

INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION EAST PARK
ANNEX 1 of the Jury Report - Award Criteria

AWARD CRITERIA:			100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	
A. MEETING THE FUNCTIONAL & LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS – 60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points)	A1. Landscape criterion	The quality of the landscape design with regard to the protection of the biotope – maximum 15 points.	13	6	3	10	4	3	10	12	8	8	8	7	9	5	9	8	2	9	9	9	11	5	6	0	4	9	12	
		Relationships with the existing natural and built context – maximum 5 points.	4	2	2	4	1	2	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	2	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	5	
		Selection and composition of the proposed plant species – maximum 5 points.	5	3	0	3	0	1	3	4	2	3	3	4	4	2	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	1	3	0	2	4	4
		The design concepts of the planting, designing and perception approaches – maximum 5 points.	5	2	2	4	1	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	4	2	2	4	4	3	4	2	3	2	1	2	4
	A2. Functional criterion	The quality of the functional solution for biotope protection – maximum 4 points.	3	2	1	3	0	1	3	4	2	1	3	3	3	1	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	
		The proposed valorisation scenarios and the approach of the accesses and routes designed accordingly – maximum 2 points.	2	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2
		The major functions design – maximum 2 points.	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
		The auxiliary functions (vehicle parking, municipal facilities, etc.) design – maximum 2 points.	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2
	A3. Architectural criterion	The quality of the architectural project with regard to the protection of the biotope – maximum 3 points.	3	1	1	3	0	0	3	3	0	1	1	1	2	0	2	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	2	0	1	2	3	
		Integration of new buildings in the specific landscape context – maximum 3 points.	2	1	0	2	0	0	3	2	0	2	1	1	2	0	1	2	1	2	2	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	
		The quality of solving the relations between the component subzones of the landscape ensemble – maximum 4 points.	4	1	1	3	1	1	4	3	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	
	A4. Financial criterion	Compliance with the investment and design services maximum cost estimate indicated in the competition documentation – 5 points.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	0	5	0	0	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	
		The rationality and sustainability of the functional-spatial solution in relation to the estimated price – maximum 5 points.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
B. ADDED ARCHITECTURAL-ARTISTIC VALUE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION – 40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points)	B1. The park's character following the proposed intervention and the general atmosphere of the intervention - maximum 20 points	20	7	5	13	4	5	15	18	18	9	7	7	12	4	14	7	5	10	14	9	15	7	7	3	5	11	16		
	B2. The power of the ensemble as centre of interest following the intervention and its capacity to adapt in time - maximum 10 points	10	5	1	7	1	1	7	9	8	5	4	3	6	1	7	3	3	4	6	5	7	5	4	2	3	6	8		
	B3. Quality and clarity of the representation of the ideas so as to illustrate the competitor's ability to implement the proposed project - maximum 10 points	9	5	1	7	2	3	8	8	4	6	5	3	7	3	8	5	2	6	7	4	8	4	4	2	2	6	8		
TOTAL		94	48	29	75	26	30	78	87	67	55	53	46	69	33	71	47	36	60	64	57	80	43	51	27	39	62	83		

Landscape arch. Catherine Mosbach -
President

Geogr. Dr. Catherine Zanaria Franceschi

Landscape arch. Peter Veenstra

Arch. Ra

Arch. Toader Popescu

Arch. Tamina Lolev

Cristian Domşa, Biodiversity specialist

Jury Secretary: Arch. Ilinca Pop

Professional Advisors

Arch. Kazmer Kovacs

Arch. Răzvan Vasii

Competition Coordinator

Arch. Mirona Crăciun

Date: 07.02.2021