



**INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION
PIAȚA SFATULUI – BRAȘOV CENTRAL SQUARE
JURY REPORT**

DATE: 08.04.2022 - 10.04.2022

PLACE: CATTIA, BRAȘOV

1. JURY

- **Full members:**

arch. Johannes Bertleff
arch. Josep Miàs
arch. Phillipe Prost
arch. José Mayoral
arch. Köllő Miklós
arch. Ștefan Bâlici
arch. Miruna Stroe

- **Deputy members**

arch. Dragoș Popescu
arch. Marilena Manolache

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE JURY

The Jury members have met in Brașov, on the 8th of April. Arch. Josep Miàs (full member of the Jury) announced that, for personal reasons, he could not be present for the Jury sessions. In accordance with the Competition Rules, art. 1.5.4., arch. Dragoș Popescu (deputy member) became a full member of the Jury, through the jury's decision.

All the other members of the Jury were present for the Jury works and arch. Ștefan Bâlici was unanimously elected as president of the Jury.

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

- Competition Coordinator / President of the Technical Committee: arch. Mirona Crăciun
- Professional advisors: arch. Emil Burbea-Milescu, arch. Radu Tudor Ponta
- Jury Secretary: arch. Ilinca Pop

There were **31** 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 **31** projects.

The president of the Technical Committee presented the Technical Committee Report to the Jury, drafted following the formal verification of the Competition Brief and Rules'



requirements. Projects no. 112 and 126 did not present the Financial Proposal (in breach of the Competition Rules, pt. 2.3.4 și pt. 3,6.2). Thus, the Technical Committee has proposed the disqualification of projects 112 and 126 to the Jury.

The Jury unanimously decided to disqualify projects 112 and 126.

29 projects have been admitted in the Jury proceedings.

3. AWARD CRITERIA

When assessing the solutions, each criterion shall be scored between 0 and the maximum expressed at each criterion. The maximum score is of 100 points, the weight of the criteria being explained in detail as follows.

A. THE FULFILLMENT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL-URBAN FUNCTIONAL NEEDS

60% of the final assessment (maximum 60 points)

A1. Functional criterion - maximum 20 points

Points shall be awarded for the scenarios of use and the synergistic activities solution proposed for the square, from an urban and architectural standpoint.

A2. Technical criterion - maximum 20 points

Points shall be awarded for the feasibility of the proposed solutions, their sustainability and durability.

A3. Financial criterion - maximum 20 points

The following shall be scored:

- The best offer from an economical point of view - 5 points.

Exceeding the maximum estimated cost of the design services will lead to the disqualification of the project.

- The rationality and sustainability of the functional & spatial solution in relation to the maximum cost estimate for the investment - maximum 5 points.

Calculation algorithm for criterion A

$A=A1+A2+A3=20+20+20=60$ points, maximum number of points granted

B. THE ADDED ARCHITECTURAL-ARTISTIC VALUE

40% of the final assessment (at most 40 points)

B1. The development vision for the “Citadel” area –maximum 10 points

Points shall be awarded for the vision and strategic dimension proposed for the development of this historical area “Brasov Citadel”, both with regards to the correlation between its different spaces and maintaining the qualities of a “city that is alive.”



B2. The landmark status and the general atmosphere of the intervention - maximum 20 points

Points will be awarded for the exceptional value of the proposal, beyond all technical requirements, in order to create a design that is in accordance with the site's history and the emotional intensity it holds.

B3. The quality and clarity of the representation of ideas so as to illustrate the candidate's capacity to execute the proposed project –maximum 10 points

Points will be awarded to the graphic and stylistic qualities of the competition project.

Calculation algorithm for criterion B

$B=B1+B2+B3=10+20+10=40$ points, maximum number of points granted

Calculation algorithm for the final assessment (a maximum of 100 points possible)

$A+B= 60 +40 = 100$ maximum number of points

4. JURY SESSION – WORKING METHODOLOGY

The working sessions of the Jury were preceded by a visit to the competition site. Then, arch. Emil Burbea-Milescu and arch. Radu Tudor Ponta – Professional Advisors - presented the Competition Brief, with detailed explanations regarding the particularities of the intervention area and the requirements addressed to the participants.

