

MAMAIA SEASIDE, CONSTANȚA
INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION

Amenajarea complexă a plajelor din stațiunea Mamaia, județul Constanța – Mamaia Seaside |
Număr de referință atribuit dosarului de Autoritatea Contractantă: / *Reference number issued by*
the Contracting Authority: 13207/MM/31.05.2023

JURY REPORT

DATE: 14-19.09.2023

LOCATION: Bucharest National Arena, 1st floor

1. JURY

Full members:

- arch. urb. Irina Popescu-Criveanu
- landscape arch. Ana-Maria Horhat
- arch. Igal Ahad Tartakovsky
- arch. Saša Begović
- arch. Rodrigo Perez de Arce A.
- arch. Silviu-Virgil Aldea
- Răzvan Radu – Representative of AC

Deputy members

- arch. Dan Petre Leu
- Adrian Abrudan – Representative of AC

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE JURY

The Jury members met in Bucharest, on the 14th of September. All members of the Jury were present for the Jury works and arch. Rodrigo Perez de Arce A. 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 advisor: arch. Sorin Istudor;
- Jury Secretary: arch. Raisa Parpală;
- Organizing team: urb. Louisiana Stoica.

There were **19** 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, **19** 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 concludes that all projects formally meet the requirements of the Competition Brief and the Competition Rules and does not propose any project for disqualification.

A total of **19** 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 FUNCTIONAL-LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURAL 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. Landscape criterion – maximum 20 points

The following will be scored:

- 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 – maximum 5 points.
- Selection and composition of the proposed plant material; the concepts of planting, design, and perception – maximum 5 points
- The quality of the materials proposed for surfaces, equipment, and furniture - maximum 5 points
- Easy maintenance of facilities and cost reduction solutions – maximum 5 points



A2. Functional criterion – maximum 20 points

The following will be scored:

- Solving the subdivision of beaches - maximum 10 points
- The quality of the solution for the integration of existing and proposed functions - maximum 5 points
- Solving the main functional areas, accesses, and proposed routes – maximum 5 points

A3. Architectural criterion – maximum 15 points

The following will be scored:

- 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 - maximum 10 points
- 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 – maximum 5 points

A4. Financial criterion - maximum 5 points

The following will be scored:

Falling within the investment and design ceiling indicated in the tender documentation.

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

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

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

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

- a) For the lowest of the offered prices (marked Price min) 5 points are awarded.
- b) For the other prices offered (marked Price(n)), the score $P(n)$

is calculated proportionally, as follows: $P(n) = [\text{Price}(\text{min}) / \text{Price}(n)] \times 5$

B. ADDED ARCHITECTURAL – ARTISTIC VALUE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION

40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points)



Evaluates on a scale from 1 to 40 the architectural-artistic value of the proposed solution, and the added value that the solutions bring for the correct and adequate solving of the Brief requirements. It is calculated by the sum of the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

B1. The nature of the proposed mediation and access area and the general atmosphere of the intervention – maximum 20 points

The criterion assesses the project's ability to generate a unique and memorable destination, an exemplary intervention at the level of the coast as an accessible and inclusive space. Thus, the following shall be considered: the spatial-urban value, the landscape-compositional value, the atmosphere and character of the proposed intervention, the quality of the proposed spaces and the sensory relationships generated, as well as the relationship with the natural setting; the adaptation of the details and materials used to the specific needs of each intervention and the redesign programme as a whole.

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 – maximum 10 points

The project has the chance to create a new spatiality and a new image of the beaches and the resort in general, in line with contemporary principles of spatial planning and sustainable development. Thus, the following aspects will be assessed: the representative/contemporary character of the proposed developments, the potential of the solution to establish a model of best practice in the design of seaside areas.

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

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

Calculation algorithm for point A – Minimum requirements:

$$A = A1 + A2 + A3 + A4 = 60 \text{ points}$$

Calculation algorithm for point B – Added value:

$$B = B1 + B2 + B3 = 40 \text{ points}$$

Calculation algorithm for the final evaluation (maximum 100 possible points)

$$A + B = 60 + 40 = \text{maximum } 100$$

4. JURY SESSION – WORKING METHODOLOGY

The working sessions of the Jury were preceded by a visit to the competition site. Then, arch. Sorin Istudor – 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 analyzed the **19** projects individually, based on the Award criteria, and on the set of requirements expressed by the Competition Brief, the Competition Rules. A collective discussion followed the individual analysis, after which the Jury selected the projects that offer a favorable answer, overall, to the specific requirements of the Competition Brief and the Award Criteria.

