



## VICTORIEI SQUARE, TIMIȘOARA

### INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION

*"Design and modernization of the Operei (Victoriei) Square and streets in the Citadel area",*  
Reference number issued by the Contracting Authority: 14756536\_2023\_PAAPD1425456

### JURY REPORT

**DATE:** 13-15.10.2023

**LOCATION:** Bastion 3, Hector Street no.1, Timișoara

## 1. JURY

### Full members:

- arch. Ana Sverko
- arch. Maria Chiara Pozzana
- arch. Maruša Zorec
- urb. Gruia Bădescu
- arch. Dragoș Oprea
- arch. Ciprian Silviu Cădariu
- arch. Titus-Gabriel Almăjan – Representative of AC

### Deputy members

- arch. Monica Sebestyen
- deputy mayor Ruben Lațcău – Representative of AC

## 2. ORGANIZATION OF THE JURY

The Jury members met in Timișoara, on the 13<sup>th</sup> of October. All members of the Jury were present for the Jury works and arch. Maria Chiara Pozzana was unanimously elected as President of the Jury.

The following persons were present next to the jury:

- Competition Coordinator, president of the Technical Committee: arch. Mirona Crăciun;
- Professional advisors: arch. Daniela Calciu, arch. Kazmer Kovacs;
- Jury Secretary: urb. Louisiana Stoica;
- Organizing team: arch. Raisa Parpală.

There were **30** 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, **30** 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. **Projects with competition numbers 100, 103 and 111** exceeded the maximum cost estimate of the design services contract (established at 7.415.850,00 lei without VAT, as per article 4.2.4 detailed in *Annex 2.6 - Cost estimate*), infringing **articles 2.2.1, point 3, and 3.6.2. subpoint b). of the Competition Rules.**

Therefore, the Technical Committee proposed to the Jury for disqualification on the basis of article 2.3.4 of the Rules, **the projects with competition numbers 100, 103 and 111.**

The members of the Jury unanimously decided to eliminate from the Jury proceedings the projects proposed for disqualification by the Technical Committee.

A total of **27** 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. SATISFYING THE ARCHITECTURAL - URBANISTIC FUNCTIONAL – LANDSCAPE NEEDS**

##### **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. Functional criterion – maximum 30 points**

Points will be awarded for the synergistic solution of the functions proposed for the square and the adjacent streets, from an architectural, urban, and landscape point of view.

The following will be assessed: the quality of the layout of Victory Square and the surrounding urban spaces, the management of predominantly pedestrian traffic flows, the ability to focus physically and not only symbolically the quality of the main urban center of the municipality.

##### **A2. Technical criterion – maximum 10 points**

The feasibility of the proposed solutions, their durability and sustainability (proposal of easy-to-maintain solutions, use of local materials, etc.) will be assessed.

### **A3. Ecological criterion – maximum 15 points**

The following will be scored:

- The proposed urban plantation typology, from the perspective of sustainability, functional concept and integration into the architectural ensemble; - maximum 10 points
- Solving the collection and reuse of rainwater for the maintenance of landscaping – 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) = 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. THE EXPRESSIVE - ENVIRONMENTAL ATTRIBUTES OF THE INTERVENTION — THE ADDED VALUE OF THE PROPOSAL**

### **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 development vision of Victoriei Square and its surroundings – maximum 15 points**

The vision and strategic dimension proposed for the development of this historic area of Timisoara will be evaluated, both regarding the correlation of its different spaces around the esplanade, as well as the enhancement of its historical and identity meanings.

The following will be scored: compositional value, spatial-urban value, landscape value.

**B2. Expressing the position of the major urban center of the Victoriei Square and the general atmosphere of the layout – maximum 15 points**

The inventiveness of the proposal, the spatial coherence, and the unity in diversity of the components of the urban complex included in the study perimeter will be scored, in accordance with the symbolic importance of the place.

**B3. Quality and clarity of representation of ideas – maximum 10 points**

The graphic expressiveness of the drawings will be scored to reflect the contestant's ability to implement the proposed project.

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. Daniela Calciu and arch. Kazmer Kovacs – 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 **27** 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. The Jury discussed

elements related to the general concept of the entries and the approaches to the design of the square and adjacent streets, the typologies of the interventions, the functionality of the created spaces and the manner in which the solutions adapt to the needs of the community.

