



JURY REPORT

INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION

SOPOR MASTERPLAN - URBAN ZONING PLAN - CLUJ-NAPOCA 2019

DATE : 07 – 09 October 2019

LOCATION: "Casa Radio" Cluj-Napoca

1. JURY:

Permanent members:

1. eng. urb. Pablo de Otaola Ubieta
2. arch. Borislav Ignatov
3. conf. univ. dr. Bogdan Suditu
4. urb. Paola Rizzi
5. landscape arch. urb. Nicolas Triboi
6. arch. Ligia Subțirica
7. arch. Claudiu Salanță
8. arch. Daniel Pop
9. arch. Daniela Maier

Deputy members:

1. arch. urb. Dracea Răzvan
2. arch. urb. Anca Virginaș

Associated Experts:

1. arch. urb. Sorin Gabrea
2. lect. dr. arch. urb. Anca Ginavar
3. lect. dr. arch. urb. Toader Popescu



2. ORGANISATION OF THE JURY

Mr. eng. urb. Pablo de Otaola Ubieta and mr. arch. Borislav Ignatov could not attend the jury sessions. As per the Competition Rules the deputy members of the Jury - arch. urb. Dracea Răzvan and arch. urb. Anca Virginaş become full members. All other members of the jury being present, a president was elected.

Ms. urb. Paola Rizzi was elected President of the Jury.

The following persons were present at the jury sessions:

1. president of the technical committee and competition coordinator arch. Codruța Pop
2. professional consultant arch. Klaus Birthler
3. competitions consultant arch. Mirona Crăciun
4. secretary of the jury arch. Eleonora Dulău.

In the competition were submitted 12 projects, and after the Competition's Secretariat inspection, it was concluded that all of them comply with the provisions stated in the Competition Rules regarding the submitting of the projects phase.

In the selection of the Technical Committee entered 12 projects.

The president of the Technical Committee presented the Technical Committee Report, which contained the check of the formal conditions found in the Competition Brief and Rules.

Two of the projects (no. 61 and no. 56) have exceeded the cost estimate limit for the Financial Proposal. The jury decided to award zero points (from the 10 allowed) to these projects.

The Jury unanimously decided to admit all 12 projects in the jury proceedings.

3. AWARD CRITERIA

Category	Assessment criterion	points	Criterion description
A. Compliance with the minimum	A.1 Functional issues	10	The proposal's response to the functional need and the way they are combined



technical requirements	A.2 Design principles	20	The way the proposal complies with the design principles.
	A.3 Land balance	5	The optimum percentage in the land balance.
	A.4 Financial proposal	10	Awarding

Computing algorithm $A=A1+A2+A3+A4= 10+20+5=$ **45points maximum for criterion A**

B. Added value of the proposed intervention	B.1 Mobility	10	The way the motorised and non-motorised traffic is organised
	B.2 Greenery plots	10	The way the existing natural elements are valorised for an enhanced quality of life, the real estate value increase and micro-climate regulation, the continuity of the greenery network.
	B.3 Concept clarity and quality	20	The way the proposal responds to the brief challenge, the innovative character, the strategic and space organisation and the clarity of concept explanations.
	B.4 Quality and feasibility of the implementation steps	15	The way the steps and public policies proposals adapt to the given context.

Computing algorithm for category B, Added value

$B=B1+B2+B3+B4= 10+10+20+15=$ **55points maximum for criterion B**

Computing algorithm for final assessment (max. 100 points)

$A+B=45+55=100$ points 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 professional consultant of the competition, during which the requirements and the assessment criteria 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 3 projects were eliminated from the Second Round of discussion, namely **52, 53, 55**.

The projects selected after the first round to move on are: **50, 51, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61**.

Round II

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

In the second evaluation round, the jury reviewed the nine remaining projects in the competition, on the basis of the award criteria. The proposed solutions have been debated and the jury made general observations regarding the proposed spatial and strategic solutions, the principles of sustainability, zoning and functions proposed, the principles of organizing the traffic flows, the way in which the existing natural elements were used. The joint analysis generated points of view on each solution and the projects with the number **51, 56, 59, 61** were the ones selected for further analysis in the Third Round.

Round III

From the resulting hierarchy, the projects ranked in the top four 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 proves 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.

