



# JURY REPORT

## DESIGN COMPETITION

**Urban Development of Str. Kogălniceanu, Str. Universităţii and Adjacent Streets**

DATE : 14 – 16 September 2018

LOCATION: Students` Culture House Cluj-Napoca

## 1. Jury

### Full members:

1. Arch. Rudolf Gräf
2. Arch. Pieter Uyttenhove
3. Arch. Stefano D'Avino
4. Arch. Ligia Subţirica
5. Arch. Kazmer Kovacs
6. Arch. Johannes Bertleff
7. Arch. Raluca Munteanu

### Alternate members:

8. Arch. Matei Bogoescu
9. Arch. Andrei Cebotaru

## 2. Organisation of the jury

Mr. architect Stefano D`Avino, a full member of the jury, could not attend the jury sessions due to personal reasons. The full members that were present voted for one of the two alternate members to replace mr. D`Avino, therefore mr. architect Matei Bogoescu became a full member.

The next step was the vote for the chairman of the Jury. The chairman was elected unanimously as mr. **arch. Pieter Uyttenhove**.

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

- professional and technical consultants arch. Maria Cristina Găvozdea, arch. Dan Clinci.
- president of the technical committee arch. Mirona Crăciun.
- secretary of the jury arch. Loredana Gaiţă.

In the competition 11 projects were submitted, and after the Competition's Secretariat inspection, it was concluded that all of them comply with the provisions of the „Competition Rules”.

In the selection of the Technical Commission entered 11 projects.

The president of the Technical Commission 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 Commission noticed that:



– the projects with numbers **58** and **60** did not present the Design financial offer, and the lack of financial offer is a deviation that may entail the Jury's decision to reject a project from the Jury assessment phase (stated in the „Competition Rules”).

The jury unanimously decided to disqualify the projects number **58** and **60**.

Thus, the jury commission admitted 9 projects.

### 3. Award Criteria

#### A. Fulfilment of the architectural-urbanistic functional requirements

60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points)

##### A1. Functional criterion – maximum 20 points

The proposed scenarios for use, the solution to the access and routes from an urbanistic and architectural point of view will be scored.

##### A2. Architectural-landscape criterion – maximum 20 points

The integration of the project in the protected constructed zone and how it relates with the existing built and vegetation patrimony will be scored.

##### A3. Financial criterion – maximum 20 points

The following aspects will be scored:

- complying with the investment ceiling indicated in the design competition documentation;
- rationality and sustainability of the functionally spatial solution in relation to the estimated price.

#### Calculation algorithm for criterion A

$A=A1+A2+A3=20+20+20=60$  points maximum possibly granted

#### B. Architectural-artistic added value

40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points)

**B1. Character of the zone and general atmosphere of the intervention** - maximum 20 points

**B2. Quality and clarity of the expressed ideas demonstrating the competitors's capacity to implement the proposed project** - maximum 20 points

#### Calculation algorithm for criterion B

$B=B1+B2=20+20=40$  points maximum possibly granted

The calculation algorithm for the final evaluation (maximum 100 points possible)

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



#### 4. Jury session

The jury established the following working methods:

The jury analyzed each project individually. The joint analysis and deliberations were preceded by a visit to the intervention site, where the professional and technical consultants pointed the requirements and awards criteria expressed in the competition brief, and their relation to the site. It has been agreed that the selection of projects should be done through several sessions.

##### Round I

In the first round, the Jury jointly reviewed all the projects admitted in the jury session, marking each project according to the award criteria. Based on the individual scores, the averages for each project were calculated.

According to the average of the obtained scores, the last 5 projects, namely **51, 54, 55, 57, 59**, were excluded for the judging from Round II.

The projects selected after the first round to bring forward were: **50, 52, 53, 56**.

##### Round II

The jury continued with detailed analysis of the qualities of each project that passed the first round.

