



COLENTINA LAKES, 2ND DISTRICT, BUCHAREST

INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION

Design, reconfiguration, systematization of the areas (shores) corresponding to the lakes located within the administrative territorial radius of Sector 2

Reference number issued by the Contracting Authority: DC1000216 - B/21/2024

JURY REPORT

DATE: 12-16.09.2024

LOCATION: National Arena, 2nd District, Bucharest

1. JURY

Full members:

- landscape arch. Mary BOWMAN
- arch. landscape des. Iris CHERVET
- arch. urb. Alina-Alisa BRATU - Chief Arch. 2nd District, Representative of AC
- urb. Andreea NECȘULESCU
- urb. hydrologist Christian PIEL
- arch. urb. Toader POPESCU
- arch. Vlad Sebastian RUSU
- arch. Ștefan GHENCIULESCU

Deputy members

- arch. urb. Elena STOIAN
- arch. Felicia-Daniela MUNTEANU - Representative of AC

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE JURY

The Jury members met in Bucharest, on the 12th of September 2024. All members of the Jury were present for the Jury works and landscape arch. Mary Bowman 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. urb. Sorin Manea, arch. Cătălin Berescu
- Jury Secretary: arch. Raisa Parpală, urb. Louisiana Stoica.

There were **30 tenders** submitted in the competition. All projects complied with the provisions of the Competition Rules concerning the works of the Reception

Secretariat. Therefore, **30 tenders** 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.

Upon opening the packages, the Technical Committee noted that the tenders with Reception Secretariat entry numbers 1, 2 and 3 present the same conceptual intervention scheme - although submitted separately, they represent a single tender with 3 lots, that received **competition number 110**.

Tenders with competition numbers 107 and 122 exceeded the maximum cost estimate of the design services contract of Lot 1 (established at **10.398.406,6 lei without VAT**, as per article 4.2.5 of the Rules, detailed in *Annex 2.6 - Cost estimate*), infringing **articles 2.1.1., 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 tenders with competition numbers 107 and 122**.

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 **26 tenders** have been admitted into the Jury proceedings, in which projects containing 1, 2, or 3 lots were tendered, as follows:

- for **Lot 1, 21 projects** have been admitted in the Jury proceedings.
- for **Lot 2, 16 projects** have been admitted in the Jury proceedings.
- for **Lot 3, 16 projects** have been admitted in the Jury proceedings.

Thus, a total number of 53 projects have been admitted in the Jury proceedings.

3. SOLUTION EVALUATION CRITERIA

The criteria that substantiated the evaluation of the proposed solutions are the following:

A. MEETING THE FUNCTIONAL & LANDSCAPING AND ARCHITECTURAL REQUIREMENTS - 60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points)

Compliance with the minimum requirements demanded by the competition brief is evaluated on a scale from 1 to 60. It is calculated by the sum of the points awarded by the jury for the following aspects:

A1. Viability of the urban planning and landscaping intervention – maximum 15 points

The following will be scored:

- Integration of the intervention in the:
 - o urban context, meaning the consideration of the relationship with the surroundings and with the areas of interest in the vicinity, taking into account



the compliance with the regulations and urban planning conditions of the area;

- context of the existing natural environment, meaning the selection and composition of the proposed planting material in relation to the conditions of the site;
- The configuration of the urban designs, the roadway/ pedestrian areas, the areas limiting the road in relation to pedestrian traffic, etc;
- The opportunity and the complementary nature of the proposals expressed both at the level of the *Conceptual Intervention Scheme* and the *Design Solutions*.

A2. Coherence of the urban planning and landscaping intervention – maximum 15 points

The following will be scored:

- The way in which the proposals relate to the existing built and natural environment (the ability to form a coherent and harmonious landscape);
- The concepts of planting, design and perception, with reference to harmony, complementarity, variety and the ability to preserve or form specific identities in a coherent landscape ensemble;
- The quality of architectural-volumetric solutions, with reference to the development of zones and sub-zones (proposed constructions and urban furniture elements used).