The jury came to the conclusion that the hierarchy will be the following:

Round IV – Prize awarding

The jury decided:

The **first prize**, design contract with an estimated value of 2.800.000 RON, VAT not included goes to **project no. 59**.

The **second prize**, in the amount of 35.000 RON goes to **project no. 61**.

The **third prize**, in the amount of 20.000 RON goes to **project no. 51**.

STATEMENT OF THE JURY

Design competitions for public spaces have already become a tradition for the Cluj-Napoca City Hall. But this is a unique competition for Romania, being for the first time after 1989 that a design for a new neighborhood, starting from zero, is proposed. The dynamic of the population of the city, its morphological conformation, the need of urban development, the exerted pressure on the residential area and on spaces for services, education, health, culture, production, etc., require the emergence of new urbanized areas within the city borders.

The jury was aware of certain issues, such as how the location of the proposed neighborhood (in fact the size of a real city) was chosen. The jury also found that the brief was established as a result of consulting the owners from the area through debates and online questionnaires. Their opinions generated proposals on the topic, regarding the typology and location of residential areas, mobility, urban amenities, functional mixing, integration and development possibilities.

The competition brief is very clear regarding the need for a new type of approach, and choosing this subject for a competition brings to attention one of the major problems of the city, as well as those of other urban or rural settlements in Romania, that were confronted with the phenomenon of urban development.

It is about uncontrolled, chaotic development / expansion. The post-revolutionary legislative framework was extremely lax and fluid, the regulations acquired rigor and clarity - as much as it is - in years. As such, the extensions and the other urban interventions often had a random character, without an integrating framework.



Considering the above, the jury thinks the promoter initiative to be a salutary, promising and a brave one.

Regarding the participation in the competition, it can be said that the number of registered projects was a pleasant surprise for the jury. The topic is difficult and complex, the competition calendar coincided with the months dedicated to the summer holidays and nevertheless the participation is to be welcomed, not only in terms of the number of competitors, but also from the point of view of the projects proposed.

In this regard, the jury appreciates the seriousness of the approaches, the way the competitors have responded on the topics. The satisfaction of the minimum requirements and the added value of the proposed intervention were analyzed. From these analyzes resulted the final score and hierarchy. In conclusion, although this is the first contest of this type, the jury expresses the hope that the winning solution and its implementation, complex and difficult, with many stages that will take time, will encourage the public administrations to use The Design Competitions as a tool for public procurement in the field of urban planning and architecture.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The project perimeter needs to be clarified: definition, establishment, correlation with the limits of property, in some cases with the extension of the regulatory area

Legal status

- all landowners are inventoried
- cadastral and land book updating is done for all regulatory parcels in the project
- all overlays should be solved and updates should be made for the configuration in the stereo 70 system
- all ownership documentation should be analyzed
- the legality of the ownership documents should be checked
- potential conflicts should be listed
- a mediation policy should be established for these conflicts
- easements should be clarified [ex.underground gas pipe, suspended and underground electrical cables]

Land/site

- preliminary hydro-geotechnical study [circa 75 15 m deep drills and 25 60 m deep drills]
- the drilling papers should be overlapped and compared with the updated topographic documentation
- chemical analysis for land and water



- the risk areas should be identified [ex.flooding hazard areas]

City hall/Municipality [in circa 5 years]

1. a work group should be formed to analyze the conditions for the concretization of the project, to define the design brief and an implementation strategy [real estate market study with the detailed identification of the functional requirements]

- the possibility of introducing public institutions in the studied site should be identified
- potential urban actors that could be interested in the project development should be identified
- how much, who, how, where from and until when should be quantified
- the blueprint of the implementation strategy for the project should be made

2. the public institution that will be in charge of developing the project should be configured [legal status, financing, technical equipment etc.]

3. an integral form of the project should be made

- a final image of the project should be formulated
- the juridical and economic takeover of the land should be established
- the feasibility studies should be made
- the business plan should be made [when, how much, calendar]
- the agency in charge of the project development should be established
- the takeover of the properties
- the capitalization of the project should be made
- the negotiation with the promoters, buyers and leasers should be negotiated
- the comercialization of the project

FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For the project no. 59 – First Prize

Appreciations

The jury appreciates the coherence of the proposal, the evident mixed of functions and typology of buildings.

The network of the public spaces is well distributed in the entire site and allows to identify the neighborhoods, that could follow the implementation in steps and phases of the entire project.