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

In a first round, the Jury analysed the 29 projects individually, based on the Award criteria, and on the set of requirements expressed by the Competition Brief.

A collective discussion followed the individual analysis, after which the Jury selected the projects that offer a favourable response, as a whole, to the specific requirements of the Brief and the evaluation criteria.

The jury discussed matters related to the general approaches of the square design, the types of the interventions proposed inside the protected area, the functionality of the proposed spaces and how the solutions meet the needs of users.

Thirteen projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining sixteen projects after the first round were: **101, 104, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 113, 114, 116, 118, 120, 121, 124, 127, 129.**

Round II

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the sixteen projects that successfully passed the first round. The projects were further evaluated according to the Award Criteria and the requirements of the Competition Brief. The members of the Jury first analysed each of the projects individually, and then discussed in detail the specific approaches of each project in relation to all the aspects described by the Criteria and Brief. The projects were analysed concerning the functionality, feasibility, and rationality of the proposed solutions, but also taking into consideration the general atmosphere, the vision and the quality and clarity of the representation of the ideas presented through proposals.

Following this round of debate, five projects were eliminated.

The projects selected to go further in the third round were: **101, 104, 106, 108, 114, 116, 118, 120, 121, 127, 129**

Round III

The Jury continued the analysis of the projects remaining under scrutiny, seeking to identify those projects that demonstrate a thorough understanding of the particularities of the studied area, that meet all requirements in an optimal way, using the Award Criteria and referring to the requirements of the Competition Brief.

Six projects were eliminated in this round.

The projects that were selected following this round were the projects with competition numbers **101, 104, 108, 114, 127.**

Round IV

The five remaining projects in the competition were further evaluated by the Jury, following each of the Award Criteria described in the Competition Brief, in relation to the fixed requirements submitted to the competitors.

In this round, two of the five projects stood out for their special approaches to the square space design. The jury decided to award two honourable mentions to projects with competition numbers **104** and **127.**

The three projects that were selected following this round were the projects with competition numbers **101, 108, 114.**

Round V – Prize awarding

The jury decided:

The **Ist prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 1.484.700 LEI, without VAT, was awarded to **project number 101**

The **IInd prize**, in the amount of 74.235 RON including VAT, was awarded to **project number 114**

The **IIIrd prize**, in the amount of 39.592 RON including VAT, was awarded to **project number 108**

Two **honourable mentions** were awarded to **projects number 104 and 127**.

5. STATEMENT OF THE JURY

The International Design Competition for the PIAȚA SFATULUI - BRAȘOV CENTRAL SQUARE 2022

On the need for competitions dealing with urban and architectural heritage

It is far too rare in Romania for interventions dedicated to historic urban public spaces to be based on solutions resulting from a competition. However, there are notable precedents (we can remember, for example, that the gradual pedestrianization and development of Unirii Square in Cluj-Napoca is now a possible benchmark for the recovery of public spaces in historic cities, started with a competition). Perhaps out of reluctance towards a specialized field, insufficiently frequented. Therefore little known in its professional details, perhaps out of insufficient understanding of the importance of the gestures that (re-)shape the spaces that are essential to the life of our communities and that are also mirrors of them, we are not often faced with such an opportunity - to choose the optimal solution through competition. But today we are in this situation, for such a valuable and important space - the Council Square in Brașov!

Therefore, the Municipality of Brașov is to be congratulated and appreciated for giving the city's cultural heritage and urban fabric the attention and care they deserve and need. And so is the Romanian Order of Architects, which has been committed to promoting architectural competitions across Romania for many years, with ever more relevant results.

We start by appreciating the excellent grounding of the competition on solid historical-urban research and probing the perceptions and aspirations of the local community and the professional one. We also appreciate the good positioning of the competition at the intersection of the imperatives of preserving identity and identities, protecting and appropriately presenting cultural heritage, recovering the qualities of public space,

sustainably rethinking our living environment. The brief of the competition thus contains, implicitly or explicitly, a number of pinch points - if not challenges: 1) the confrontation with the theme of urban cultural heritage understood as a texture of values, manifested in space and time, and seen from the perspective of its integration into the life of the city; 2) the requirement to update cultural heritage, especially public heritage, which may also include topics such as the right to culture and the right to cultural heritage; 3) the democratic use of public resources, including those of space and culture; 4) the management of the complex functional needs of the contemporary city, without losing the historical values and significance of the place; 5) sustainability, recognized as an essential precondition for any building (or re-building) approach.

