



**REGENERAREA URBANĂ A ZONEI PIETEI CIBIN – URBAN REGENERATION OF
THE CIBIN MARKET AREA, SIBIU**
INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION

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

JURY REPORT

DATE: 09.06.2023 – 12.06.2023

LOCATION: Sibiu Municipal Stadium, 2nd floor

1. JURY

Full members:

- arch. Mirjam Niemeyer
- arch. Iris Gleichmann
- arch. Michael Engel
- arch. Ildiko Mitru
- arch. Horia Moldovan
- arch. Cristian Şandru – Representative of the OAR Territorial Sibiu-Vâlcea Branch
- arch. Gheorghe Pătraşcu – Representative of CA

Deputy members

- arch. Astrid Rottman
- arch. Ioana Urdea – Representative of CA

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE JURY

The Jury members met in Sibiu, on the 9th of June. Arch. Mirjam Niemeyer, (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. Astrid Rottman (deputy member) became a full member of the Jury. Before the opening of the Jury works, arch. Ioana Urdea, the second deputy member of the jury, also informed the Organizers that she could not attend the Jury sessions.

All the other members of the Jury were present for the Jury works and arch. Iris Gleichmann and arch. Michael Engel were unanimously elected as co-presidents of the Jury.

The following persons were present next to the jury:

- Competition Coordinator: arch. Mirona Crăciun;
- Professional advisors: arch. Andreea Tănase, arch. Toader Popescu;
- Jury Secretary: urb. Louisiana Stoica;



- Organizing team, president of the Technical Committee: arch. Ilinca Pop.

There were **21** 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, **21** 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 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.6, and 3.7.7. of the Competition Rules and proposes, based on article 2.3.4 of the Rules to the jury, the disqualification of project number **115**. The Jury unanimously decided to disqualify project number **115**.

A total of **20** projects have been admitted in the Jury proceedings.

3. SOLUTION EVALUATION CRITERIA

The criteria that will form the basis of the evaluation of the proposed solutions are the following:

A. Meeting 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. Viability of urban intervention – maximum 25 points

The way in which the proposed solutions respond to the requirements resulting from the context in which they operate plays an important role in the success of the urban regeneration approach. Thus, in the evaluation of the projects, the following aspects will be followed:

- Ensuring a correct and viable solution regarding the way to organize traffic in the Cibin Market area, respectively the access points in the agri-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 study.

A2. Functionality of the proposed solution – maximum 15 points

To lay the foundations of a feasible approach, it is essential that the proposed solution meets all the spatial and functional requirements imposed by the design brief and respects the legal framework in force. Thus, in the evaluation of the projects, the following sub-criteria will be followed:



- 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.

A3. Parking spaces number – maximum 10 points

Given the desire of the Contracting Authority to free up as much of the public space as possible from the existing parking spaces on the ground, the solutions that offer the highest possible number of parking spaces for cars will be scored.

Thus, the solution that offers the largest number of parking spaces for cars will be scored with 10 points. For the solutions that offer a number of parking spaces for cars greater than or equal to the minimum number required by the brief (325 spaces), the score related to criterion A3 will be calculated proportionally, by reference to the solution that offers the largest number of parking spaces for cars.

The score (P(n) = maximum 10 points) maximum 10 points) is awarded as follows:

a) The solution that offers the largest number of car parking spaces [written NP(max)] is awarded 10 points.

b) For the other solutions (written NP(n)), the score P(n) is calculated proportionally, as follows:

$$P(n) = [NP(n) / NP(max)] \times 10 \text{ points}$$

Important! The minimum number is a mandatory requirement. Projects that do not meet the minimum of 325 car parking spaces will be disqualified.

A4. Financial offer regarding design service – maximum 10 points

The financial proposal will be scored - maximum 10 points.

The best offer from an economic point of view will be scored with 10 points. Failure to meet the maximum estimated ceiling leads to disqualification of the project.