The green network is well connected to the existing surrounding natural area. The distribution of the public spaces integrated together with the green network offers a comfortable environment and enhances the quality of life.

The mix between built environment and the green-blue frame generates a large qualitative variety of public space.

The built pattern that is proposed is easily adaptable to the topography of the site and offers the possibility to define the urban space through strategies that are adapted to the needs defined by the community.

The solution ensure the accessibility to the public transport network.

The project is sensitive to the existing cadastral plan.

Despite the fact that at first glance the general impression is that of a traditional urban pattern, the project has a contemporary approach. Actually the project proposes human scale public spaces, adapted to pedestrian use, where nature is invited in large proportions.

The project was appreciated for its precision, it doesn't propose utopian scenarios. One of the most appreciated qualities of this proposal is its discretion and coherence.

The project is not an innovative one, but it does have qualities that should become a common sense norm in the romanian context.

Recommendations

In order to ensure a sustainable mobility we recommend the design to be adapted according to the local sustainable mobility plan.

In respect with the protected areas according to the law and the existing buildings we recommend to be more sensitive.

On the side facing East Park we recommend to keep and maintain the visual permeability and easy access.

We also recommend the development of community gardens near to Palocsay Research Institute in order to design an agricultural ring.

It will be necessary to reconsider the East area near the military base according with the legal obligations.

For the project no. 61 – Second Prize

Appreciations



The jury appreciate the attention that was given to the different aspects: the green and blue system, the transport and mobility, that is well organized and structured.

The design highlights a multifunctional and mobility hub. The solution to cover a sector of the speed road, offers a good and seamless connection to East Park.

The proposed implementation strategy is clear and in accordance to the existing planning documents.

The presence of the urban community gardens in the south offer a sustainable transition to the natural and agricultural field.

The jury appreciates the integration of the speed road highway in earthworks and vegetation.

Recommendation

It is important to clarify the options on typology buildings and functions in order to ensure coherence between build pattern and public space.

Fragmentation of the urban spaces in the central area generate a low identity. We recommend the design of some public green squares.

We recommend also the development of the community gardens near to Palocsay Research Institut in order to build an agricultural ring.

For the project no. 51 – Third Prize

Appreciations

The jury appreciates the solution of combination and alternance of the two systems: the built and the green space.

The urban pattern is composed by adaptable modules, that are well detailed and represented, but formal - the final result is somewhat rigid.

The diversity of urban and agricultural nature typology was appreciated. The blurred transition between nature and built environment (on the north and south borders) permit to preserve lands for the evolution of the city in those areas. The concept of the community gardens and its location of the south border was appreciated.

The phasing of the project is in accordance with existing transport infrastructure and enhance the future development.



Recommendations

The strategy of relocating underground the speed road and the relocation of the gas pipeline, has a really low level of feasibility.

Instead of densifying the pattern in the center it would be better to do it closer to the north intermodal hub.

For the project no. 57 - Honorable mention

The jury decided to award an honorary mention, regardless of the ranking, to the project no. 57, due to its innovative approach.

The jury noted many conceptual and innovative qualities of this project. It is a project that asks many questions and comes with many courageous proposals.

What kind of city do we want for tomorrow? How do we want to live in the city? How do we want to move? What does agricultural urbanism mean? What will be the new relationship between urban and rural?

«**What kind of city do we want for tomorrow?**» In the 19th century, urban utopias tended towards the garden-city, green, clean, sanitized. The current tendency is to dream of a city without cars, based on shared spaces, with new relationships and new typologies of natural areas: agricultural, wild, indefinite. Today the urban wasteland takes on value and tends to replace the urbanized sanitary park. The city of tomorrow wants to be participatory, with the involvement of the population. The city of tomorrow wants to be co-built and sustainable.

We find all these elements in the project.

«**How do we want to live in the city?**» The project proposes a new way of living in the city, a vision in which the inhabitant decides and creates the spaces where he wants to live. The people are in central position having the ability to get involved in the process of transforming the living environment.

«**How do we approach urban mobility?**» The project proposes a built area where cars are left in collective parking lots, on the outskirts. The city is dedicated to pedestrians and the parking spaces are completely removed from the street; there are no conflicts with pedestrians, and no pollution. The pedestrian city is well connected through the public transportation system and through various ecological means of transportation (bicycles, scooters etc.). This dream is already a reality in several ties or neighborhoods in Europe.



