



INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION EAST PARK

JURY REPORT

DATE: 05.02.2021 - 07.02.2021

PLACE: CLUJ ARENA, CLUJ

1. JURY

Full members:

Landscape arch. Catherine Mosbach
Geography dr. Catherine Zaharia Franceschi
Landscape arch. Peter Veenstra
Arch. Radu Ponta
Arch. Urb. Toader Popescu
Arch. Tamina Lolev
Cristian Domșa, Biodiversity specialist

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE JURY

Arch. Șerban Țigănaș recused himself from the full member of the Jury position on 04.01.2020. Therefore, the deputy member representing the profession of architect, arch. Tamina Lolev, took over the role of full member of the Jury throughout the judging of the international design competition for the East Park, according to the Competition Rules, art. 1.5.4.

Arch. Ligia Subțirică, full member of the Jury, could not be present at the Jury sessions, for objective reasons. Based on the same article of the Competition Rules, the position of full member of the Jury was taken over by Cristian Domșa. All other members of the Jury were present during the Jury's proceedings.

Arch. peis. Catherine Mosbach was unanimously elected President of the Jury.

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

- Professional advisors: arch. Kazmer Kovacs, arch. Răzvan VasIU
- President of the Technical Committee: arch. Mirona Crăciun,
- Jury Secretary: arch. Ilinca Pop.
- Special guest for the opening of the Jury Sessions: arch. Vasile Mitrea



There were **27** projects submitted in the competition. All projects complied with the provisions of the Competition Rules in what concerns the works of the Reception Secretariat.

Therefore, in the Technical Committee procedure entered **27** 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.

27 projects were accepted in the Jury sessions.

3. AWARD CRITERIA

In assessing the projects, there will be awarded scores between 0 and a maximum expressed on each criterion.

The maximum score is 100 points, the weights of the criteria being explained in detail as follows:

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

Meeting the minimum requirements imposed by the competition brief is evaluated on a scale of 1 to 60.

It is calculated by summing up the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

A1. Landscape criterion

The following will be scored:

The quality of the landscape design with regard to the protection of the biotope – maximum 15 points.

Relationships with the existing natural and built context – maximum 5 points.

Selection and composition of the proposed plant species – maximum 5 points.

The design concepts of the planting, designing and perception approaches – maximum 5 points.



A2. Functional criterion

The following will be scored:

The quality of the functional solution for biotope protection – maximum 4 points.
The proposed valorisation scenarios and the approach of the accesses and routes designed accordingly – maximum 2 points. The major functions design – maximum 2 points. The auxiliary functions (vehicle parking, municipal facilities, etc.) design – maximum 2 points.

A3. Architectural criterion

The following aspects will be scored:

The quality of the architectural project with regard to the protection of the biotope – maximum 3 points.
Integration of new buildings in the specific landscape context – maximum 3 points.
The quality of solving the relations between the component subzones of the landscape ensemble – maximum 4 points.

A4. Financial criterion

The following will be scored:

Compliance with the investment and design services maximum cost estimate indicated in the competition documentation – 5 points.

**Failure to meet the maximum cost estimate leads to the sub-criterion being awarded 0 points.*

The rationality and sustainability of the functional-spatial solution in relation to the estimated price – maximum 5 points.

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

The architectural-landscape-artistic value of the proposed project is evaluated on a scale from 1 to 40.

It is calculated by summing up the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

B1. The park's character following the proposed intervention and the general atmosphere of the intervention – maximum 20 points.

B2. The power of the ensemble as centre of interest following the intervention and its capacity to adapt in time – maximum 10 points.



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.

