INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION - **PIAȚA CIBIN**, **SIBIU** ANNEX 1 of the Jury Report - Points table according to the award criteria

Construire parcare si restructurare Piata Agroalimentara Cibin - Municipiul Sibiu (Concurs de solutii + PUZCP + SF + PT + DE + studii de amenajare a teritoriului) |
Numar de referinta atribuit dosarului de Autoritatea Contractanta: / Reference number issued by the Contracting Authority: 4270740_2023_PAAPD1399944

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | | 100 | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 108 | 109 | 110 | 111 | 112 | 113 | 114 | 116 | 117 | 118 | 119 | 120 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A. Meeting the spatial, functional and technical requirements 60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points) | A1. Viability of urban intervention - maximum 25 points | Ensuring a correct and viable solution regarding the way to organize traffic in the Cibin Market area, respectively the access points in the agro-food market area or the underground parking lot; Integrating the presence of Cibin River in the proposed urban planning concept; Adapting the proposed solutions to the urban context in which they operate, integrating the recommendations of the substantiation studies, especially the provisions of the historical | 10.00 | 5.00 | 21.00 | 6.00 | 16.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 6.00 | 10.00 | 19.00 | 5.00 | 23.00 | 13.00 | 4.00 | 14.00 | 11.00 | 8.00 | 12.00 | 17.00 |
| | A2. Functional quality of the proposed solution – maximum 15 points | study. Integration of all functions requested by the competition brief and judicious use of space; Correct resolution and optimization of functions and technical circuits by integrating innovative solutions; Volumetric and functional adaptation of the solution to the urban context in which it operates. The use of durable finishes, less sensitive to weathering, vandalism or the passage of time. | - 6.00 | 4.00 | 13.00 | 5.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 6.00 | 12.00 | 4.00 | 14.00 | 9.00 | 4.00 | 10.00 | 7.00 | 5.00 | 8.00 | 11.00 |
| | A3. Parking spaces numb | per – maximum 10 points | 8.68 | 8.88 | 8.21 | 8.23 | 8.63 | 8.61 | 8.08 | 8.21 | 8.61 | 8.21 | 9.60 | 10.00 | 8.11 | 8.11 | 8.11 | 8.23 | 8.08 | 8.38 | 8.63 |
| | A4. Financial offer regarding design service – maximum 10 points | | 9.02 | 9.02 | 8.89 | 9.14 | 8.90 | 8.89 | 8.89 | 8.89 | 8.89 | 10.00 | 9.07 | 9.13 | 8.89 | 8.91 | 8.90 | 8.90 | 9.90 | 8.89 | 8.89 |
| B. The expressive- environmental attributes of the intervention 40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points) | B1. Quality of the urban intervention - maximum 10 points | • The way in which the proposed built complex enhances the existing architectural and archaeological heritage; • The capacity of the proposed pranning contept to support the approach of urban regeneration of the area dedicated to the contest (the quality of the proposed functional, spatial and volumetric relationships, the way in which they respond to the needs of different categories of users: traders, producers, buyers, **Ethanhing a might level of permeability on the ground moor, so that the built complex can be easily traversed, even by those people who are not present in the area to benefit from the services | 6.00 | 4.00 | 8.00 | 5.00 | 7.00 | 6.00 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 7.00 | 8.00 | 3.00 | 9.00 | 7.00 | 3.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 6.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |
| | B2. Plastic expressiveness of the proposed volume - maximum 20 points | *fire potential of the solution to establish a model of good practice in the treatment of a contemporary insertion in a historical fabric: The representative / contemporary character of the proposed volume. | 9.00 | 5.00 | 16.00 | 6.00 | 12.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 5.00 | 10.00 | 14.00 | 4.00 | 17.00 | 11.00 | 4.00 | 12.00 | 10.00 | 8.00 | 11.00 | 13.00 |
| | B3. The quality and atmosphere of the proposed spaces - maximum 10 points | The quality of the proposed spaces and the visual relations generated, the enhancement of the silhouette of the historic center; Easy orientation inside the proposed built complex (wayfinding) and ergonomic use of spaces, in order to create an environment as friendly as possible to its users. The quality of the proposed details and finishes, the use of contemporary urban furniture; | 6.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 5.00 | 8.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 6.00 | 8.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 7.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 7.00 | 5.00 | 7.00 | 8.00 |
| | TOTA | | 54.70 | 38.90 | 83.10 | 44.37 | 71.53 | 47.50 | 45.97 | 41.10 | 56.50 | 79.21 | 37.67 | 90.13 | 64.00 | 35.02 | 68.01 | 59.13 | 49.98 | 62.27 | 73.52 |
| | | IOIAI | 100 | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 108 | 109 | 110 | 111 | 112 | 113 | 114 | 116 | 117 | 118 | 119 | 120 |

arch. Iris Gleichmann - President arch. Cristian Şandru

Professional Advisors arch. Andreea Tănase

12/6/2023

arch. Michael Engel - President arch. Gheorghe Pătrașcu

arch. Toader Popescu

arch. Ildiko Mitru arch. Astrid Rottman

Competition Coordinator arch. Mirona Crăciun

arch. Horia Moldovan

Jury Secretary urb. Louisiana Stoica

Organizig Team: arch. Ilinca Pop