



JURY REPORT

SOLUTIONS COMPETITION REVITALIZATION AND ACTIVATION OF „FEROVIARILOR” PARK

DATE : 26 – 28 May 2018

LOCATION: Students` Culture House Cluj-Napoca

1. Jury:

Permanent members:

Arch. José Mayoral Moratilla

Arch. Ligia Subțirică

Arch. Vlad Gaivoronschi

Landscape Arch. Elisabeta Dobrescu

Arch. Cristi Borcan

Deputy members:

Arch. Anca Cioarec

Landscape Arch. Alexandru Ciobota

2. Organisation of the jury

Mr. landscape architect Alexandru Ciobota, a deputy member of the jury, could not attend the jury sessions due to personal reasons. All other members of the jury being present, a chairman was elected. Mr. **arch. José Mayoral Moratilla** was elected Chairman of the jury.

The following persons were present next to the jury, as:

- professional and technical consultants arch. Răzvan VasIU, arch. Dan Clinci.
- president of the technical committee arch. Mirona Crăciun.
- secretary of the jury arch. Loredana Gaiță.

In the competition were submitted 14 projects, and after the Competition's Secretariat inspection, it was concluded that all of them comply with the provisions of the „Feroviarilor Park – Competition Rules”.

In the selection of the technical commission entered 14 projects.

The president of the technical committee presented to the jury the technical committee report, which contained the check of the formal conditions from the brief and the competition rules. In conclusion, the technical committee noticed that:

- The project with the competition number **55** has the „Estimate of the design services” signed, so it does not comply with the anonymity conditions required by the Competition Rules.
- The project with the competition number **57** does not contain the „Estimate of the design services”, thus not following the Competition Rules. The estimate is a compulsory competition element requested by the acquisition law in Romania, and in the same time, it represents the basis of the negotiation procedure between the winners and the promoter.



The jury unanimously decided to disqualify the projects with numbers **55** and **57**.

Thus, into the jury commission were admitted 12 projects.

3. AWARD CRITERIA

A. MEETING THE FUNCTIONAL –LANDSCAPING AND ARCHITECTURAL-REQUIREMENTS - 60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points)

Evaluation on a scale of 1 to 60, if the **minimum requirements** imposed by the contest brief have been meet.

It is calculated as the sum of the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

A1. Functional Criterion – max 10 points

The following will be scored:

- The usage scenarios propose and consequent resolution of accesses and routes;

A2. Landscaping Criterion – max 25 points

The following will be scored:

- Relationship with the existing plant material;
- Selection of the proposed plant material;
- Planting, use and exploitation concepts.

A3. Architectural Criterion – max 15 points

The following will be scored:

- Relationship of the proposed project with the surrounding landscape;
- Solving the proposed functions;
- Architectural appearance.

A4. Financial Criterion – max 10 points

The following will be scored:

- Falling below the investment limit indicated in the contest documentation;
- Rationality and sustainability of the spatial functional solution in relation to the estimated price.

B. ADDED ARCHITECTURAL-ARTISTIC VALUE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION – 40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points)

Evaluation on a scale from 1 to 40 of the architectural-artistic value of the proposed solution.

It is calculated as the sum of the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

B1. Character of the park following the proposed intervention and the general atmosphere of the intervention – max 20 points

B2. The force of urban “attractor” that the park will have following the intervention and the ability to adapt over time – max 10 points

B3. The quality and clarity of the representation of ideas, so as to illustrate the competitor’s ability to execute the proposed project – max 10 points



Calculation algorithm for point A – Minimum requirements

$A = A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4 = 60$ points

Calculation algorithm for point B – Added value

$B = B_1 + B_2 + B_3 = 40$ points

Calculation algorithm for the final evaluation (maximum 100 points are possible)

$A+B = 60 + 40 = 100$ maximum

4. Jury session:

The jury established the following working methods:

The analysis and deliberations were preceded by an explanation of the brief and a guided site visit held by the technical and professional consultants of the competition, during which the requirements and the assessment criteria related to site analysis were restated.

It has been agreed that the project selection should be accomplished through several sessions.

Round I

In the first round, the jury analysed the projects individually, assessing each project according to the award criteria. Based on the individual scores, the average grades for each project under evaluation were calculated, after which the plenary debates on each project started.

According to the total points obtained, the last five projects were eliminated from the discussion, namely **52, 53, 56, 59, 60**.

The projects selected after the first round to move on are: **50, 51, 54, 58, 61, 62, 63**.

Round II

In the second round, the jury continued analysing the qualities of each project.

In the second evaluation round, the jury reviewed the seven remaining projects in the competition, on the basis of the award criteria. The proposed solutions have been debated and the jury made both general (regarding the overall image created by landscaping, the insertion of the park into the larger landscape, the proposed functions, the expected atmosphere) and detailed observations (the treatment of accesses, circulation, the relationship between the proposed facilities and the surroundings, the selection of species and the compatibility created in relation to the preserved vegetal material). The joint analysis generated points of view on each solution and the projects with the number **50, 51, 58, 62, 63** were the ones selected for further analysis.