Calculation algorithm for point A – Minimum requirements:

$$A = A1 + A2 + A3 + A4 = 60 \text{ points}$$

Calculation algorithm for point B - Added value:

$$B = B1 + B2 + B3 = 40 \text{ points}$$

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

$$A+B = 60 + 40 = 100 \text{ (maximum)}$$

4. JURY SESSION – WORKING METHODOLOGY

The working sessions of the Jury were preceded by a visit to the competition site. The Jury members then arrived to Cluj Arena, where arch. Vasile Mitrea held a presentation about the history of the East Park throughout the past half century. A presentation of the Brief by the Professional Advisors of the competition, architects Kazmer Kovacs and Răzvan Vasiu followed, with detailed explanations about the particularities of the site, in relation to the requirements of the Brief.

It was agreed that the selection of projects should be done through several rounds of analysis.

The Jury agreed upon the following working method:

Round I

During the first round, the Jury firstly analyzed the 27 projects individually, both based on the Award Criteria and the requirements of the Competition Brief.

A collective discussion followed the Jury's individual analysis of the projects, highlighting the projects that responded optimally to both the requirements for the protected biotope area and those concerning the qualities of the proposed intervention. Eleven projects were eliminated in this round of professional debates.

The sixteen projects selected after the first round to go further were:

100, 103, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 117, 118, 119, 120, 125, 122, 126.



Round II

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the sixteen projects that successfully passed the first round. The Jury members continued with an individual analysis of the remaining projects, followed by a more detailed discussion about the specific approaches of the projects in what concerns the protected biotope area, the protection zone, and the public garden. The projects were analysed both from a landscaping and an architectural perspective, according to the Award Criteria. Following this round of debates, eight projects were eliminated.

During the second round of debates, the Jury appreciated project **108**, and although it was not selected for the next round, they decided to award it a special honorific mention for its merits.

The projects selected for the third round were:

100, 103, 106, 107, 112, 114, 120, 126.

Round III

The Jury continued to analyze the eight remaining projects, with a focus on those projects that show a thorough understanding of the particularities of the studied area, and which respond to the landscaping and architectural requirements with outstanding proposals. During the third round of debates, the Jury appreciated project **120**, and proposed the award of a special honorific mention for the recognition of its merits.

The three projects that successfully passed the third round were: **100, 107, 126.**

Round IV – Prize awarding

The jury decided:

The **Ist prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 6.288.360 LEI, without VAT, was awarded to **project number 100.**

The **IInd prize**, in the amount of 120.000 LEI, was awarded to **project number 107.**

The **IIIrd prize**, in the amount of 60.000 LEI, was awarded to **project number 126.**



5. STATEMENT OF THE JURY

Cluj-Napoca's East Park is an important space for further generations. The construction of the park gives shape to the regeneration of the city's most important resource: the blue-green network of streams that converge in the river Someș. With the planned urban development of Sopor ahead, the area will change from a neglected city edge into a central public space. The special attention that the city gives to the upgrade of this area is exemplary for the ambition of Cluj to improve the quality of life of its residents. The jury hopes the city will serve as an example for other Romanian cities.

The design competition attracted 27 design proposals. The collective work shows an incredible array of potential development directions. The design task as formulated in the brief was not easy. Concrete proposals for vegetation, earth works, infrastructure, programming, and architecture were asked to be brought together into one powerful and realistic ensemble of appealing atmospheres, able to evolve over time. The proposals should protect and work around the valuable wetland biotopes while at the same time creating a strong network that connects the different park areas and the surrounding neighbourhoods. Even with these requirements and constraints, many designers went beyond responding to the objectives and added beautiful ideas and qualities.

The jury thoroughly assessed all design proposals, following the judgement criteria, and ranked them. The three proposals with the highest ranks show different strategies in a convincing way, while the winning design has a strong vision and a real potential to truly elevate the park and the city. Next to that, two honorable mentions were given to proposals that really stood out in their quality, but also had deficits that were too fundamental to announce them as prize winners.

East Park will become much more than a 'green lounge' for the city, as most parks built over the past centuries. Future parks should bring environment and culture together - we can no longer separate human life from animal and plant life, as if they are fundamentally different. Parks have the potential to achieve subtle links between all kinds of life, and to reach a balance between what the earth is giving and what we introduce as artefacts.