Optimally resolving these complex requirements was not a simple task for the participants, and we would like to congratulate them for their effort. We hope that such competitions will become a regular reality for authorities and give us all new impetus to continuously question how we understand and manage cultural heritage and urban space.

For us, the jury members, the competition confronted us with the responsibility towards the city, towards the community, towards cultural heritage: towards the quality of the built environment, which is one of the focal points of public policy in the European Union today, referred to with the German term 'Baukultur'. With this competition, we are not only connecting to a broad, international reflection, but also offering possible answers - through the projects awarded today.

The approaches of the participating projects range from conservation (with mixed nuances and meanings, including enhancement of architectural expressions of the recent past, or resource saving and sustainability in general), to regeneration and - one could say - reinvention. The jury had to evaluate these different approaches carefully and identified several projects that offered convincing - if radically different - responses to this mix of demands. Of these, three are the ones that presented optimal solutions, with valid and powerful approaches and refined - but perfectible - details.

Through the competition brief, the authors were encouraged to consider the sustainability of their proposals and to take a stance on both the existing development and the architectural gestures they propose for future generations. However, the various approaches rarely went beyond reusing existing building materials on the site in more or less feasible formulas or preserving existing terraces. With the encouragement of professionals and under the imperatives of the contemporary situation, sustainability should take its central place in the definition of any architectural gesture.

Common features of the winning projects

Grounding through study: The depth of the study that underpins both the overall attitude and design decisions expressed by each of the award-winning projects is to be commended. Their authors have added to the initial research that formed part of the competition documentation their own research, deepened or oriented in different



ways, not ignoring the study of archives, iconographic documents, topographical and cadastral documents, historical and literary sources, and - above all, not to be overlooked - the study of the historical built fabric, which is both the material and the framework of the proposed interventions.

Critical stance: All projects propose, based on their own assessment frameworks, a critical stance towards the existing situation, expressed through assumed, valuable gestures. This avoids the risk of aseptic - correct but reductive - approaches that present what the city's architectural and urban heritage offers us today in an undifferentiated and undervalued way. In particular, the authors of the projects in question have taken very clear positions on the issues proposed by the competition - dealing with the recent historical layer of the site, the intervention dating from the last communist decade; generating places and opportunities for diverse activities; developing the public space; interacting deeply with the values of the site.

Vision directed towards urban quality of life: All the winning projects express - each in a different way - a clear and valuable vision of improving the quality of life in the urban space of the Council Square. Either by generating well-individualized spaces, but integrated in the whole square, or by carefully and adaptively managing the interface between the square space and the adjacent public and private functions, or by efficiently using historical references, the winning projects give new values to this major urban core of Braşov, the Council Square.

Creativity: In a fortunate continuation with the above-mentioned aspects, the authors of the winning projects found the right way, in each case, to assume their professional role through creative gestures. Each project expresses ideas and develops creative gestures that are coherent and powerful, but at the same time set in a well-chosen and controlled balance with the historical built context.

A good capacity to integrate future needs and features: All the awarded projects demonstrate a good capacity to adapt to future needs and to integrate potential new features, such as the anticipated vestiges of archaeological research and excavations.

6. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT NO. 101 – FIRST PRIZE

The overall discourse that underpins the project is constructed around an investigation into archetypes and major themes of European culture, rather than starting from a detailed assessment of the site's history - which is not, however, left aside, but it is transferred onto a considerate work with the built fabric and visible while further considering the details of the project. The proposal reflects on the potential further opening of the facades of the Council House and invites the house to participate to the life of the square and take its rightful place. As such, the project reaffirms the central position of Casa Sfatului as the centre of gravity of the square.

The subtle differentiation of articulated spaces, both within the square and with the surrounding urban spaces, is closely related to the historical layers of the city and instantiated by designed objects that interpret historic references. This system of objects is also used to redefine the relationship between Casa Sfatului and the square and create different atmospheres, supported by the delicate continuous surface of the square. The project carefully documents this process by presenting images with an ephemeral quality that frame studied perspectives. Thus, the project seeks to capture an atmosphere that heavily relies on local heritage, instead of emphasising the current visual qualities of the fronts.