**13** projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining **14** projects left after the first round were: **101, 102, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 113, 114, 115, 120, 123, 127 and 128.**

## **Round II**

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the **14** 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 architectural, urbanistic, functional and landscape needs and the B chapter criteria – the expressive environmental attributes of the intervention.

**6** projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining **8** projects left after the second round were: **101, 106, 108, 109, 113, 114, 127 and 128.**

## **Round III**

The jury continued the analysis of the **8** 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 needs and wishes of the Contracting Authority, in the specific context of Victoriei Square, as an important historical, cultural and identity landmark at the city level.

Following this round of debate, **3** projects were eliminated. The projects selected to go further in the fourth round were: **109, 113, 114, 127 and 128.**

#### **Round IV – Prize awarding**

The jury unanimously decided:

The **I<sup>st</sup> prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 7.415.850 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 109;**

The **II<sup>nd</sup> prize**, in the amount of 148.317 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 113;**

The **III<sup>rd</sup> prize**, in the amount of 74.158,50 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 127;**

The **I<sup>st</sup> mention**, in the amount of 37.079,25 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 128;**

The **II<sup>nd</sup> mention**, in the amount of 37.079,25 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 114.**

## **5. STATEMENT OF THE JURY**

### **International Design Competition for VICTOREI SQUARE, TIMIȘOARA, 2023**

The Victoriei Square in Timisoara is a gateway to public spaces of the city center, with a distinctive "square-garden" character. But although it has great spatial potential, the square lacks an integral urban design that would show its values and offer a vision of its future in terms of content and possibilities of use.

The jury appreciates the intention of the city authorities to revitalize the Victoriei Square into a modern public space and to launch an international competition to get the best solution for its redesign and revitalization. The interest of 30 participants who submitted the project to propose ideas for improvement of this complex and interesting site, and the diversity of their approaches, clearly show that the competition was necessary, and the competition brief was well prepared.

The jury analyzed and reflected upon the proposals and discussed among them many remarkable proposals. Multiple visions were proposed for the square, which is why the jury had the very demanding task of classifying and carefully evaluating each of the proposals in accordance with all evaluation criteria of the proposed solutions.

The jury especially appreciated the projects that researched, analyzed and creatively reflected on the existing qualities of the space, its history, complexity, diversity, connections, many important existing buildings, urban elements and memories. Moreover, the jury especially evaluated the aspects of the landscape design and closely related ecological dimensions, which are key to the vision of the future of the public space as a whole, and especially of this square, which inherits the character of an emphatically green urban zone.

The jury embarked on a deep analysis, in order to recognize projects that represent a transition between the existing qualities of the space into their perfected, carefully thought out, ecologically responsible and quality designed proposal. In other words, the jury was looking for the right balance between old and new, projects that use existing qualities and introduce new ones; which recognize and preserve the historical and physical, tangible and intangible qualities of the space, but at the same time open space for a new and richer life of/on the square.

The jury searched for projects that meet all of the above criteria, which contain modern values of sustainability, ecology, accessibility and feasibility, but at the same time retain the necessary flexibility in the further development of the project, which does not compromise the concept and integrity of the idea.

Carefully examining the projects according to the prescribed criteria, the jury concluded that the selected mentions and prize-winning projects best satisfied them, having the highest coherence between functionality and the strong conception, invention and creativity. Also, the feasibility of the projects was considered, that is, the possibility of transmitting the idea into reality without major obstacles.

The jury, coming from different backgrounds, had many fruitful and mutually enlightening discussions and shared different opinions. It was a challenge and both intellectual and professional pleasure to bridge different perspectives through a constructive dialog about all the complex topics that were in focus, and at the end reached a harmonious agreement about the selected projects.

## 6. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### PROJECT NO. 109 – FIRST PRIZE

The jury recognizes this project as the first prize winner because it expertly addresses architectural, urbanistic, functional, and landscape requirements, while simultaneously providing significant added value to the place. This project is a testament to the harmonious convergence of contemporary urban life with nature.

From a broad perspective, the jury lauded the preservation of the square's typological specificity—embodying the concept of a “city-center square-garden”. Notwithstanding the challenges posed by the current utilization of this space, the infusion of nature into the urban setting remains its most enchanting feature. The project draws inspiration from these existing qualities, augmenting them with innovative elements. The space was evaluated holistically, subsequently identifying four distinctive environments and the challenges inherent to each. These challenges were addressed with delicacy and a modern touch.