To achieve this meaningful integration, the jury strongly advises to appoint a curator for East Park, someone that keeps the larger vision alive over the years, and guides the evolution of the park. This curator should be nominated at the beginning of the process, to engage a dialogue with the design team and to be involved in the conceptual process. The position of the curator comes in addition to the organizer of the competition – a professional intermediate between the city and the design team. The curator will assemble a group of gardeners to follow the construction process, and to optimally guide the growth and the evolution of the park. The future of a park is deeply linked to the way it is constituted: the way in which water and earth are coming together determines the capacity



for future life. As it is usual to appoint a curator for a botanical garden or a museum, East Park deserves the same approach. In that way it will be possible to create a park where hybridization between the given world and civilization is established in a respectful way.

6. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Project no. 100 – First Prize

SHIFTING NATURES proposes East Park as one continuous space, gradually changing from protected wetland to a quiet park with generous open spaces. It smartly merges the fluidity of space of the wetland area with the orthogonal arrangement of the nursery plantation into one coherent drawing. It is built up with minimum means - topography, water, vegetation and paths, yet the outcome creates impressive richness and diverse atmospheres that are open to evolve over time and to absorb future needs.

As over the centuries the wetlands have been drastically reduced in size, the design makes space for new wet biotopes, and restores some of the capacity of the original water system. Even though the wetland is protected, it is not static. The team mapped how the site developed over the last two decades and takes it as an inspiration for future development of the territory. The open water and wetland from the protected biotope is extended to create an accessible buffer space, where park visitors can enjoy the wildlife without disturbing the sensitive fauna. The canalized *Becas* river is provided with new meanders and a wide river bed with soft slopes. From an ecological point of view, the expansion of the associated forest gallery is a plus. Also, the planned expansion of the wetlands toward the park spaces is beneficial for the characteristic biodiversity.

The programme is not spread out all over the park, but has been concentrated in the southern corner, leaving the majority of space open for spontaneous events and temporary use - individual and collective. All built functions have been combined into one building. As park pavilions often struggle to attract enough visitors and to create vivid ambience, concentration is a robust choice that will optimally facilitate social interaction between the different park users. The structures themselves allude to valued contemporary architectures. They are at the same time examples of subtlety and discretion of intervention, and an architecture that plays with the spatial quality of the intermediate — inside–outside, light–shade, covered–open... The materials indicate light non-invasive structures, simple shapes that, through loose articulation, become elements of mediation between city and park. The continuous glass facades on the ground floor establish a strong visual relationship between the interior and the exterior, allowing the indoor activities to animate the public space around, and the natural atmosphere to flow into the interior.



The playground located on the hinge between lake 3 and the main park space has been removed, to establish a continuity of space and natural qualities.

SHIFTING NATURES infiltrates into the first line of infrastructure of the northern neighbourhood and introduces a strong connection between the city and the park. Also, the path network toward the commercial zone on the west side of the park has been reinforced, allowing the citizens to directly immerse into the environment.

The design transforms accurately the current topography, integrating hydrology and 'milieux'. The vegetation proposal is precise and always related to the soil conditions and fauna it could attract. All valuable existing vegetation is integrated into the new scheme.

Recommendations

1. While the interface between the neighbourhood and the park that was introduced on the north side shows a great quality, the interface in between the park and the south side is currently underdeveloped and deserves a similar attention.
2. The clean aesthetics and minimal composition of the masterplan shown in the plan and the images, will have to meet the local specificities. A challenge will be to incorporate these, and to meet them as an enrichment of the original scheme and finding a balance between the clarity of design and the imperfection of the remnants of current reality.
3. When further developing the architecture of the main pavilion, its appreciated qualities such as the lightness, transparency, and delicate articulation should be enhanced, while the loose and playful configuration of the volumes could be more connected to its surroundings.
4. Making use of introducing a lower level in the main pavilion, the project should consider the possibility of using geothermal energy to cover as much as possible of the buildings' energy requirements.
5. During the elaboration process of the project, the team should employ the consultancy of local biologists (specialists in habitats, birds, other taxa), in order to choose the best solutions for protecting biodiversity. It's also important to employ a surveyor to map the topography and the position of all trees and objects.
6. Given the fact that existing wetlands are of paramount importance, the new planned water systems should take into consideration the results and the recommendations of the mandatory hydrological study, in order to avoid any possible impact on the wetland habitats.
7. It is important to verify that all planned developments on southern and south-western shores of Lake 3 are projected beyond the limit of the D3 zone ("unarrangeable protected bank").