The proposal encourages the democratic use of the space and social interaction, by an effective generation of sub-spaces and places within the general canvas of the square; these places are created by means of architectural elements - a platform, articulations, seating areas - all reinforced by trees, that provide shade. The functionality of the space is suitably addressed and, by using the various objects, it creates welcome variation. The compelling subtle objects are very well calibrated to the human scale and successfully mediate the articulation with the adjacent streets. The project enhances the presence of the History Museum within the square and gives a nod to the two ecclesiastical institutions, the Evangelical Church and the Orthodox Church.

The strategy of the project is developed out of a detailed mapping of the built structure around and inside the Square, which reaches far into to the detailed representation of the internal layout of each building - transposed in plans and cross-sections (this is the only project that shows a cross-section view of Casa Sfatului). There is a careful and interesting balance between the heavy, fixed furniture and the flexible and moveable chairs that can adapt to the current and future uses of the square. The project not only supports urban life, but by its delicate articulations it encourages a lived space.

The proposal is easy and simple to realise from a practical standpoint. The details presented are refined and elaborate and support the buildability of the project in a compelling manner. As previously noted, the project further convinces by employing well represented drawings. While this is a very personal design, it also has a durable character.

Recommendations

In the complex composition of the project the symbols inspired by cattle branding do not find a suitable theoretical support and instead risk being taken too literally. Hence, the jury recommends further consideration of such symbolic elements.

As a further point of reflection, we suggest extending the emphasised network of adjacent public spaces around the citadel to other important ones, such as the synagogue courtyards or gardens that can be identified on additional mapping.

The number and placement of fixed sitting elements should be balanced in accordance with the present use of the space.

The jury also has a recommendation for the municipality in support of the idea of using flexible sitting and encourages resolving the practical issues that might arise from the necessity of protecting the chairs.

PROJECT NO. 114 – SECOND PRIZE

The project is based on a masterful consideration and interpretation of the local history. The relationship with history is delicately embodied through the proposed pavement and reinstating the old water stream. The proposal operates a reactivation of the Council House and, more importantly, of the tower, through the new seating area and secondary entrance. All architectural gestures are delicate markings of historically relevant elements.

The project builds on a very thorough and detailed study of the entire built structure of the Walled Town - Cetatea, that reveals a network of functional and historical landmarks and features and proposes a coherent vision for the enhancement of this layer through potential future projects. This overall narrative includes proposals on how to treat boundaries, focal points (e.g. the high school), public spaces at street junctions, and also proposes solutions for structural issues, such as parking outside the historic core. Varied types of pavement are proposed, in accordance with specific areas within the Walled Town; the project presents generic samples for solving these accurately.

One particular solution for spatial integration within the Citadel is the subtle completion of a green ring around the Walled Town by the plantation of new trees that would enrich the possibilities for promenades. The proposal offers a well calibrated relation with the perimeter of the square (activating the existing buildings) as well as the adjacent streets, further illustrated by including the elevations in the layout representation.

The connections to adjacent spaces are well thought out and manifested by controlled details for the intermediate areas and articulations, for instance the trace of an old bridge. The entire project relies on meaningful and delicate gestures that work well within the city. The jury appreciated the sustainable approach of reusing substantial amounts of the existing materials within the fixed furniture elements, by crushing stones and casting objects using them. The authors display a delicate and intelligent way of working with the materials, illustrated by considerate details. The variety of pavement solutions is commendable, and the material choice is very interesting in a local context, however it raises questions about the feasibility, functionality and maintenance of the space, due to its inconvenient texture for sustained walking.

Recommendations

As the surface of the square is perceived as seamless from a distance, more differentiation between spaces should be created by means other than very subtle changes in pavement.

The lived aspect of the square would be further enhanced if the authors would explore ways of making the pavement more walkable.

In order to add to the shared and democratic use of the space, the jury recommends considering including more seating areas, adapted to the current use of the square.

PROJECT NO. 108 – THIRD PRIZE

The project is referential to all the historical layers identified through the historical study. It creates a continuous topography, keeping what the authors consider the most important features reinvented in an urban collage, without a clear hierarchy between these elements. Among these, it recreates the waterflow through a new fountain and gutter or some old tree alignments near the Council House and along the north-east facade of the Square, suggesting the lost promenade along it. The trees near the House emphasise the main access, however partially hiding the north-west facade of the building and its presence in the Square. The junction with Honterus Courtyard is not emphasised further than the pavement articulation created for all the facades/properties.