A3. Functionality of the proposed solution – maximum 25 points

The following will be scored:

- Versatility and ability to adapt the proposals to changes in context, foreseeable changes in the administrative, legislative and urban development of the city.
 - the ability to functionally adapt the proposals and optimize the use of spaces (functional changes or the exercise of activities depending on the time of day or year);
 - the ability to form functional (zonal) sequences;
 - the adaptation of details and finishes to the specific needs of each programme/function.
- Inclusion, associated with accessibility, dialogue and social openness;
- Sustainability, associated with the respect for the natural and built environment (the characteristics of the presented solutions in terms of their resistance and maintenance over time, meeting the nZEB standard, the use of Nature-Based Solutions - NBS, etc.) but also for existing cultural values (including the educational and formative role of the proposed facilities);
- Resolution of the proposed functional units/areas, with representation at the activity level (sports typologies and their requirements, cultural & social and recreational activities, promenade, etc);



- Phasing of interventions, minimizing the discomfort created in carrying out the activity during the implementation period.

A4. Financial criterion - maximum 5 points

Compliance with the maximum cost estimate of the investment and design indicated in the competition documentation will be scored.

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

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

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

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:

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

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 plastic expressiveness and aesthetic value of the proposed intervention in itself and in relation to the surroundings – maximum 15 points

The following will be considered:

- The overall concept, architectural and landscape expression;
- The representative/contemporary character of the proposed ensemble;
- The potential of the solution to establish a model of best practices;

B2. The character, quality, and atmosphere of the proposed spaces – maximum 15 points

The following will be considered:

- The force of "urban attractors" that the areas/objectives within the lots will have following the intervention;
- The quality and atmosphere of the proposed spaces and the sensory relationships generated;

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 Manea – 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, per each lot. It was agreed that the selection of the projects would be made through several rounds of analysis per each lot, to identify the most suitable proposals.

The Jury agreed upon the following working method:

Round I

In the first round, the Jury analyzed the **53** 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, per each lot. The Jury discussed elements related to the general concept of the entries and the approaches for each of the three lots, the typologies of the interventions, the functionality of the created spaces and the manner in which the solutions adapt to the needs of the study areas.

Lot 1

From the projects of **lot 1**, **9** projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining **12** projects left for **lot 1** after the first round were:

100, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 111, 116, 118, 123, 124 and 126.

Lot 2

From the projects of **lot 2**, **7** projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining **9** projects left for **lot 2** after the first round were:

100, 102, 103, 106, 108, 111, 116, 123 and 124.

Lot 3

From the projects of **lot 3**, **8** projects were eliminated in this round.

The remaining **8** projects left for **lot 3** after the first round were: **100, 101, 103, 106, 111, 119, 121 and 124.**

Round II

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the **29 projects** that successfully passed the first round: **12 projects** from **lot 1**, **9 projects** from **lot 2**, **8 projects** from **lot 3.**

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, per lot, and then discussing collectively the general approaches of the projects in what concerns both the A chapter criteria – meeting the functional & landscaping and architectural requirements and the B chapter criteria – added architectural – artistic value of the proposed intervention.

Lot 1

From the projects of **lot 1**, **6** projects were eliminated in this round.
The remaining **6** projects left for **lot 1** after the second round were: **100, 103, 106, 108, 116 and 124.**

Lot 2

From the projects of **lot 2**, **3** projects were eliminated in this round.
The remaining **6** projects left for **lot 2** after the second round were: **100, 103, 106, 108, 123 and 124.**

Lot 3

From the projects of **lot 3**, **2** projects were eliminated in this round.
The remaining **6** projects left for **lot 3** after the second round were: **100, 101, 103, 106, 111 and 124.**

Round III

The jury continued the analysis of the remaining projects for each lot and assessed them comparatively, seeking to identify those projects that demonstrate a thorough understanding of the particularities of each studied lot 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, for each lot, by their ability of integrating all the functions required by the competition brief, compliance with the needs and wishes of the Contracting Authority, in a territorial context, at the level of the Municipality of Bucharest and in the specific context of the



2nd District. The jury was also looking for excellence both in the concept and in the delivery.

