 points** for projects that propose the execution costs of works with over $\pm 50\%$ derogation from budget
- **0 points** for projects that did not submit the estimate or propose flawed execution costs.

Following the project evaluation according to the criteria set in the competition documentation, the following total scores were granted by the jury (each jury member filled in an individual score card):

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	AVERAGE OF SCORES
50	343	49
51	336	48
52	259	37
53	287	41
54	294	42
55	259	37
56	161	23
57	182	26
58	182	26
59	294	42
60	266	38
61	371	53

62	189	27
63	245	35
65	287	41
66	252	36
67	231	33
68	252	36
69	238	34
70	189	27
71	245	35
72	182	26
73	455	65
74	231	33
76	252	36
77	168	24
78	350	50
79	364	52
80	238	34
81	203	29
82	385	55
83	259	37
84	238	34
86	287	41
87	357	51

According to the average of scores, the classification of projects has come out as follows:

ENTRY NUMBER	CLASSIFICATION
73	- took the first place with an average of 65 points, and was granted Prize I of 60,000 Lei.
82	- took the second place with an average score of 55 points, and was granted Prize II of 45,000 Lei.
61	- took the third place with an average score of 53 points, and was granted Prize II of 35, 000 Lei.
79	- took the fourth place with an average score of 52 points, and was granted a Mention of 20, 000 Lei.
87	- took the fifth place with an average score of 51 points, and was granted a Mention of 20, 000 Lei.
78	- took the sixth place with an average score of 50 points, and was granted a Mention of 20, 000 Lei.

The jury names the **project with the competition number 73 as the winner of the design competition**, with an average score of 65 points, and total of 445 points.

The winner will be invited by the promoter to negotiations without previous announcement of participation, with a view to grant the service contract for the project “Arrangement of the ground space University Parking: Technical Project”.

Jury’s decision is mandatory for the promoter.

The current minute will be handed to the Promoter – Bucharest Municipality – to be endorsed.

5. APPRECIATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JURY REGARDING THE SELECTED PROJECTS (PRIZED AND MENTIONED):

The jury would like to underline the following assumptions:

The competition started while the works on the underground parking were in progress. Obviously, that fact placed tight conditions on the proposals. From the theme documents, data for a clearer conclusion as to the future square in the east, across the roundabout are missing. Despite difficulties, the competitors proved their deep commitment and the outcomes were highly appreciated by the jury.

They all thought that the winners of Prize I and Prize II **were by far the best** of all.

The appreciations of the jury took into consideration the identification of the specific needs and problems of the site to be arranged – as part of the square ensemble around the junction between the two major axes – along with the main ways of intervention. Besides, the evaluation took into account the criteria for establishing the winning project as stipulated in the competition theme.

Project no. 73

Appreciation:

By rigorously observing the competition theme, the solution proposes a unitary square with an exclusively pedestrian island in the middle; the island is surrounded by spaces that allow for road traffic. The island is limited by several lighting bodies, while the four statues are placed in the middle. Thus, the statues are given a major role which emphasizes the memory of this place.

The jury noticed that this is the only project that, providing elegant, moderate landscaping, offers clear state-of-the-art marks which are not subordinated to the volumetric fashion of late 19th century.

At the same time, the jury noticed the powerful idea underlying the project, the simplicity and economic solution that allow both instant implementation and possible future adjustments to potential needs.

The proposed illumination is adequate, while the furniture is not conspicuous and overbearing through number and concept.

Recommendation:

To define the square space more clearly, additions of green elements, in the spirit of the project are recommended, particularly tall vegetation in the vicinity of the Sutu Palace, which will match to the plantation within the palace yard.

It is recommended that the tiles for the statue island meant to underline the value of the space should be carefully studied.

Project no. 82

Appreciation:

It is the only project with a vision of the next stage – a unitary, entirely pedestrian square. The jury thought the progression of the two phases quite sensible, while the first stage answers the demands of the competition theme, too.

For the future, directly related to the design and building of the University subway station, the project proposes an underground traffic road along Elisabeta Boulevard. Thus, the modification to the underground parking is proposed. The square space is well limited by plantations on the eastern and western sides.

The jury found that the statue of Michael the Brave was moved as to its initial position, which reduced the score of the project.

Project no. 61

Appreciation:

The project belongs to the large category of projects which proposed the preservation of the current traffic road crossing the square, thus separating the pedestrian from the traffic zones.

The jury appreciated the different solutions for the square landscaping that precisely focus on various situations.

Projects 79, 87 and 78 (mentioned)

The projects belong to the large number of projects proposing the resorting to the traditional configuration of the square.