In the second evaluation round, the jury reconsidered the four projects remaining in the competition based on the objectives formulated in the competition brief. The general concept of the design, the atmosphere created, the capacity of the spaces to accommodate events, the pavement treatment and the urban furniture proposals, the relation of the project with the built environment, the lighting system and the water management system, as well as the sustainability of the solution were analyzed.

The joint analysis has generated concrete point of views related to each solution. The projects selected for Round III were: **52, 53, 56**.

##### Round III

From the resulting rankings, the projects ranked in the first three places were analyzed in detail to determine the final hierarchy and designate the winner. For this approach, the response of the proposed solutions to the award criteria has been re-examined in detail and compared. Discussions on the use scenarios, the integration of the vegetation layer in the presented solution, the relation between the pedestrian and the car space, the rationality of the financial proposal, the differences of atmosphere (urban / intimate / rural) and the spatial poetics in relation to the functional need and the specific users of those public spaces.

The jury decided the hierarchy of the remaining projects: **53, 56, 52**.



## Round IV – Prize awarding

The jury decided:

The **first prize**, design contract with an estimated value of 755.000 RON, VAT not included goes to **project no. 53**.

The **second prize**, in the amount of 60.000 RON goes to **project no. 56**.

The **third prize**, in the amount of 30.000 RON goes to **project no. 52**.

## Statement of the jury

As at previous occasions, Cluj Napoca Municipality together with the Romanian Order of Architects decided to organize a design competition for public spaces in Cluj. The subject of the competition was "Urban Development of Str. Kogălniceanu, Str. Universității and Adjacent Streets". The jury took note of the fact that the rehabilitation of this public space constituted an older intention of the local public administration, following the interest shown by citizens, institutions and mass media on this subject.

The redesign and revitalization of these streets is therefore a response to the expectations of the city's inhabitants, some of whom, not only a few, consider M. Kogalniceanu as "the most beautiful" street in Cluj. The jury was able to formulate its own opinions and appreciations following the visit to the competition site. The challenge faced by the competitors was finding solutions to preserve, and even to emphasize, as much as possible, the multicultural, multi-ethnic, multiconfessional character of the city, representative for the tolerance and harmonious coexistence of its inhabitants. As the competitors saw, the area is valuable both for its location in the historic city center and for the existence of a built heritage dating from different epochs, belonging to distinct styles and sheltering a variety of functions.

The jury selected and hierarchized the projects according to the quality and feasibility of the proposals, through a rigorous and transparent process. In examining the proposals, the jury also considered of great importance the manner in which the participants have integrated and highlighted the existing patrimony. The composition of the jury, consisting of architects belonging to different generations, nationalities, specialties and schools of thought, has generated a complex and integrated approach to the judging process.

The jury wishes to welcome the attitude of the local public administration, a true supporter of design competitions in the field of urbanism, architecture and landscaping. We also wish to express our appreciation for the excellent collaboration between the Romanian Order of Architects and the Cluj Napoca Municipality, a guarantee of obtaining high quality solutions in all competitions so far, and hopefully, future ones.

## FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### For the project no. 53 – First Prize

The competition winning project is an integrated reflection on the complex problems contained by the site and the specific requirements attached to the architectural competition. For their concept, the authors build on the metaphor of the hopscotch: "it is the ritual of our everyday lives, which we are bound to enact". The different layers of their submitted work – whether written, drawn, sketched or rendered – represent a complete and coherent



documentation of the solutions proposed. The result is a successful attempt to respond to all major problems with minimal intervention. Each sequence of the proposed urban "hopscoth" is both illustrated in detailed architectural drawings and described in culturally and historically well supported texts.

The history of Kogălniceanu Street is well served by the inner circulation scheme connecting it efficiently to the rest of the urban fabric, while keeping the studied area relatively quiet.