Following this round of debate, for each lot, the project that will receive prizes and the ones that will be mentioned were established, as follows:

Lot 1

For **lot 1**, the three projects proposed to be given prizes were: **103, 106 and 116.**

For **lot 1**, the three projects proposed to be mentioned were: **100, 108 and 124.**

Lot 2

For **lot 2**, the three projects proposed to be given prizes were: **103, 108 and 124.**

For **lot 2**, the three projects proposed to be mentioned were: **100, 106 and 123.**

Lot 3

For **lot 3**, the three projects proposed to be given prizes were: **103, 106 and 124.**

For **lot 3**, the three projects proposed to be mentioned were: **100, 101 and 111.**

Round IV – Prize awarding

The jury unanimously decided:

For Lot 1:

The **Ist prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 10.398.406,60 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 103;**

The **IInd prize**, in the amount of 223.695 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 106;**

The **IIIrd prize**, in the amount of 124.275 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 116;**

A mention, in the amount of 49.710 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 124;**

A mention, in the amount of 49.710 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 100;**

A mention, in the amount of 49.710 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 108;**

For Lot 2:

The **Ist prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 8.692.194,41 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 103;**

The **IInd prize**, in the amount of 223.695 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 124;**

The **IIIrd prize**, in the amount of 124.275 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 108**;

A mention, in the amount of 49.710 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 106**;

A mention, in the amount of 49.710 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 100**;

A mention, in the amount of 49.710 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 123**.

For Lot 3:

The **Ist prize**, consisting in the design contract with an estimated value of 14.949.052,12 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 103**;

The **IInd prize**, in the amount of 223.695 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 124**;

The **IIIrd prize**, in the amount of 124.275 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 106**;

A mention, in the amount of 49.710 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 100**;

A mention, in the amount of 49.710 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 101**;

A mention, in the amount of 49.710 LEI without VAT, was awarded to **project number 111**.

5. STATEMENT OF THE JURY

International Design Competition for COLENTINA LAKES, 2ND DISTRICT, BUCHAREST, 2024

The Colentina Lakes in the 2nd District are part of a system of 15 lakes in Bucharest. The entire 'lake necklace' is part of a historical series of complex hydrological projects to create a recreational area to the north of the city. The lakes form an important ecological corridor at the city and regional scale. Over the last 35 years, the lakes and waterfront have been degraded due to intensive urban development, concessions affecting ownership, a general lack of maintenance and climate change. The lake shores are currently discontinuous and the area generally unmaintained. The opportunity for improvement and enhancement is ambitious and the Contracting Authority recognises that the lake and its shores are a precious natural resource and important amenity space for a growing population.

The brief stresses a need to achieve a continuity of the public paths along the shores and to improve the relationship between the lake and the surrounding neighborhoods.

The Colentina River plays an important role in the development of Bucharest and includes several important historical landmarks in addition to its environmental



importance as a green and blue corridor. The Implementation Area includes approximately 27 km of promenades, amenity spaces and lakeside landscape over more than 100 Hectares. Due to the scale of the project, the competition was divided into 3 separate areas or 'lots'. Each of the contestants was asked to provide a Conceptual starting point for 3 separate zones along the lakes. Contestants were free to decide which of the lots they would develop. Several of the teams developed more detailed proposals for all 3 lots.

In general, the jury found that the strongest projects had developed an overall landscape strategy which acknowledged that the string of lakes and the surrounding landscape must work together as one ecological system while at the same time allowing for punctual improvements to the lakeside amenities and system of pathways. Those projects without an appreciation of the wider context and without a proposal for a site wide strategy often provided weak detailed proposals for the individual lots.