6 projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining **13** projects left after the first round were: **100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 110, 112, 113, 114, 116, and 117.**

Round II

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the **13** 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 analyzing the proposals individually, and then discussing collectively the general approaches of the projects in what concerns both the A chapter criteria – meeting the functional, landscape and architectural requirements and the B chapter criteria – the added architectural-artistic value.



4 projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining **9** projects left after the first round were: **100, 103, 104, 105, 107, 110, 113, 114 and 117.**

Round III

The jury continued the analysis of the **9** 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.

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 requests of the Contracting Authority, as well as the functionality of the vegetation and landscape solution, of the proposed circulations, the relation with the urban context and the relation to the Black Sea. Each project was analysed based on each criteria and sub-criteria presented by the Brief.

Following this round of debate, **3** projects were eliminated. The projects selected to go further in the fourth round were: **100, 103, 104, 107, 110, and 117.**

Round IV – Prize awarding

The jury unanimously decided:

The **Ist prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 7.650.780 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 100;**

The **IInd prize**, in the amount of 185.625 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 103;**

The **IIIrd prize**, in the amount of 86.625 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 104.**

The **Ist mention**, in the amount of 24.750 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 107;**

The **IInd mention**, in the amount of 24.750 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 110;**

The IIIrd mention, in the amount of 24.750 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 117**.

5. STATEMENT OF THE JURY

International Design Competition for MAMAIA SEASIDE, CONSTANȚA, 2023

The Mamaia seaside resort stands out as one of the unique spots along the Romanian black sea coastline. The Jury would like to commend the decision of the National Administration “Romanian Water” and the municipality of Constanta to launch a competition for the development of such an important part of the country’s natural and touristic assets. This important international competition intrigued 19 teams of talented professionals who submitted an entry of a consistent high quality and standards portraying remarkable visions and creative thinking.

The project site presents a complex challenge to the participants to utilise its unique location on the Black Sea and the Danube delta in between two sources of water – the Siutghiol lake and the Black Sea and mitigate between this fragile coastal environment and the overdeveloped resort as a unique place to be enjoyed and shared between all forms of life, ensuring resilience against increasing current and future threats.

This project represents a great opportunity for the rediscovery of the coast’s natural and cultural heritage as a place of architectural excellence where innovative architectural solutions were put into place.

It thus has the potential to become a landmark and an exemplary process at both local and regional level, adding value not only to its neighbouring developments on the resort but to the entire community of Constanța and the entire Black Sea region.

The project is seen as a pioneering experiment in accordance with the contemporary principles of design and management of urban coastal areas. It serves as a high-quality blueprint for tackling the intricate issues the Romanian seaside is grappling with, prioritising nature-based solutions to ensure the protection of beaches against aggressive urbanisation, ensuring cost-effectiveness and maximum architectural quality, with a responsible consumption of energy and resources.

The competitors were asked to showcase both a strategic and a more detailed level of intervention, moving from general plans and concept schemes to details concerning their

planting strategy, architectural interventions, and space usage. Even with all these requirements and constraints, the submitted projects showcase an array of diverse scenarios, with part of them adding innovative new ideas and qualities.

The Jury conducted a comprehensive evaluation of all design proposals, engaging in four rounds of professional discussions. The assessment process evolved from an overarching examination of the site's strategic aspects and overall urban concept to a more in-depth analysis. Through this method, the Jury aimed to ensure that the chosen proposals could withstand scrutiny. Six proposals advanced to the final round, sparking numerous debates where each juror expressed their perspectives, drawing on their respective expertise. This approach facilitated a well-rounded assessment of the projects.

The top three proposals underwent rigorous stress tests and development scenarios to guarantee that they could maintain their quality throughout the technical development and implementation phases. While each of the finalist schemes exhibited strengths and weaknesses relative to one another, these points were thoroughly deliberated. Nevertheless, the Jury reached a unanimous decision in favour of the winning project. Its thorough conceptual foundation and quality of thought position it to be a prominent intervention firmly rooted in contemporary discourse.

In conclusion, due to the project's significance, the Jury has formulated a set of recommendations for the local authority.

The Jury considers that the commissioning authority and local municipality should have a dedicated team that follows the project from its early design stages to its implementation and maintenance, ensuring a successful synergy with the winning team.