There is a careful consideration of signage, inspired by documented historic examples, which traces back the commercial character of the square.

In order to show the careful consideration of historical layers, the authors chose to represent the existing surface of the square superimposed on the proposed outline.

The proposed configuration allows for most traditional events to occur (from small scale to large scale cultural events). However, the combination of the urban furniture-benches and water - partially limits the large events. The adjacent terraces have a marked presence, supported by the difference in pavement. The project approaches the entire public space of the Citadel in a phased manner, with a view into the future development of Brasov. However, the proposal to continue the paving of the central square into the adjacent streets, especially on Republicii, puts pressure on the entire network of public spaces to be refurbished in the near future, in a manner suggested by the project.

On Muresenilor street, the enlargement of the sidewalk combined with the pavement marking of the buildings allows for an enrichment of the possibilities for developing activities on the ground floor.

The project considers Casa Sfatului by emphasising its entrance, placing benches and trees in close relation, while limiting the intervention on the monument itself.

The proposed paving solutions are generally low maintenance and the materials used have a good outdoors durability and are likely to develop a charming patina.

Recommendations

The connection between the two major historical public spaces - Honterus Courtyard and Piața Sfatului - could be further explored and differentiated; currently, the pavement marks the facades and properties and there is an opportunity of integrating the semi-public space into the marking logic.

Having the large format polished granite slabs on the perimeter of the square might prove a technical challenge on a sloped topography, so further consideration of placement of different types of pavement is recommended.

7. FINAL RANKING

COMP. NO.	PT.	COMMENTS
101	93.87	1ST PRIZE
114	86.5	2ND PRIZE
108	82.37	3RD PRIZE
104	79.97	<p>SPECIAL MENTION OF THE JURY</p> <p>The jury appreciates the sustainable approach of the project, by reusing the current topography of the site and certain defining elements of the project from the 1980s. The project highlights a careful qualitative analysis of the existing components, by removing less functional parts and improving those with latent potential. The authors acknowledge the status of the fountain as an established icon that it has acquired over time and the principle of its redevelopment emphasises its value as a social hub. The solution shows maturity in accepting the recent history of the city, finding a</p>



		<p>way to work with this existing resource through adaptation rather than replacement.</p> <p>By redesigning the perimeter pavement in a unified manner, the solution succeeds in creating a coherent relation between the architectural language of the square and that of the adjacent public spaces. We appreciate the introduction of medium sized vegetation, associated in an inspiring way with urban furniture, but the placement of trees along Muresenilor / G. Baritiu street creates a spatial segregation and to some extent denies the unifying effect of the homogenous pavement in the pedestrian and road area. The choice of the graphic pattern for the central area, adjacent to the Council House, creates too strong a contrast with the perimeter area which benefits from a more restrained language.</p> <p>Concerning the existing and envisioned functions in Sfatului Square, the jury considers compelling the strategy of redesigning the existing fountain as a gathering space. However, the overall proposal limits the continuity of the space and the potential use of the square for large events due to the strong artificial topography.</p> <p>The attempt to give a second life to many of the existing pavement and the reuse of the infrastructure is one of the strongest aspects of this project. This strategy makes evident the project's commitment with the limited resources and energy. The reuse of the pavement components, marble and stone basalt, allows the team to create different configurations and geometries. The reuse of the concrete infrastructure reduces the needed investment for its execution. Despite the mentioned attributes, the feasibility of reusing a large percentage of the existing stone blocks and marble is questionable.</p> <p>For qualities of the solution, the jury proposes this project for an honourable mention.</p>
127	78.87	<p>SPECIAL MENTION OF THE JURY</p> <p>One of the valuable features of the historic structure of the Walled Town - namely the network of public spaces, connected by streets, passages and under-passages - is turned into one of the very few design gestures that make this</p>



