



PARC LACUL MORII – LACUL MORII PARK, SECTOR 6, BUCHAREST
INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION

JURY REPORT

DATE: 28.10.2022 - 30.10.2022

PLACE: Mincu House, Headquarters of the Romanian Order of Architects, BUCHAREST

1. JURY

Full members:

landscape arch. Dimitra Teochari (Greece/Germany)

landscape arch. João Nunes (Portugal/Switzerland)

arch. urb. Benjamin Kohl (Germany/Romania)

arch. Mihai Munteanu – Representative of the Contracting Authority

arch. Rudolf Gräf (Romania)

arch. Sorin Istudor (Romania)

arch. Radu Ponta (Romania)

Deputy members

Biologist Ioana Mihaela Georgescu (Romania)

arch. Răzvan VasIU (Romania)

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE JURY

The Jury members met in Bucharest, on the 28th of October. Landscape architects Dimitra Teochari and João Nunes (full members of the Jury) announced that, for personal reasons, they could not be present for the Jury sessions. In accordance with the Competition Rules, art. 1.5.4., arch. Răzvan VasIU and biologist Ioana Mihaela Georgescu (deputy members) became full members of the Jury, through the jury's decision.

All the other members of the Jury were present for the Jury works and arch. Rudolf Gräf 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. urb. Mihaela Hărmănescu, arch. urb. Sorin Vasile Manea

- Jury Secretary: arch. Ilinca Pop
- Organizing team: urb. Louisiana Stoica, arch. Raisa Parpală.

There were **11** 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 **11** 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. Following the formal verification, the Technical Commission concluded that all projects complied with the Competition Rules. A total of **11** 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. MEETING THE FUNCTIONAL & LANDSCAPING AND ARCHITECTURAL REQUIREMENTS

60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points)

Evaluates the minimum requirements set by the competition brief on a scale from 1 to 60.

It is calculated by the sum of the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

A1. Landscaping criterion - maximum 20 points

The following will be scored:

- Capitalizing on the development potential of the area at a conceptual level and integration into the green-blue system of the city;
- Coherence of the visual-aesthetic relations of the proposed arrangements in the implementation area with the existing natural and built context (the ability to form a coherent landscape);
- Concepts of planting, arrangement and perception;
- The selection and composition of the proposed plant material in relation to the conditions of the site;

A2. Functional Criterion – maximum 20 points

The following will be scored:

- The opportunity and complementarity of the proposed functions at a conceptual level with the existing natural and built context at the scale of the area and, as the case may be, of the city (the vision for the study area);
- The quality (accessibility, the ability to form a coherent functional system, the clear functional structure of the layout of the future park) of the resolution of the functional relationships between the component sub-areas of the landscape ensemble proposed for implementation and vicinities;
- The functional versatility of the proposals (multifunctionality, the exercise of some activities depending on the time of day or year) and the consequent resolution of accesses, routes and platforms;
- Resolution of the proposed functional units, with representation at the activity level (types of sports, cultural and social activities, landscaped beach, etc.) – detailed spatial compliance;
- Solving auxiliary functions (vehicle parking, building arrangements, etc.);

A3. Architectural-Volumetric Criterion - maximum 10 points

The following will be scored:

- The quality of the architectural-volumetric solution for furnishing the park (proposed constructions and elements of urban furniture used). The typological coherence of the objects/volumes and the ability to form compositions will be appreciated;
- Integration of existing buildings and new ones in the proposed landscape context (atmospheric coherence);

A4. The financial criterion – maximum 5 points

The following will be scored:

Compliance with the investment and design ceiling indicated in the tender documentation – 5 points.

***Exceeding the maximum estimated cost leads to the disqualification of the project.**

For falling within the ceiling indicated by the lowest price, the maximum score (5 points) is awarded; for other prices, points are awarded proportionally.

$$P(n) = [\text{Price}(\text{min}) / \text{Price}(n)] \times 5 \text{ pts}$$

The score (P(n) = max. 5 points) is awarded as follows:

- a) For the lowest of the offered prices (marked Pretmin) 5 points are awarded.
- b) For the other prices offered (marked Price(n)), the score P(n) is calculated proportionally, as follows:

$$P(n) = [\text{Price}(\text{min}) / \text{Price}(n)] \times 5 \text{ pts}$$

A5. Sustainability criteria - maximum 5 points

The following will be scored:

- Solutions for plant material recycling and waste management, with graphic representation in plan (technological equipment and flows);
- The quality of the materials used from the point of view of sustainability and how they relate to the idea of "natural setting";
- Solutions for the use of renewable energy in the operation of the park, identified/graphically represented;

B. ADDED ARCHITECTURAL-ARTISTIC VALUE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION

40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points)

Evaluates on a scale from 1 to 40 the architectural-artistic value of the proposed solution.