For falling within the ceiling indicated by the lowest price, the maximum score (10 points) is awarded. For other prices, points are awarded proportionally.

$$P(n) = [Pre\breve{t}(min) / Pre\breve{t}(n)] \times 10 \text{ points}$$

The score (P(n) = maximum 10 points) is awarded as follows:

a) 10 points are awarded for the lowest of the offered prices (written Price (min));

b) For the other prices offered (written Price (n)), the score P(n) is calculated proportionally, as follows:

$$P(n) = [Pre\breve{t}(min) / Pre\breve{t}(n)] \times 10 \text{ points}$$



**B. The expressive-environmental attributes of the intervention
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. Quality of the urban intervention – maximum 10 points

• The quality of the urban intervention thus plays an important role in the approach to urban regeneration of the Cibin Market area. Within this criterion, the following aspects will be evaluated:

The quality of the urban intervention thus plays an important role in the approach to urban regeneration of the Cibin Market area. Within this criterion, the following aspects will be evaluated:

- The way in which the proposed built complex enhances the existing architectural and archaeological heritage;
- The capacity of the proposed planning concept 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, visitors)
- Ensuring a high level of permeability on the ground floor, 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 offered.

B2. Plastic expressiveness of the proposed volume – maximum 20 points

The architectural quality of the proposed built complex brings added value to both the project and the local community. With the right approach, the project has the chance to become a landmark in how to treat a contemporary insertion in a historical fabric. The following aspects will be evaluated:

- The 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.

B3. The quality and atmosphere of the proposed spaces – maximum 10 points

The criterion evaluates the ability of the project to generate spaces centered around the needs of the users (traders, manufacturers, buyers, visitors), using the proposed finishes and the relationships between the spaces to create a pleasant ambient environment.

- 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;



The calculation algorithm used 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

Scoring Criterion B (maximum 40 points) = B1 + B2 + B3

4. JURY SESSION – WORKING METHODOLOGY

The working sessions of the Jury were preceded by a visit to the competition site. Then, arch. Andreea Tănase and arch. Toader Popescu – the Professional Advisors, 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 analyzed the **20** projects individually, based on the Award criteria, and on the set of requirements expressed by the competition documentation: the Competition Brief, the Competition Rules and the “Questions and Answers” documents, which, according to Competitions Rules, point 3.4.5, are an integral part of the competition documentation. A collective discussion followed the individual analysis, after which the Jury decided to establish which of the projects complied with the eliminatory criteria of the Brief.

In this sense, the A3 Evaluation Criterion presented by the Brief mentions unequivocally that a minimum parking spaces number must be met. The Brief states: „*The minimum number is a mandatory requirement. Solutions that do not meet the minimum of 325 car parking spaces **will be disqualified.***” (Competition Brief, A3 Criterion, page 52).

A thorough verification followed, considering the mentioned eliminatory condition. The Jury noted that answers to question no. 9 in the 1st “Questions and Answers” round provide clear indications regarding what the minimum number of parking spaces required by the Brief (325) includes and does not include.

In this sense, during “Questions and Answers” session Round 1, it was made clear that the number of 325 parking spaces **does not include any parking spaces situated at the ground level adjoining the market area, nor the parking spaces used for the supply of the market, or the taxi stop.** (see the „Questions and Answers” Document Round 1, pages 4 and 5).

Based on these requirements, the Jury discussed the situation of project 107. Although project 107 indicates, in the *Table of areas and parking spaces*, a total number of 518 parking spots, the verification revealed that the calculation of this total number does not



consider the requirements of the Brief regarding the minimum number of parking spaces required for the parking building. A number of 225 parking spaces are accommodated by the P1 facility. The project proposes an additional P2 facility accommodating another 90 parking spaces, but the secondary parking building is placed outside the intervention area of Objective 1. An additional number of 135 parking spaces are placed in the adjoining area of the market and are added to the total number of required parking spots in spite of the clear indication that the total number of parking spaces **must meet the minimum of 325, not including those adjoining the market.** Thus, it was concluded that the proposal only accommodates a number of 225 parking spaces which correspond to the conditions required by the Brief out of the minimum number of 325.

Considering all facts, the Jury decided to disqualify project 107, based on the A3 Criterion's eliminatory role and the answers to question no. 9 provided in the „Questions and Answers” Document Round 1.

The remaining nineteen projects left after the first round were: **100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120.**

Round II

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the **19** projects that successfully passed the first round.