«What does agricultural urban planning mean?» At present, the notion of agricultural urbanism is defined by the way in which an owner can build "at maximum" agricultural land. It is a negative vision that does not understand the importance and potential of agricultural activities around cities. Towns also eat and need to be connected to agricultural areas (proximity agriculture). Project 57 proposes to preserve and protect wetlands, grassland and agricultural production areas. Modern cities develop urban agriculture projects with urban farms.

Even if the project does not define an urban agriculture project, it has the merit of proposing an area specially reserved for these activities, which could be linked to the orchard area of the Palocsay Research Institute.

We must be aware that agricultural specialists will never come by themselves towards the city to propose an agricultural project - the cities have the mission to imagine and to create land reserves for new projects of productive urban nature.

«What will be the new relations between urban and rural?» In an increasingly mobile and connected society, the opposition between «urban» and «rural» tends to disappear. Urban and rural areas are increasingly collaborating because problems and solutions related to their development are connected. The cities become metropolises and the problems related to the sustainability of the cities oblige us to study problems related to waste, transport, energy and food in a macro way in which the rural and the urban will collaborate.

Project 57 asks us all these questions and is the only one. Unfortunately, the project is unrealistic for this area with more than 1000 owners wanting to build.

We respect the conceptual level, and we hope that in other urban planning competitions all projects will try to draw inspiration from the themes evoked in this project.

FINAL RANKING

CONTEST NR.	POINTS	JURY ASSESSMENT
-------------	--------	-----------------



59	87p	FIRST PRIZE
61	75p	SECOND PRIZE
51	71p	THIRD PRIZE
56	68p	The generosity and continuity of the created green areas were appreciated. The high scale vision and connectivity with the city were well analyzed, but the identity of the southern vicinity with its historic orchards was ignored. The relation with the adjacent neighboring areas remained rigid and hermetic. The urban fabric created is too regular and lacks differentiation between the generated public spaces, it does innovate. The strong point is the connectivity of the enclaves through a generous green corridor. One of the deficiencies of the project is the insufficient exposition of the participants' ideas regarding the implementation of the project.
57	66p	HONORABLE MENTION
60	64p	The jury appreciated the detailed concerns regarding the integration of the future neighborhood in the periurban concept in conjunction with the location of the dense functional areas near the intermodal nodes. The concern and thus the detailing of the implementation mode generates a complexity superior to the elaboration of an urban planning documentation, but the jury considered that an analysis on the functional complexity and the sustained highlighting of the implementation stages.
54	63p	The analysis of the implementation strategy, correlated with contemporary mechanisms that can govern it, was appreciated. We appreciate the integration of the green areas and their connectivity. The proposal of a strong segregation was considered a lack of ability in urban



planning. Moreover, the absence of a correlation between the functional distribution and the express road and of a coherent interconnection, lowers the feasibility of the project.

-
- | | | |
|-----------|-----|--|
| 50 | 57p | <p>The accessibility, the relation with the context and the natural environment give a distinctive character to the project. The attention given to the implementation of the project denotes a good understanding of the context of an urban operation of such magnitude.</p> <p>The sustainability concept was appreciated with its integration of the agricultural component in the form of community gardens as a distinctive identity of the area, but the solution is not integrated coherently in the given context. The proposed urban structure seems unorganized and monotonous.</p> |
| 58 | 54p | <p>The considerable dimensions of the planted areas were appreciated as well as their differential treatment, but the standardization of the planted areas nullifies the intention. The organization of the circulation does not respect the given context.</p> |
| 53 | 50p | <p>The presence of the planted spaces was appreciated, but their lack of connectivity can only be considered a grave deficiency of the project. There is no clear functional delineation of the various residential areas. The scale of the spatial organization was considered inadequate to the context.</p> |
| 52 | 49p | <p>The jury appreciates the diversity of volumes and the achievement of a generous green area as well as the intention to connect them, but this is presented without ensuring a general coherence. A dissociation between the built and the green areas can be noticed.</p> <p>The form is not supported by context. The structure of the street system does not offer the necessary connectivity for good mobility in the area. The ecological concern was</p> |
-



appreciated, and a certain concern towards alternative energies.

55	30p	It positively enhances the topography of the place, but the solution lacks value due to its formal monotony and the lack of innovation.
-----------	-----	---

The Jury was assisted, during the Jury Proceedings, by the associates experts. Their point of view can be found in the annex to this Report.