		<p>project powerful - the visual prolongations of connecting streets and passages into the pavement of the Square. A second historical layer that informs the project is derived from the investigation on the interface between public and private space, as it is shown by iconographic sources. The result is providing inspiration for an interpretation of historical shading of shop windows, to create a system of awnings around the perimeter of the Square. This defines an intermediate stripe - outside and covered - for terraces, to define a commerce-and-services buffer around the open space. The disposition of trees along the south-east front of the Square, along the former Corso, the fashionable public promenade, and around the Council House, indicate a conscious and positive relationship with the historic values of the place. However, they do require a certain revision in respect to the overall questionable effect of too many tree alignments in a relatively small space.</p> <p>The project consciously emphasises the quality of open space - provided with minimal infrastructural features - to freely accommodate and enhance use, be it for social, economical or cultural reasons. Thus, it clears up a wide central area of the Square and creates the already mentioned buffer around it. The unifying gesture takes the form of a uniform pavement, a simple square-based pattern, that does recall the present paving pattern of the Square, toned down to eliminate the unnecessary bold colour and material contrast. This programmatic approach is derived from the analysis of the historic core, and it is extended in a series of potential further proposals, coherent with the one for the Square, to be extended to other significant public areas of the Walled Town.</p> <p>The functional scheme proposed by the project - relying strongly on a grid of fittings embedded into the pavement - supports a non-rigid and flexible use, with purpose-built removable furniture. Thus, by means of such a simple and effective strategy, the project successfully creates the possibility for a diversity of use-scenarios to happen. The proposal to (re-) introduce a temporary market into the Square fits very well within this functional framework, thus addressing the needs of permanent and occasional residents of the area and reviving an important historic function. A further functional layer of the project is expressed by the introduction of trees into the public space, each one surrounded by a seating area, and marked out of the general pavement. This adds a very important dimension to the functional pattern of the Square,</p>
--	--	--



		<p>the free social interaction, striking a balance between free, democratic use, and commercial use. However, such an end would have been much better served by a free disposition of trees, and not by the proposed alignments. The simple structure proposed by the project - uniform pavement, a few gravel areas, paved border stripe - make for an overall simple and easy to build solution that also requires minimal maintenance, adding to the sustainability of the project</p> <p>For qualities of the solution, the jury proposes this project for an honourable mention.</p>
118	75.92	<p>The jury appreciated the global approach to the citadel, with the Square as a focus point of the pedestrian routes and other smaller piazzas. While trying to adapt the positions of the pedestrian routes along the main facades of the Square or the positions and form of the fountain, it creates a new powerful axe of the water which is cutting the main free space in a less fortunate manner than the previous natural water course. The enforced axial direction for the Council House is not the most fortunate decision.</p>
129	74.23	<p>The jury appreciated the use of vegetation that creates different areas within the square. However, the atmosphere and the use of vegetation seem to be more suitable for a park than for a mediaeval old city. The geometrical solution is too rigid, with no elements that establish a conversation with the facades. In addition, Casa Sfatului is not participating in the square, it simply sits on a plate.</p>
120	69.87	<p>The jury appreciated the enlargement of the pedestrian circulation on the north-western facade of the Square, on Muresenilor street. The grouping of the trees is appropriately creating pockets of shadow within the Square. The urban furniture in front of the Council House is creating fragmentation and the use of a playground is not a flexible choice. Some of the urban furniture is appropriate, while other, as the lighting posts, are too overwhelming in size. The occasional traffic lanes along the facades are too differentiated from the rest of the pavement, creating a powerful limit.</p>



106	69.37	<p>The jury appreciates the intention of the project to unify the urban space by choosing a uniform graphic pattern of the pavement, but the design is too aggressive in proportion and chromatics. The introduction of medium sized vegetation is beneficial but the alignment of the trees along Muresenilor Street visually separates the spatiality of the square. The building housing the public toilets is uninspiringly configured and located in the immediate vicinity of the Council House. The project contains no proposals for commercial signage within the square.</p>
116	67.94	<p>The jury appreciated the images describing instances in the Piața Sfatului Square urban public life. However, the induced geometry is fragmenting the space, while the real intentions about the Square are not clear. The new interpretation of the water presence in the Square, the toilet entrance or the night lighting have an over-designed geometry.</p>
121	67.87	<p>The jury valued the interesting design based on curves that relates to the facades' fronts and the historical presence of the water channel. The unity of the materiality of the proposal was also well received. However, some aspects of the proposal were not well calibrated, according to the jury. First, the random positions of the trees do not unfold the potential of the vegetation as a generator of different spaces and pockets of shadow. Second, the urban furniture presented comes from a catalogue and are not designed as distinct elements. Third, the colour of the facades is missing, which does not facilitate the understanding of the relation between the intervention and the facades. Finally, the pavement surface encounters the facades with no gesture or mediation and intersects with the existing streets in a questionable way.</p>