The jury proceeded to evaluate the projects in accordance with the Award Criteria and the requirements of the Competition Brief, firstly analysing the proposals individually, and then discussing collectively the general approaches of the projects in what concerns both the A chapter criteria – meeting the spatial, functional and technical requirements – viability of urban intervention, the functionality of the proposed solution; and the B chapter criteria – the expressive-environmental attributes of the intervention – in terms of the quality of the urban intervention the plastic expressiveness of the proposed volume and the quality and atmosphere of the proposed spaces.

8 projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining **eleven** projects left after the first round were: **100, 102, 104, 109, 110, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119 and 120.**

Round III

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the **11** remaining projects. 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 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 parking buildings, as well as the functionality of the agri-food market, the relation with the urban context and the natural asset of the site – the Cibin river. Each project was analysed based on each criteria and sub-criteria presented by the Brief.

Following this round of debate, **5** projects were eliminated. The projects selected to go further in the fourth round were: **102, 104, 110, 112, 116, and 120.**

Round IV

The jury continued the analysis of the **6** remaining projects and assessed them comparatively, 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.

3 projects were eliminated in this round.

The projects that were selected following this round were the projects with competition numbers **102, 110 and 112.**

Round V – Prize awarding

The jury unanimously decided:

The **Ist prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 3 734 608 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 112;**

The **IInd prize**, in the amount of 113 770 LEI with VAT, was awarded to **project number 102;**

The **IIIrd prize**, in the amount of 56 885 LEI with VAT, was awarded to **project number 110.**

5. STATEMENT OF THE JURY

International Design Competition for the Urban regeneration of the Cibin Market area, Sibiu

A new approach for Sibiu

We, the jury, have spent the last four days studying the results of the first public architectural design competition in Sibiu organized together with the Romanian Order of Architects. This deserves our compliments to all those involved: the Contracting Authority – The Municipality of Sibiu, to make use of this procurement instrument, to the Order of Architects as the professional organizer of this procedure, but above all to all

the participating competitors who invested work and energy in creative proposals for the given task.

We are aware of the importance of this competition, both regarding its involvement of different responsible actors but mainly regarding the role of the proposed intervention at the fringe of Sibiu's historic fabric. The latter adds another dimension of responsibility to the task. We also had to consider that the insertion of the new building can or will serve as a role model for further developments along the Cibin River and in the vicinity of the historic centre.

All this has put us, the jury, in a pioneering position for Sibiu and implicitly a great responsibility.

In addition, the requirements of the brief are demanding in themselves, as it is required to:

- provide an appropriate architectural solution, combining an agri-food market with a comprehensive car park,
- to propose urban design solutions for spatial connection to the inner historic centre,
- to solve problematic situations of the existing traffic in the area,
- to develop a graphic identity.

Solving all these requirements in perfect unity was obviously not easy for the competitors. We highly appreciate the efforts made by all competitors to deal with the requirements and specifications in a professional way. We would like to thank the competitors for their contributions, which formed the basis for intensive, lengthy but productive discussions among the jury members.

The jury was satisfied with the high number of competition entries and the diversity of solutions. Generally, the quality of most of the projects was considered appropriate. The jury had to weigh up solutions with different emphases, between their advantages and disadvantages. And as in any competition, especially one with such complex requirements and a high level of responsibility, we could not identify a perfect project. Some of the solutions contributed to the valid discussion but since this an architecture design competition, they could not be considered further. A number of the projects were considered to be either convincing architectural or functional solutions.

The jury proposes to the Contracting Authority to:

- acknowledge the efforts of the competitors accordingly and to present all results of the competition to the public in an exhibition,
- to promote both a meaningful dialogue of new public architecture in historic contexts and the catalytic function of design competitions in the solution-finding process.

The range of projects

We saw a wide range of projects, which could be summarized as follows:

1. There are essentially three different approaches tackling the combination of functions, required surfaces and reference to the urban fabric: a) proposing one up to three compact, rather bigger volumes often resulting in a big gesture, b) combining several smaller volumes in the attempt to adapt to existing scales in proximity and c) placing the volume partially underground under the conditions imposed by the brief, thereby reducing the height of the building.
2. There are two different categories of consideration of the historical environment of the building site: a) either a clear reference to the typical features of Sibiu (such as Sibiu eyes, roofscape, clay tiles, arcades, colors, fortification, etc.) or b) an explicit proposal for an independent solution. Only a few projects could convince the jury with a clear point of view, while the historic references were often perceived as rather artificial and indecisive. However, most of the projects proposed high quality solutions for the design of the public spaces in the area.
3. A few projects took more account of aspects of sustainability, responses to climate change, promotion of alternative modes of transport, etc. and went a step further than others. This was discussed and appreciated by the Jury. However, in a few proposals it resulted in solutions that fell short of aspects of an architecturally appropriate design for this specific site.