The jury stresses the importance of prioritising public interest and usage of the waterfront, a key resource for local communities ensuring varied and sustainable scenarios extending beyond touristic and high seasonal usage.

Having said that, we congratulate the winners and all the participants, and wish the local authority success in implementing an outstanding project!

6. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT NO. 100 – FIRST PRIZE

This scheme stood above every other one in the eyes of the jury for the clarity of its overall vision, its conviction about the master plan, the clear understanding about the site's dynamics and its overall consistency with the competition objectives.

Based on reconnecting with the natural environment, its main concept is supported by a clear and insightful analysis of the evolution of the place - the relentless process of anthropization - and its characteristic phases. The jury particularly appreciated the consideration given in this scheme to the question of time as indicated in his precise diagrams and written statements. A multidimensional consideration of time is also appreciated for its inclusion of site history, natural dynamics and ecological succession, and the logistics of the phased naturalisation process. These considerations provide a fundamental set of tools for properly evaluating site dilemmas. The acceptance of time as a primary theme also provides, in the jury's view, clear guidance on the short, medium and long-term scenarios to be faced in the implementation of the master plan.

At the urban level, the scheme provides a nuanced cross-sectional management, a fine-grained understanding of city-to-coast transit, implemented through layering, soil variations, gradations in space and planting. This is summed up as a smooth transition from urban to coastal. This relationship is well orchestrated and easy to understand.

The proposed distinction between sectors on the longitudinal axis of the beach is clear and consistent, while the intertwining of paths with the existing urban matrix is simple and effective, both along the longitudinal and transverse axes. Access hierarchies are clearly stated, as are rhythms and distances between them. The characterization and distribution of main, secondary and tertiary access points provides good guidance for arranging and consolidating future program scenarios.

The functional part of the space in belts or strips is in accordance with the spatial planning criteria proposed by the tender program and can be easily implemented. The articulation between these strips is well achieved and can be easily reinforced.

The landscape criteria are very well stated, although the important function of the sand and landscape protection devices proposed as wind shelters may not be emphasized enough. Although clearly indicated in the general plan, as well as in the diagrams dealing with wind currents and erosion, they are not so clearly visible in the detailed developments. These

elements are invited to play a major function both as shelter providers and also as place-making devices with the capacity to counter the somewhat overwhelming vastness of the beach. The selected plant material is in harmony with the specific coastal habitats and contrasts well with accents in color and texture, which represents a good starting point for future development. The spatial arrangement of cultivated islands is a very good mix of geometric structure and naturalistic appearance. The scheme offers ecologically adaptable capacity and a very thoughtful selection of plants. The variety of types in terms of color and texture as well as mass and structure is valued as an important advantage. The jury also appreciated the consideration given to aspects such as rooting ability, soil stabilization and low maintenance requirements. Vegetation works well with wind and climate, although sector plans should reflect this through further detail. This was one of the few projects that mapped and took into account the tall vegetation present on the site: these specimens are expected to play an important role in the future development of the scheme. These images clearly show the benefits of re-naturalizing the site and suggest a wealth of environments and experiences fully aligned with the spirit of the competition's objectives. They confirm a very sensitive approach as well as sophisticated professional competence.

The jury also appreciated the consideration given to aspects such as rooting ability, soil stabilization and low maintenance requirements. Vegetation works well with wind and climate, although sector plans should reflect this through further detail. This was one of the few projects that mapped and took into account the tall vegetation present on the site: these specimens are expected to play an important role in the future development of the scheme.

As for the built elements, the jury rated the proposed pavilions as elegant, simple, functional and adaptable with a modular construction that allows flexibility for a wide range of assemblies that will surely be in demand. The selection of prefabricated floor slabs is thought out with environmental and logistical considerations in mind. The proposed night scenarios can be developed in the following stages with the potential of innovative programming agendas.

The jury praises the atmosphere and spatial qualities given in the different perspective views included in the proposal. These images clearly show the benefits of re-naturalizing the site and suggest a wealth of environments and experiences fully aligned with the spirit of the competition's objectives. They confirm a very sensitive approach as well as sophisticated professional competence.