The Colentina Lakes project has the ability to be a visionary landscape project for the city, the region and the nation. It can act as an exemplar project to promote the importance of clean water in the city, access to nature, and enhancing the lifestyle and wellbeing for a diverse and growing population. The jury strongly felt that in order for the project to realise this ambitious project to improve the quality of the landscape and access to the lakes, that the strategy for cleaning and improving the water quality needs to be integral to the conceptual approach from the start. The natural ecosystem cannot be thought of independently to the human activity surrounding the lake as the two are intertwined. The attraction of the string of lakes is the water and without an improvement in the quality of the water, the project is unlikely to be successful. Human habitation has degraded the water quality and surroundings, but human intervention has the capacity to reverse these conditions and create an environment where both people and the natural habitat can thrive.

- Each of the projects was reviewed with the following key points in mind:
- Continuity of the public paths
- Relationship to the urban surroundings
- Improvement of public amenities
- Eco-systems and nature-based solutions
- Example of good practice
- Can the concept proposals be seen as prototypes for other areas

The jury was therefore very concerned that unless there was a unifying approach to the wider landscape rehabilitation strategy, the contracting authority will find it difficult to present the project as an exemplar of landscape improvement worthy of an international design competition. Best practice in comparable European projects of

this scale would place equal importance on the ecological balance of the project with cultural, social and economic issues.

After long professional debates, the jury decided to award the first place for all lots to the project whose concept scheme stood out through its character and its capacity to become a best practice example. The jury reached this decision after four successive rounds of debates, at the end of which it concluded that this team has both the most convincing conceptual approach, as well as the strongest individual proposal for each lot.

We hope that this decision for a single vision will send a strong message to all the various departments in the city and metropolitan region to work in a collaborative way to realise the strategic goals that will be needed to improve the environmental quality of the Colentina Lakes in order to realise the grand ambition of this Design Competition.

General recommendations for the contracting team:

- While developing the proposal, the competitors have to bear in mind the fact that the projects within the implementation area defined in the competition brief must be realisable without having to extend the concept in the study area. The solution will pay specific attention to the topography of the land as well as to the ownership structure. Furthermore, it will pay attention to the planting scheme on the riverbanks and to inserting plants that play a strategic part in purifying the water.
- At the same time, the competitors will have to adapt the solution to the evolution of the current ownership structure, depending on the complexity and timeline of the subsequent expropriation procedures. Any changes arising from the evolution of the ownership of property will be discussed beforehand and agreed with the local authority.
- Seeking to reduce the segregation of the northern and southern areas, the winning team will improve the cycling and pedestrian connections between the two riverbanks of all three lots. The proposals will be based on detailed analysis and studies.
- The proposals need to take into account the accessibility and safety requirements for the pathways, ramps and steps to ensure that the site conforms to best practice and encourages people of all abilities and ages to enjoy the site.

6. LOT 1

6.1. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS LOT 1

Lot 1 General Jury Observations

In addition to the general objective of the promenade, this lot had to address the improvements to Verdi park as well as the connection from the park to the first lake. Responses varied between significant alterations to the park to conserving the existing layout. The relationship between the shore and the water was another issue explored in this lot. The more successful projects took on board the enhancement of the territory between the water and the shore in order to improve the latter's quality and to create new experiences of engagement with the water.

PROJECT NO. 103 – FIRST PRIZE

Jury Comments

The proposal for Lot 1 includes a natural bathing area which also functions as a theatrical space creating a strong entry point or 'door' to the project looking down from the bridge. The project has a good level of connectivity with Verdi Park directly linked to the Lake and expresses the connection with a boulevard of flowering trees through the park. The proposal offers a flexible approach to the activities within Verdi Park to be discussed and developed with the authorities. The jury felt that the proposal for the park is implementable at an early stage.

The proposal for Lot 1 uses natural strategies for cleaning the water while at the same time improving the landscape character. The scheme proposes different planting layers and creates an intermediary landscape between the water and the shore. Nature is introduced with a more urban character in this Lot. The different interventions can be read as part of a singular landscape.