Both the cathedral and the Opera house transcended mere two-dimensional urban flat image; they were perceived as integral components of the square, whose corresponding segments of the public space are skillfully delineated. The square's longitudinal layout is envisioned as a continuum between these two prominent landmarks. The spatial demarcation between the square's sides and its center is clearly defined. This design caters to a myriad of functional uses and dynamic movements: from leisurely seating adjacent to the lush greenery, or café terraces spanning the square, to brisk walks alongside the tree-lined perimeters, or observational transit through the rain garden.

This project's deference to the location's history, as incorporated into its future vision, is evident in the retention of certain symbolic urban elements in their original locations, and the strategic relocation of others to highlight their significance. The project's transformative vision doesn't overshadow pre-existing values. Furthermore, the design ensures inclusivity for users of all ages and backgrounds.

The design is contemporary and tailored specifically for each recognized ambiance. The relationship with the side streets, which aren't equipped generically, but through an analytical approach based on the study of each space, is commendable. The expansion of the entrance to the underground level and its activation is also positively evaluated. This design gesture simultaneously draws attention to the Huniade Castle.

The square is conceived as an 'urban carpet' which connects all the elements and symbols of the space. The long promenade has been transformed into an open system of spaces and gardens, credited to a well-established hierarchy of places and urban design elements. The idea of reusing marble parts of the existing pavement, which aligns with the general approach of building upon existing structures rather than erasing them, is commendable.



Also, the position chosen for the elevated podium for public presentations at the location of the temporary Nursery, which featured the planting of 1306 plants in Victoriei Square, is deemed of fine quality.

The project is feasible in terms of execution, allowing for construction in logical phases.

From an ecological perspective, the project accentuates the existing character of the garden-square and, in line with contemporary ecological considerations, celebrates biodiversity and demonstrates the highest level of ecological sensitivity. The proposed list of trees and other species is precise and abundant; the height and density of the plants respect the values of the existing environment and the need to provide shade. The jury appreciated the attention to local fauna, especially the species of birds that inhabit the current square, which through this redesign, are intended to be retained in the space. The introduction of an 'urban rain garden' is a very welcome concept applied in this project.

### **Jury recommendations**

The recommendations are directed in three thematic areas:

Accessibility:

- The jury recommends that more intensive accessibility be considered in the central part of the square in the rain garden area, in order to facilitate the direct access of people to the plants.

Visibility:

- A detailed examination of the selection of trees (volume, shape, and maintenance) in relation to all visibility lines and the visibility of facades, main buildings, and spatial symbols is essential, especially concerning the area around the Huniade Castle.

Design:

- The adjacent pavement should be sensitively differentiated from the main pavement.
- The areas surrounding Huniade Castle should be further developed.

**PROJECT NO. 113 – SECOND PRIZE**

The project builds upon the inherent character of the "square-garden", but with an entirely fresh approach that introduces a novel organization and conception of space. The inventive methodology is lauded, as it unveils new opportunities for interaction amongst users and between users and the urban-landscape milieu. The proposal is based on intensive accessibility.

The pronounced longitudinal orientation of the solution facilitates a clear, adeptly articulated division between the central and peripheral zones of the square. Simultaneously, it accommodates diverse circulation routes in all directions. Present, significant green, public space in this proposal morphs into an interactive zone, receptive to varied utilization scenarios - a democratic realm that beckons engagement.

The design elements are modern, and the repositioning of the symbolic urban elements in the space was executed with a sensitivity that the jury commended. The proposition to situate the museum at the underground level, managed by the city government, is deemed as a high-quality proposal.

The project unveils an innovative, contemporary approach to water. However, the emphasis on movement as the primary design catalyst shifted the landscape and ecological aspect of the project to the background, both in terms of quality and quantity.

### **Jury recommendations**

Central zone of the square:

- Fundamentally, the prime critique is the scant attention bestowed upon the landscape regions in the square's nucleus, which occasionally appear just as a residuals of a potent design gesture. The jury advocates for a more robust integration of the botanical aspect, incorporating additional trees and expanded green areas.
- A reconsideration of the material utilized for the central surface is advised.

Interconnection between the cathedral and opera edifices:

- The visual link between the church and the opera ought to be highlighted.

Spatial configuration:

- The plaza in front of the cathedral is perceived as too confined. In this context, a reevaluation of the usage scenarios for this area and the requisite infrastructure is necessary.