Jury recommendations

- The design team should strengthen the shaded areas along the promenade with more extensive tree planting. Additional tree planting should be in accordance with the main rows of trees and streams, and it is desirable to take into account seasonal variations.
- The jury recommends the strengthening of the wind protection devices, the extension of the finger-shaped gardens perpendicular to the coast as the main elements in the overall design strategy in accordance with what the 1:5000 plan shows. Likewise, it would be desirable to strengthen and thicken small dune formations that extend as far as possible towards the facilities on the beach with shaded areas. It is advisable to review the resort to invasive shrubs and trees and develop a consistent planting strategy in the following stages of development.
- The structural capacity of the pavilion needs to be strengthened to achieve a higher level of resilience and to facilitate maintenance or replacement issues. This should be achieved without losing architectural or typological values.
- The design team should examine layouts of pavilions on site with a view to a more diverse range of setting options and positions (in the shade, within the garden strip, on the edge and in the middle of the sand)
- The jury recommends reconsidering the landscape treatment of the area in front of the casino. respecting its symmetrical part, but adding shelter to the landscape and strengthening its spatial character.
- The presence of some really invasive species in the plant material, prompts the jury to recommend further studies.
- Existing and proposed vegetation requires maintenance with a management practice that supports biodiversity and resilience to climate change. The jury recommends that the documentation that will be provided within the maintenance brief should be very consistent in this direction, to support the contracting authority in the approach of good maintenance, in line with contemporary good practice in this field.

PROJECT NO. 103 – SECOND PRIZE

Starting with the title itself, this proposal makes a strong statement - "In-between Two Waters". For the jury, this speaks to his comprehensiveness and very detailed approach to the entire Mamaia resort area. It is one of the few projects that analysed a wider geographical area, the ecosystem of the Danube Delta, lakes, plus geological characteristics and development.

The analysis includes the historical development of the entire zone, urban plans from the initial tourist development of the region, as well as very attractive photos of the area that show the most fruitful tourist and development period of the 70s of the last century. With them, the authors evoked the character of the space and the logic of its functioning.

Inspired by this analysis of local characteristics and historical sources, ideas and qualities from the present and the past are created to coexist. The authors propose a very detailed linear park, which follows a logical north-south longitudinal direction, as the main "backbone" of the conceptual core and an intermediate zone for the accommodation of the main functions. This new green corridor combines three lanes of vegetation and landscaping, as well as infrastructural elements for traffic.

The scheme offers very good settings for the Development Planning Strategy. These are presented in three stages. The first one comprises an urban forest plus meeting nodes and piazzas, thus configuring the main landmark that gathers diverse poles of activities. The following step consolidates the seafront forest with the expansion of those points and the existing promenade, the third stage contemplates the formation of dunes and transversal pedestrian and bicycle paths.

The landscape proposal of the scheme is very well thought out and equally well structured from the existing promenade and its integration, to the idea of the forest, then the dunes to the coast itself. The planting strategy is very intelligent and well articulated with exceptional attention to detail such as species selected for specific soil conditions, exposure to humidity, wind or salt. The proposed dunes are protected by bushes and thorns to stabilize the vegetation. The planting grid is extremely suitable for immediate effect and subsequent maintenance.

The jury considered this scheme to be the one that achieves a good sectorization of the sandy surface of the beach in accordance with the request, with the interesting addition of the so-called public areas / access. The diagram of the distribution of beach facilities and activities is well laid out and consistently developed: it includes well-designed beach facilities

with variants, such as beach bars and other facilities. They follow a unique design principle with variations, which gives very good quality objects. The choice of materials and modularity for these buildings is excellent, such as timber and precast concrete elements.

Despite the good assessment of the landscape proposal, the jury felt that, unfortunately, the sensitivity and attention to detail it shows on a small scale cannot be found as good on a larger one. It would be desirable to present the development of the proposed new landscape along the coast, the creation of different atmospheres or identities depending on the existing natural and built context and their translation within the presented views, axonometrics or plans. The landscape that emerges from the latter is monotonous and undifferentiated. The spatial undulation of the proposed landscape seems like a missed opportunity to create differentiated, intimate, sensitive areas.

Jury recommendations

- Despite the good positioning and design of the linear park, the jury recommended that the connections with the promenade be clearer in some positions, and perhaps wider, due to the large expected flow of people in the north-south direction.
- Nodes and plazas are essential elements and points of transitional communications and events, and according to the jury, they are too small and unclear and should be expanded and made much clearer.
- Pedestrian paths and bicycle paths are properly placed in the green linear zone, and the winding design is in accordance with the basic idea of an interesting long promenade, but the jury believes that the two should be separated, primarily because of the problem of cross traffic.
- Jury acknowledges the good quality of the design of facilities and beach facilities and recommends bringing their locations closer to the green zone, primarily due to better connections with roads and trails while ensuring better protection. Also, the main objects should be further elaborated in terms of their construction and variations.