Solution

The jury gradually converged the choice of solutions, especially considering the first point mentioned above, which concerns the structure of the building. In a final round, the jury once again intensively discussed the following aspects: functionality, architectural expression, feasibility, consideration of the context, visual qualities, solutions for public space and traffic, and a possible role model function.

The jury members agreed that a solution should prevail which convinces through balance and not through a grand gesture.

In the end, after a long discussion and with careful consideration of all awarding criteria, the Jury thus selected the winning project, with its qualities, but also with the potential for further improvements, some of which we decided to introduce in the Jury recommendations.

6. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT NO. 112 – FIRST PRIZE

The jury appreciated the attention and detailed solutions to all the requirements of the competition brief, the rationality of the architectural and functional solutions of the building

of the agri-food market and public parking, as well as the way the proposed intervention relates to the complex urban context. The urban and architectural proposals for both objectives of the project are viable and realistic, promoting coherent and complete functional solutions and formal approaches.

A1. Viability of the urban intervention

From an urban planning point of view, in the case of objective 1, it is worth noting the privileged relationship with Turnului Street by withdrawing the new building from the alignment and creating a public space that enhances the relevant historic buildings in the vicinity, as well as the relationship between the intervention area and the historic core of the city. From the point of view of traffic organisation, the solution solves in a coherent way the requirements, proposing to link pedestrian, bicycle and car public spaces by a similar pavement treatment.

A2. Functionality of the proposed solution

The functional organisation of the project responds to the requirements set out in the competition brief, proposing a rational organisation of different utilities, clearly resolved. The proposal exceeds the parking requirements for cars and bicycles called for by the brief.

B1. Quality of urban intervention

Through the attention paid to the relations with the immediate neighbourhoods, as well as through the proposed volumetric composition, the building is carefully integrated into the complex urban context, mediating between the area of the Cibin river, the area of historical urban fabric - before the demolition of the fortifications, part of the *intra muros* area - and the two fragments of urban fabric in the vicinity of Malului street, one resulting from the interventions of extension of industrial functions after the demolition of the Honvez Barracks and the other, the result of recent developments, without obvious regulations.

B2. / B3. Plastic expressiveness of the proposed volume / quality and atmosphere of the proposed spaces

The fragmentation of the volume of the proposed construction mitigates the massiveness while allowing the creation of visibility corridors that relate the pedestrian area in the vicinity of the Cibin and the silhouette of the historic town. The architectural expression of the proposed buildings (the main one and the one located on Piața Cibinului Street at the corner of Măsari Street) is not based on the interpretation or processing of local architectural sources, but promotes contemporary materials that generate an original architectural image, marking the current intervention. The multiplication of volumes contributes to control the scale of the intervention and to the natural relation to the existing built environment. The proposed market buildings and public car park are the first illustrations of potential approaches to new architecture in the *extra muros* area, delimited to the north-east

by the Cibin river and occupied until recently by industrial buildings, targeted for restoration, conversion and reintegration into contemporary developments.

Recommendations

The jury recommends that the apparent austerity of the proposed facades could be mitigated by further study of the textures, colours and possibilities of including vegetation. It is also necessary to study the possibilities of increasing the widths of the main internal circulation routes and the height of the spaces intended for the agri-food market (ground floor), as well as the potential use of the terrace areas generated on the first level. At the same time, given the provision of a large number of parking spaces (402 compared to the 325 required by the brief) and the potential increase in structural presence on the upper floors, it is advisable to reconsider the convenience of use of some of them, as well as the slopes of the access ramps. With regard to the organization of bicycle parking spaces, the jury recommends studying alternatives, more easily accessible or included in the proposed main building. Although the project proposes a unification of the pavement textures of the neighbouring public areas, thus linking them more closely, the jury recommends a clearer linking of the newly proposed interventions for Objective 1 and the landscaped area on the south-eastern bank of the Cibin river.