Round III

From the resulting hierarchy, the projects ranked in the top five were analysed in detail to determine the final hierarchy and the winner. For this approach, both the award criteria and the objectives formulated in the competition brief were considered. The jury sought to identify the project proposal with the most complex response to the multi-criteria challenges of a site in the area of confluence of community, ecological, cultural and real estate interests, which at the same time prove technical maturity - quality, clarity and pragmatism of the solutions and concepts presented - able to bring the jury's confidence



vote on the ability of the winning project to materialize the project during the time and the allocated budget, with the most faithful pursuance of the winning solution.

The jury came to the conclusion that the hierarchy will be the following: **50, 63, 58, 51, 62.**

Round IV – Prize awarding

The jury decided:

The **first prize**, design contract with an estimated value of 555.450 RON, VAT not included goes to **project no. 50.**

The **second prize**, in the amount of 35.000 RON goes to **project no. 63.**

The **third prize**, in the amount of 20.000 RON goes to **project no. 58.**

Statement of the jury

The Romanian Architect's Order (chamber) and Cluj-Napoca Municipality put their efforts together, once again, at organizing a solutions competition with the goal to solve one of the main urban problems of the city.

The challenge was to attract the interest of competitors for theme of `The Regeneration and revitalization of the Feroviarilor Park` Competition and to organize the competition with an integrated approach.

The organisation of a design competition is the starting point for an urban space revitalization welcoming citizen's necessities and expectations.

The Jury selected and prioritized the projects considering their qualities and feasibility.

The judging process, based on transparency and rigor, was the result of sharing and comparing different points of view through the experience and professionalism of its members. Belonging to different generations, nationalities professions and ideologies, the jury members ensured a complex and integrated approach of the judging process.

Finally, we want to add the full appreciation of the jury for the openness of the Cluj-Napoca public administration, for choosing competitions as the ideal approach to obtaining valuable solutions in the field of architecture, landscaping and urban planning and also for the excellent collaboration with the Romanian Order (Chamber) of Architects.

Final conclusions and recommendations

For the project no. 50 – First Prize

The project proposes transforming the park into a "Garden of Someș", integrating the river into the design solution. The water becomes an "ecological axis", a transforming element and an attractor of the park.



Through a complex and hierarchical zoning, the project defines four "functional stripes" with various degrees of usage and multiple possible scenarios.

The solution highlights the two existing access areas by creating two subtle "gates". The jury appreciates the discovery of new opportunities for access to the eastern area and the accessibility of the river's opposite bank.

By means of sustainable development principles, the project proposes an ecological approach that enhances the biodiversity of space and creates balanced areas. The solution integrates the existing vegetation in the proposed solution and it proposes a selection of local species, with great potential for adaptability to the local conditions and with reduced maintenance over time. By creating a new topography, accentuated by the presence of specific vegetation, the park becomes a "world in a world", a protected, intimate place that you rediscover each time you pass through it.

The project intelligently integrates both sides of the Someș river, continuing the directions of the existing masterplan.

The project skilfully uses a rainwater management system with retention ponds and biofilters. Also, the solution proposes a controlled flooding system for the Someș river, which can potentially generate biodiversity in the area.

The built elements integrate naturally and subtly into the landscape. Architecture is discreet, refined, reversible and open to diverse uses.

The jury particularly appreciates:

- The proposal of a new identity for the Parcul Feroviarilor by integrating the water into the landscape and by re-naturalizing the Someș riverbanks.
- The diversity and complexity of the proposed solutions, in terms of space, vegetation, atmospheres and usage scenarios.
- The refinement and the clarity of the proposed solutions, from large-scale solution to details.

The jury recommends a topographic recalibration of the eastern area of the park to avoid creating a barrier between the park and the neighbourhood, the rethinking of the relationship with the new real estate development in the south, and the expansion of the accessibility area to support events with bigger crowds.

To ensure the feasibility and the functioning over time of the proposed hydrological system, the jury recommends in-depth technical studies. It also recommends the promoter of the competition to ensure a specific maintenance, capable of sustaining the atmosphere and functionality of the "Someș Garden", as it is reflected in the proposed solution.

For the project no. 63 – Second Prize

The jury appreciates the clear and simple functional design which facilitates good usage and flexibility. Functional zoning of the open meadow, in antithesis with densely planted areas, has great potential. The pavilion is strategically positioned in the south access area, adjacent to the new real estate development, resulting in a favourable relationship with its surroundings. For the main pavilion, the project proposes a solution adapted to the park scale.



In terms of landscape architecture, the emphasis on the relationship between densely planted areas and areas that have only a herbaceous top layer and the attention paid to the vertical systematization were appreciated the jury. The relatively circular configuration of the main path, integrating the assembly, also judged as a positive point, due to its rather symbolic function, one allowing total freedom of movement within it. The north-south oriented central open area that converges towards a generous access to Somes is the major theme of the project, complementary to the circular configuration of the main avenue.