PROJECT NO. 104 – THIRD PRIZE

The jury appreciated this scheme for its bold freshness of approach, great design sensibility and attention to craft. Relying on a matrix of entrance sand walls / walkways,

its urban part emphasises the notion of a threshold while configuring sheltered gardens along the beach.

The same principle orchestrates the placement and distribution of facilities and infrastructure, which offers a good functional response. Although they may not be optimal for their foundation requirements in relation to the notion of reversibility, the jury found rammed earth walls an interesting option, due to their architectural quality, strong presence in the landscape and good resistance of the material.

The casino garden is also appreciated as perhaps a counterintuitive but strong response to the challenges of the place, also due to its relations to the heritage of the place and its reactivation through a very suggestive scenario. The proposed swimming pool was evaluated as an intelligent answer on how to rebrand the historic bar on the casino island, while avoiding its reconstruction in a new environment.

Although the jury evaluated the scheme as daring and very suggestive and although the configuration of protected environments with the consequent implementation of microclimate seemed favorable for the creation of secluded gardens, its planting and landscape criteria were judged insufficiently developed.

Moreover, although it referred to perhaps suggestive and poetic enclosure scenarios as in certain old traditions, this scheme did not explicitly address the fundamental question of how to orchestrate the actual spatial and experiential relationship between the city and the coast, and especially between promenades, gardens and beaches. From what the jury could determine, the high wall was the only device proposed to separate one from the other with discrete room-like connections interspersed along the 6.5 km long barrier. Such a device seemed simple and somewhat aggressive compared to the expectations of a seaside resort.

The award given to this scheme celebrates its bold approach while also taking into account the outstanding issues outlined above.

Jury recommendations

- The jury recommends a review of the urban edge of the scheme to achieve a friendlier way of integration between the beach, gardens, promenades and urban networks.



- The jury recommends an interlocking north-south approach across the gardens as another significant structural element as an atmospheric trail through the shaded areas.
- The jury recommends taking into account the existing trees: also clarifying the landscape proposal and the intention regarding tall and medium vegetation.
- The jury recommends the development of a landscape proposal with special reference to its longitudinal distribution and the atmosphere and environment that will be presented in these spacious public gardens.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, the jury supports the outcome of the competition, appreciating positively this public initiative which will lead to an increase in the architectural, urban and landscape quality of the study area and will contribute to strengthening the identity of Mamaia. The impeccable organisation of the competition made it possible for serious, professional teams to participate.

The Jury has formulated recommendations for the contracting authority, as well as for the local public administration authority in order to accomplish the intervention objectives. These recommendations are regarding the main intervention phases, as established in the brief and, also, integrated in the Competition Rules – zonal urban plan, followed by complete design services for the entire intervention area.

Recommendations for the Zonal Urban Plan:

- Integrating a detailed analysis of the existing situation, in order to improve the links between the developed beach area and the resort, taking into account the issues related to the historical evolution of the territory; its natural, cultural and landscape characteristics and the urban planning principles of each construction phase. Visual and functional links between Lake Siutghiol and the sea should be emphasised.
- Integration of the specific objectives set by legislation, the choices made by the municipality's programs and of the main options resulting from the citizen participation process. The plan must take into account the inseparable relationship between the resort and the beach, including at the urban planning level;



- In particular, it is necessary to involve – together – the contracting authority, the local public administration authorities and the responsible central public administration authorities in the subsequent planning phases.
- The jury recommends a firm stance on the accessibility of beaches for all categories of public. To this end, the creation of beaches with unrestricted public access under public management is recommended; at the same time, the development of rented beach sub-sectors should include a wider area, unoccupied, on the seaward side, reserved for public access and intervention. The ZUP will establish the minimum mandatory distances from the western beach boundary of this area.
- In the organisation of the beach sub-sectors, it is recommended to couple the free/public areas to obtain larger areas, as well as to couple - if possible - the activity areas for economy in operation. Some crosswind protection works may be required in the future.

Recommendations for SF/PT:

- Calculate the beach facilities requirements in a correlated manner with the territorial division of beach subsectors and the dimensional and typological standardisation objectives of the competition brief.

