



LICEUL LUCIAN BLAGA – LUCIAN BLAGA HIGHSCHOOL, CLUJ-NAPOCA
INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION

JURY REPORT

DATE: 03.03.2023 – 05.03.2023

LOCATION: Onisifor Ghibu Theoretical Highschool, Cluj-Napoca

1. JURY

Full members:

- arch. Michál Cohen (UK)
- arch. Anca Mihalache (UK)
- arch. Tamás Fialovszky (HU)
- arch. Daniel Tellman (RO)
- arch. urb. Vera Marin (RO)
- arch. Irina Tulbure (RO)
- arch. Eleonora Dulău (RO) – Representative of the OAR Territorial Transylvania Branch

Deputy members

- arch. Andreea Mureșan – Representative of AC
- arch. Dragoș Dascălu (RO)

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE JURY

The Jury members met in Cluj-Napoca, on the 3rd of October. Arch. Urb. Vera Marin, (full member of the Jury) announced that, for personal reasons, she could not be present for the Jury sessions. In accordance with the Competition Rules, art. 1.5.4., arch. Dragoș Dascălu (deputy member) became a full member of the Jury.

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

The following persons were present next to the jury:

- Competition Coordinator / President of the Technical Committee: arch. Mirona Crăciun
- Professional advisors: arch. Elena Stoian
- Jury Secretary: arch. Raisa Parpală
- Organizing team: urb. Louisiana Stoica

There were **33** 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, **33** projects were admitted to the Technical Commission procedure.



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 Committee concluded that one project does not comply with the provisions of the Rules, infringing articles 3.7.6, 3.7.7, and 4.1.7 of the Competition Rules and proposes, based on Article 2.3.4 of the Rules to the jury, the disqualification of project number **122**. The Jury unanimously decided to disqualify project number **122**.

A total of **32** projects have been admitted in the Jury proceedings.

3. AWARD CRITERIA

In evaluating the solutions, each criterion will be given points between 0 and the maximum value indicated for each criterion. The maximum total score is 100 points. The weighting of the criteria is explained as follows:

A. FULFILLMENT OF THE SPATIAL, FUNCTIONAL and TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points)

The compliance with the minimum requirements demanded by the competition brief is evaluated 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. Spatial quality of the intervention – maximum 20 points

The following will be scored:

- integration of the intervention in the urban context, compliance with the regulations and urban conditions of the area, consideration of the relationship with the vicinities, with the existing and preserved buildings, and with the areas of interest in the vicinity - maximum 12 points
- the proposed urban landscape - the viability of the urban arrangements, the roadway/pedestrian area, the parking areas, the transitions between the public spaces and the educational complex, the way of relating to the existing built and vegetal background, etc. – maximum 8 points

A2. Functional quality of the proposed solution – maximum 25 points

The following will be scored:

- compliance with the program (integration of all functions requested by the competition brief), compliance with the standards and norms regarding school buildings, sports halls, etc. – maximum 10 points
- functioning of the overall proposal and the optimization of the space usage, their accessibility, versatility and flexibility in ways that are appropriate to the functions and in relation to the proposed scenarios of use, the possibility of subsequent adaptation to new ways of use– maximum 15 points

A3. Technical value: energy concept and means of realization – maximum 10 points



- the energy concept in relation to the current regulations regarding energy economy – maximum 5 points
- the economy and rationality of the means of realizing the project in order to limit the construction and operating costs – maximum 5 points

A4. Financial criterion – maximum 5 points

The following will be scored:

Falling within the maximum cost estimate for the investment and design indicated in the competition documentation – maximum 5 points.

*Failure to meet the maximum cost estimate leads to the disqualification of the project.

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

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

The score ($P(n) = \text{max. 5 points}$) is awarded as follows:

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

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

B. THE EXPRESSIVE-ENVIRONMENTAL ATTRIBUTES OF THE INTERVENTION, THE ADDED VALUE OF THE PROPOSAL

40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points)

The architectural value of the proposed solution, respectively the added value that the solutions bring to the correct and adequate resolution of the competition brief requirements is evaluated on a scale from 1 to 40. It is calculated by the sum of the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

B1. Artistic expressiveness of the proposed intervention in itself and in relation to the vicinities – maximum 25 points

- the overall concept, the architectural, urban planning and landscaping expression, the quality and clarity of the representation of ideas – maximum 20 points
- the representative/contemporary nature of the proposed complex – maximum 5 points

B2. The character, quality and atmosphere of the proposed spaces – maximum 15 points

- the quality of the proposed spaces, the experience of different categories of users – maximum 10
- the adaptation of details and finishes to the specific needs of each function – maximum 5

The calculation algorithm for the final evaluation of the projects is as follows:

Final score (maximum 100 points) = criterion A score + criterion B score

Criterion A score (maximum 60 points) = $A1 + A2 + A3 + A4$

Criterion B score (maximum 40 points) = $B1 + B2$

4. JURY SESSION – WORKING METHODOLOGY

The working sessions of the Jury were preceded by a visit to the competition site. Then, arch. Elena Stoian – the Professional Advisor, presented the Competition Brief, with a detailed explanation regarding the particularities of the intervention area and the requirements addressed to the participants.

It was agreed that the selection of the projects would be made through several rounds of analysis to identify the most suitable proposals.

