



JURY REPORT OF THE COMPETITION

“ PREPARATION OF AN INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE BANKS OF SOMES RIVER IN CLUJ-NAPOCA MUNICIPALITY” Solutions Competition

DATE : 28 september – 1 october 2017

LOCATION: Strada Iuliu Maniu, nr. 4, Cluj Napoca, Romania

1. Jury:

Full members:

1. Arch. Ildiko Mitru
2. Arch. Ligia Subțirică
3. Arch. Claudiu Salanță
4. Nicolas Triboi – landscape arch.
5. Urb. Alexandre Sorrentino
6. Arch. Darko Polic
7. Arch. Dietmar Steiner

Deputy members:

8. Arch. Vlad Rusu
9. Ștefan Teișanu

2. Organisation of the jury

All the members of the jury were present at the jury meetings.

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

- technical counsellor Dan Clinci Arch.
- president of the technical committee Mirona Crăciun Arch.
- secretary of the jury Loredana Gaiță Arch.

The election of the jury chairman was done in the presence of all the jury members.

Mr. **Dietmar Steiner**. was elected Chairman of the jury.

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

In the selection of the technical commission entered 11 projects.

The president of the technical committee presented to the jury the technical committee report, which contained the check of the formal conditions from the brief and the competition rules. In conclusion, the technical committee noticed that one project did not deliver the cost estimate of the design services (the financial offer), thus it is not following the Art. 2.3.4 of the Competition Rules, namely the project with the number 59. The financial offer is required by the Romanian public procurement laws and it is the basis from which the negotiation



procedure with the winner can begin. The jury decided unanimously to disqualify the project with the competition number 59.

Into the jury commission were admitted 10 projects.

3. AWARD CRITERIA

A. ACHIEVEMENT OF THE FUNCTIONAL - URBAN AND ARCHITECTURAL DEMANDS - 50% of the final evaluation (maximum 50 points)

Assesses on a scale from 1 to 50 the compliance with the **minimal requirements** provided for in the contest brief.

Is calculated via arithmetic average of the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

A1 -maximum 20 points

Functional - urban logic and rationale of the general concept

Consideration will be given to:

- connection with the city - maximum 10 points
- proposed functions - maximum 10 points

A2 -maximum 10 points

Functional - urban logic and rationale of the concept for the areas proposed for implementation

Consideration will be given to:

- proposed functions - maximum 5 points
- detailing solutions - maximum 5 points

A3 -maximum 5 points

The manner in which the solution relates functionally and aesthetically with the built environment

A4 -maximum 5 points

The manner in which the solution relates functionally and aesthetically with the natural environment

A5 -maximum 5 points

Design delivery timeline (points awarded in the negotiation phase)

A6 -maximum 5 points

Design fee (points awarded in the negotiation phase)

B. ADDED ARCHITECTURAL - ARTISTIC VALUE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION - 50% of the final evaluation (maximum 50 points)

Assessed on a scale from 1 to 50 the architectural and artistic value of the proposed solution.

Is calculated via arithmetic average of the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

B1 -maximum 10 points

The degree of novelty and plastic expressiveness added to the functional and volumetric development in order to increase the attractiveness of the area

B2 -maximum 10 points



General and specific benefits for the city created by the new architectural landscape intervention

B3 -maximum 10 points

The balance achieved between the various studied areas and the connection between them

B4 -maximum 10 points

Feasibility and sustainability of the proposal for the reactivation of the inert areas

B5 -maximum 10 points

The quality and clarity of ideas that illustrate the competitor's ability to implement the proposed project.

Calculation algorithm for point A - minimal requirements

$A = A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4 + A_5 + A_6 = 50$ points

Calculation algorithm for point B - added value

$B = B_1 + B_2 + B_3 + B_4 + B_5 = 50$ points

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

$A+B= 50 +50 = 100$ maxim

4. Jury session:

The jury established:

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

It has been agreed that the project selection should be accomplished through several rounds of solution scheduling.

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 average of the obtained points, the last four projects were eliminated from the discussion, namely **50, 51, 56, 57**.

The projects selected after the first round to move on are: **52, 53, 54, 55, 58, 60**.

Round II

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

In the second evaluation round, the jury reviewed the six remaining projects in the competition, on the basis of the award criteria. The proposed solutions have been debated and both general and detailed observations have been made. The joint analysis generated points of view on each solution and the projects with the number **52, 54, 58** and **60** were the ones selected for further analysis.

Round III



From the resulting rank, the projects ranked in the top four were analysed in detail to determine the final hierarchy and the winner designation. The jury reached consensus and came to the conclusion that the hierarchy will be the following: **60, 58, 52, 54**.