8. The position of the pool designed on the northern shore of Lake 3 should be reconsidered in order to minimize the impact on the nearby protected habitats.

Project no. 107 – Second Prize

Next Nature proposes an acupunctural strategy within a system that connects the larger scale (the river Someş and the important green areas in the South of the city), with the local features on site — neighborhoods, thresholds, entrances and the park development. The strategy is enhanced by using constructive design tools so that the place becomes a landmark that welcomes new inhabitants eager to discover lands they are not used to experiencing in urban regular life.

Next Nature focuses on a pragmatic transition between the existing marshlands and the abandoned nursery reconfigured as a rhythmic garden sequence. Additional North–South water channels linking the protected waterlands with the Becaş river are highlighted by a circular discovery path crossing all places.

That hypothesis follows the typological continuities of the previous uses of the land. It continues the history of the grid of the breeding grounds and extends it to the existing urban connections.

The path network crosses specific places without systematically highlighting the threshold of each of them, which is an attractive way to discover singularities of gardens and seasonal rhythms. In addition, it alternatively distributes activated lands on both sides of the main axis.

Furthermore, the project is concerned with designing a family of sustainable architectural interventions comprising enclosed programs of different sizes and uses, as well open structures like the bird-watching towers. The shapes themselves emphasize the visibility of the natural texture of the roof and allows it to become yet another material ingredient for the design of the entire environment.

While the idea to draw inspiration from a generic vernacular remains debatable, the general image of the built structures engages a promising contemporary approach.

Recommendations

1. Given the fact that existing wetlands are of paramount importance, the new planned water systems should take into consideration the results and the recommendations of the mandatory hydrological study, in order to avoid any possible impact on the wetland habitats.



2. During the elaboration process of the project, the team should employ the consultancy of local biologists (specialists in habitats, birds, other taxa), in order to choose the best solutions for protecting biodiversity.
3. It is important to verify that the planned paths around the lakes 4 and 5 are beyond the limit of the existing reed belt that is part of zone A3 (aquatic protected biotope).
4. The strategy for plantation and the tools involved in water regulation should both be more clearly defined.

Project no. 127 – Third Prize

The project defines continuities from the urban scale to the local one as a way to reverse the transformation of an isolated ‘abandoned’ land back to regular life. This connective net is then ‘literally’ translated to a design process that enables different kinds of uses (illustrated with various sketches) as well as different perspectives by working with topography.

Water management is the key tool of the links between the northern, existing districts and the southern, projected urban development. Two new lakes organize centralities by assembling activities in between the northern, protected marshland and the southern *Becas* river bed. The project proposes to collect the rainwater from the districts all around through a remediation system (bio-filtration) nourishing the lakes, the wetlands and the river. That strategy is proposed to be extended to the public garden of the Sopor district.

The design process highlights a circular system – both for pavilions & lands rhythms – that proposes a large mesh – an “archipelago of public gardens” – combining water, plants, mobilities in one coherent identity generated by cut and fill to manage the water bed.

A specific attention to the transplanting of existing trees, evolution of the planting belts and seasons rhythms is generously developed on a series of sketches.