The Jury agreed upon the following working method:

Round I

In the first round, the Jury analysed the **32** 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 an overall favourable response to the specific requirements of the Brief and the evaluation criteria.

The jury discussed issues related to the general directions of approaching the modernisation of the Lucian Blaga High School and adjacent streets. The overall approaches proposed by the projects were discussed, at a general level, in terms of the integration of the intervention in the urban context, by respecting the urban regulations and conditions of the area, the consideration of the relationship with the vicinities, the existing and preserved buildings and with the areas of interest in the vicinity, and the proposed urban landscape, through the viability of the urban arrangements, the road/pedestrian area, the parking areas, the transitions between the public spaces and the educational complex, the way of relating to the existing built and vegetal background.

13 projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining nineteen projects left after the first round were: **100, 101, 104, 107, 109, 111, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 125, 126, 130, 131, 132.**

Round II

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the **19** 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 the Brief.

The projects were analysed in terms of the functional quality of the proposed solution, and in terms of the energy concept, and the means of realising the usage scenarios, in the context of the long-term project development. The jury focused their attention on the solutions' compliance with the programme by their ability of integrating all the functions



required by the competition brief, compliance with the standards and norms for school buildings, as well as optimising the use of space, accessibility, versatility, and flexibility in ways appropriate to the functions and in relation to the proposed use scenarios, and the possibility of subsequent adaptation to new ways of use.

Following this round of debate, **12** projects were eliminated. The projects selected to go further in the third round were: **104, 113, 117, 119, 121, 130 și 131.**

Round III

The jury continued the analysis of the remaining projects, seeking to identify those projects that demonstrate a thorough understanding of the particularities of the studied area and that respond to all the requirements in an optimal way, using the award criteria and referring to the requirements of the Competition Brief. They also took into account both the plastic expressiveness of the proposed intervention in itself and in relation to the vicinities, and the quality of the proposed spaces, the experience of the different categories of users and the adaptation of the details and finishes to the specific needs of each function.

4 projects were eliminated in this round.

The projects that were selected following this round were the projects with competition numbers **119, 130 și 131.**

Round IV – Prize awarding

The jury unanimously decided:

The **Ist prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 3 564 809 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 119;**

The **IInd prize**, in the amount of 75 000 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 131;**

The **IIIrd prize**, in the amount of 40 000 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 130.**

Two honorable mentions were awarded to **project numbers 113 and 121;**

5. STATEMENT OF THE JURY

International Design Competition for the LUCIAN BLAGA HIGH SCHOOL, CLUJ-NAPOCA

This is a public competition to extend and modernise the split Lucian Blaga school, a school built in the 1970's in one of the most notable housing districts of the 1960's which is particularly well preserved. It is only natural that the design competition creates

exemplar schools within this community where 21st century learning environments are celebrated.

The Cluj Napoca Municipality and the Romanian Order of Architects should be congratulated to have run an ambitious, well organised competition to improve the school facilities and consider how the existing buildings can be transformed to provide a more innovative learning environment. There are new and more modern ways of teaching and they require new types of spaces within our schools.

Themes brought to the table include:

1. How to deal with a school split on two sites and improve the urban realm for the school and local community;
2. How to add sensitive interventions to the schools within this context;
3. How to produce a cohesive solution that puts as much effort into the new facilities as the old;
4. Careful consideration of the landscape and topography to become a resource for the school;
5. Creating child/student centred environments that are a delight to both learn and teach in.

Solving all the constraints and opportunities within both sites and the urban realm was not easy for the competitors but they should all be congratulated in their creative solutions.

The jury could not find a perfect project but we could find a few projects that were more successful than others. At the end we unanimously chose the scheme that resolves all these issues very well but not perfectly. We have made recommendations where improvements should be considered and hope that they are implemented.

An appropriate response:

In the given context, we believe a balanced solution that respects but responds positively to the existing is more important than grand gestures. We are encouraging a timeless architecture that will be easy to maintain and cost effective to run but at the same time with the ability to change over time.

Common themes that run through the most successful schemes:

- We looked closely as to how the proposals improved the urban realm in the wider context and responded to the grain of city in this area.
- A contextual response was essential understanding the topography and views from the two sites
- We liked schemes that created a public gesture at the entrances to the building – giving space back to the city. The line between the public and private spaces needed to be carefully considered to avoid the current statu quo of narrow pavements with high fences and unwelcoming gates.
- The community use of the spaces and external facilities needed to be convincing.

- The schemes that did well considered carefully how to create interventions within the existing buildings where learning is celebrated with a variety of spaces and transparency between spaces.
- All spaces should be well lit and ventilated with a clear idea of the proportions and how the space would be used.
- We expected a careful consideration of the architectural language that knitted together the new and old.
- The use of the outdoors to provide pupil centred spaces for outdoor learning, learning through play, social spaces and sport spaces.
- Acknowledgement that sustainability needs to be addressed in more detail in the next stage but where there was an ambitious agenda.
- Solutions that accommodate all of the programme in a delightful convincing way.

The jury acknowledged the complexity of the brief especially because the school programme was not clearly defined between the two sites. We were surprised and delighted by the large number of entries and appreciate the time and energy each team has sent on developing their ideas. We found good ideas in all the entries.

6. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT NO. 119 – FIRST PRIZE

The winning proposal responds holistically to all aspects of the complex brief and offers an **outward looking exemplar solution**. This is particularly innovative for the current Romanian educational infrastructure. The team's scheme has given careful thought to how best to design for young people in an all through school.