PROJECT NO. 102 – SECOND PRIZE

The project proposes a solid architectural presence with a clear boundary of the building. The design tries to take its location into account, by forming a combination of the industrial architecture, in scale, the historic city in its function, and the edge of the city on the river Cibin in its position.

A1. Urban viability of the intervention

The project is minimizing the space for individual car traffic with the advantage to the pedestrians and bicyclists. It touches on the idea of a shared and greener public space. It is focusing on human scale and tries to reduce the movement of individual cars in the inner town, with a preference for walking, cycling or buses or taxis.

The building design forms a strong wall and places a row of trees along the river. With a surrounding arcade, the project picks up on the idea of the arcades of Sibiu, allowing for a dry and protected walk around and into the market hall from all sides. The open access from all directions through the market hall, brings the building into the urban fabric. At the same time the project is based on the idea of re-interpretation of fortifications. This results in an architecture which is perceived heavy and unfriendly rather than inviting.

A2. Functionality of solution

The rational of the building is very strong. The design is organized on four levels and has a structural clarity. The market hall on the ground floor allows for enclosed and open spaces, appropriate for its different functional needs. It forms a big area in the centre of the building that is used for the market and could be a new space for the city that could be made available for events. But the jury has doubts on the suggested openness and flexibility of these functions.

The design incorporates daylight for the main market area and features two green areas within, which gives it a good spatial feel. The administration space is mentioned but not shown in the plans. The Car parking and a restaurant are on the floors above. The car park has a clear structural layout on the first floor but would need further thought for its circulation on the second floor. The overlap of the different functions on the second floor is not solved. It is not clear whether the entrance / exit to the carpark fulfills the normative requirements. The restaurant, placed on the second floor uses the advantage of the view over the cityscape into the mountains, at the same time a view on to the open market, which gives a nice quality. The project proposes an integrity between a brick façade and a copper roof. The brick facade implies a building solidity and at the same time, it allows for natural air circulation of the car park. At the same time, it would need a further clarification on how it could be easily accessed and aired.

B1. Quality of urban intervention

The materiality of the design with brick has a strong presence and forms a firmness of the proposed building. The high quality of detail and design, gives a contextualisation in terms of materials and finishes. The architectural expression references the architecture of the ancient bastion. The proposed material works well in terms of durability. This is appreciated by the Jury.

B2. Plastic expressiveness

The clarity in the design gives a solid fusion in reference to the historical fabric of Sibiu, even a modern reinterpretation of the bastion. But the Jury considered that the solidity of the building block could be overwhelming to the otherwise smaller scale of the historic city. Since the four elevations of the building have no differentiation, the building isolates itself from its environment and gives almost the impression of an invader to the city. Through that the building is somehow indifferent to the context.

B3. Quality and atmosphere of proposed spaces

The structured layout gives a good orientation inside the building. The design allows easy and inclusive access. The layout of the plan is flexible and can allow an adaptation to future needs.

The project did not manage to work out a clear idea for the public spaces and their urban furniture. The mentioning of the „sponge city” idea is good but is not reflected in the design. The future use of the bulk market would also need further qualification.

Recommendation

The car parking access and circulation would need additional thought. The first and second floor circulation need to be brought into synchronization, which could leave the restaurant and terrace to move a floor up. The use of the bulk market site should be clarified as well as the position of the administration offices.

The Jury recommends that the public spaces would need to be detailed further, along with the shared space idea and the necessary parking. The idea of the „sponge city” and the use of resources should be taken up further.

PROJECT NO. 110 – THIRD PRIZE

The project stands out for its complex, complete and detailed treatment of the two objectives included in the competition brief, with special attention paid to the expressive features of the proposed interventions - buildings or public spaces.

A1. Viability of the urban intervention

The interventions propose balanced solutions for both agri-food market and its vicinity and the adjoining streets and the two small squares in the historical fabric of the Lower Town. From the perspective of the proposed traffic solution, the project pays special attention to pedestrian spaces, which are enhanced. The retreat of the parking building from the alignment of Turnului Street, perpendicular to Malului Street, allows the expansion of the public space and the perception of some of the relevant buildings bordering the site. The new buildings also generate a wide public space towards the Cibin Square Street which is transformed into a pedestrian area. Similarly, the space of the square in front of the Gong Theatre is extended by diverting road traffic in the area of the current car park. The solution includes a series of references to the existence here of the bastion, references that take the form either of landscaping design (in the space in front of the current Siemens headquarters) or of differentiated textures of the street pavement.