Regrettably, the main scope of the project — that of using water to establish an “alliance” of connections — doesn’t “graphically” translate into a persuasive link between Lake 3 and the marshland, these areas being illustrated as inert and fixed. In a similar way, the graphical representation of the edges of the two newly created lakes seems more to suggest an restrictive belt, rather than illustrating a gradient of porosity which is the strength of the concept.

The image of the built interventions is both unitary and sensitive: the pavilions, the cultural structures, the sports amenities and the amphitheater all use motifs derived from the same



formal family whose kinship is highlighted by coherently using the same materials. Additionally, the way in which the amphitheater works with the landscape is commendable.

On the other hand, the two main architectural interventions are treated in a very similar way which leads to a dilution of their respective identities. Also, the structural finesse of the interventions leaves open both the issue of their structural realism and that of their adequacy from the perspective of sturdiness.

Recommendations:

1. Should the planned piers from the Lake 3 northern and southern shores be inside the D3 protected area, this feature should be either disregarded, or moved to the east.
2. Given the fact that existing wetlands are of paramount importance, the new planned water systems should take into consideration the results and the recommendations of the mandatory hydrological study, in order to avoid any possible impact on the wetland habitats.
3. During the elaboration process of the project, the team should employ the consultancy of local biologists (specialists in habitats, birds, other taxa), in order to choose the best solutions for protecting biodiversity.

Project no. 120 – Special Mention of the Jury

The project interprets the brief in a radical and minimalist way, which made it stand out among the competing proposals. The park is clearly defined by its main areas: Lake 3, the velodrome as a hinge program, the vineyard buffer threshold, the marshland clearly confined within a rigid limit permeated only by occasional punctual accesses, the main clearing rythmed by different uses and features, the forest as a threshold to the southern sport gardens. This clear series of typologies is illustrated by painting references and by seven singular “milieus,” not only illustrated by a list of species.

The strength of the project lies in the way it introduces contrast and clear boundaries between “spontaneous” places open to evolution of wilderness and the high-maintenance garden system that integrates the sport facilities towards the neighbouring district. The radicality also lies in the masterly way furniture can be combined in one piece of artefact for many functions. The weakness lies in the abrupt limit between the protected biotope and the activated areas, and the lack of a more porous intermingling of the two, as was asked for in the brief.



While people are generally afraid of empty spaces, where precise activities are not predefined, the jury proposed the honorable mention taking into consideration that in landscape design it is very important to allow for open systems that can absorb what is unknown at the time the park is constructed. A park is a facility that is going through many generations. The large clearing is an opportunity for polyvalent appropriation and unprogrammed events as the park is delivered to the public.

The juxtaposed design of the three important areas of the park separates, but also brings together parallel worlds. The seemingly hard but permeable boundary, the lawn and the protected natural area are three hypostases whose proximity enhances the particularities of each. Access points to the park, the southern boundaries of the park, the labyrinth of sports facilities and other important nodes all become “constructed nature” that mediates the transition between the three environments at a level closer to the direct, sensory, and personal experience of the individual. On the fabric thus woven, edifying gestures define dualities between the viewer and the one been looked upon. The position of the largest built structure of the park literally becomes a connecting line between the lawn and the forest using the former to announce itself and the latter to conceal its scale. In addition, and in contrast with the “simple” scheme, the 1:200 zooms show delicate transitions between open and closed places.

Project no. 108 – Special Mention of the Jury

The design stays on a conceptual level and leaves many aspects and areas of the park unexposed. However, it does introduce valuable ideas that stand out among the other competition entries. The masterplan introduces connecting figures - a running loop and two green corridors that exceed the boundaries of the park and could establish a very strong spatial, programmatic and ecological connection between the park and the surrounding neighbourhoods. Programmatically, it gives interesting proposals for nature education and it puts emphasis on a variety of user groups. The tree nursery is kept in function and even extended to feed the green spaces and green axes in Sopor. It introduces greenification as a theatrical long term process, in which active residents can take part.

While the abstraction of the plans and illustration makes it difficult to evaluate the spatial quality, the proposed ideas could lead to an innovative and exciting park.