A1 The proposal is a delightful response to the surrounding urban fabric, as well as the wider landscape and topography. It establishes positive links to the park on the east side and improves connectivity between the two school sites and also to the neighbourhood alley network, with an emphasis on active mobility, traffic calming, urban pockets and play areas.

We enjoyed how the team provided a public plaza to the north, acknowledging the relationship to the commercial centre, allowing easy drop off and pickup and a safe space for a school bus. The transition from the public realm to the school grounds is via the main entrance space which also articulates the old and the new buildings is particularly successful.

Appropriately, the southern site benefits from a more modest plaza that works equally well.

Stepping back the secure line to the building frontage at key points is an elegant solution for the public-private interface, generous to the community in giving back spaces for public use.

It is suggested to remove the central parking and make space for an urban lookout point towards the bigger landscape and the rolling hills to the east. This should be considered by the local authorities when re-designing wider neighbourhood parking strategy.

A2. The design team has kept the primary and early years in the northern site with secondary and high in the southern site. They have placed a new building to the north of each site, housing the larger, more public spaces, that tend to be used by the local community.

The intervention on the existing buildings brings out the best of the existing layout in terms of modularity and potential for opening up, providing a wide variety of formal and informal teaching spaces.

Accessibility is another strong point. The overall connectivity across and between both sites is particularly successful, resulting in a legible, inclusive environment.

A real strength is the landscape proposal within the school grounds, providing a well-balanced variety of external spaces for pupils of all ages and different activity interests.

The community functions are clearly located close to the schools' entrances, ensuring ease of management.

A3 All sustainability intentions are stated clearly and supported by the jury. The agenda should be developed early in the next stage of the project to ensure seamless implementation.

B1 The architectural concept of creating a south facing multi-level U shape composition on both sites opening to the south is powerful and will result in a delightful environment that will benefit all users.

The landscape concept complements the architectural one with a very strong response, zoning the school site legibly. There are no incidental leftover spaces on the school grounds.

The team has clearly presented their ideas graphically and in writing, making it easy for the jury to understand the careful thought given to the proposal.

The proposed architectural language unifies the old and new, which is to be commended, but we encourage the team to be more ambitious in their aspirations with regards to external building materials to ensure the building will engender a sense of pride for many generations to come.

B2 The winning project delights through the intentional and aptly resolved suite of outdoor and indoor spaces, that support an inclusive experience, with parts of the building easily opened up to the community either after or during school hours if so desired.

The team have carefully considered the interior materials palette, proposing a mix of timber with acoustic absorption which will contrast well with the more robust external

materials. The jury welcomed the library options, demonstrating once again that the team is flexible in their approach to the design of key spaces in the school.

We believe this thoughtful design solution will result in a child/student friendly school, both inside and out, capable of also catering to what parents, teachers and the community need from this public building.

Recommendations

- Reconsider basement and try to omit;
- Reconsider the levels to the northern plaza, more aligned with the topography
- Bike storage is not fully resolved and needs to be in the secure area.
- More attempts to link indoor and outdoor at ground level, particularly in the existing buildings, in order to improve active learning and social spaces.
- Increase transparency between classroom and circulation to encourage the corridors to be used as an extension of the learning environment; passive supervision is essential.
- Consider integrating limited green/growing walls to improve biodiversity across the sites
- The Local Authority should work with the team to find an elegant solution for parking in the wider walkable neighbourhood;
- School management should be open to the new ideas for the spatial layout that will allow a more innovative and student-centred pedagogy.

PROJECT NO. 131 – SECOND PRIZE

The proposal sets another, different example as a very strong, clever, and effective response to the internal brief requirements, thus showing how an entire educational infrastructure could be transformed for the 21st century. This is by contrast to the winning scheme an inward-looking exemplar solution.

The proposal, is very efficient in extending towards the street site of the schools, doing without the large external spaces between the pavement and the edge of the building and maximising the school grounds to the east.

However the jury does not feel that the same attention to detail has been given to the external spaces within the school premisses, the landscaping proposal being too generic and lacking variety.

A1 The team addresses the link between the two sites by slowing down traffic and creating urban pockets. However, they have not considered the treatment of the neighbourhood alleys in much depth.

The north building places the entrance to the school to the west, resulting in a very long frontage onto the street that we feel may be uncomfortable in this setting. By contrast, the urban agora solution to the south site is inspirational. The treatment of boundaries has been aptly considered to avoid long areas of fencing to the street.

The relationship of the northern outdoor play space to the community will result in a weak urban response. We would also recommend a different approach to parking on both sites to avoid eating into play/outdoor space.

A2 The proposal locates the early years and primary on the north site with secondary and high on the south.

The jury was impressed by the functional simplicity of this scheme in terms of how the learning spaces operate indoors. The addition of accommodation to the west of each site results in a deep plan, creating the opportunities for different types of learning to take place at all levels of the school in close proximity to the other functions of the school ensuring good passive supervision of these breakout spaces – essential if they are to work correctly. The team has used this opportunity to position the toilets to the centre of the deep plan with minimal technical disruption, at the same time designing out areas for bullying.

The beauty of this scheme resides in its simplicity – it delivers a compact but dynamic and flexible building, that also has the potential of being extremely energy efficient.