### **PROJECT NO. 127 – THIRD PRIZE**

The project begins with the idea of transforming the existing square into a memorial park. Recognizing Victoriei Square as the symbolic birthplace of Romania's liberation, the new design seeks to emphasize this historical significance in the collective memory by turning the square into a commemorative space. By merging the memorial essence with the park's ambiance, landscape itself becomes the vessel for commemorating the revolution. Trees in the square symbolize the heroes of the Revolution; they encapsulate memories from their very planting, envisioned as a communal endeavor.

The jury believes the project conveys a simple yet strong and potent message. It responds with a sophisticated and cohesive design, potently crafting a contemplative space. Drawing from spatial analysis, the project seamlessly integrates historical layers into its design.

While the project facilitates movement in all directions, the tree arrangement impedes interaction with the square's existing boundaries. It also neglects the connection between the cathedral and the opera house — two pivotal spatial landmarks and defining features of the square. Regarding the open spaces adjacent to these two buildings, the jury evaluates that the area in front of the cathedral with the monument is well-executed. Conversely, placing the fountain in front of the opera house is not both functionally and aesthetically optimal.

From a design and ecological standpoint, the pavement proposal is commendable. However, it's worth noting that a majority of the surfaces are mineral. While some are permeable, the green ground coverage is minimal, especially around the trees, which have restricted space.

#### **Jury recommendations**

- To increase the green areas and create more gathering spots for diverse activities.
- To consider side streets, neglected in the current proposal, as an integral element of the overall spatial concept.



## 7. FINAL RANKING

COMP. NO.	PT.	COMMENTS
109	92,95	<b>1<sup>ST</sup> PRIZE</b>
113	88,23	<b>2<sup>ND</sup> PRIZE</b>
127	84,19	<b>3<sup>RD</sup> PRIZE</b>
128	82,19	<b>1<sup>ST</sup> MENTION</b>  <p>The project proposes transforming the existing garden base at Victoriei Square into an urban forest, which is more accessible to users than the current square and contains a greater number of subspaces with varied usage possibilities.</p> <p>The jury values this solution because it combines and emphasizes the specific character of the “garden-square” with enhanced accessibility. The project promotes inclusiveness and pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>The space in front of the cathedral is recognized as an entrance area, while the space in front of the opera building is designated as a memorial space and is marked by a small but conceptually and symbolically strong intervention.</p> <p>The incorporation of water into the design is commendable, as is the attention to the different perceptions of place throughout the seasons, and the careful formation of light and shadow using trees. However, the jury finds shortcomings in differentiating the intensity of the greenery based on the qualities of the urban space, as well as the insufficiently presented green carpet.</p> <p>Another weak point is the uniformity of experience in the entire central part of the space due to the repetition of the</p>



		same spatial gesture regardless of the changes occurring in the space – thus, the subspaces lack the necessary distinction.
114	80,22	<p><b>2<sup>ND</sup> MENTION</b></p> <p>This project deserves recognition for its strong and clear idea of directly extending the park space, enveloping the cathedral, and entering the city through Victoriei Square. In this way, the square clearly becomes a green gateway to the city's old center. This green entrance is subsequently extended through the square by a green linear system, which also incorporates the side streets. The jury appreciates this concept, which accentuates the “garden-square” character inherent to Victoriei Square.</p> <p>However, this powerful idea has its flaws, as the dense greenery significantly reduces the view of the cathedral (which is one of the key landmarks in the city) from all other directions except from the square itself.</p> <p>The jury commends the placement of the sculpture in front of the cathedral without a pediment. Yet, there is criticism regarding the seating area in the center of the square being too narrow and overly static.</p> <p>The main critique of the project is the creation of a new "gateway pavilion", which is unjustified both as an idea and in its unfavorable location, and the space around it is inharmoniously articulated. However, the park space in front of the school deserves praise, as does the area around Huniade Castle.</p>
101	77,40	<p>The proposal stands out through a reserved balance between the classical linear composition of the central garden and the newly suggested pathways. It is notable for its detailed approach through the reuse of reminiscent elements of the passage while introducing new elements (the</p>