They were selected due to their qualities evincing the accuracy of solution, rationality of proposals and skilful solutions of details within a context that kept things in a simple manner.

The current minute was concluded today, November 3, 2011 in three copies.

Members of the jury:

1. Arch. **Luigi Snozzi** (Switzerland)
2. Dr. Arch. **Luis F. P. Conceição** (Portugal)
3. Arch. **Angelo Roventă** (Austria)
4. Dr. Arch. **Zeno Bogdănescu** (Romania)
5. Dr. Arch. **Nicolae Lascu** (Romania)
6. Arch. **Eugen Pănescu** (Romania)
7. Arch. **Gheorghe Pătrașcu** (Romania)

Written down by

Arch. Ioana Alexe

Jury Secretary

ANNEX

DISCLOSING THE ANONYMITY FOR THE PRIZED AND MENTIONED PROJECTS

In the presence of the jury members, after the jury minute was signed, the competition secretariat proceeded to remove the seal of the box in which the Technical Commission put the confidential envelopes of the projects.

The envelopes of the prized and mentioned projects were picked up.

The identity of the competitors is written down as follows:

PRIZE I

PROJECT NO. 73, IDENTITY SYMBOL AA1111

COMPETITOR: Ambra Fabi

CO-AUTHORS: Simona Dirvariu, Ambra Fabi, Carole Lenoble

PRIZE II

PROJECT NO. 82, IDENTITY SYMBOL SD2209

COMPETITOR: DRĂGAN ARCHITECTURE

AUTHOR: arh. Radu Drăgan

CO-AUTHORS: arh. Sandu Hangan, peisagist Denis Targowla, ing. iluminat Nathalie Cede, Martina Bordini (Light Cibles)

PRIZE III

PROJECT NO. 61, IDENTITY SYMBOL BA1992

COMPETITOR: S.C. 4B Consultanta Arhitectura S.R.L.

AUTHOR: S.C. 4B Consultanta Arhitectura S.R.L.

CO-AUTHORS: ing. Eugen Ionescu, ing. Viorel Bulzan, ing. Doina Boariu, ing. Dragoş Marcu

MENTION

PROJECT NO. 79, IDENTITY SYMBOL AO2611

COMPETITOR: S.C. OUTLINE ARCHITECTURE OFFICE

AUTHORS: arh. Cristina Barna, arh. Sorin Diaconescu, arh. Traian Cîmpeanu

MENTION

PROJECT NO. 87, IDENTITY SYMBOL AI1227

COMPETITOR: S.C. ADN Birou de Arhitectură S.R.L. / S.C. Exhibit Architectura S.R.L.

AUTHORS: S.C. ADN Birou de Arhitectură S.R.L. (Andrei Șerbescu, Bogdan Brădățeanu, Adrian Untaru, Irina Băncescu, Cristina Enuță, Oana Cucoranu, Bogdan Tănase Marinescu) și S.C. Exhibit Architectura S.R.L. (Johannes Bertleff, Dragoș Oprea, Magda Vieriu, Carolina Comșa, Cristina Matei)

CO-AUTHORS: ing. peisagist Alexandu Ciobotă, ing. peisagist Raluca Rusu

MENTION

PROJECT NO. 78, IDENTITY SYMBOL RA0034

COMPETITOR: S.C. REPUBLIC OF ARCHITECTS S.R.L.

AUTHOR: S.C. REPUBLIC OF ARCHITECTS S.R.L.

CO-AUTHORS: Arh. Alexandra Lițu, arh. Radu Ponta, arh. Emil Burbea, arh. Oana Coarfă, arh. stagiar Andrei Radu, arh. stagiar Raluca Trifa, stud. arh. Doru Boeriu.

The secretariat will pursue the action of opening the confidential envelopes with a view to inform each competitor about the jury evaluation according to those stipulated at art. 3.12.1 from the Competition Regulation.

The anonymity of the competitors into the Solution Competition *ARRANGEMENT OF THE GROUND SPACE UNIVERSITY PARKING: TECHNICAL PROJECT* is thus revealed.

The current Annex has been concluded today, November 3, 2011, in three copies.

Members of the jury :

Arch. **Luigi Snozzi** (Switzerland)

Dr. Arch. **Luis F. P. Conceição** (Portugal)

Arch. **Angelo Roventă** (Austria)

Dr. Arch. **Zeno Bogdănescu** (Romania)

Dr. Arch. **Nicolae Lascu** (Romania)
Arch. **Eugen Pănescu** (Romania)
Arch. **Gheorghe Pătrașcu** (Romania)

Written down by
Arch. Ioana Alexe
Jury Secretary