The proposal falls short in the resolution of external spaces.

A3 The jury appreciated the coherence of the architectural response but the environmental proposal is questionable because it suggests an extensively glazed solution which impacts both cost of construction and running costs.

We also appreciated that no basements have been created in the slope, on the other hand, this has a detrimental impact on the landscape design and use of the school grounds, at least in the proposed solution.

B1 The general concept of a tight massing by adding the additional accommodation to the west is clever and creates an efficient new building in one simple gesture. The team have suggested rooflights and voids in the northern building to gain natural light into the deepest part of the plan.

The urban concept is not as well resolved because of the long northern building and the location of the entrance. However, the southern solution is exemplary.

The scheme has very clearly - demonstrated a high level of professionalism - making it easy for the jury to see the new interventions.

The scheme is highly ambitious in proposing an aspirational vision, but less so for the outside spaces. We believe the winning scheme should demonstrate a careful balance between providing an aspirational presence in the community and fitting into its context. We are not convinced this scheme has this balance quite right.

B2 The proposal does open well on the ground floors to the landscape but the landscape in the school grounds as a whole remains unresolved, with little identity.

The community and inclusive use of these buildings are bound to be good owing to the simplicity of the concept. We question the location of the sport and canteen -locations in the northern building but appreciate their co-location.

The materials and furniture in the two schools appear to be better suited for older pupils.

Recommendations

- The community element of the northern block should have a better relationship to the commercial centre and the long elevation onto the road should be reduced.
- A more sustainable elevational treatment should be explored;
- The external learning environment and landscaping in the school grounds should have the same care and attention as the internal space, providing a variety of outdoor spaces that are age appropriate and address different activity interests.

PROJECT NO. 130 – THIRD PRIZE

This scheme is a very strong response to the urban and wider landscape context. It splits the secondary school between both sites which was questioned but we agreed that this could be a managed solution where the younger pupils of the secondary school remain on the primary school site to the north. This is to be confirmed as appropriate by the school management.

The scheme is not dissimilar to the winning proposal in that it creates extensions to the north on both sites but this proposal creates a semi-enclosed large public plaza to the north that relates to the commercial centre.

A1 The north-south orientation of the new northern block relates very well to the urban grain to the - east of the sites and this was appreciated as a good way of integrating the proposal into the urban context. The entrance to the southern building is not as successful because a new plaza is intimated but not clearly demonstrated between private and public open spaces.

The linking between the two sites has been well considered but the large parking area between the schools is not a good element in the landscape when the priority should be given to pedestrians and pedestrian links with views to the park.

A2 The access to the sports hall on the southern block is not considered well enough (narrow stairs and two floors down that are not ideal for younger pupils). This will impact the accessibility and seamless use of these facilities by the wider public. In addition, the location of a block of the teaching above the gym raises concerns about these spaces being easily accessed by all students. Not to mention the technical challenge of building cellular spaces above a sports hall.

The team has added a new intervention to the west of the southern site that is welcoming in creating a visual link between all floors however we question the value for money of this gesture given that the proposal is 5% over the area.

A3 All sustainability intentions are stated clearly and supported by the jury and should be capable of implementation.

B1 We support the idea of building to the north of each site and by turning the new building on the northern site in north-south orientation it creates a very pleasant, safe waiting area for parents as well as a statement in the community. The urban response is strong as are the architectural solutions to the elevations. Consideration has been demonstrated with sun shading to southern elevations. Equal consideration should be given to improve the look of the existing buildings.

We believe the building presence in the community will bring pride to the school community.

Graphically, the scheme is not clearly labelled in places, and this led to some confusion.

B2 The team has not made the most of the relationship between indoors and outdoors in both the teaching wings and the shared functions such as dining.

The jury liked the internal images showing a robust material pallet but including the warmth of timber. The intent to open to the community is indicated but it needs further refinement and management to make this easily accessible.

We commend the team for the entrance sequence in the north building that will delight.

The jury is concerned about the isolation of the teaching areas above the sports hall.

Recommendations

- A solution should be explored that omits the extra floor above the sports hall;
- The jury questions the necessity of the basement and the use of an ASHP solution if the sites are connected to the district heating main;
- The southern building needs a fully designed urban forecourt;
- Reconsider the amount of glass and curtain walling in the new buildings;
- Toilets should be redesigned to minimise areas for bullying;
- Secure bike storage should be integrated seamlessly with the landscape proposals and if possible moved from the fence line.

PROJECT NO. 113 – HONORABLE MENTION

Similar to the winning scheme this places new buildings to the north of each site and a pavilion in the landscape for the northern site.

This team proposes a clever solution to move the early years and primary pupils to the southern site allowing the more public northern site close to the commercial centre to be used by the older pupils. This takes pressure off the external areas of southern site because less internal accommodation is required.

This proposal gets a special mention because of its sensitive integration with the wider context and the delightful architectural expression that puts equal emphasis on the old and new giving the school community a sense of pride. This scheme successfully balances the old and new.

It is unfortunate that the pavilion splits the community use to both the north and south of the northern site which will make this difficult to manage. In addition access to the sports pavilion can only be reached by going outdoors.

We found a lack of ambition to create innovative learning spaces within the existing buildings (not opening up, retaining very long corridors with no transparency).

In adding the additional accommodation to the northern block a new east-west wing is added that houses many of the teaching spaces. This results in too many north and south only facing classrooms.