The idea of "common" - community, community space, free, in a relationship with Somes, suitable for various events on a larger scale, as well as the easily adaptable character were appreciated within this project whose strategic theme was based on three key concepts: flexibility, clarity, community.

To fully answer the theme of the contest, the jury recommends:

- re-analysing the oblique configuration of the proposed pedestrian bridge over Somes;
- reconfiguration of the plant selection and composition, keeping the design's original ratio between densely planted areas and open ones;
- refining the architecture of the pavilion;
- adapting the church access and detailing all the park access points.

For the project no. 58 – Third Prize

The jury appreciated the functionality of the solution that proposes clear hierarchies of circulations and spaces generated by the vegetation configuration, resulting in different characters and differentiated structures. The project proposes different access possibilities to Somes' shore, with different types of atmosphere predominantly on the north side. Various scenarios for the use of premises, including at night, are also illustrated. Children's play spaces are generous and the pavilion creates a multifunctional area.

From the architectural point of view, the pavilion is adapted to the site, with a covered transition between outside and inside.

The vegetation structures different spaces with an environmental transformation potential, each season. The topography of the land is carefully constructed, generating major public access areas such as the front of the church. It is worth mentioning the reuse and re-integration of the existing platform.

The main attractor is the generous contact area of the Somes river bank, with a particular social polarization potential.

In order to optimize the proposed solution, the jury recommends:

- checking the opportunity of the road bridge;
- strengthening existing access from the South;
- reconfiguration of the public space in the access area from the church;
- studying the composition and the vegetal associations in chromatic and volumetric terms;
- refining the pavilion in a harmonious relationship with the park's atmosphere;
- improving the ambient comfort in the area defined as the attractor - access to Somes' shore.



FINAL RANKING

CONTEST NR.	POINTS	JURY ASSESSMENT
50	96p	1st PRIZE
63	79p	2nd PRIZE
58	75p	3rd PRIZE
51	71p	The jury appreciates the natural and organic character of the overall design and the created hierarchy between spaces. The proposal of a water storage basin and the relation with the Somes River are appreciated in regard to landscape design. From an architectural point of view, the reversibility of the pavilions and the poetry behind the agora-like pavilion are considered as positive points. Despite these clear positive aspects of the proposal, the lack of flexibility in the use of space determine a too rigid solution and the composition of the planted areas has not been thoroughly studied.
62	70p	The jury appreciated the potential and courage of the approach and the permeability of the „built ring”. The main disadvantages of this solution are the pathway of the S-N axis which is treated in an arbitrary and unsupported manner. Moreover, the risk created by the construction through the potential subordination of the park to its massiveness and architectural character.
61	69p	The proposed structure for the landscape design and the relation it creates with the Somes River, the integration of the second bridge and of the E-W route near the church are appreciated. On the other hand, the massiveness of the pavilion and the scale of the functional hub subordinates the park, thus resulting in a lack of flexibility in the overall design.
54	64p	The Jury appreciated the vigour of this solution and the connectivity it proposes for the park in the main access points. The disadvantages of this solution are the scale of the central building, the massive pedestrian routes and the strong urban character of the project.
59	57p	The treatment of the access areas, the proposed zoning and the reinterpretation of the memory of the place are appreciated. The rigidity of the urban-natural relation, the lack of coherence in landscape design, the emphasized presence of the attractor pavilion which serves as a train station for the children’s train are disadvantages of the solution.
53	56p	The access points, the relation with nearby areas and the natural character of the solution were appreciated. Despite of these positive points a lack of hierarchy in between the created places, a rather random positioning of planted areas without a clear spatial structure and an arbitrary configuration and positioning of the pavilion are clear disadvantages of the proposed solution.



56	54p	The Jury appreciates as positive the clarity, eloquence of the proposed solution and the introduction of the water theme. On the other hand, the jury does not appreciate the strong urban character, the lack of flexibility and the excessive use of built areas.
60	51p	The different scenarios proposed for the use of space were appreciated but the limitation of planted/green areas, the excessively thematic character of the park and the strong presence of built volumes are considerable disadvantages.
52	44p	The intention of introducing water inside the park is appreciated, along with the connection with the context and the poetry of the scenario. The lack of economic realism and flexibility are major flaws.

This Jury Report was completed in two copies in Cluj Napoca, on the 28th of May 2018.

Permanent members:

Arch. José Mayoral Moratilla

Arch. Ligia Subțirică

Arch. Vlad Gaivoronschi

Landscape Arch. Elisabeta Dobrescu

Arch. Cristi Borcan

Deputy members:

Arch. Anca Cioarec

Secretary of the jury - Arch. Loredana Gaiță

Competition coordinator - Arch. Mirona Craciun

Professional and technical consultants

Arch. Răzvan Vasiu

Arch. Dan Clinci