7. FINAL RANKING

COMP. NO.	PT.	COMMENTS
100	88.01	1ST PRIZE
103	83.03	2ND PRIZE
104	80.01	3RD PRIZE
107	75.01	1ST MENTION



		<p>This project focuses on the re-naturalization of the coast of Mamaia by creating a new eco and bio-resilient environment rebuilding the endemic sand dunes on its waterfront.</p> <p>It should be commended that this is one of the few proposals that consider the entire area of the resort, including both waterfront - the sea and the lake. By doing that, the project attempts to reconnect the entire area, offering a new system of roads, trails, natural environments and built structures.</p> <p>A comprehensive analytical study led to a coherent concept that consists of ecological corridors, a sustainable mobility network and a properly sub-divided coastal zone considering the entire length of the area according to the tenants needs and capacities. The solution offers a variety of atmospheres, accents, contrasts and dynamic transitions. The emphasis on biodiversity was appreciated and supported very well the basic concept of re-naturalizing of the waterfront.</p> <p>The proposed architectural elements are modular and adaptable yet need further improvement regarding the appearance and positioning.</p> <p>While the proposal offers a promising conceptual landscape design, in the enlarged plans and renderings it displays insufficient solutions regarding the integration of the developed green areas to the existing context, including incoherent and underdeveloped pathways and public spaces in substantial intersections with the existing promenade.</p> <p>In addition, the planting scheme is lacking shading solutions along significant portions of the elaborate paths throughout the green park. The jury found the overall atmosphere of the proposed landscape somewhat foreign to the history of the place. The planting principles presented in the diagrams and sections including the different vegetation layers are lost in the images and isometric perspectives presented, where</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



		<p>herbaceous and shrubby vegetation with the same chromaticity prevails in all sectors, leaving the main circulations very exposed. It must be noted that some of the proposed tree species (<i>Ailanthus altissima</i>, <i>Acer negundo</i>) are dangerous invasive species that can remove native species from natural and cultivated plant communities in a short period of time.</p>
110	73.51	<p>2ND MENTION</p> <p>The jury appreciated the comprehensive study of the multi-layered context of the site including the complex urban environment and the existing fabric, historical development, geological structure and the ecological system. It was clear from the master plan that the proposal presented a deep insightful understanding of the site. The concept of restoring and further establishing a strong connection between the resort and its coastal strip is elaborated and articulated through the design of the many East-West pathways positioned intelligently as a continuation to the existing circulation of the resort and in some cases strengthening the functionality of existing structures through the newly created public space around them.</p> <p>The proposal also offers a variety of public spaces and green typologies designed to fit different activities distributed sensibly along the coastal park which allows for a necessary balance in a park of such scale.</p> <p>Additional strong points that were taken into consideration were the architectural elements which were designed efficiently and professionally with a rational and clever positioning along the coast embedded in dunes and vegetation which creates character and protection from the elements. The technical quality and clarity of the drawings and renderings is to be commended.</p>



		<p>Taking that into account, the proposal lacked a clear approach towards the distinct character of the landscape which was underdeveloped and could improve the coherence of the vegetation scheme and species. In addition, the quality of the public space as displayed in the axonometric views is insufficient in terms of its relation to the coast and the resort and falls short in comparison to the promise presented in the concept.</p>
117	69.06	<p>3RD MENTION</p> <p>The jury appreciated the presented project for its clear concept and intelligent design effectively altering the vast scale of the beach.</p> <p>The proposal presents a coherent longitudinal park that contains all the key amenities and extends towards the beach, outlining a series of intimate bays and natural alcoves along the beachfront. In this setting, green promontories of trees advance gently towards the sea line breaking the monotony of the extensive beach strip. Through this simple and nature based design, the project brings much needed rhythm and orientation. These recesses not only provide natural zoning of the beach but also create a sense of privacy and tranquillity in the public space. While the proposal develops a meandering generous urban promenade under the dense canopy, a compelling alternative to the existing fragmented one, the project is underdeveloped and treats essential aspects in an insufficient manner and lacks the complexity promised by such an ambitious endeavour as presented in the concept.</p> <p>The integration of art into the project was noteworthy, as it tries to establish a sense of belonging, connecting visitors to the artistic cultural heritage of the seaside. While the images convey very well the great potential of these opposed characters, they also bring forth the question of proportions,</p>