Catering located only at the furthest southern end of the south building will not be well used by the older pupils who will be drawn to use the commercial centre.

PROJECT NO. 121 – HONORABLE MENTION

The typology is slightly different in this sensitive scheme in that it adds single storey podiums as a unifying feature to each school along the road. The sports facilities are sunk into the sites on the eastern side of the existing buildings. We appreciated that the edge treatment to both schools are different: a garden given to the community separates the school building with the road for the northern building. The southern building that houses the older pupils has the addition of a curved podium creating the boundary to the school.

This proposal gets a special mention because of its sensitive proposals around greening and sustainability. We were taken by the fun graphics of the presentation.

The additional floor on the northern building is questionable as to its buildability and suitability for the youngest children.

We like the idea of vertical connection within the school but question the resolution in the northern building.

The new façade in the north building is a good element but we do not believe the team have resolved the internal functioning new stair with the punched elevational treatment.

The canteen/dining room is only located in the northern building which is considered acceptable but its segregation from the sports hall means easy community use will be difficult to achieve.

7. FINAL RANKING

COMP. NO.	PT.	COMMENTS
119	90,04	1 ST PRIZE
131	85,04	2 ND PRIZE
130	81,04	3 RD PRIZE
113	76,09	HONORABLE MENTION
121	74,58	HONORABLE MENTION
117	72,04	<p>The jury appreciated the openness of the proposal towards the street and the public spaces around, and the quality of the street design. There is a strong intention of connecting the two sites and the drop-off area was well solved in relation to the main entrance.</p> <p>The proposal of putting the secondary school and the highschool both on the southern plot leads to an overbuilt surface, with little exterior spaces left. Also, in regards to the interventions on the existing buildings, putting the secondary and highschool together on the southern plot led to forced classrooms in wrong positions with less fortunate proportions.</p> <p>The jury also appreciated the large schoolyard on the north plot which can be opened to the public. The outdoor gardens on the roof of the common areas were considered interesting and with a lot of potential. There was little detailing in the design of the terrace on the south plot. The dugout courtyard for the preschool was considered questionable in both quality of space as well as providing natural light to the classrooms especially in wintertime.</p>



		<p>The jury appreciated the different social/common spaces proposed and the way they connect in a continuous space with few separations that can give opportunities for different configurations for different types of learning. It was a nice idea to free up the middle part of the existing building but it raised structural questions that were not solved in the proposal. Some rooms have poor natural lighting as well as no visual connection with the exterior (administration, multipurpose room, offices).</p>
104	71,30	<p>The jury appreciated that the proposal has high ambitions in relation to the scale of the new school infrastructure. The scale of the intervention in the structure may result in substantial demolition and this rises a fundamental question: should we keep these buildings based on an outdated educational model or should we just demolish them in order to create a new educational building based on new models without the compromises imposed by the existing structure. Also, the jury appreciated the openness and the quality of the public spaces proposed in front of the school in relation to Baisoara street. The presentation and the quality of the images were appreciated, and they explained quite clearly the concept of the proposal.</p> <p>However, the proposal mixes secondary school and highschool and further expands the space of the southern school, in relation with a smaller plot thus giving the impression of overbuilding. The proposal for the southern plot was considered not to provide sufficient usable green space. Although the suspended bridge is an interesting element of the project, there are questions regarding how to use it, as the proposal does not focus on the interior.</p> <p>Although there are significant changes to the interior (leading to a possible unsustainable solution with construction problems), with a grandiose interior atrium, it is not really usable as a common area. In the end, both buildings, at the upper floors function more or less in the same manner as they always did, with a long corridor and spaces on each side, without gathering spaces that facilitate socialisation.</p> <p>The new interventions are on the south side of each plot, making it a problem in what concerns natural lighting of the existing buildings especially in winter.</p> <p>There are functional issues in relation to the multipurpose hall and the way it can be used by the community. The multipurpose hall has accessibility issues as all the public has to climb stairs in order to reach the gallery on the first floor. The changing rooms are at the same level as the public access hall.</p>



101	68,61	<p>The jury appreciated the interesting proposal for the covered entrance on the south plot, which assures the possibility to interact with the street and public space. Also, the intention of breaking up the newly proposed buildings and the fragmentation into smaller volumes was appreciated, giving it the impression of pavilions, a rational way of volume composition.</p> <p>The good use of materials and their combination (interior & exterior), giving the proposal a distinct quality was noted by the jury.</p> <p>On this project, the jury remarked the lack of a clear space distribution of the interior transformations (north site - existent building) and the weak focus on the urban design of the streets were noted.</p> <p>Also, a reduced climatic efficiency in designing the new and the existing building was noted, mainly due to the fact that they are separated.</p>
125	68,54	<p>The jury noted a limited but effectful intervention on the existing buildings, the quite rational functional solving (almost too formal and inflexible). Although the mixing of the spaces makes it less easy to read; this mixing of functions closes the possibilities for an optimal usage of the buildings. The unitary and coherent architecture of the building and the sincere and expressive treatment of the facades create the optimal premises for representativeness.</p> <p>The lack of a good relationship between the street and urban spaces reduces the engagement of the community - that can be seen in the insufficient interest of the proposal in designing and detailing the entrances of the schools.</p> <p>Also, the reduced design diversity proposed for the main schoolgrounds was noted.</p>