This Jury Report was completed in two copies in Cluj Napoca, on the 9th of October 2019.

Jury members:

urb. Paola Rizzi

landscape arch. urb. Nicolas Triboi

arch. Ligia Subțirică

arch. Claudiu Salanță

arch. Daniel Pop



arch. Daniela Maier

arch. urb. Dracea Răzvan

arch. urb. Anca Virginaș

conf. univ. dr. Bogdan Suditu

Secretary of the jury - arch. Eleonora Dulău

President of the technical committee and competition coordinator - arch. Codruța Pop

Professional consultant - arch. Klaus Birthler

Co-opted experts' report

„SOPOR MASTERPLAN” DESIGN COMPETITION

In view of the coordinated and competitive urban development of a 250 ha area, Cluj-Napoca municipality, supported by OAR Transylvania, has organized a design competition which is supposed to lead to the elaboration of a planning document substantiating a new development model; this model would generate a coherently planned and consistently implemented intervention, so as the new neighborhood insures a high quality of life, based upon the principles of sustainable development.

The co-opted experts have analyzed the competition documents and the submitted projects and, based on the provisions of art. 128 of the *Application methodology of public procurement procedures established through Law no. 98/2016 concerning public procurement*, approved through Government Decision no. 395/2016, have drafted this report. We estimate that some general and specific considerations as to the necessary subsequent measures for planning, regulating and implementing the winning project, as well as to the competition brief and the submitted projects are necessary.

1. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS AS TO THE PROJECT AND ITS SUBSEQUENT IMPLEMENTATION

The city of Cluj-Napoca is currently undergoing a process of rapid economic development, consistently attracting, during the last few years, an educated population that has high expectancies as to quality of life and is connected to modern concepts of urban life, thus necessitating and adequate urban offer.

The envisaged development of a new neighborhood harboring ca. 35,000 – 50,000 inhabitants (an estimate resulting from the submitted projects and not from an explicit brief requirement) is a public urban operation of unprecedented dimension and technical, economical and legal complexity in post-communist Romania. Its success relies upon the understanding and assumption of this complexity by the local administration, and upon their motivation to take all the necessary implementation measures.

The planning and implementation process will be a lengthy one, and its results will only be visible over time. Developing such an urban operation will necessitate a consistent financial effort and dedicated human resources, with multidisciplinary background (urban planning, architecture, engineering, geology, hydrology, environment, cadaster, economy, sociology, legal, management etc.)

It is likely that, during the immediate aftermath of this competition, the local municipal structures will be able to drive and manage the planning process (with the help of the winning team, and maybe some support from the professional architects' and planners' organizations), but the final success of the implementation stages is highly dependent on the establishment of a development agency or of an equivalent administrative structure, indispensable for the management of the project and all of its components, be they public or private. It is also important that the zonal urban plan (PUZ) that will

follow contains a detailed action plan.

It must be underlined that, although at this point we are dealing with a design competition, many elements could, in the future, influence and alter the content of the winning solution, and that the project will most likely need some adjustment. On the one hand, the specific substantiation studies that will need to be elaborated during the planning phase or the requests of the various permitting structures will have to be accommodated. On the other hand, the negotiation and implementation strategy of the project, as it will be established by the municipality, may determine the regulatory provisions.

The development process will be grounded on the regulations that will be approved by the PUZ, but it also supposes the integrated elaboration of several other components. For instance, a detailed urban marketing study is necessary, which should define the speculative pressures and should identify all relevant stakeholders. Above all, development objectives in accordance with the various strategic documents for Cluj-Napoca (the Development Strategy for Cluj-Napoca Municipality 2014-2020 or the Integrated Urban Development Strategy for the Cluj-Napoca Metropolitan Area) will need to be defined. If this strategic vision would lack, the project runs the risk of turning into a simplistic version of a “bedroom neighborhood”, which, in spite of its initial planning, would burden the existing transportation and utility infrastructure, as well as the municipal public services.

The municipality’s intent to encourage an innovative approach and to take over responsibilities which have not, as yet, been assumed by other administrations is commendable. Nevertheless, the authority needs to make sure that, during the procurement phase, the structure of the contractual phases and of the deliverables respects the staging and specifications established by law (Law no. 350/2001 and its application norms, approved by Ministerial Decision no. 233/2016, as well as by other relevant legislation). The planning documents need to also include all the implementation measures mentioned in the competition brief.

