

INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION - MAMAIA SEASIDE, CONSTANȚA

ANNEX 1 of the Jury Report - Points table according to the award criteria

EVALUATION CRITERIA			100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118
<b>A. MEETING THE FUNCTIONAL-LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURAL REQUIREMENTS – 60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points)</b>	A1. Landscape criterion <b>maximum 20 points</b>	The quality of the landscape solution for the integration and mediation of different typological and functional areas; relations with the existing natural and built context – <b>maximum 5 points</b>	5.00	1.00	2.80	5.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	1.50	3.50	0.50	0.70	2.50	2.80	1.00	1.70	4.00	1.50
		Selection and composition of the proposed plant material; the concepts of planting, design, and perception – <b>maximum 5 points</b>	5.00	2.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.30	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.00	2.30	3.00	2.00
		The quality of the materials proposed for surfaces, equipment, and furniture - <b>maximum 5 points</b>	4.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	2.70	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	3.00	2.00	2.50	4.00	2.30
		Easy maintenance of facilities and cost reduction solutions – <b>maximum 5 points</b>	4.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.50	2.80	4.00	2.00	2.30	3.00	3.50	3.00	2.80	4.50	1.70
	A2. Functional criterion <b>maximum 20 points</b>	Solving the subdivision of beaches - <b>maximum 10 points</b>	10.00	5.00	7.50	9.00	9.00	8.00	9.00	9.00	7.00	7.50	9.00	3.00	7.50	7.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	9.00	7.50
		The quality of the solution for the integration of existing and proposed functions - <b>maximum 5 points</b>	4.00	2.50	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	1.50	3.00	2.50	2.00	4.00	2.50	2.20	2.70	2.70	1.50	3.00	3.50	1.50
		Solving the main functional areas, accesses, and proposed routes – <b>maximum 5 points</b>	5.00	2.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	2.70	2.80	3.00	2.80	3.00	3.00	2.30
	A3. Architectural criterion <b>maximum 15 points</b>	The quality of solving the standardized projects and the integration of the new facilities in the context of the general concept, where the flexibility, adaptability, sustainability of the solution are appreciated - <b>maximum 10 points</b>	7.00	2.50	3.50	9.00	9.00	6.00	4.50	6.50	6.00	1.80	7.00	4.50	7.50	7.00	7.00	5.00	7.00	5.00	3.00
		The quality of the architectural solution and the integration into the new spatiality of the beaches of the Casino ensemble and of the bridge with sea bar – <b>maximum 5 points</b>	3.00	1.50	0.50	4.50	5.00	2.50	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.50	3.00	1.50	1.50	2.00	2.00	1.20	2.20	3.00	1.00
	A4. Financial Criterion <b>maximum 5 points</b>	Staying within the maximum design cost indicated in the competition documentation – <b>5 points</b>	1.01	1.01	1.17	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.56	1.01	1.01	1.03	1.01	1.74	1.10	5.00	1.01	1.01	1.16	1.06	1.02
<b>B. ADDED ARCHITECTURAL – ARTISTIC VALUE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION – 40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points)</b>	B1. The nature of the proposed mediation and access area and the general atmosphere of the intervention <b>maximum 20 points</b>	20.00	6.00	9.00	17.00	16.00	13.50	7.50	15.50	12.00	8.50	15.00	7.00	9.00	10.00	13.00	8.00	10.00	14.00	7.50	
	B2. The power of the solution to change the perception of the beach area in particular and the seaside resort in general, as well as its ability to adapt over time <b>maximum 10 points</b>	10.00	6.00	7.00	10.00	10.00	9.00	6.00	10.00	8.00	6.50	10.00	5.00	7.50	8.00	8.50	6.00	8.00	10.00	7.00	
	B3. The quality and clarity of the representation of ideas in such a way as to illustrate the competitor's ability to implement the proposed project <b>maximum 10 points</b>	10.00	4.00	6.00	7.50	7.00	7.00	6.00	8.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	4.00	4.50	6.00	6.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>88.01</b>	<b>38.01</b>	<b>52.97</b>	<b>83.03</b>	<b>80.01</b>	<b>66.51</b>	<b>48.06</b>	<b>75.01</b>	<b>59.01</b>	<b>46.33</b>	<b>73.51</b>	<b>39.04</b>	<b>50.50</b>	<b>61.00</b>	<b>63.01</b>	<b>45.51</b>	<b>55.66</b>	<b>69.06</b>	<b>40.32</b>
			<b>100</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>118</b>

arch. urb. Irina Popescu-Criveanu

arch. Silviu-Virgil Aldea

Consilier Profesional  
arch. Sorin Istudor

18/9/2023

landscape arch. Ana-Maria Horhat

Răzvan Radu - Representative of AC

Coordonator concurs  
arch. Mirona Crăciun

arch. Igal Ahad Tartakovsky

Adrian Abrudan - Representative of AC

Secretar Jurizare  
arch. Raisa Parpală

arch. Saša Begović

Echipă Organizare  
urb. Louisiana Stoica

arch. Rodrigo Perez de Arce A.