It is calculated by the sum of the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

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

B2. The urban "attractor" force that the park will have following the intervention and the ability to adapt over time - maximum 10 points

B3. The quality and clarity of the representation of ideas in such a way as to illustrate the competitor's ability to implement the proposed project - maximum 10 points

Calculation algorithm for point A – Minimum requirements

$$A = A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4 + A_5 = 60 \text{ points}$$

Calculation algorithm for point B – Added value

$$B = B_1 + B_2 + B_3 = 40 \text{ points}$$

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. Then, arch. urb. Mihaela Hărmănescu and arch. urb. Sorin Vasile Manea – 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 the first round, the Jury analysed the 11 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 issues related to the general directions of the approach to the design of the intervention area at the conceptual level and its integration into the green-blue system of the city, the types of interventions proposed, and the concepts of planting, landscaping, and perception, the resolution of the functional relationships between the component sub-areas of the landscape ensemble proposed for implementation and the neighbourhoods and how the proposals respond to the needs of the users.

5 projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining 6 projects after the first round were: **100, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108.**

Round II

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the six projects that successfully passed the first round, seeking to identify those projects that demonstrate a thorough understanding of the particularities of the studied area and that meet all the requirements in an optimal way, using the Award Criteria and referring to the requirements of the Competition Brief. The projects were analysed in terms of the functionality, feasibility, and sustainability of the proposed design solutions, but also in

terms of the overall atmosphere, vision, quality, and clarity of the representation of the ideas presented in the proposals.

In this round, one of the five projects stood out for its outstanding approaches. The jury decided to award an honourable mention to project 106.

The projects selected to go further in the third round were: **100, 103 and 105.**

Round III – Prize awarding

The jury decided:

The **Ist prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 2.677.700 LEI, without VAT, was awarded to **project number 100;**

The **IInd prize**, in the amount of 148.254 RON without VAT, was awarded to **project number 103;**

The **IIIrd prize**, in the amount of 74.127 RON without VAT, was awarded to **project number 105.**

An **honourable mention** was awarded to **project 106.**

5. STATEMENT OF THE JURY

The International Design Competition for the LACUL MORII PARK, DISTRICT 6 BUCHAREST 2022

The future of densely developed and highly urbanized cities depends on the structure and the quality of free and natural spaces within. Lacul Morii and its future park represent a significant ecological potential and a resource of unbuilt land that the administration can recover and develop for the community. The sector 6 administration intends to strategically preserve and enhance the ecological and climatic role that Morii Lake has as part of the green-blue infrastructure of the city.



The present competition organized by the local authority and OAR is the instrument needed to identify the best and most innovative design solution with the objective of keeping, enhancing and connecting the area around Lacul Morii within the green-blue network of the city, by adding an ecological, climatic and leisure role to the hydrotechnical it already had. The competition brief describes a large spectrum of issues and contemporary requirements specific to open spaces adjacent to large, open bodies of water, presenting the competitors with the opportunity to address them from a multidisciplinary perspective and with a good understanding of the area from a historical, ecological, urban, and functional point of view. All these layers are juxtaposed as to propose a connection of the lake to a partially existent, partially desired, green infrastructure of the city.

The answers the competitors found and proposed confirm the jury's opinion of the added value that an international design competition has in finding excellent solutions for complex objectives of public investment. The submitted proposals offer a large array of interdisciplinary solutions, well calibrated within each project as answers to the brief's challenges. They also show how "Lacul Morii" park can become a model for future design within the present context of climate changes and excessive urbanization crisis. The jury did an in-depth analysis and had an extensive debate with regard to the proposed designs and the instruments each competitor developed, evaluating and re-evaluating the solutions based on how well and how completely the brief's criteria were met and if a convincing answer to the problems was presented.

The jury considers as highly valuable the way the proposals structured the solutions for the implementation area with the more general planning concepts for the larger study area. This approach offers the administration the chance to investigate possible solutions to connect the future park with its surroundings and the Dâmbovița River corridor towards the north west (Dragomirești Vale) and the south east (Văcărești Natural Park). The jury recommends that the planning concepts presented by the competitors be used as elements within the project briefs for future planning solutions along the aforementioned directions.