100	68,11	<p>For this project, the jury appreciated the interior courtyards which have a good atmosphere, appropriate to the program. The rich inner spaces with a nice atmosphere, the multi-level space around the library and the lobby, and the focus on inside-outside spaces was also noted. Interior material usage, the detailing, and the care for a segmentation of the active and quiet courtyards give this project a special atmosphere.</p> <p>The lack of integration of the public space and the limited openness towards the public space was noted, limiting the project against contemporary desires regarding schools and their role in the community. Residual green spaces and areas of limited opportunity are present in the layout of the plots. Difficulties in organising school activities due to the chosen distribution of functions, especially in the northern plot, had been also noted.</p>
109	68,06	<p>For this project, the diagrams are good in explaining the concept and the functional organisation. The architectural language, creating a coherent approach that unites and is still distinctive for each plot was appreciated.</p> <p>The entrances are generous and there are good intentions regarding the existing building creating interaction spaces and alternative learning spaces.</p> <p>The jury noted the weak connection proposed between the two sites. The design seems car-centered. Along the street there are barriers, thus not improving the overall quality of Baisoara alley. Some classrooms have no direct sunlight due to the parallel placing of the new building in the southern plot. Limited community usage due to a less coherent system of relations between the functions of the groundfloor was not appreciated.</p>
116	67,19	<p>The jury appreciated the diverse usages of the outdoor space, with clearly defined characters and functions. The good connection of classrooms with outdoor spaces for the smaller children was also noted. The existence of a garden pavilion for outdoor learning was appreciated although its position in relation to the plot limits is questionable.</p>



		<p>The proposal displays very little ambition in terms of design and architectural image on the exterior, with low interest in improving the overall architecture of the existing constructions. The lack of integration of the public space and the limited openness towards the public space was noted, limiting the project against contemporary desires regarding schools and their role in the community.</p>
120	66,54	<p>On this project the jury observed the good proportions and a good volume composition between old and new, also the sensitivity and respect towards the built heritage of the neighbourhood at large and for the existing buildings (especially on the southern plot). However it may be regarded as somewhat unambitious and not referencing correctly the architectural characteristics of the period when the entire neighbourhood was created.</p> <p>The diachromatic sketches show improvements in the upper floors of the north site building but the detail is sadly not existent in the presented plans. The different entrances - for the school and for the community - create uncertainty on both buildings. The very poor relationship between the inside and outside and the large retaining wall and platform are questionable. Unused pockets of landscape in the southern part were noted.</p>
107	65,11	<p>On this project, the jury noted on the entrance space connected with the amphitheatre and the library as a sensitive and well-organised gesture. Small spaces (outdoor classrooms) for small group study are a positive feature as well as the transparency of the entrance and its connection with outdoor spaces.</p> <p>The lack of integration of the public space and the limited openness towards the pavements was noted, limiting the project against contemporary desires regarding schools and their role in the community. The apparent lack of improvement of the roads and parking, not linking the schools properly in the public realm was not appreciated.</p> <p>The lack of direct link of indoor and outdoor spaces reduces the opportunities in the ground floor of both sites.</p>



132	62,04	<p>The jury appreciated the northern positioning of the extensions (so that overshadowing is excluded) and the attempt to focus the public and community-friendly spaces on the ground floor. The good wall/floor ratio improves the sustainability of the proposal and the transparent treatment of the entrances were noted on both buildings.</p> <p>The lack of focus towards breakout rooms with passive supervision in the existing buildings is not well considered. The new classrooms with the inversed depth/width ratio makes them less successful than those in the existing building. Removal of the staircase from the northern school is questionable in regards of functionality and fire hazard. Lack of detail regarding the public space in regards of drop-off and pick-up was also noted.</p>
114	59,89	<p>The jury appreciated the pedestrian connection between the two sites, separating pedestrians from car circulation. Also, the generous common spaces proposed in the extension buildings were found to be well-suited to the function. The interior provides a nice atmosphere through the good use of both the materials and the skylights proposed.</p> <p>However, the entrances are hidden and somewhat inaccessible. Alongside the fence placed on the edge of the sidewalk, the proposal does not improve the general atmosphere of the street. For the southern plot the new building is placed on the south side, blocking potential perspectives and also shading the school yard. Also, adding separate new extension buildings on both sites, unconnected to the schools makes their use difficult from the children's point of view. The treatment of the slope on the south side is not very detailed, and it seems that it does not improve the current situation. Lastly, the jury found a weakness of the proposal in the lack of an overall architectural image unity because of the contrast between a mostly kept existing building facade and the new proposal.</p>
111	59,75	<p>The jury considered the positive and detailed link between the two sites. Positioning the entrances in the northern part of the buildings is appreciated as well as the possibility of community use especially in the case of the northern building (security issues may apply though).</p> <p>On both sites the jury appreciates the extensions towards the northern limit of the plot, reducing overshadowing.</p> <p>Placing the sports court over the hall in the southern plot creates a levelled outdoor circulation which is appreciated.</p>