A2. Functionality of the proposed solution

The solution proposes a complex volumetric composition for the agri-food market and the public car park, with a correct and detailed resolution of the functional areas, generating an extensive public space (partly usable for open-air commerce) towards the Piata Cibinului street, a space outlined by the new buildings and the pedestrian walkway, in the axis of which a water mirror is arranged, recalling the route of the Morii canal.

B1. Quality of urban intervention

The proposed solution relates sensitively to the complicated nearby urban context, trying to mediate between fragments of urban fabric that are different in terms of historical

evolution and morphology and paying particular attention to the enhancement of those components with cultural relevance and historical traces.

B2. / B3. Plastic expressiveness of the proposed volume / quality and atmosphere of the proposed spaces

The fragmentation of the proposed building into bodies of different heights contributes on the one hand to the creation of a varied image and on the other hand to the opening of the perspective towards the silhouette of the historic centre. The compositional complexity is balanced by the uniformity of the architectural language and the modulation of the spatial and structural solutions proposed, giving the ensemble a somewhat monumental character. The preciousness of the architectural details diminishes the differentiated reading of the functional areas and disguises the utilitarian character of the building in favor of representativeness.

Recommendations

The jury recommends reconsidering the use of timber for the load-bearing structure of the public car park. The jury also recommends a reconsideration of the proposed detail solutions for the brick and brickwork envelope of the building. The jury considers it important to take into account the use of the terraces above the two tall volumes of the built complex and the possibility of introducing a facade treatment that would soften the monotony of the front facing Turnului Street, a front developed in parallel with that of the Siemens buildings.

7. FINAL RANKING

COMP. NO.	PT.	COMMENTS
112	90.13	1ST PRIZE
102	83.10	2ND PRIZE
110	79.21	3RD PRIZE
120	73.52	The segregation of the Brief's two main functions into two separate volumes was appreciated by the jury. The agri-food market, compactly placed on the ground floor, embraces and apparently hides at eye level the volume of the car park, which is developed exclusively vertically. Set back from the alignment of the facades, the car park initially seems to lose its dominant presence, but the 6-



		<p>storey height still gives it an undesirable massiveness perceived from the space adjacent to the building. The jury also appreciated both the modularity proposed for the volumetry of the agri-food market and the ceramic finish towards the outside, as they allow a natural integration of the new building into the silhouette and general appearance of the historic centre of Sibiu. The interior ambience is restful in colour and materiality and well adapted to the human scale. The jury also appreciated the way in which the archaeological heritage of the former bastion is physically highlighted on the space of the current car park. The jury considers, however, that the volume of the car park is far too high in relation to the existing built environment, especially along the Street Piata Cibin, and the aesthetics and finish of its facades unfortunately further accentuate this dominant presence. Last but not least, the temporary construction of the food market was a less appreciated aspect by the jury.</p>
104	71.53	<p>The Jury appreciated the proposed relation to the river Cibin, the modularity of the space and the powerful expressive atmosphere but considers a lack of continuity with the context. The main achievement of the project is putting the main required spaces in two levels, keeping the historical reference points visible above the low rise building. The openness of the space on all sides offers a nice spatial atmosphere in the market area but the design is considered not sufficiently inclusive because of the level difference between the market space and the streets. The 70 cm below street level carpark area is difficult to access and narrow in design, making it difficult to be used.</p>
116	68.01	<p>The project is part of the group of proposals that deal with functions in separate volumes. The fragmentation helps to respect the morphology of the area, as do the sloping plans and the ceramic finishes used, which refer to the roofs of the buildings, all of which are elements that help to integrate the objective into the historic area, an aspect appreciated by the jury. From a functional point of view, the volumetric separation of the agri-food market from the car park is beneficial and allows unrestricted use of the spaces but creates constraints in this case for the correct resolution of circulation and parking of vehicles. The jury considered that the diversion of traffic on Turnului Street is not feasible, and as a result an important element of the project, that of providing a generous public space, has been eliminated. The jury also considered the marking of</p>