The differentiation between the various projects was a lengthy process and the final hierarchy was set by unanimous consent after an extensive professional debate. The winning project presents convincing solutions to the brief's requirements and provides directions for future space planning designs by the local authority. It is the jury's opinion that the quality of the winning design ensures a durable and sustainable development of



the area with a high potential of becoming a landscape planning and open spaces development and management model.

Given the unquestionable importance of the project, the jury offers several recommendations that we hope may guide the contracting authority in the better implementation of the project:

1. Formation of a working group of experts from institutions and other stakeholders in order to continuously coordinate the process of development and implementation of the project, including (among others):
 - representatives of the Bucharest Municipality and the local administrations of the adjoining sectors and communes, including their departments for green spaces
 - representatives of Apele Române
 - representatives of A.D.S.
 - representatives of the companies administering the municipal networks
 - representatives of NGOs and the civil society, especially concerning urban ecology, sports (nautical but not only) and accessibility for persons with disabilities
2. The start of a process of public information and consultation, in order to integrate suggestions and critics in the further development and implementation of the project.
3. Coordination with the real estate developments proposed for the adjacent lots in private ownership, in order to implement a common and unitary spatial concept based on the proposals from the competition, by implying the owners / developers.

We consider it important for the local administration to designate a team responsible for project management in order to ensure the desired quality during the further development and implementation of the proposed solution, including also follow up, supervision and maintenance of the park after finishing the building site. A collaboration with biologists/ecologists in the process of monitoring the development of biodiversity and in establishing the park's maintenance and operation plan is vital in order for the Lacul Morii Park to become an example of sustainable development.

In order to enhance the value of the designed solution of the park, and to obtain a coherent development of the adjacent urban area, as to integrate the lake in the green-blue system of the city, the administration should initiate an urbanism documentation - PUZ for the entire area, as far as the western and northern administrative limits. The PUZ will establish new urban regulations, new functions and new principles of urban

development and will include proposals for the update, expansion, and optimization of the existing motorways, pedestrian and velo roads.

The jury encourages the local administration to take over the proposed connections of the park with the green-blue network and the existing green spaces in the area as design briefs for future implementation.

6. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT NO. 100 – FIRST PRIZE

The project establishes with the greatest accuracy the role of the development of the “Lacul Morii” park in space and time: from a temporal perspective, the design requires and imposes a reconsideration of the role that the great public works and massive urban projects of the 1980’s have within the city; from a spatial perspective, the project proposes pertinent and subtle spatial expansions and bonds a park must have, mainly with its immediate surroundings but also with the city as a whole. The spatial concept strategically extends towards the superior and inferior Dâmbovița waterway as a necessary way to stay grounded in ecological, urbanistic, and social facts.

The project shows a highly sensitive approach to the landscape as a whole, with its different degrees of anthropic influences, as it delivers a blueprint for a larger area than requested in the brief. The ecological rehabilitation and recovery processes included are reverberating in the entire 6th District throughout the Crângași Park, Marin Preda Park and the north-eastern polder area as well as the southern lake shore and the Dâmbovița waterway to the southeast. By doing so it sets a first step into the rethinking of the development of a green-blue infrastructure in the northern part of Bucharest.

The contribution to further the biodiversity of the area is defined by three strategies: defining a wetland forest in the polder area, growing the complexity of water vegetation, and introducing a complex mixture of native plants.

Vegetation is structured on four levels of height with a gradual transition from the lowest on top of the dike to the highest towards the urban areas nearby. This ensures a dynamic spatial parkour along all directions.

The landscape design is based upon a linear composition favouring a clear walking and planting path network along the park while generating depth by overlaying multiple stripes along them as successive and overlaid filters. Considering both directions this instrument allows dynamic variations of perception during the promenade, but also strengthens differences between impressions during contemplation.

The project strategically pursues the need for better walkability and pedestrian accessibility in the city, in equilibrium with the opening of active mobility networks. Those are highly important for the future development of neighbourhood areas along the park, as the main mobility needs should be covered by bike, pedestrian, and public transport.

The design proposal reveals a deep understanding of how programmed and spontaneous activities can follow one another in a landscape without disturbing planted areas and reducing the impact of built areas. The design language for different pavilions also serves as an indication for the sensitive nature of the architectural concept, inspired by nautical imagery.