For instance, we emphasize the necessity of going through the participatory procedures in accordance with the provisions of MDRT Decision no. 2701/2010, starting with the initiation stage of the PUZ and going on through the entire drafting and approving process, and not just during the mediation stage, which is proposed as an intermediary phase before finalizing the urban plan. It is also unclear if the required mediation is viewed as a form of public consultation or of obtaining the consensus of all the land owners regarding the reshaping of the ownership structure. Another example is the necessity of elaborating all the specific studies needed during the strategic environmental assessment procedure.

It is also necessary to clarify, during the contract negotiation phase, the required duration of the technical assistance that needs to be provided, as the implementation period will likely last for more than 10 years. This duration is mainly conditioned by the adequate financing of the development by both public and private stakeholders, as well as by the clarification of the land ownership issues.

Similar successful examples in international practice usually rely upon “anchor” public investments, which create attractiveness and increase the economic value of the area. It is important that the municipality defines this program and insures its quick implementation.

We estimate that this area can become an important secondary urban pole, which might take over some of the functions and attributes of the central area of Cluj-Napoca. This significant opportunity might be missed if this land will be occupied by a monotonous residential area, that would represent, on a medium and long term, an important loss for the city.

2. CONSIDERATIONS AS TO THE COMPETITION BRIEF AND THE PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

A. General considerations

As to the competition brief, the organizers have chosen to allow for a significant amount of freedom in imagining the proposed neighborhood, giving relatively limited background information. This option implies that the specific substantiation studies would have to be elaborated within the framework of the contract that will follow the competition.

The brief imposed drastic limitations as to the available paper space for the projects as opposed to the complexity of the requirements, which had to treat not only the physical shape, but also economic, social, ecological and other problems; these has proven difficult to cover within the confines of the allowed paper space and imposed word limit.

Some of the submitted projects have convincingly laid out their concept, analysis and approach. On the other hand, many propositions have not succeeded in graphically or textually expressing all the necessary elements, often limiting themselves to spatial aspects, treating mostly the urban form and sometimes generically enunciating considerations from the competition brief.

Another general observation dwells on the fact that most of the projects do not take into account the specific topography of the area, proposing solutions that either denote a misunderstanding of the site or suppose important earthworks.

Because of the lack of information as to the expectations of the administration regarding the number of inhabitants / users of the area and the major public amenities necessary at city level, the submitted projects exhibit very different approaches. These range from intensive land use, with high density levels and high-rise buildings, which continue the current general market-driven tendencies, to only partial occupations of the available land and conservation of extensive unbuilt areas. Technically, all approaches are possible, but the necessary subsequent financial efforts differ greatly.

A general assessment indicates that many projects include interesting and valuable elements, some of which could be included as brief conditions for the subsequent zonal urban plan, amending the winning solution (of course, taking into account the intellectual property of the projects).

All projects have, to various degrees, abolished the existing property structure (which has all the characteristics of an agricultural use), which is a good thing insofar as the quality of the proposed urban layout is concerned. Nevertheless, this supposes that the municipality embarks in a complex and difficult action (which it has implicitly assumed through the competition brief) and directly participates in developing the project, either as moderator or as a potential public partner. We underline the importance of the implication of the municipality in completely and correctly identifying the current ownership structure.

Although all projects propose some kind of expansion of the public transport network, the connections with the rest of the city are generally unsatisfactory, because they build upon an existing situation that cannot be directly modified, as it has not been part of the objectives of this competition. Nevertheless, new possibilities of connecting the new neighborhood to the future underground and railway infrastructure will need to be considered during subsequent development stages. These new connections could modify the urban layout of the winning solution.

Finally, most competitors exhibit little preoccupation for implementation mechanisms and public policies, although this has been an explicit request of the competition brief. It is highly recommended that these elements be developed in subsequent stages, regardless of which project will win the competition.

B. Project-based considerations

PROJECT 50

The proposal has a plausible relationship with its vicinities, especially with the southern one, which is a quality that is missing from many other projects. There is also a preoccupation for devising implementation mechanisms. However, the functional and morphological organization is rigid and non-hierarchical, and the proposal regarding the configuration of the high-speed transit traffic is unconvincing.