		the bastion by the proposed architectural installation to be exaggerated. The public space design for investment objective 2, the street furniture, the lighting system, the planting and the proposed finishes were appreciated.
113	64.00	<p>The project has a pragmatic approach that generally meets the requirements of the brief. The volumetry is clear but one that proposes a precious and unnecessary symmetry. The proposal has a logical simplicity but unfortunately leads to the idea of a banal shopping mall. It is to be appreciated the organization of the public access space from Turnului Street. It is also appreciated the sensitive but not emphasized treatment of the public spaces adjacent to the market (Coroana square, etc.) with vegetation insertion. But at the same time, the massive impact of the intervention in the urban fabric is neglected. Although elements of identity with the city are suggested, they are not sufficiently detailed. Thermal insulation of the parking lot is excessive and unnecessary. The relationship with the bank of the Cibin river is neglected. From the point of view of traffic - in principle, the existing situation is preserved, which corresponds to the provisions of the Brief: there is no intention to improve, on the contrary, by providing access / exit from the parking lot only from the Măsarilor Street will complicate the traffic in the area. There was no discernible concern to exploit the archaeological potential, although this fact is announced in the text in support of the proposed solution. Despite its rational and clear composition in terms of functionality, by introducing a forced, unnatural symmetry, the logic of the place changes, the ensemble becoming excessively monumental.</p>
119	62.27	<p>The proposal creates easy access to the market, on every side, offering shelter from the traffic on the main road, str. Malului. There is a reference to the historical bastion, however not very successful and a little artificial. The jury appreciates the logic of the car park access and the way that the requirements of the brief regarding the functions, the minimum access lanes and the permeability of the site were put together, but finds the architectural expression aggressive and too dynamic for the context.</p>
117	59.13	<p>The project proposes a pragmatic solution to the competition brief, both functionally and economically. An honest aesthetic approach exposes the pedestrian to both the car park in the semi-basement of the building and the food market spaces, positioned on a higher level than the</p>



		<p>perimeter pavement. The roof of the entire complex is covered in vegetation and thus appears to be a continuation of the landscape along the banks of the Cibin river. Despite the open space approach, the square level is not easily accessible, being located higher up, and the metal construction, apparently a visually neutral presence, does not provide by concept and proposed details the requirements of a quality architectural intervention in the context of the historic city centre.</p>
109	56.50	<p>The idea of making a pedestrian area in the S-E side is good, but leaves many unresolved spaces, which together with the proposed parking access are causing problems with circulation in the whole area. The forced reference to the historic bastion leads to a geometry of the market that causes disadvantage to the organization of functions.</p>
100	54.70	<p>The Jury appreciated the compact, judiciously organized volume, with two visually well-defined horizontal registers – one wide, open and inviting on the pedestrian level is the food market space, and the upper, seemingly opaque one houses the two levels of the car park. On the upper terrace level, a third register offers the community a space for events and relaxation, as well as a beautiful view of the Cibin River or the historic centre of Sibiu. Unfortunately, the existence of access problems to the car park levels, as well as the structural ambiguity here too, detract from the viability of the proposed solution.</p>
118	49.98	<p>The project proposes a monobloc parking, but at the same time also developing it on the ground floor, which affects the space dedicated to the market, in the most comfortable accessibility area. Great importance is given to the public space in the access area from Turnului Street. Although this covered public space is interesting, it is given an exaggerated importance in the context of the functions required by the Brief and the context of the urban fabric. The height of the "awning", in the idea of ensuring visibility towards the evangelical church tower, is, however, exaggerated and inadequate. The allocation for the market of about 50% of the space on the first floor level is not appreciated. The general impression is that the space allocated to the market is subordinated to the parking function and the public space. The project presents imprecise and insufficient information for an objective assessment of the compliance with the constraints of the competition brief.</p>