The project values the island as a central focus of the landscape design, through the density and diversity of activities made possible, relatively autonomous from the usual functioning of the park and its alleys. As a potential destination of a promenade, the island's design proposal allows for an inverted perspective from the horizon towards the shores.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended to separate more clearly areas of nautical sport from areas of biodiversity.
2. Understanding the need for sport amenities, a reconsideration of density and grouping them in one area is advised.
3. A further refinement of the architectural language proposed should be adapted for existing built structures (especially those on the island).
4. A clearer attitude toward the important existing trees should be formulated, as well as of their roles in the suggested compositions.
5. In order to better substantiate the competitors' claims at biodiversity, the jury recommends further limitation of the use of species and cultivars alien to the European continent.

PROJECT NO. 103 – SECOND PRIZE

The landscape design envisions a green corridor connecting areas on the northern Dâmbovița waterway with the Marin Preda park, inside the neighbourhood, and with the Crângași park, as a seamless extension of the park and a connection with the commercial and transport hub.

The consistent ecological connection is shaped as a linear urban forest, concealing the lake and dike, while revealing the surprisingly diversified areas and activities in the park. The park itself is shaped as a string bundle - forest, dike, promenade - the system of diagonal alleys guides the visitor through a great variety of habitats from city tree alignments to the interior of forestry bodies, going up to the level of the tree corona and finally culminating with the opening to the lake horizon.

The project builds up a relation to the water, contemplative and distant, using a series of balcony like structures with a distinct rhythm, and alternating with ponton type structures on the water and small beaches allowing for direct and immediate contact.

The clustered concentration of sport amenities in the existing industrial area (subzone 3b) can become an advantage if this area is delayed from urban restructuring.

Contrasting the general, soberly character of the solution, the detail of the design shows a variety of forms and architectural elements, including existing urban furniture, specially designed furniture alluding to the name of the lake (windmill lake) and its identity.

Recommendations

1. Defining and ensuring that the ecological link functions in each stage of the development.
2. Expanding biodiversity development by eliminating foreign, potentially invasive species in favour of local plant communities.
3. Diversifying the plantation plan in the northern part of the site in order to increase the spatial complexity and enforcing the forest character of the proposal.
4. Careful consideration of the land ownership situation for an immediate implementation process.

5. Throughout the detail phase of the design process, the project should further consider the compatibility of the compositional approaches of the island and of the area along the shores of the lake.

6. Architectural structures can be further shaped to better integrate within the natural landscape and between each other.

PROJECT NO. 105 – THIRD PRIZE

The design proposal delivers a project with great formal consistency, as the logical continuity of the pathways crosses spaces of various atmospheres that flow one into the next. The organic design language of the spatial frames is in harmony with the landscape elements and the spatial distribution of greenery, planted pockets and tree groups. The sensitive and integrative attitude regarding the existing vegetation is highly appreciated.

The project enforces connections along the dike, while obstructing connections toward the urban fabric.

The treatment of the island is original, as the main intervention is architectural, in the form of an elongated pavilion dedicated to various uses and contemplation. It is placed on the northwestern side while the southern and eastern part of the island are planted intensively, ensuring intimacy for the beach. Planned and spontaneous activities share among themselves the ample lawn that separates the different atmospheres.

The promenade alley ensures a diverse pathway to follow for visitors. It connects all spatial elements, pavilion, tree groups, meadows, and water as one functional landscape.

Recommendations

1. In depth study of the connections and measures to improve functional and relational continuity between the future park and nearby urban areas.
2. Analysis of opportunities for the reconfiguration of the public street grid in favour of pedestrian and active mobility use, respectively in favour of the development of biodiversity.
3. Further considering the land ownership situation in order to ensure a timely project implementation.
4. Detailing the planting design for a better understanding of the concept and resulting spaces.



7. FINAL RANKING

COMP. NO.	PT.	COMMENTS
100	90.41	1ST PRIZE
103	80.41	2ND PRIZE
105	70.01	3RD PRIZE
106	64.02	<p>SPECIAL MENTION OF THE JURY</p> <p>The proposal is extremely interesting, approaching the area as a territory with depth and mass, not only a surface. The solution and the suggested technologies are taking into consideration the body of water from the perspective of climatic engineering.</p> <p>The project stands out by the way of coherently integrating technology to manipulate micro-climates and ecological construction methods in the design; the proposed interventions are meant to diversify the climatic systems, fauna, and flora of the area, generating ecological diversity and beneficial local micro-climates.</p> <p>The geological and topographical qualities of the proposal are explicit. The use of earth, natural and vegetal soil create a new landscape and an original topography, a new structure that defines varied perceptions and geomorphological compositions where a whole new ecological system can settle and thrive.</p> <p>We suggest to the team a slightly more pragmatic approach to the requirements of the brief and a more thorough analysis of the technical aspects of the design – for example, the pedestrian</p>