The spatial configuration of the site is already rich and expressive. The project enhances the specificity of each particular place by adequately addressing the built and institutional context; it creates an interface between the public domain and the life of a series of cultural institutions: school, university, academy, church. At the same time it evokes the principle of the children's game, providing places of low motorised traffic, shared space and places of repose. Thus the enduring city life is integrated with the individual experience of passers-by.

The street is recovered from its present unsatisfactory status of a space of transit to a succession of various, multiple experiences. It becomes a composed set of particular urban moods in different places. There is an effective graduation from the Universităţii Square, with the restored statue of the Saint Mary the Protector, to the classicist façade of the University, then the brutalist Academy Library and the adjoining new square with the background of the neoclassical "temple" – a sports hall. This newly opened square is an important addition to the "hopscoth". The epitome of the journey comes with the neighbourhood of the reformed church, transformed into an intimate place of quietude through vegetation and the differentiated floor covering. Finally, a "coda" to the composition is provided by the last and narrowest street sequence leading to the mediaeval fortifications.

The overall approach is respectful towards the built heritage both in terms of visibility and the emphasis put on its more valuable components. The means used are discreet and measured. The project provides added value to the extant monuments and is careful to make reference to the architectural and urban history of the place. It also proposes an understated version of the required memorial to the University rectors, completing the sculpture already there without overwhelming it. The authors eliminate the fir trees behind the monument of the "Școala Ardeleană", thus offering the modernist tower a spectacular perspective, the tower itself becoming the monumental background to the bronze sculpture group.

Only three materials are used for the floor covering in a differentiated way, according to each placement and intended effect. The spatial continuity is ensured by the means of a central gutter, another reference to historical structures.

One of the major merits of the proposal is the treatment of existing and proposed vegetation. Plantation is an additional tool for shaping the urban space, to control perspectives and to create intimate environments. There is a careful choice of both the placement and the botanical species. The trees will emphasize the cycle of the seasons and the thoughtfully planned lighting will mark the quotidian cycle of day and night.

### **Recommendations:**

Within the generous and well planned arrangement scheme, the jury recommends a few points where the concept can be developed further.

- Details of the lighting can be reworked to adapt better to the specific urban spaces.
- The University rectors' memorial should include all the names from the founder of the first Jesuit school in 1581. It also should be extensible with future names.
- The Brutalist façade of the Academy Library is a strong architectural and institutional presence. It requires a specific treatment; its side façade will also become a front in the ensemble of the new square. The volume will be perceived as a corner building, hence its reinforced importance in both the main street and the square needs attention.



- The side streets need to be reconsidered in order to enhance their specificity.
- The Calvinist church parvis and garden deserve a unified and comprehensive approach.
- The garden arrangements around the Tailors' Tower miss their chance to become a destination of the Kogălniceanu promenade.
- The whole solution needs to be adapted to the needs of people with visual and mobility disabilities.
- While the solutions for the evacuation of rain water are carefully treated, it would be appropriate to collect and reuse rain water for gardening purposes.

### **For the project no. 56 – Second Prize**

Project no. 56 presents a unitary and rigorous concept that proposes three coherently integrated spatial typologies: the pedestrian street (a continuous space that includes the largos, squares and statuary groups), the vegetable garden (in relation to the Reformed Church) and the mineral garden (outside the medieval wall) located in the eastern extremity of the site. The proposal is characterized by a modern, geometric and austere urban character, suited to the academic vocation of the area.

The proposed spatial configuration is rather minimalist, integrating where possible (see the case of the Babes Bolyai University ramp which is also a bench) the accessibility requirements with the urban furniture. This approach was much appreciated since it was not explicitly required by the brief.

The design of the Reformed Church's courtyard (possibly inspired from the monastic practices of open space use) is remarkable, in the proposed configuration as a succession of utilitarian gardens with a practical and educational role.

Use scenarios of different areas are detailed and creative, demonstrating the ability of the competitors to adapt the outdoor activities to the scale of spaces in question. Much appreciated were the uncommon uses of the streetscape for outdoor classes, midnight dinners, street art and jazz concerts in the shadow of the bastion. Major events, such as film screenings and concerts, were appropriately placed in the University Square and in the largo of the Babes Bolyai University, highlighting the architectural context and heritage.