Round IV – Prize awarding

The jury decided:

The **first prize**, design contract with an estimated value of 1.577.345 lei, no VAT included (BNR rate of exchange on 13.12.2016) goes to **project no. 60**.

The **second prize**, in the amount of 60.000 lei goes to **project no. 58**.

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

Statement of the jury

The jury wishes to underline the initiative taken by the Cluj-Napoca Municipality together with the Chamber of Architects of putting together specialists from Romania and other countries to form an independent jury as a new form of integrated competition. It is a starting point to establish a new process of selecting urban or architectural designs/ projects in connection with public and political needs. This global and integrated approach aims to bring forth a new vision, credibility and transparency in a selection process based on quality and professional skills. By sharing and crossing experiences and points of view coming from different backgrounds and nationalities, the jury feels that it enriches the vision that Cluj is looking for its urban future.

Both the diversity and the quality of the different proposals prove the true need for the implementation of the competition as a public procurement procedure, dedicated to new urban and architectural initiative.

Final conclusions and recommendations

For the project no. 60 – First Prize

The solution is centred on the idea that the river Someş is a living organism, able to provide energy to the entire community.

The proposal makes use of the transformative force of landscaping and relies on the citizens' involvement in the development of the project. It is successful in tackling the complexity of landscape concept, extending the limits of conventional urban solutions.

The project brings innovative solutions for Romania and indicates a new way to handle the relation between cities and nature.

The proposal invites all urban actors to use the city, the natural landscape and sustainable urban practices. It is a sensitive approach of the competition theme.

The project has the potential to be a best case practice in urban river management in Romania. Normally the approach on rivers is often aggressive: concrete walls, dams and destruction of wildlife and natural ecosystem. This proposal can become a true national manifesto, inviting all Romanian cities to re-think the relation with their rivers.



Slowing the stream and preserving biodiversity and the natural ecosystem are seen as sustainable solutions to maintain the natural character of the river. This project uses interdisciplinarity to team up with nature, instead of working against it.

The jury appreciates:

The idea of EXPANSION – The project envisions gaining more space for the river and, by doing this, envisions the creation of a stronger identity for the river and for the community.

The idea of CONNECTION – The project brings new perspectives of the river, resulted from a sensible remodelling of its topography and from the creation of new pathways and open spaces for the citizens. The concept of the "balconies opened on the river" brings new contemplating possibilities. These balconies resemble artistic interventions and have the potential to become iconic images of the river Someș and the city of Cluj-Napoca.

The idea of ACCESSIBILITY – The project proposes a topographic remodelling of the waterfronts, done through a variety of solutions to connect with the water: mineral – stone, sand, concrete, and vegetal: wood, grass, forest.

The jury appreciates the diversity of the river ambiances created by the project. These new spaces will allow and encourage a natural evolution of the ecosystem.

We salute the generosity of the proposal: simple, subtle and a provider of accurate solutions. The overall design of the urban elements is coherent and flexible.

The solution is an open invitation for the community to bring constant contributions to the development of the project.

The jury believes that the solution presented for the sanitation station in the East region has to be reconsidered with a stronger focus on the ecological respects and scaled up to a larger area.

We also recommend the team to plan a soft lighting scheme aligned with the rest of the project.

The project team is encouraged to study the left riverbank in the proximity of the Horea Bridge and to present a more detailed, non-invasive solution.

We recommend the team to use the project concept and approach to study possible connections between the Armătura Park, the Railroad Workers Park and the Iris neighbourhood, both being possible subjects of future design competitions in Cluj-Napoca.

For the project no. 58 – Second Prize

The project addresses the city neighbour areas, studying both the upstream and the downstream of the river, and thus demonstrating a long-term approach.

The solution is based on a solid analysis of the areas and on a good knowledge of the legal framework in urban planning.

The project is solid and compliant with the competition rules, being a proof of professionalism and knowhow. It is a complex project, combining urbanistic approach with architectural and landscape approaches.

The panel appreciates the solutions for sections 4 and 5, which envision possible sustainable development directions for the river and its waterfront.

Certain river profiles are treated in details that could be easily integrated into a technical project.

The panel appreciates the graphic presentation of the project.

Possible improvements:

- More attention should be paid to the relation between the new architectural landscape intervention and the natural environment, for example in the case of the natural ecosystem near Got Bridge (in the proximity of Grigorescu Park).



- Reanalyse the aesthetic and functional impact of some newly proposed architectural interventions, such as the German's Bridge in Zone 1 and the swimming pool complex in the Armătura section.
- The strategy of the project could leave more space and flexibility for the community to contribute to the project development and to the production of activities in the studied areas.