Jury Recommendations:

- The team needs to pay attention to boundary limits surrounding the natural bathing pond and ensure that the proposal sits comfortably within the perimeter
- The proposal for enhanced planting and densification of vegetation needs to take into account the existing buildings and amenity spaces as well as planning documents and any other administrative documents already approved by the local authority
- The layout and dimensions of the floating islands used for water filtration will take into account the level of pollution, the currents and the climate. In order to do this, the layout of the floating islands, their shape and

dimensions will be discussed and approved by Romanian Waters, the local authority in Bucharest and the National Agency for Environmental Protection

- Within the strategy above, additional studies will need to be commissioned

PROJECT NO. 106 – SECOND PRIZE

Jury Comments

This is a strong and coherent project which is sensitive to the surrounding environment. The proposal poses a series of questions which the team aimed to address in their proposal with a focus on nodes, portals and bridges. The jury appreciated that this scheme used nature-based solutions in the landscape approach and considered a bigger area of intervention in the conceptual approach. The team sought to preserve local memory by re-using and re-animating existing structures and elements such as the pools. The overall quality of the graphics and images were professional, and the jury appreciated the simplicity and thoughtfulness of the interventions. Although this was a competent scheme, the jury felt that the scheme presented, and the conceptual approach taken was not as strong as the winner.

Jury Recommendations:

- The architectural proposals for all of the constructions will take into account the integration of the buildings with the existing natural landscape as well as the landscaping that is proposed.
- The proposal for enhanced planting and densification of vegetation including the pathways needs to take into account the existing buildings and amenity spaces as well as planning documents already approved by the local administration
- The team is to ensure that the location of bridges and paths are in appropriate places to ensure good pedestrian connectivity

PROJECT NO. 116 – THIRD PRIZE

Jury Comments

This project proposed nature-based solutions with rain water collection in Verdi Park. The jury appreciated that this project emphasised the connection between the surrounding neighbourhoods and the study areas through the water management strategy. The jury also noted that this team put forward a long term 50-year strategy for restoration of the landscape and was one of the few teams that proposed a planting strategy. The jury felt that the scheme for the pavilions and architectural elements could have been more developed and questioned the position of the bridges.



6.2. FINAL RANKING LOT 1

COMPETITION NO.	POINTS	OBSERVATIONS
103	94,68	1ST PRIZE
106	88,67	2ND PRIZE
116	84,85	3RD PRIZE
124	79,72	MENTION The team presented a good project with a response to the brief requirements but the jury felt this was not a very outstanding design solution for this lot. The team proposed natural areas that will act as a gradient between urban and natural in the vicinity of Verdi park, of which some cannot be implemented. The regular shaped reed beds proposed on the Tei lake might be difficult to maintain. The promenade is well linked with the surroundings and the team proposed different street profiles that favor slow mobility solutions next to Verdi park.
100	74,67	MENTION The project has a holistic approach to the urban context and of the integration of the proposals with the challenges in the vicinity. The solution tackles well and in detail the links with the city and the functional areas are well connected in respect to the natural habitat. The project also proposes various public amenities, designed as functional attractors, in order to respond to neighbourhood needs. The solution pays attention to flooding problems and is respectful of existing habitats. In general, the project exhibits good coherence between different sequences and scales. The jury appreciated the respectful approach of the existing natural elements, and the atmosphere proposed by this project.



		<p>The detailed solution of the pavilions does not serve the concept, and it does not provide an answer to the necessity of enhancing the attractions of the implementation area at city level. Even if the project proposes a landmark object that is repeated for the gateways / milestones points, the use of the same object without any site specific or functional adaptation sometimes becomes redundant.</p> <p>The jury recommends paying more attention to elements of detail, in order to obtain a more attractive solution for the entire site.</p> <p>The concept proposed for Lot 1 is good, but the level of detail does not generate a coherent approach to its specific problems. For Verdi Park, the jury appreciated the intention of following the traces of the former racetrack, but the idea is, unfortunately, not thoroughly implemented and not sustained by the landscape design proposal. The proposal also does not increase the attractiveness of the place.</p>
108	72,67	<p>MENTION</p> <p>The jury appreciated the project's ability to identify the main dysfunctional aspects of the studied public space and the proposal of viable solutions for them. The general concept based on natural rainwater management solutions and their precise detailing was appreciated, both in the case of adjacent street layouts and public green spaces. The project contributes significantly from the landscape point of view to the atmosphere of the studied areas, proposing specific vegetation for natural solutions for rainwater retention and filtration. The solution proposes materials and finishes in accordance with the general layout concept, also contributing to increasing the quality and attractiveness of the public space.</p> <p>Despite these very welcome measures, the project fails to be as convincing in terms of urban design and the atmosphere of the natural setting as other projects. In the development of Verdi Park, the jury did not identify a clear functional and compositional</p>