Although there is a soft differentiation between resting areas and transit areas through the use of pavement design, urban furniture and vegetation, the proposal is flexible allowing for the resizing of areas according to needs.

The concept uses the water element creatively, to underline certain elements of the site, such as the entrance to the Piarist Church, Scoala Ardeleană statue group and others. It is worth mentioning the composition of the water basin (UBB rectors' memorial) with the Scoala Ardeleana statue group and the Academic College tower, which adds value to the Babes Bolyai University largo.

The paving materials are consistent with those employed in other central areas of Cluj, but the design includes new textures and patterns, which contribute to the placemaking qualities of the project. There is a detailed and sensitive drawing of stone pavements, using subtle changes in the geometry to mark important areas, such as the existing statues or the entrances to the major institutions.

The landscape concept is based on three main elements: the tree alignments which preserve and enhance the compositional rhythm of the street, landmark trees placed in strategic areas within the main spaces and tree groups acting as a buffer between different areas (see the case of the medieval wall and the postwar housing).





### **Recommendations:**

- The new trees that are added to the existing greenery must be fitted to the context and resilient in urban microclimate conditions;
- The pavement design needs further detailing for execution; the degree of permeability must be studied in accordance with the proposed materials and the rainwater drainage concept. A strategy for the re-use of rainwater would be highly appreciated;
- The project should include proposals for the use of private courts as suggested by the brief, allowing for a better integration of all public spaces;
- It is recommended to develop the idea of accessibility to all entrances and spaces (if possible) and to include a guidance system for visually impaired people;
- A detailed system of representation for the rectors' names on the fountain is required to illustrate all since the founding year;
- The urban furniture proposal suggests the use of some generic catalogue elements that are not suitable to the context. A more integrated and minimal approach is highly recommended (see the case of the access ramp to the Babes Bolyai University which is used as a bench).

### **For the project no. 52 – Third Prize**

The distinguishing feature of the project is the usage of river stone, a specific material for Cluj until the beginning of the twentieth century. This pavement is used to create a precise zoning, defining walking and resting areas. The insertion of noble areas covered with large tiles near the main access points creates a sensorial connection between the Institutions and the public space adjacent to them.

It is noteworthy, however, that the detail of implementing this type of pavement as well as the excessively large areas near the important institutions induces a rural atmosphere.

The jury appreciates the qualitative and sensitive detailing of the urban furniture and its inspired positioning within the public space. The discreet presence of water in various forms contributes to the quality of the environment and the experiencing of space by pedestrians.

The project uncovers alternative routes through private and semi-private courts, proposing a convincing concept of their gradual implementation.

The jury remarks positively the proposed solution for paying homage to the UBB rectors' which has a subtle character.

The landscape concept is convincing through the selection of plant species and the alternation of vegetation scales that are used to define spaces and enhance urban biodiversity.

The lack of detail and differentiation in the lighting scheme that should emphasize the newly created spaces and generate a night scenography, weakens the general architectural and atmospheric quality of the proposal.

The poor integration of Baba Novac statue, as well as the proposed urban design for the Tailors Tower and the fortification wall show a not as thoughtful approach as the rest of the project, especially regarding the layout of paved and green areas.

### **Recommendations:**

- The jury recommends reducing the areas paved with river stone in front of Babeș-Bolyai University and in front of the Library of the Romanian Academy. It is mandatory to reconsider the technical details for the river stone pavement.
- A further recommendation is to enrich the lighting systems by introducing ambient and architectural lighting to better balance the specificity of different spaces.