		<p>sundial), although there is a need for a unifying compositional concept. The work meticulously addresses object details, but at the same time, the overarching generative main idea requires a more decisive expression.</p>
106	75,20	<p>The project is respecting the spatial organization and the three existing parts of the square. The project develops the relationship of the square with the Cathedral. Rows of trees have been added on both sides of the square, and a good arrangement of the park around Huniade Castle has been developed. But the central part of the square, which is at present a garden, was canceled, and this point represents a reduction of the proposal. Also the solution for the square in front of the Opera is not convincing.</p>
108	72,43	<p>The project has offered a very sensitive and thoughtful representation of the historical context, especially the Petrovaradin Gate, with a good architectural solution represented in front of the Opera and the Cathedral. Keen solutions are represented in the drawings especially regarding the Crucificare statue. The solution for Huniade castle is positive as it adds vegetation but the perspective towards the castle is altered. An excessive geometrical scheme is repeated all along the square with the reduction of the garden surface.</p>
123	68,18	<p>The jury acknowledges the project's initial references and the intention to unify the space, as well as the reevaluation of the areas at both ends of the central axis. Additionally, the intention to create retreat spaces (rooms) stands out, but there is a recognized need to diversify the experiences they offer. The proposed solution for the public space in front of the Modex building requires a reconsideration, in light of the importance of the Huniade Castle and the relationship it establishes with it.</p>



104	65,68	The first project reference is suggested to be the Mall in St. James Park, and it is a correct reference useful to develop the principal theme of the design - a large boulevard where to walk. In the middle three different situations have been created, but without really designing a garden. In front of the Opera a square has been designed and towards the Cathedral an interesting new location for the Crucificare sculpture has been proposed.
107	63,93	The work focuses on an overlaying network of directions rotated relative to the main axis, intended to organize the entire composition, but it lacks sufficient support and justification. In contrast to this approach, the alignments of trees are arranged parallel to the main axis, which does not support compositional coherence. This way of treating the horizontal surface, seemingly unifying from a graphic perspective, is not clear enough at the pedestrian level, as indicated by the presented images.
102	61,69	A total change of the present geometry is the first impact of the proposal. Round shaped flower beds with small hills create movement in the space. On the contrary a more severe geometry surrounds the Huniade Castle and a new woodland fills the space towards the Modex building to the north side. A dry fountain and a new shelter are set in the space in front of the Opera. The originality of the solution is in conflict with the present elements and eliminates the possibility to come across the square from south to north.
120	60,69	The general concept of the project is to enlarge the point of view to the surrounding areas, introducing rows of trees on the secondary streets. The principal character of the design of the square is based on the boulevard idea, but without developing the central existing garden. A good solution is proposed for the underground passage, however it can also



		pose some practical problems. The closing solution between the square and the cathedral lacks clarity.
115	56,18	The jury appreciated the consideration of each side street and subspace in defining functional areas, and the intention of relocating the monuments. Nevertheless, the solution seemed too empty and mineral, without places of gathering. Moreover, the project does not respond satisfactorily to the ecological dimension of the brief as it does not showcase its concept on landscape design and use of vegetation, nor the rainwater management (evoked just as a decorative element).
110	51,69	The project proposes an "urban forest" which partially satisfies the ecological aims of the competition, nevertheless the other types of vegetation are scarcely present. Moreover the heritage value of the square is obstructed by the abundant canopy. The main problem is the proposed fences, which lowers the functionality of the space and creates an unattractive separation.
119	50,05	The project brings forward a concern for maintaining axial visibility of the two main buildings at the square's edges, while proposing a solution that is not bound by monotony. Moreover, the concern with memory is appreciated, while not successfully articulated. Nevertheless, the proposed space does not encourage sociability and diverse uses.
121	48,46	The jury appreciated the urban meadow concept and the relocation of monuments that provides a different profile for Huniade square. However, the project unfortunately lacks detail, as well as a consideration of the side streets. The connection with the cathedral is not treated





		satisfactorily. Moreover, the representation is at times unclear.
118	46,29	The Jury appreciated the solution around Huniade Castle, engaging with the ecological history of the area, as well as the accessibility of the designed spaces. Nevertheless, the main square has a rigid approach, unsatisfactorily addressing the landscape design, including the issue of adequate sun protection that affects the space today. The presence of kiosks in Huniade square raised the question of the flexibility of uses. There were also concerns about the covering of the Modex buildings.
124	42,96	The jury appreciated the inclusion of activities for different generations. The project centers on a mineral solution with a rigid design. The main concept of the folk pattern was unconvincing, not connected with the history and value of the square and accentuating an already long square.
126	40,72	The proposed design is not justifiable enough neither from an esthetical point of view, nor from a functional one. Particularly problematic are the suspended pedestrian walkways. Moreover, the elevated structure is blocking the perspective to Huniade square and the visibility of the Castle.
105	37,00	The proposal changes the space in a radical way. It introduces the central open access with organically shaped landscape on the edges of the longitudinal square. The longitudinal elements are differentiated with pavements and greenery. The project emphasizes transitional axes of the side streets which largely break the main axis into three parts. The circular square in front of the opera is closing the side Huniade Square and also the views from the adjacent