7. FINAL RANKING

COMP. NO.	POINTS	COMMENTS
100	94	1ST PRIZE
107	87	2ND PRIZE
126	83	3RD PRIZE
120	80	SPECIAL MENTION OF THE JURY
106	78	<p>The project organizes very simply the main “parts”. It highlights specifically a sculptural land welcoming possible events with art works and a pavilion combined with a lake as a “generous land.” The overall atmosphere is more indebted to an urban park organized around two lakes as the heart of the park, one major and one minor. The seasonal events are illustrated by small sketches.</p> <p>The conceptual link between spontaneous lands and public park is underdeveloped especially as illustrated in the master plan. It is reduced to a filled “scenic walkway belt” limiting the protected area</p>



		<p>within the public “open” space. However small, a diagram translating sensorial experiences was highly valued.</p> <p>Seven main entrances rhythm the connections to the surrounding neighborhoods (the latter unfortunately not represented). However the accessibility of the area dedicated to sport facilities is weak.</p> <p>The Jury appreciates the spatial-volumetric proposal of the cultural pavillon, its contextual relationship, its interior flexibility and its landmark quality, and also the creation of a range of urban furniture from the same family.</p>
103	75	<p>This project works with a clear distribution for vegetation and programme, that builds upon the current structure of the landscape. It adds a promenade, and orchard, a lawn and a patchwork of park rooms for active leisure. It is well connected to the surrounding neighbourhoods, existing and planned. In the area between Lake 3 and the wetlands, the current pavement and program has been removed to create a strong natural connection between the two main parts of the park. The most daring intervention is the positioning of the cultural pavilion, in the middle of the park, close the protected zone. Together with the view towers it is beautifully represented, and very credible in creating a strong ensemble of built architecture with landscape.</p> <p>However, the grid of park rooms, called ‘the maze’, remains quite undefined. The concept of a maze seems to be hard to combine with the programme that is introduced; the playgrounds, sports fields, skate place and a sculpture park are placed next to each other without any meaningful interaction; the</p>



		<p>whole is no more than the sum of its parts. The main promenade seems to be oversized and too urban for its natural context.</p> <p>The visitor's center has a well-chosen position and is very-well integrated in the landscape through the powerful horizontal lines. The architectural expression and the interior space articulation are remarkable. The drafting is sensible, poetic.</p>
114	71	<p>The project focuses on optimizing the water dynamics and biodiversity, as a natural environment for human activity. The informal design is based on natural materials, landform and vegetation, is rather a collection of ideas and potentials than a grand design. It allows communities to take part in the maintenance, programming and even the design of the site. It opens up the area for almost anything: as long the choice of materials stays coherent, it could create an attractive, informal, adventurous and spontaneous landscape, where ecology and community thrive in coexistence. The design proposal is refreshing by refusing the introduction of hard park elements and looking for soft alternatives: a hill instead of a view tower, spontaneous vegetation instead of tree rows, willow follies and various constellations of wooden elements to sit, play, exercise, and so on. While usually community gardens are temporary and pushed into the fringes of the city, here it gets a generous position and space. The proposal is likely to have a small carbon footprint, and will not require the full construction budget, while it offers a clear opportunity to the residents of Cluj. It could be a valid choice to turn East Park into the city's relaxed back yard, rather than to formalize it into an aesthetic park.</p>



		<p>The use of natural materials for the architectural intervention is to be appreciated. At the same time, the intervention presents a formal mix and a heavy volumetry, creating an untenable, intrusive image in the natural landscape.</p>
112	69	<p>The project invests the existing conditions by enhancing some particular elements and assembling them in a “patch” system. It declines several transitional boundaries generously illustrated in terms of “milieux.” The water flows are investigated by introducing some earth work — cut and fill — emphasizing the edges as a dynamic fluent regulation threshold. A network of paths, from the largest to the narrowest, develop promenades regularly rhythmmed by delicate installations “observatories” in contact with the floristic and faunistic events.</p> <p>The proposal is very well connected to the neighborhoods and proposed a coherent land but at the same time the whole doesn’t allow for the distinction of major or minor features.</p> <p>The architectural interventions are very discreet, presenting formal coherence.</p>
108	67	HONORABLE MENTION
118	64	<p>The design transforms the tree nursery into an urban park with winding paths, and an even spread of diverse landmarks, programmes and vegetation. The natural areas are flanked by view towers, platforms and boardwalks. Many of the elements have been delicately elaborated; the diversity of</p>