For the project no. 52 – Third Prize

The work proposed an analytical approach to the future process of integrating Someş River to the city of Cluj. Someş was seen as a joint factor for all important existing, built and natural resources of the city.

Panel especially values overall strategic approach of this work. The idea of “Natural River” was based on 4 layers of reinventing the river's importance for the city, by bringing upfront its values.

Both zones included in the theme were equally well methodologically treated, offering phases in a short/ medium/ long term spatial realization with not less important, map off participatory processes naming all sectors and stakeholders and their interdependence. Connectivity with wider urban context is thoroughly analysed for both locations.

The panel appreciates the proposed solution for the industrial zone, south of Armatura Park, which was treated reasonable, with an intention to keep the element of industrial heritage and to propose new developments in the public – private joint venture. The idea of the ring is surprising, while the functional and aesthetic impact of its implementation is to be thoroughly planned.

Impression of the deep analytical approach was somehow corrupted with disobeying traffic flow regulation, urban planning and mobility regulations of the city. Closing the street on the north edge of the Central park, while keeping the tramway lane, is a possible long term quality solution. However it will now cause severe problems in the traffic system of the city centre.

The proposed solution of removing the parking in front of the Napoca Hotel and planned bridges and an island in Someş are also seen as problematic and would be hard to be integrated as such in all future documents.

FINAL RANKING

CONTEST NR.	POINTS	JURY ASSESSMENT
51	33	The jury appreciates the design and planning principles detailed as Subsystems. But these principles were not expressed and showed in the presentation. It did not show enough design perspective, the main focus was too much over object versus urban layout and area problematics.
56	34	The temporary installations used as transition objects are interesting, especially in the sense of public space usage. But the project did not bring input on the relevant topic- the river as an urban scheme. The diversity and the naturality of the river zone are not taken into proper urban consideration. Also, the objects proposed lack a relation with the nature.
57	38	The connection with the city is relevant and the concept links the surrounding areas. But the principle is not expressed enough in the design of the two areas. The various built interventions lack a real relation with the surrounding ambiance. The design is not integrated in the spirit of the river.



53	43	The multiple sequences shown in the design reflect the need for reconnecting and reusing the valuable spaces. The focus on people and public use is highly relevant, especially the activities for Armătura Park section. Thinking of key points over the river's rhythm in a walkable distance is reflecting the preoccupation for the users of the public space. But the insertion of over-dimensioned building system is seen as a contradiction to the nature and the value of the historical parks.
50	44	The concept of a soft network is an asset for the reconnection of the entire ecological system of the city. The different scenarios of views show a good comprehension of the different problematics. The design for Armătura Park is overdesigned and did not integrate the river as an urban flow. The Futuristic Park shows a lot of work over the design, but the intervention does not fit in this complex urban context, it would be better integrated in an open natural environment. The design of the second area does not pay respect to the historical Babeş and Haşeganu Park, and the interventions are somehow brutal.
55	49	The proposal for temporary and movable objects shows a good design capacity, but on an urban level it does not match the concept a green development of river. The intervention in the Armătura Park is in contrast with the statement of site re-naturalisation. The concept of dividing the zones along the river and in the same time connecting them with the city shows that the overall design is in correlation with the urban strategy of the city.
54	58	The jury appreciates the thoughtful study of the urban layers of the city. The project shows a deep analysis of the green zones and blue corridors as a backbone to a global urban system. The idea that the river could act as a vector of developing and redesigning the old industrial area brings a new perspective to the overall concept. Connecting the Central Park with the sport facilities by eliminating the barrier of the road integrates the area as a whole. But, the urban scale concept was not reflected in the detailing of the two zones. The design for the Armătura Park is in contrast with the naturality of the river's ambiance and the small alleys are randomly drawn.
52	67	3rd PRIZE
58	77	2nd PRIZE
60	89	1st PRIZE

This Jury Report was completed in two copies in Cluj Napoca, on the 1st of october 2017.

Full Members:

Jury chairman



Arch. Dietmar Steiner - Austria

Arch. Ildiko Mitru - Romania

Arch. Ligia Subțirică - Romania

Arch. Claudiu Salanță - Romania

Nicolas Triboi – landscape arch. - Romania

Urb. Alexandre Sorrentino - France

Arch. Darko Polic - Serbia

Deputy members:

Arch. Vlad Rusu - Romania

Ștefan Teișanu - Romania

Secretary of the jury - Arh. Loredana Gaiță

Competition coordinator - Arh. Mirona Craciun