		<p>streets. The proposal for the Huniade Sq closes new, bringing some vegetation in front of the Modex building and creating a small square in front of the historic castle, hiding it perhaps too much. The pavement is very diverse and is not helping to connect the space as a whole. Many new proposed elements are not in coherence with the existing buildings and memorial elements of the space.</p>
125	33,59	<p>The proposal is very urban, changing the area from the garden into a mineral platform. The carpet landscape is replaced with trees which do not emphasize the linear logic of the space. The proposal for the presentation of the wall is radical, it poses the question of presentation and functionality. The symbols are rearranged without a clear functional reason. The concept of landscape is unclear and not elaborated enough. The water basin in front of the cathedral is an interesting proposal, but the bridge is destroying it. The geometrically shifted squares with proposed scenarios of the programs are not in accordance with the main pavement plan.</p>
129	32,68	<p>The project opens well the central axis but at the same time does not introduce much volumetric greenery. The carpet greenery which is covering the central area offers many different possibilities for the users and experience of the proposed landscaping. The squares in front of the opera and Cathedral are well proportioned but do not offer new inventive proposals for the place. The proposal for the Huniade square with the proposed playground fountain and the pavilion is closing the space very much.</p>
117	27,44	<p>The idea of the project introduces a new carpet of greenery into the square, which has no respect to the existing qualities of the place. The natural green functions as a park and opens up in the squares which all have the shape of a half circle. Transitions are not clear and problematic in all</p>



		<p>directions. The underground passage is not used for any public program. The way adjacent streets interact with the main square is very formal. The sunken square in front of the opera is not an appropriate proposal. The project is very undefined, and it is difficult to understand how it could really function in the space. The landscape is not related to the buildings and the longitudinal logic of the space. The quality of the presentation is not complex enough, clear and sensitive.</p>
122	24,68	<p>The project proposes the radical change of the existing space. The flow through space is the starting point for new forms which define the structure in the space. The green islands form, together with the trees a new landscape in the existing void between the buildings. The project has no relation to the complex history of the area and offers no public spaces for the community's future. There is no open space in front of the Opera, also the role of the Cathedral in the square is not present enough. Transitions from the lateral streets are not possible. Functionality of the project is problematic, as well as sustainability and maintenance of it. The presentation of the project lacks complexity and sensitivity.</p>
112	23,22	<p>The project suggests a radical transformation of the space. It changes everything in the main square and in the adjacent streets. It introduces many different elements which are not coherent between each other and with the existing values of the space. With the new landscaping proposal, the project tries to make the space more dynamic and enable more transitions, ignoring the qualities which are already there. The proposal for the square has nothing to do with the historical layers of the city, it is not functional and is bringing a lot of confusion to the space instead of unifying it. A city is not a tabula rasa, a careful reading of the existing should be</p>



		the starting point for every good project, whether urban renewal or new architecture.
116	16,46	The proposal does not introduce many changes to the existing space. The three green islands remain and the existing vegetation as well. It proposes the rearrangement of Huniade Square, a new pavement and the renewal of all the infrastructure. It does not suggest improvements in spatial connections, interactions inside the space and in the landscape. The proposal for the adjacent streets is not developed. The project does not bring any interesting suggestions for improvement of the space and is not elaborated enough on any level, from the concept to design, landscape, details, and materiality.

This Jury Report was drafted in two copies in Timișoara, on 15.10.2023.

arch. Ana Sverko

arch. Maria Chiara Pozzana

arch. Maruša Zorec

urb. Gruia Bădescu

arch. Dragoș Oprea

arch. Ciprian Silviu Cădariu

arch. Titus-Gabriel Almăjan – Representative of AC

arch. Monica Sebestyen

deputy mayor Ruben Lațcău – Representative of AC

**Professional Advisors:**

arch. Daniela Calciu

arch. Kazmer Kovacs

**Competition Coordinator:**

arch. Mirona Crăciun

**Jury Secretary:**

urb. Louisiana Stoica

**Organizing Team:**

arch. Raisa Parpală