		<p>wooden structures and vegetation is attractive, and the main pavilions have a clear spatial quality.</p> <p>The interaction between the different zones and different functions is too limited. The current bottleneck between Lake 3 and the wetland is kept in place. The vegetation is organized in plots, separated by paths; as a result, visitors always walk along spaces but only a few times get the chance to go through them. The evenly spread programme and the distance between paths and buildings introduces a similar condition and distribution of visitors all over the park.</p>
125	62	<p>The concept of the miniaturisation of the Carpathians may be a valuable hypothesis, but its translation in the master plan lacks evidence. The diagrams show that behind the 'baroque approach,' there are good intentions testifying to the in-depth reasoning of the project. A wood deck in loop travels along the preserved lands as a path of discovery. The drawings are poetically represented in master plans and sections, a quality unfortunately supplanted in the public park by a mobility network that combines the main facilities in a very rough manner (sport area, cultural pavilion etc.), in stark contrast to the dedicated environment. The series of species are precisely distributed per thirteen functions and services intermingled in a variegated pattern.</p>
117	60	<p>The design process follows a very systematic registering of the different components in sets of similar weight. The representation of the master plan is complemented with a series of small explanatory sketches. The articulation of the different typologies of places is not clearly defined and orchestrated. It looks like a 'collage.' The</p>



		<p>overall atmosphere is that of an urban park without as many hierarchies between spontaneous, 'out of control' areas and programming. Installations and pavilions are interesting, sometimes a little bit roughly represented in the visuals. It is a case where the functional reading superseded the sensitive one.</p>
119	57	<p>The Jury appreciates the intentions of the project regarding the protected areas, the community gardens and the proposed ambiance. However, the proposal contains no structure, no zoning and no sort of purpose / programming. The positioning of the softscape and hardscape is quite arbitrary.</p>
109	55	<p>The Jury appreciates the concept and the intention of a connecting pathway crossing all areas and a system that can adapt to various situations. It is a concept with great potential and the overall image is attractive. However, the result is extremely systematic and designed. Consequently, the effect is excessive, especially for the protected areas. Moreover, there is no global position in the territory and no coherent zoning structure. The playgrounds and the proposed functions seem to be dysfunctional, in terms of accessibility.</p>
110	53	<p>The project preserves the wetland and the tree nursery, and frames these landscapes with wildlife corridors. While the preservation of the wetland was required, keeping the tree nursery is a remarkable choice. It is envisioned to function as a public garden in the park, though little is proposed to upgrade its attractiveness. All built program is placed at the park entrances, functioning as gates. It can be appreciated as a clear choice that helps to define the boundaries of the park, but it also limits</p>



		<p>the interaction between architecture and landscape. In the end, the proposal is too monotonous and rigid to unlock the full potential of the site.</p>
122	51	<p>The scheme of this proposal is very systematic, with a ring of nature, and buffer zones around the central park area, and a clear hierarchy of paths. The wooden structures are a clear part of the same family. The concentration of the sports program and cultural program is effective. It is a modest project that organizes and upgrades the existing landscape. In the end it is felt to be too modest, offering too little seduction to the park visitor. The core of the park is left quite empty. The amount of natural experiences that is offered to the park visitor is limited; a walk along the central park axis or the secondary park path that surrounds the core area, might turn out a little too monotonous.</p>
101	48	<p>The design takes the central road through the tree nursery and turns it into a central park axis with four nodes; a sports cluster, a cultural center and two smaller nodes. While this straight forward upgrade of the existing infrastructure could be effective, the other interventions don't show the same formal and programmatic coherence, and run the risk to get lost in the park. The rest of the park stays quite empty. This could be a quality, but this potential has not been developed in the project proposal. While the water, the wetlands and the wet conditions of the area form the main qualities of the current landscape, the design doesn't reinforce or capitalize on them and is limited to consuming current landscape qualities through view towers and platforms.</p>



