INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION | NICOLAE BĂLCESCU HIGHSCHOOL

ANNEX 1 of the Jury Report - Points awarded according to the evaluation criteria

EVALUATION CRITERIA			100	101	102	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	122 [·]	123 1	24
A. MEETING THE FUNCTIONAL AND ARCHITECTURAL & URBAN PLANNING REQUIREMENTS 60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points)	A1. Quality of the urban intervention - maximum 20 points	integration of new interventions in the protected built area, compliance with the regulations and conditions imposed by the protection of the area, consideration of the relationship with neighbours, etc maximum 12 points	12	7	8	10		10	-		6		2	3	5	8	3	8	4	11	7	7	2	7	3
		proposed urban landscape (solving the urban arrangements, the road / pedestrian area the parking areas, the transitions between public spaces and the whole high school, the way of relating to the existing built and vegetal fund, etc.) - maximum 8 points		8	6	8	3	6	8	2.5	6	3	1	2	1	6	1	6	2	8	6	3	0.5	4	3
	A2. Architectural quality of the proposed project – maximum 20 points	compliance with the program, compliance with standards and norms regarding school buildings, sports halls, etc maximum 5 points	5	3.5	4	5	2	5	2	2	2.5	4	1.5	2	1.5	3.5	1	4	3	5	4	2.5	1	3	2
		architectural value, qualities of the architectural concept - maximum 5 points	5	4	5	5	1	4	4	1	2	2.5	1.5	1	1	2.5	1	3.5	1	4	3.5	2.5	0.5	2.5	1
		functioning of the overall proposal and optimization of the relationship between functions the balance between the areas occupied by classrooms and the rest of the spaces (laboratories, offices, common areas, etc.), versatility and flexibility of (common and not only) space usage - maximum 5 points		2.5	4	5	3	4	2.5	2	2	2.5	1	2	1.5	3	1	3.5	2	4	4	2	1	2.5	1
		spatial, environmental, and natural lighting qualities in the school - maximum 5 points	4.5	4.5	4	5	3	4	5	1.5	2	2.5	0.5	2	2	5	0.5	5	1.5	5	4	2	1	3 '	1.5
	A3. Technical value: energy concept and means of achievement - maximum 10 points	feasibility of the structural / constructive intervention - maximum 2 points	2	1	2	0.5	0.5	2	1.5	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	0.5	1.5	0	1	0.5	2	0.5	1	0.5	1 (0.5
		energy concept in relation to current regulations on energy saving (and nZEB) - maximum 2 points	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	0	1.5	0.5	2	0	2	1.5	0	0	0 (0.5
		the materials used and the approach of some principles of sustainable development - maximum 2 points	2	1				1.5		1	0.5	1											1		
		the economy and rationality of the means to carry out the project in order to limit the building and operating costs - maximum 2 points				0.5	0	1.5	1	0.5		1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5				0.5	0.5 ().5
		the possibility of staging the interventions so that school activities can be organized during the execution of the works - maximum 2 points		2				2		0			0	0		1	0	2				1.5			0
	A4. Financial criterion – maximum 10 points	the best offer from an economical point of view - 5 points.	3.1	3	3	3	3	3	3		3		3	3		3	3	3				3.1			3
		rationality and sustainability of the functional & spatial solution in relation to the maximum cost estimate for the investment - maximum 5 points.	5	3.5	3	2	2	4	4	2	'	2	1	'	1	2	'	3	1	4	2	3	1	2	1
B. ARCHITECTURAL & URBAN PLANNING ADDED VALUE OF THE PROPOSAL 40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points)	B1. The plastic expressiveness of the proposed intervention in itself and in relation to the protected area - maximum 20 points	new constructions - maximum 10 points	10	7				7	8	5	7		3			8	2	7	4	10	7	4.5			4
		the relationship between the new interventions and the protected area - maximum 5 points	5	1.5	4	4	1.5	4	3	2	1	4	1	2	1	3	1	3.5	0.5	2.5	2	2	1.5	4	2
		urban arrangements - maximum 5 points	4.5	5	2	5	2	3	4	1	2	3	0.5	1	0	3	0.5	4	0.5	5	3.5	2	0.5	2	2
	B2. The characteristic nature, quality and atmosphere of the	indoor environment - maximum 5 points	5	5	4	5	2	3	5	2		3	1	2	3	4	1	3	2				1.5		2
	proposed spaces – maximum 10 points	outdoor environment – maximum 5 points	5	4	3	4	2	2	4	2	3.5	2	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	5	3	2.5	1.5	3	2
	B3. The quality and clarity of the re proposed project - maximum 10 po	presentation of the ideas so as to illustrate the competitor's ability to implement the pints.	9	9	9	8	7	8	10	4	7	7	3	4	4	9	2	8	4	7	8	5	3	8	4
	1	TOTAL	94	73	76	83	42	74	79	38	50	54	23	32	30	70	21	72	32	87	65	48	22	58	34
			100	101	102	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	122 [·]	123 1	124
arch. Mihaela Criticos		arch. Johannes Bertleff	Professional Advisor arch. Elena Stoian					Date: 07.11.2021																	
arch. Horia Marinescu		arch. Şerban Patrulius	Competition Coordinator																						
arch. Ştefan Tuchilă			arch. Mirona Crăciun																						

arch. Mariana Michiu

arch. Maria Duda

Secretary of the Jury: arch. Ilinca Pop