		<p>The focus on the southern slope is noted although developing resting places and platforms in relation to the ramps would increase the usability of the proposal. There is little intervention in the existing buildings, not developing the spatial quality of the schools. Limited links to the outdoors, little consideration, and the lack of variety of the landscaping in the schoolyard make the exterior space less desirable than it could be. The variety of architectural treatment of the facades does not create a unifying whole for the solution. Poor annotation of the drawings did make the project hard to understand.</p>
126	54,54	<p>For this project the jury considered the rational image of the entire intervention, integrated into the general image of the neighbourhood, leaning respectfully towards the original architecture. The logical intervention on the south plot, doing the extension on the northern part keeps the view to the landscape free and the courtyard well-lit. The generous spaces in the school extensions are clearly represented in the detailed axonometric schematics.</p> <p>The lack of any meaningful interventions in the existing buildings, keeping them in the same outdated typology was observed. The reduced integration of the public space and the limiting openness towards the public space was noted, leaning the project against contemporary desires regarding schools and their role in the community, resulting in pockets of unused space on the plot. Opportunities were missed in opening the ground floor towards the exterior areas proposed in the project.</p>
118	53,26	<p>The jury appreciates the proposed connection between the two sites which is separated from the car circulation. The connection between the two schools by using a running track was found to be a very ingenious solution. The general urban design was considered to be quite ambitious, changing the face of the street. The only problem was considered to be the access areas to the schools, found to be too small considering the number of users. We appreciate the intention in creating a pleasant space, however, the resulting space is a very large recreational area which remains a completely separate space in relation to the classrooms. Almost no internal space improvement to the existing building.</p>



		<p>The jury considered that the main question related to this proposal concerned the fact that the extensions for both sites were conceived as separate pavilions, fragmented, and connected in a very unconvincing and complicated fashion with the school building which could result in serious interventions on the interior. Considering the end-user - the children using this school - this solution was thought to be most uncomfortable. For both the school buildings the interior - exterior connections were not well thought of.</p> <p>The solution with an underground parking underneath the running track and pedestrian space is considered unsustainable. Also, the entrance to the parking (the proposed elevator) was not present on the ground floor plan to see its connection with the public space.</p>
105	49,04	<p>The jury appreciated the internal courtyard defined by the existing and proposed building on the north side. It provided good intimacy and atmosphere for the users. The plan of the extension on the same side was also considered very flexible and an interesting solution. The use of wooden structures was also considered a plus. However, the jury was concerned regarding the new level added to the existing building, which was not the best option for expansion as primary schools are recommended to have only 3 floors. Additionally, the different structures and systems used for one school lacked architectural unity. Another downside was the car park located next to the main entrance, which may negatively impact the user experience. Furthermore, the southern plot's opaque concrete wall related to the sports terrain had a very unwelcoming effect on the user. The unnecessary third staircase in the southern building did not add anything to the general functioning or image of the building. Finally, the fence towards the street did not add any value to the atmosphere of the street, which was a missed opportunity to enhance the school's openness to the community.</p>



106	47,04	<p>The jury appreciated the quality of the urban relation of the school with the street by opening up the fence to a certain point, enlarging the street profile. The entrances were generous but lacked an equally generous outside public space. However, the strong architectural gestures with long cantilevers for the sport halls or the greenhouse on the roof, the monumentality created through the indiscriminate use of materials (stone) made the proposal feel like it did not belong in this context. Moreover, the outdoor space underneath the sports hall was very dark and unwelcoming, and the structure was colossal, which could be a significant issue for the users. We also found that there was no clear architectural strategy in the composition of the school and its relation with the extension, and the use of the same materials for the existing and newly proposed extension did not help in creating a distinct identity. Additionally, there were accessibility issues that needed to be addressed. Finally, there is an argument that the typology of the building on the north site, the longitudinal extensions, blocked the visual connection with the landscape, which was a missed opportunity to enhance the users' experience.</p>
129	44,04	<p>The jury appreciated the conceptual links across the site but questioned how this will be resolved with school security.</p> <p>The jury appreciated that they reclad the existing elevations with the cladding of the new building but are concerned about the amount of glass from a sustainability point.</p> <p>The big gesture to cut the ground floor plans of the south building is brave but we have concern over how they will resolve security, but it would have been stronger to locate all the public uses off this newly formed covered space.</p> <p>Some improvements have been suggested to the inside of the existing buildings creating a breakout space on each upper level that will be successful but there is not sufficient detail to interrogate how the supporting spaces will work.</p> <p>Landscape of the school yards is poorly considered with little variety of spaces.</p>
103	42,13	<p>The jury liked the proposal that puts the extensions on the north side of the sites ensuring the outdoor spaces get good sunlight. There is also some consideration to the landscape on the western sides of the sites but this could have been developed further.</p>



		<p>The multifunctional space on top of the sports hall will have technical challenges in the construction but we can see how this could develop into an innovative STEM and resource space.</p> <p>No attempt to link the two sites.</p> <p>No improvement to the north building is a lost opportunity as it has been successfully done on the southern site where they have used a translucent cladding that will provide good light into the deep plan.</p> <p>School yard design offers no variety of pace and the lack of labelling makes interrogating this project difficult.</p>
108	40,18	<p>The 3D images show some learning spaces that are innovative and could be successful, however we struggled to understand where these spaces are located on the plans because there is little labelling of spaces.</p> <p>Internally, the material language and choice of furniture could result in an interesting school for older pupils only, but the architectural expression externally does not reflect the school programme which looks more like a commercial building.</p> <p>No improvement to the existing layouts internally but they have wrapped the old buildings with new facades.</p> <p>The proposal is deficient in some areas – they have not provided a sports hall on each site.</p>
102	38,04	<p>The jury appreciates the proposed generous public space in front of the northern building that will be good for both the community and the parents waiting to collect their children. Also, the entrance lobby is generous and has great views to the distant landscape.</p> <p>In the north building colocation of the community space and the sports hall separated by a courtyard could be a successful space but unfortunately, this is backed by teaching spaces which means that the separation between school use and community use would be difficult.</p> <p>However, there is no improvement internally or externally to the existing buildings which is a lost opportunity.</p>