		relations and sensitivity of such objects in the context they are presented.
105	66.51	<p>The proposal offers a smart scheme integrating the green zone of the coastal park into the existing resorts fabric and circulation, embedding the existing functions into green and shaded areas creating convincing public spaces. This is not expressed in the more detailed design of the landscape where the pathways and plazas are inconsistent with the existing roads and circulation and lack a clear hierarchy and characteristics. While the architectural elements are well developed and sensible, the design could be improved, and the positioning would have benefited from a better synthesis with the vegetated layer of the park. The solution for the Casino area lacks more feasibility and sensibility.</p>
114	63.01	<p>At an analytical level, this scheme provides a positive comprehensive and ambitious structure for the interior design of the proposed park with a detailed description of the types of each sector and their visual and atmospheric attributes. However, it was somewhat difficult for the jury to follow the order of the different sectors, where the planting schemes seem to dilute the generic description of the green spaces, despite the suggestive seasonal development diagrams.</p> <p>The overall proposition was also seen to be lacking in structure, particularly as regards the excessively convoluted garden paths. The garden edge towards the beach seems somewhat uninspiring.</p> <p>The pavilions were appreciated as elegant, simple, and unassuming pieces, quite in line with the requirements. Together with the first point this is where this scheme makes a substantial contribution.</p>
113	61.00	<p>The proposal derives from an in-depth and comprehensive analysis of the site offering a clear understanding of its geological and ecological attributes. However, this does not</p>



		<p>translate into the overall scheme which lacks coherence and a clear hierarchy of connections to the existing context. The landscape as presented in the proposal shows potential for creating rich natural spaces including water elements and different layers of vegetation, yet it is not fulfilled due to the insufficiency of the vegetation and dune composition and lack of hierarchy within the distribution of public spaces and activities. The architectural elements are well developed as modular and functional spaces yet could be further improved regarding positioning and synthesis with the dunes and vegetated areas to allow for shade and wind protection.</p>
108	59.01	<p>This scheme is appreciated for the care given to the functional and zoning parameters as shown in the diagrams and for the attempt to create a set of elements that can satisfy different requirements. Some of the references were considered suitable and inspiring by the jury. The same can be said for the lighting strategy and its suggestive night scenarios, a proposal that should probably be limited to only one area due to the possibility of light pollution.</p> <p>However, especially when judged against the detailed sectoral proposals as a result of the strategy for nature reserves, which consist almost exclusively of shrubs and ground cover, the overall effect is considered excessively open and exposed, thus not providing protected environments. The botanical garden of the casino seems too abstract and equally lacking in shelter.</p>
116	55.66	<p>The proposal offers an interesting concept on an urban scale and exceptional attention to the existing public spaces, referring to the resort's original modernist design. The concept shows the potential to create interesting public spaces integrated into the existing context and although it provides a clear vision, the proposal does not articulate them in design. The coastal park consists of different densities of green areas that are not developed further and remain at a</p>



		<p>conceptual level without a clear hierarchy or sense of place. The structure of the parks is fragmented, creating separate segments that result in a discontinuous space. The architectural elements are conceptually sufficient, but require further development with reconsideration of the use of canvas or fabric taking into account the environmental conditions.</p>
102	52.97	<p>This scheme is appreciated for the attention it paid to soil conditions, microtopographies and the interrelationships of plants, birds and insects. The overall strategy is clear and functional. Creating multiple activity zones protected behind the first landscape strip was considered a good design option. The jury also appreciated the proposed typologies offered for these activity zones.</p> <p>The jury considered that the detailed developments are insufficient, both at the level of the general layout and circulation, and at the level of architectural elements such as the pavilion where some parts seem excessively overdeveloped. The same applies to the casino pavilion and its surrounding area.</p> <p>As shown in the renderings, the sharp edge that separates the garden from the sand seems diagrammatic and counterproductive to the strategy mentioned above. The jury could not be convinced of the advantages of the outdoor walkway, which is exposed to the sun and away from the edge of the protected garden.</p>
112	50.50	<p>The proposal shows clarity in understanding the zoning structure of Mamaia and the importance of characterising the four main zones. It is also one of the few considering the existence of an additional waterfront on the lake on the western side, which is highly commendable. However, progressing from the conceptual level to design, the proposal lacks critical aspects such as a clear structure and hierarchy between paths, activity areas and vegetated zones, while</p>