105	47.50	<p>The project takes a correct approach in terms of meeting the requirements of the Brief. The answer is a decent one but one that does not go beyond some banality of the approach. The square is correctly solved at the ground floor level, but with excessive compartmentalization of the premises, which does not allow a fluidity of the interior spaces. The parking lot is located on the front of Turnului-Street starting from the 1st floor (the ground floor is dedicated to the square except for the ramps) being a massive building containing 3 levels of enclosed parking and a fourth not covered level. This approach creates an excessively massive front towards the Turnului-Street. The center of the composition is dedicated to a "patio" that creates a pleasant atmosphere and natural lighting. The architectural expression is dominated by scenographic elements (arches applied in most cases in front of blind walls), and unjustified by the author. The treatment of the facades of the body of the parking lots has a positive aesthetic impact, but the doubling of the facades that have a classic heavy structure with windows, with massive ceramic blocks is excessive. The relationship with the Cibin River is neglected, offering an opaque front with only two penetrations towards the interior of the square. The relationship with the existing urban fabric is one of indifference, instead the treatment of adjacent common spaces (squares) is made with sensitivity.</p>
106	45.97	<p>The project proposes a particular approach, a pavilion structure, with a bar-type commercial space on two levels, communicating in the median area of the site with the body dedicated to parking developed on three levels, with a restaurant with terrace on the top level, facing the historic city. The jury appreciated the fact that the solution proposes a volumetric division of the complex, articulating its various components along the longitudinal (main) circulation space at the level of the food market. The opening of the Morii Canal also enriches the pedestrian route developed along Cibin Street. However, the existence of operational problems at the car park level and the persistent massiveness of the (initially divided) volumes, together with the aesthetic option of the facades, lead to a solution that is difficult to integrate into the existing urban fabric.</p>
103	44.37	<p>The Jury considered it nice to have a rooftop terrace which opens both towards the city and towards the river. The Jury also appreciated the idea of keeping free spaces</p>



		by introducing a water basin, visible from Malului street and from the market. Keeping the shape of the bastion on the whole site is a strong reference to the past but using it as a bus station coverage on the north side was considered formal.
108	41.10	The project team set out to design a proposal that interprets elements that define Sibiu and the site: the dormers, the brick, the tiles, the wall polychromy, the vegetation. Objective 1 is composed of two distinct bodies, joined by a monumental staircase. The car park is arranged in a volume flanking Turnului Street, while the agri-food market is developed on two levels. The ground floor of the agri-food market is organized around an atrium which is intended to mark the ruins of the bastion and the presence of the water which once covered the area. The finish of the corten tiles that refer to the dormer windows and the flat roofs, partially circulable due to the low slope, covered with a polychrome paving and lawn, confer a distinctive note to this project. The placement of some retail spaces on the upper floor was judged by the Jury to be inappropriate, as was the effort to create a pictorial surface on the roof terraces, which is hardly legible.
101	38.90	The project proposes an interesting idea; "an extension of the bank of the Cibin River" over the site with a huge ceramic roof and green areas with a very agitated volumetry and a pedestrian walkway that climbs from the base of the "hill" to its top on an exaggeratedly long and unjustified journey in terms of purpose. The compositional and economical effort is unreasonably high in relation to the functions it accommodates and the effect it produces. Basically, functionality is neglected in favor of a slightly eccentric idea. Accessibility is difficult. It is very difficult to read the plans of the parking lot because the relevant sections are missing.
111	37.67	The project presents a bold approach, proposing an urban slab that partially covers Turnului and Malului Street, creating a generous urban public space that facilitates the development of multiple functions both on the ground floor (covered space) and on the upper floor, and that communicates at a pedestrian level via a bridge with the street located on the opposite bank of the river. The placement of the parking area on the ground floor and the sales areas upstairs was considered by the jury to be a disadvantage, and the extension of the landscaped area over the street and adjacent areas was also considered to



		be an over-extension of the investment. On the other hand, the sculptural, plastic handling of the proposed artificial orchard, which also gives the name - Ograda Sibiului – to Objective 1, was underscored by the jury.
114	35.02	It's the only proposal that keeps the meat area market built after 2000, raising the vegetable market on a concrete slab structure that encloses the old building, making spaces for the car park beneath. Having the main market area on the first level, it becomes difficult to access or to cross.

This Jury Report was drafted in two copies in Sibiu, on 12.06.2023.

- arh. Iris Gleichmann

- arh. Michael Engel

- arh. Ildiko Mitru

- arh. Horia Moldovan

- arh. Cristian Șandru

- arh. Gheorghe Pătrașcu

- arh. Astrid Rottman

Professional Advisor:

- arch. Andreea Tănase

- arch. Toader Popescu

Competition coordinator:

arch. Mirona Crăciun

Jury Secretary:

urb. Louisiana Stoica

Organizing Team:

arch. Ilinca Pop