- It is necessary to redesign the areas in the eastern and southern sides of the Tailors' Tower and the fortification wall, especially the paved areas and the green areas.
- The lighting fixtures and wooden benches with metal legs seem to be catalogue elements and make a discordant note with the unique urban furniture pieces. It is recommended to reconsider the selected items.
- The surface drainage system must be calibrated and adapted to current climatic conditions.
- It is necessary to include guiding systems for people with low eyesight as well as accessibility for persons with reduced mobility, also in the access areas of public institutions.

## FINAL RANKING

CONTEST NR.	POINTS	JURY ASSESSMENT
53	93	<b>1<sup>st</sup> PRIZE</b>
56	89	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> PRIZE</b>
52	82	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> PRIZE</b>
50	77	<p>The jury appreciates the unifying character of the proposal, achieved through homogeneous paving, which gradually and subtly adapts to the spatial and functional particularities of each area.</p> <p>Different degrees of permeability of the pavement differentiate areas with varying usage intensities and result in the improvement of the public space microclimate.</p> <p>Identifying and marking the main public squares adjacent to major institutions is a positive aspect along with evoking the opportunity to organize events in neighboring inner courtyards.</p> <p>However, concrete proposals for the revitalization of inner courtyards generates conflicts with existing functions (for eg. the placement of some sports fields in the Reformed Church's garden), and the proposed designs are out of line with the general concept and the character of the buildings.</p> <p>The grids proposed for marking the main markets are not adapted to the scale of the area.</p> <p>Another weak point of the project is the lack of a clear concept for the furnishing of the public space in front of Babeş-Bolyai University, as well as the space adjacent to the Tailor's Bastion and the fortified wall.</p>
55	65	<p>The jury acknowledges the amount of information provided by the contestants, but considers that the final result does not amount to a clear and coherent design concept. The unjustified fragmentation of the main spaces of the site (through split levels and greenery) is not functional, disturbing the clear perception of the monuments facades. Another poor choice is the perforation of the medieval fortification wall, which is considered unnecessary and unacceptable.</p> <p>The jury appreciates the landscape design in front of the Academy</p>





---

		Library, which highlights the aesthetic qualities of the upper section of the facade.
<b>51</b>	52	The jury acknowledges the competitors choice to maintain the status-quo, preserving a clear split between the sidewalks and the road and ignoring the brief requirement to redesign Kogălniceanu street as a shared-space. The jury appreciates the large variety of scenarios presented by the competitors, ranging from daily uses to large events. Unfortunately, these scenarios were not developed in further detail.
<b>54</b>	48	The jury appreciates the efforts of uniformization of the street by means of a pavement of different types of granite. The layout of the street affirms the shared character of the public space. Less convincing are the circulation around the church, the positioning of the Saint Mary the Protector statue and the random treatment of the area around the Tailors Tower.
<b>57</b>	36	The functional conception of the project is rational and fitting to the requirements stated in the brief. Yet while the initial idea, as stated in the preamble is interesting and the declared intentions valuable, they find little effect in the proposal. The personalization of each important spot is simplistic and the architectural means used, somewhat brutal.
<b>59</b>	17	The project is the illustration of a very daring approach to the theme. While the initial idea of establishing a serial sequence of places and events is valid, in order to realise it, the authors choose to demolish extant buildings and introduce aggressive new structures with no obvious purpose. Such an outspokenly anti-contextual solution for the urban project is not considered adequate for the site in question.

---



This Jury Report was completed in two copies in Cluj Napoca, on the 16th of September 2018.

**Full members:**

1. Arch. Pieter Uyttenhove
2. Arch. Rudolf Gräf
3. Arch. Ligia Subțirica
4. Arch. Kazmer Kovacs
5. Arch. Johannes Bertleff
6. Arch. Raluca Munteanu
7. Arch. Matei Bogoescu

**Alternate members:**

8. Arch. Andrei Cebotaru

Secretary of the jury - Arch. Loredana Gaiță

Competition coordinator - Arch. Mirona Craciun

Professional and technical consultants

Arch. Maria Cristina Găvozdea

Arch. Dan Clinci