115	47	<p>The master plan envisages minimalist interventions throughout all areas — preserved and open spaces. At first sight, this appears as a quality. However, it doesn't clearly define specific typologies for spontaneous and accessible areas of the main development. The coherent representation of the whole landscape becomes a weakness, while at the same time visuals illustrate unremarkable interventions. The connection between axonometric drawing and plan is occasionally elusive. Hand drawings delicately illustrate an entire range of potential uses.</p>
111	46	<p>The jury appreciates the project's approach for the humid area and the transversal crossings. On the other hand, the project does not have a clear concept, it does not take any position regarding the nursery and it does not relate to the identity of the place. Also, the wooden pier system of the southern shore of the Lake 3 is out of scale.</p>
121	43	<p>The project approaches the protected area in a beneficial manner and it does put effort into experimenting different ideas. The intention of the project is not clear, nor the zoning. The northern entrance stairs are not efficient in terms of visual connection with the wetland because of the alignment of trees in front.</p>
124	39	<p>The jury appreciates the graphic approach and the way it expresses geometry and scales in the plan. However, the project treats the objectives of the brief only in a formalistic manner, with arbitrary gestures.</p>
116	36	<p>The project has some strengths, such as focusing on the intermediate areas and the links with other</p>



		<p>spaces, or the fact that it questions boundaries being thoughtful as to possible strategies to keep the protected areas wet.</p> <p>Even though the proposition to sculpt the topography of the site has potential and the intervention is not at all monotonous, the powerful action in the protected area appears to be substantiated solely by aesthetic intentions. It proposes a formalistic approach within the wetland and it ignores or contradicts the requirements of the brief.</p>
113	33	<p>Like a catalogue project, the project has a programmatic approach, in the tradition of the Volkspark. The contact with the existing districts is inconsistent. Although it deals with circulation, water management and other aspects, there is no larger concept to support it. On one hand, proposing a series of linked gardens is an advantage. On the other hand, the artificial and the natural are in the text described as being in opposition.</p>
105	30	<p>The idea of working with five elements is not bad as a starting point, but the rigid spatial translation of this idea is neither convincing, nor convenient. The proposal uses the elements of the ancient philosophy without proper understanding.</p>
102	29	<p>Although the Jury appreciates the variety of the proposed spaces, the proposal seems to be out of scale and the relation with the local identity and context is unclear. The proposal's reference to Constantin Brancusi's Târgu Jiu ensemble is not seen as appropriate in relation to the current context of the site.</p>



123	27	Although the Jury could appreciate the manifesto intention and the transversal connectivity, the proposal and the responses to the requirements of the brief are inadequate.
104	26	Although the Jury appreciates the intention to keep the older trees on site and the overall lightness of the proposed interventions, the park has not been drawn and the project is not finished. There is significant information missing on the boards.

This Jury Report was drafted in two copies in Cluj-Napoca, on 07.02.2021.

Full members:

Landscape arch. Catherine Mosbach - President

Geogr. Dr. Catherine Zaharia Franceschi

Landscape arch. Peter Veenstra

Arch. Radu Ponta

Arch. Toader Popescu

Arch. Tamina Lolev



Cristian Domșa, Biodiversity specialist

Jury Secretary: Arch. Ilinca Pop

Professional Advisors:

Arch. Kazmer Kovacs

Arch. Răzvan Vasiu

Competition coordinator:

Arch. Mirona Crăciun