107	62.63	<p>The project uses a substantial amount of the vertical systematisation of the 1980's project, by maintaining the steps and the fountain position. The pavement is relatively neutral. The interstitial void between the front along Muresenilor and the Council House is fractured by the street paving and the proposed green space, which also eliminates the presence of the Council House facade. The use of vegetation is ambivalent: on the one hand it successfully hides the entrance to the public toilets, while on the other it reduces the impact of the Council House along Muresenilor street. The proposed night time illumination emphasises two facades of the Council House, but leaves the other two and Muresenilor in almost complete darkness.</p>
124	59.40	<p>We appreciated the proposal of a homogeneous pavement that unifies the square space but the arbitrarily introduced graphic axes generate an artificial centrality and unjustified segmentation of the public space. We consider the introduction of vegetation to be beneficial but the placement of trees parallel to the built frontages systematically obstructs the visibility of the facades.</p> <p>The proposed details create contradictory situations such as the intersection of the pavement axes and the arrangement around the trees.</p> <p>The size and positioning of the building housing the bus stop and the bicycle parking is inappropriate, generating a residual space in relation to the Council House.</p>
110	56.23	<p>The square is treated as a uniform paved surface, which carries on beyond the strict perimeter and accentuates the seamless character of the space. The entrances to the square are announced by the paving treatment of the articulations. The solution emphasises the entrance to the Council House by a different paving and level, possibly suggesting a historic level. The planimetric conformation of the fountain creates a gathering pole for the square and the community, while the long bench is a spatial barrier and hinders the perception of the facades. The design objects are placed in the square by delicate visual gestures. Apart from the fountain, the solution does not propose other shaded urban spaces that could be democratically used during summer.</p>



113	55.29	<p>The jury appreciates the sustainable approach of the project which recovers the current topography and some defining elements of the 1980s design but the superimposition of new design elements over the existing layout is uninspired. The graphic representation is imprecise and confusing. The proposed solution does not resolve the articulation of the proposed development with the adjacent urban spaces. Lack of technical skill in resolving construction details is noticeable. The project does not contain proposals for commercial signage within the square.</p>
111	54.81	<p>The importance of the Council House is emphasised by the orientation of the pavement grid and the shape of the fountain. However, the treatment of the space between the Council House and Muresenilor street is ambiguous, as is the connection to the Black Church. The directionality of the space is contradicted by the diverging pathways towards the church and the fountain. The vegetation offers shading for the terraces, but being placed too close to the facades, it masks them. The traffic is screened by vegetation, but this also breaks up the spatial continuity. The urban furniture is not very detailed, especially regarding the relationship between terrace tables and trees.</p>
130	53.86	<p>The jury appreciated the space around the fountain and the possibilities and interaction conditions that it creates. At the same time, the attempt to preserve the memory of the current design of the square through the seating areas and bleachers is interesting. These elements connect the fountain with Casa Sfatului, creating different places to gather and engage with the square.</p> <p>Even though the project has some attributes, some challenges were not well resolved. The primary artificial topography undermines the potential unitary use of the space, the network of corten connections is disruptive, and the abundance of gestures, from the lighting features to different textures and materials, do not create an apparent coherence and relation between themselves and the rest of the square. Last but not least, the use of materials is not sufficiently explored.</p>