		<p>walkway across the lake in the north-south direction seems unrealistic for technical reasons, neither is it anchored in the spatial / volumetric concept of the project.</p> <p>For qualities of the solution, the jury proposes this project for an honourable mention.</p>
108	43.01	<p>The jury acknowledges that the proposed park will be an attraction point and it will have an integrator role in the fragmented urban context of the city. The clarity of concept for each area and their continuity creates a coherent space and the good quality of the presentation was much appreciated.</p> <p>From a landscaping point of view, the list of the proposed plant and tree species is not completely in accordance with natural parks, some of them being prone to uncontrolled expansion. A more diversified and dynamic plan for the planting was required alongside with a clearer description of the concepts.</p> <p>Lastly, the choice of the architectural style and volumetric solutions used for the proposed buildings are very invasive and adversely affect the overall sustainability of the design.</p>
107	42.00	<p>The jury recognizes the quality of the concept and the logical disposition of the various functions around the lake as well as the approach the competitors made with regard to the surface of the lake and the surrounding areas of the city and considers that the project shows a pragmatic approach that allows for effective future implementation.</p> <p>The plant selection for the park is explicit but is only sketched for the more natural areas, and the planning of the polder area , though interesting and potentially educational, is unsustainable. Also, even though central elements of the park and important in relation to the water, the composition of plants and trees and the design of the facilities is insufficiently addressed.</p>



		<p>The spatial quality of the park, though correct, coherent and pragmatic, is not overly original and uses rigid compositional principles that in the end lower the overall quality and flexibility of the design.</p>
110	40.10	<p>The jury appreciated the complex approach with regard to all the zones proposed in the brief, their functionality and flexibility as well as the study of the possibility of implementing the design in several phases. The continuity of the pathways and routes along the bank of the lake and the connectivity with the neighborhood areas were also much appreciated.</p> <p>However, the choice of plants and trees is not optimal since it proposes rare and exotic species. The jury considers the architectural and volumetric solutions for the various functional structures as one that is not harmonized with the general concept, leading to an elevated degree of anthropization of the landscape, especially on the island.</p>
101	37.04	<p>The jury appreciates the author's interest for the sloped areas and the level of detailing in this respect, but unfortunately, the proposals are not technically feasible.</p> <p>There is a major discrepancy between the proposed naturalization of the lakeshores and the rigid geometry of the park. The plant plan remains schematic and is lacking detailed information about herbaceous species. The locations of the different functions and areas for activities - apart from the sport fields - are not clearly defined, especially the proposal for the island is not complying to the competition brief.</p>



104	33.01	The jury appreciates – on an ideational level – the proposal to re-naturalise the studied area, but does not consider it to be sustainable, nor answering to the competition brief. The proposal is not corresponding to the artificial origin of the lake and, even though it wants to be radically ecological, contradicts itself by the implementation of the proposed functions and the landscaping concept (especially by the selection of species proposed for planting). The connections with the surrounding context and the adjacent neighbourhoods are ignored.
102	22.03	The project is presented with visual impact, but the proposal remains on a schematic level. The jury appreciates the suggested connections with the adjacent neighbourhoods and the integration in the green-blue system of Bucharest, but these good intentions are not sufficiently worked out and detailed. Specific indications about the species proposed for planting are missing.
109	15.04	The proposal is not convincing regarding landscaping, the plant plan and the selection of materials are not corresponding to the natural context. The architectural and landscaping solutions are not sufficiently detailed. The proposed functions are fragmented and in parts exaggerated, especially on the island and in the floodable area, raising doubts about the sustainability of the interventions.

This Jury Report was drafted in two copies in București, on 30.10.2022.

arch. Rudolf Gräf – President

biologist Ioana Mihaela Georgescu

arch. urb. Benjamin Kohl



arch. Mihai Munteanu

arch. Sorin Istudor

arch. Radu Ponta

arch. Răzvan Vasiu

Professional Advisors:

arch. urb. Mihaela Hărmănescu

arch. urb. Sorin Vasile Manea

Competition coordinator:

arch. Mirona Crăciun

Jury Secretary:

arch. Ilinca Pop