		<p>The sports building to the south is only accessed having gone through the main school via the outdoors and then down a spiral stair with no lift access.</p> <p>Presentation and labelling could be clearer.</p>
128	37,04	<p>The idea of a courtyard could be lovely and a good way to provide a school community but unfortunately the courtyard in the south building is very large and we are not convinced that the programme needs all this space or that it relates to the topography of the site. It will also be difficult for the school to manage.</p> <p>The long southern extension of the north building is not a good urban response to the existing housing to the west.</p> <p>There is no improvement to the existing buildings either internally or externally.</p> <p>The proposal suggests a large amount of glass in the south building proposal that is good for linking to the landscape but would be expensive to run.</p> <p>The location of the entrances is unclear, but the 3D images show some promise. The lack of detail on how the programme is achieved makes this difficult to fully assess.</p>
112	35,57	<p>We applaud the team's attempt to add a simple addition to both schools reinforcing their connection. However, there is no attempt to connect the sites along the road making moving between sites more enjoyable.</p> <p>We found that the presentation was missing plans and relevant information that made it difficult to fully understand. for instance we are unclear of where the entrances to the schools are located.</p> <p>The landscape of both sites could be further developed to add a variety of spaces.</p> <p>We are not convinced of the architectural language of the new buildings and feel that the team has chosen a language with little relationship to the context or spaces internally.</p>



110	33,06	<p>There is a utopian solution to the wider issues around cars and pedestrians. While we appreciate the thought we are not sure of the feasibility of this level of intervention. We liked the attempt to create some variety externally with the creation of external classrooms.</p> <p>There is no attempt to improve the internal environment of the existing school spaces.</p> <p>The extremely long north building has an uncomfortable relationship with the housing to the west.</p> <p>The team has not taken into account the topography across the site resulting in some larger spaces being built in the air sometimes creating additional overshadowing to the sports pitches.</p>
123	31,04	<p>The jury appreciates the lovely ideas on the day in the life of a student. However there were a number of ideas which were less successful.</p> <p>The entrance sequence to the north school from the west is close to but does not connect to the community entrance and there is no clear community plaza.</p> <p>It is unclear where the public spaces stop, and the private spaces of the school start and there appears to be little improvement to what is existing.</p> <p>The additional floor on the existing north building is not confirmed as technically feasible.</p> <p>School landscape is poorly considered with no variety of spaces.</p>
127	29,06	<p>The jury appreciates the attempt to improve the spaces in the existing building, but the result is found to be unsatisfactory. The dominant composition doesn't reflect the architectural school program, while the architectural language is aggressive, not scaled for young pupils.</p> <p>The "green walls" mask the lack of facade design and raise the problem of maintenance. From an economic point of view, the chosen solution is too expensive.</p>
115	27,00	<p>We appreciate the unity of the architectural language but the result is severe, brutal and not responding to a school in this location.</p>



		The landscape is poorly considered, especially in the north site and the placement of the parking (along the Baisoara street) gives the wrong message from a “safe school street” view.
124	23,04	<p>The team has chosen to treat the concepts of the north and south sites differently – the north is a random set of buildings in the landscape and the south is a rigid orthogonal response. However, this is one school, and we question this approach.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the project lacks cohesion between buildings and is unfinished.</p> <p>The location of the building along the eastern boundary in the north site leads to a fragmented school that will be difficult to manage.</p> <p>There is no proposal for improving the street space, and although there is a strong intention to build a garden pavilion, it doesn't create a direct relation with the park or to the school building.</p>
122		<p>DISQUALIFIED</p> <p>The jury appreciates the quality of the images and of the general atmosphere proposed. The architectural language is appropriate in its context and very well done. The organisation of the highschool is considered interesting and appropriate, opening up the ground floor for common spaces in relation to the exterior. The upper floors of the highschool provide places with a nice atmosphere for relaxation, innovative learning and social interactions.</p> <p>The proposal for the northern plot was found to be lacking in functionality as well as its ambition to improve the existing learning conditions. The sports hall is difficult to access from the point of view of the pupils. The dining room is accessible only from the outside so children will be forced to go outside from their classes and then back inside. The relation between the school and the public space of the street is blocked by the proposed fence, missing an opportunity to open it up, especially in the case of the highschool which has large common spaces on the ground floor. The interior functional structure of the northern school remains mostly the same with a long corridor and classrooms on each side.</p>

This Jury Report was drafted in two copies in Cluj-Napoca, on 05.03.2023.

arch. Michál Cohen

arch. Anca Mihalache

arch. Tamás Fialovszky

arch. Daniel Tellman

arch. Irina Tulbure

arch. Eleonora Dulău

arch. Andreea Mureșan

arch. Dragoș Dascălu

Professional Advisor:

arch. Elena Stoian

Competition coordinator:

arch. Mirona Crăciun

Jury Secretary:

arch. Raisa Parpală