117	53.25	<p>The jury appreciated the clear representation of the ideas. However, the proposed solution is dividing the Square into two parts which are treated too differently. The green space also acts like a powerful limit between the two areas.</p>
100	52.81	<p>The project re-evaluates the historic promenade and, by maintaining the position of the fountain, it connects the two relevant urban squares. The jury appreciated the substantial recycling of the 1980's layout as an economic solution, by maintaining the fountain placement and the existing steps/platforms. However, the project does not offer a solution for the traffic and by using the vegetation screen it further isolates the front of the square beyond the street, destroying the seamless aspect of the historic square. This is further emphasised by using a different paving along the street. The steps break the continuity of the space and do not support large scale events.</p>
102	47.03	<p>The graphic aspect of the central paving is in fact egocentric and it is not rationally motivated. The jury appreciated the solution that resurfaces the 1980's project as an economic one, as it maintains the existing topography. The project relies on the strengths of the 1980's project. The project also emphasises the promenade and the historic position of the trees; however, by using large canopy and tall trees, the surrounding facades and the Council House are obscured. The composition attempts to emphasise the main entrance of the Council House. While using a unifying pavement, the project misses the opportunity to resolve the articulation with the urban space around the Black Church. In contrast with the central paving, the perimetral one is appropriate and varied, and the urban furniture is suitable.</p>
125	44.64	<p>The jury appreciated the strategy of reusing the pavement and how it refers to the existing pattern, but it is not designed very effectively. In addition, the set of elements included in the project does not contribute to the square's unity. The main object, the scaffold structure, is an obtrusive gesture for the public space.</p> <p>Last but not least, the dialogue of the proposal with the existing fabric is not well calibrated.</p>



119	45.40	The project is trying to create several areas for different uses in the Square. The repetitive symbol of the city gate is not a fortunate element to be used in the Square, creating ambiguity. The multiplication of tree alignments is completely masking the north-east facade and affects the Square as a whole.
109	39.89	The jury appreciates the sustainable approach of the project that recovers the current topography and tries to unify the space through a unitary pavement. The design of the proposed objects and urban furniture is not in harmony with the rest of the proposal. The constructive details are incomplete and inaccurate.
105	37.87	We appreciate that the project recalibrates the footprint of the road so as to enhance the spatiality adjacent to the north-western street front and proposes to use Muresenilor street as a shared space. The proposal restores the spatial integrity of the square using an homogeneous pavement but the arbitrary choice of the materiality and the model of the pavement is inappropriate in relation to the architectural and historical context. The proposal fails to define distinct places and its approach is too generic. Using a layering based on a graphical symbol does not lead to a valid guiding concept for the urban design solution.
123	37	<p>The jury valued the intention to create a continuous surface. However, this new topography is not solved from a technical standpoint and breaks the connection between the civic and the religious squares. In addition, this blanket has a similar approach to all the spaces and does not allow to create different areas within the Square.</p> <p>Last but not least, the choice of material is not the most appropriate option. The brick does not dialogue well with the existing context, and it can be read as a misplaced historical reference.</p>
122	36.46	The project aims at facilitating multiple and diverse uses in the Square. However, the pavement curves induce too powerful directions, creating a conflict between the buildings and the



		design. The patterns and colours are not specific to the context.
128	32.13	The jury considers the attempt to accommodate a variety of uses within the square a positive strategy. However, the proposal creates boundaries that fragment the space with no clear beneficial intention. In addition, the proposal is represented as a flat surface without answering the questions that the given topography of the site raises. Also, there is not a well calibrated dialogue with the existing fabric, especially with the vertical planes that define the square's boundaries.
115	30.16	The jury appreciates the reintroduction of a waterway on a historic route and the creation of an attractive public space in the vicinity of the Council House. The project proposes an excessive and chaotic populating of the public space with various objects and street furniture, using an incoherent architectural language in defining these objects. The design of the various paving surfaces is arbitrary and not adapted to the spaces and buildings adjacent to the square.
103	28.95	The project tried to create a soft topography, without barriers, but the scale of the intervention distorts the historic character of the square. The project introduces a new vertical accent in the square, in the shape of a mound which obscures the Council House. The extension of the Council House with the stage, also annihilates one of the facades of the monument. The solution is quite architectural and not informed by urban planning.

This Jury Report was drafted in two copies in Braşov, on 10.04.2022.

arch. Ştefan Bâlici – Jury President

arch. Johannes Bertleff



arch. José Mayoral

arch. Phillipe Prost

arch. Köllő Miklós

arch. Miruna Stroe

arch. Dragoş Popescu

arch. Marilena Manolache

Professional Advisors:

arch. Radu Tudor Ponta

arch. Emil Burbea-Milescu

Competition coordinator:

arch. Mirona Crăciun

Jury Secretary:

arch. Ilinca Pop