		<p>presenting an inconsistent approach to synthesis and evaluation between the different layers and elements presented in the concept scheme and urban analysis. The architectural elements are well designed as lightweight modular structures, but their positioning should be reconsidered considering their relationship to the large coastal area and green vegetation zones.</p>
106	48.06	<p>The project shows a lot of sectorization, characterised by an excessive level of clarity in its appearance. The design is appreciated for its pragmatic layout of paths and facilities near the resort, reducing maintenance costs and environmental impact on the beach.</p> <p>Reduced attention to landscape design reduced the overall quality of the proposal. A lack of thoughtful landscape elements could potentially result in a less inviting and lively atmosphere, which is essential for successful public spaces. The elevated platform and the well-maintained bicycle road, unfortunately, seem to have created a barrier between the green areas and the beach area. This separation of space could hinder the flow of movement and compromise the overall user experience.</p>
109	46.33	<p>The jury appreciated some of the episodes proposed within the park and took into account the design quality of the pavilion, but did not see the structural elements that would ensure a good and consistent overall treatment of the site.</p> <p>The jury considered that most public spaces lack shade and protection from the wind. Also, the distribution of objects and garden parts like confetti that can occasionally create charming wholes seems an inadequate tool for ordering such a large and complex scheme. The excessive randomness of the placement of pavilions and activity areas results in disorder, and this lack of control contradicts the significant goals of the competition.</p>



115	45.51	<p>The proposed project placed a strong emphasis on providing easy and convenient access to the beach, aiming for a simple and pleasant experience for visitors. The jury appreciated the creation of a buffer zone between the resort and the beach, characterised by low dunes and a balanced selection of vegetation, using various species that are endemic to other coastal habitats in Romania.</p> <p>While the project showed various positive attributes such as easy access to the beach, historical analysis and a well-chosen range of vegetation, it also faced challenges related to organisation, neglect and the need for increased ambition in planting and shelter elements.</p>
118	40.32	<p>The proposal offers an interesting and transparent scheme of a green coastal park with differentiated densities according to the existing monuments in accordance with the objectives of the competition. It shows creativity and ingenuity in creating green extensions of the park on the coast, which allows for better sectorization and protection from the weather. This is not developed at the design level, it lacks clarity and becomes chaotic on the one hand, while remaining schematic on the other. The introduction of large grass areas into the coastal environment, as shown, is a questionable feasibility and should be reconsidered, while the activities along the park are shown sporadically and placed without a coherent order. Architectural elements have little flexibility and a formalistic design that does not allow interchangeability and modularity as needed. The graphic representation is very vague and remains schematic at all scales.</p>
111	39.04	<p>The proposal is articulated and has a clear concept. It proposes a minimalistic intervention that is conveniently accessible from all angles of the existing context, making it feasible for easy implementation and maintenance. Although this concept creates extensive paved areas for accessibility,</p>



		<p>it ignores the importance of the green coastal park, resulting in a significant part of the beach being left unattended, which is contrary to the aims of the tender. Furthermore, the architectural elements lack a coherent design language and typology that could facilitate disassembly and easy modification. Located within a vast and deserted beach, these structures will be exposed to harsh environmental conditions, providing some respite for users.</p>
101	38.01	<p>The presented beach development project included a pragmatic and basic approach, in accordance with the project's requirements. Namely, it included urban furniture as stated in the assignment, showing his commitment to meeting the outlined criteria.</p> <p>The inclusion of wind diagrams in the project was a valuable and interesting analytical element that could provide essential insights into how wind patterns can affect the beach area, contributing to the practicality and functionality of the project.</p> <p>However, the landscape design aspect of the project left room for improvement. It did not fully utilise the spatial potential of the area, and in some aspects he neglected it. The decision to replicate the existing boulevard was questionable as it raised concerns about redundancy and missed opportunities for innovation.</p> <p>One of the significant challenges the project faced was the presentation of images. The visuals appeared chaotic and confusing, making it difficult to grasp the underlying concept and design intent.</p>

This Jury Report was drafted in two copies in Bucharest, on 18.09.2023.

At the signing of the Report, Arch. Dan Petre Leu, deputy member of the jury, was not present.

arch. urb. Irina Popescu-Criveanu

landscape arch. Ana-Maria Horhat

arch. Igal Ahad Tartakovsky

arch. Saša Begović

arch. Rodrigo Perez de Arce A.

arch. Silviu-Virgil Aldea

Răzvan Radu – Representative of the AC

Adrian Abrudan - Representative of the AC

Professional Advisor:

arch. Sorin Istudor



Competition Coordinator:

arch. Mirona Crăciun

Jury Secretary:

arch. Raisa Parpală

Organizing Team:

urb. Louisiana Stoica