PROJECT 51

The project proposes a firm and well-defined concept, but with certain risks in terms of public acceptability. The urban layout is flexible, well organized and insures a good gradation in relation to its location. The basic urban module is carefully thought out as to its dimensions and configuration, adaptable and convincingly presented. The concern for ensuring connectivity, especially in the northern area of the site, is appreciated. However, there are some inabilities regarding urban design, especially in the articulations of the orthogonal grid with the diagonal arteries. The orientation of the orthogonal grid seems relatively arbitrary in relation to the context, being insufficiently explained. The proposed relationship with the neighboring areas is unconvincing in some cases.

PROJECT 52

The proposals of this project are simplistically treated and insufficiently explained. There is a major deficiency in the organization of circulations. The layout is a rigid one, and its rationale is questionable. However, the ecological approach of the project is one that is worth mentioning.

PROJECT 53

The project proposals are insufficiently substantiated and argued. In general, the scale of spatial organization seems inadequate to the location and context, and there is some rigidity in the design of the proposed built volumes. On the other hand, the project has a consistent presence of planted, green spaces, whose hierarchy and interrelation are plausible.

PROJECT 54

The project shows a significant interest for organizing the implementation of the proposals and for the mechanisms that should govern it. Moreover, the functional distribution is plausible, and the planted areas are organized in a coherent manner. However, there are obvious flaws regarding the urban design, the organization of the street system and the infrastructure (in particular, the treatment of the high-speed traffic artery is objectionable). The relationship with the neighboring areas is weak, and a well-defined community center is not identifiable.

PROJECT 55

The solution proposed is simplistic, insufficiently argued and uninspired. There is no coherent justification for the options taken, and the urban composition is chaotic. The only area in

which the project demonstrates a plausible point of view is the integration of the proposal into the green space system of the city.

PROJECT 56

The general concept and statement of intent of the project are well formulated, convincing and well supported. The concerns for the possibility of phasing and gradual implementation of the project are appreciated. The organization of the road network and the infrastructure is good and the northern area of the site is well configured. The project also demonstrates a good treatment of most of the relevant aspects of the brief. The rigidity of the urban layout, the relative equivalence of the project components, as well as some inconsistencies in the organization of the street system and the northwestern part of the studied area are objectionable.

PROJECT 57

The proposal is rather a manifesto and a statement of intent than a realistic project. The courage of this project to address contemporary and important international issues in urbanism is to be appreciated. There are also some aspects in the detailing of the project (such as the organization of the basic module of the built area) that are interesting. However, the proposals of this project are very difficult to implement or, realistically speaking, to be accepted by the general public. Some of the proposed solutions are also insufficiently grounded or inadequately implemented.

PROJECT 58

The project proposes an excessive densification and a lack of coherent organization of the built volumes. The general organization of the circulations is unsatisfactory. The project proposes planted areas of considerable size, but their undifferentiated and superficial treatment nullifies this intention.

PROJECT 59

The rationale and model of development proposed by this project are, from the perspective of the co-opted jury experts, highly debatable. The project shows little concern for innovation, and seems locked in a formula that does not allow evolution. The morphological and functional uniformity of the urban system is a flaw, and the concern for future implementation mechanisms is insufficient. The project, however, proposes quality community spaces, and the small-scale urban design is well implemented. The dimensioning and location of public functions is well scaled in relation with the neighborhood, but a well-defined center for the local community is missing. From the point of view of urban form, the relationship between the prospect of the street and the high-rise volumes could be improved. In general, the concept of the project is probably one without risks in terms of public and administrative acceptability.

PROJECT 60

The project demonstrates an appropriate approach in relation to the scale of the city, which is missing from most of the other proposals. The solution for the circulations and the planted areas is a good one. The management of the northeastern area of the site is convincing and

appreciated, especially due to the proposed intermodality. On the other hand, the organization and configuration of the proposed built areas is insufficiently argued and supported.

PROJECT 61

In general, the solutions proposed by the project are plausible and well-illustrated. The integration in the green infrastructure of the city and the relation with the neighboring areas are appreciated. Circulations are generally well organized, and the concern for intermodality and railway accessibility are commendable. The arrangement of the individual housing areas could be improved, and the proposed urban fabric is excessively homogeneous and uniform, with low concerns for the hierarchy and centrality.

Cluj-Napoca, oct. 2019

Co-opted experts

Arch. Sorin GABREA

Arch. Anca GINAVAR

Arch. Toader POPESCU