		hierarchy, although the intervention preserves part of the composition of the existing alleys.
123	65,67	<p>The people seem to be as much part of the proposal as the landscaping and ecological measures. Inclusive public spaces and community-oriented facilities, water cleaning and conservation are clearly present on most of the implementation area. In several places, though, the actual interventions contradict the philosophy and coherence of the proposal. The design for the structures, other constructions and the furniture does not reach, in the jury's opinion, the same level as other features of the project.</p> <p>In Lot 1, the Verdi Park suffers an excess of new platforms and other constructions. Their impact is heightened by what seems to be a rather heavy appearance. On the first section of Tei Lake, the circular pedestrian path is a welcome intervention, and the filtering grid becomes a valuable ecological instrument. However, the central position of the latter, its quite large surface, and the proposal of a general fog fountain strongly alter the perception of this important place. The connection to the urban context – particularly to the street and public spaces network - could be stronger.</p>
111	63,74	<p>The proposal has a good approach to the different sequences of landscape spaces over the entire site and of their relationship with the city, and also shows respect for planting details. The project unfortunately lacks an in-depth vision of the existing elements, both at city level and at local level, and does not succeed in creating a holistic approach of the entire implementation area or a landmark at city level.</p> <p>For Lot 1 the approach is not adapted to the existing elements, and it is too invasive and unrelated to the site.</p>
104	62,67	<p>The jury noted the quality of the inventory and diagnosis, and its graphic expression, which was very precise and technical. Special mention was made of the axonometric and topographical sections.</p>



		<p>However, this detailed expression does not make possible the understanding of the proposals for the continuity of paths, the link with the urban environment and the use of nature-based solutions. The jury regrets not being able to discern any original concepts and ideas. The atmosphere depicted in the perspectives does not provide any additional information. In conclusion, the project appears to be too neutral, insufficiently original and singular to be an attractive proposition for the scale of this project.</p>
118	59,74	<p>The team proposed a continuous shaded waterfront promenade, but with too many activity areas emerging along the way. Verdi and Petricani parks have simple schemes connected to the surroundings, but not a grand approach. The landscaping details are too generic.</p>
102	59,72	<p>The jury appreciated the quality of the graphic representation. However, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the proposed interventions from the existing buildings. The overall scale of the project is well understood, in terms of continuity and the link with the urban environment. On the other hand, the design of the public spaces on a plot-by-plot basis is inadequate, particularly in the parks (insufficient consideration given to natural ecosystems). The project proposes subtle interventions that respect the natural environment, without however conferring an identity that is sufficiently assertive to drive a distinctive renewal of the site.</p>
126	58,67	<p>The project exhibits strong concerns for the architectural solutions for various objects, but less so for landscaping. The jury has appreciated the presence of a planting scheme and the preoccupation with the year-round image of the site, but the detailed solutions for some of the objectives (e.g. Verdi park) is not strong enough. The stated idea of using biofilters is a good one, but it is not really integrated into the proposal. The concern for integrating the archaeological heritage with other functional attractions and the usage of a floating island as an</p>



		intermediate point for ensuring connectivity were also good local solutions.
119	54,78	This project has thought about discrete solutions for ecological reconstruction and proposes a variety of functional and formal solutions, but with a weak and understated general concept. Although there is a stated concern for environmental solutions, some of the areas are excessively mineralized. The general concept is not well served by the graphic presentation of the project. The solution for Verdi Park is not well connected to the rest of the implementation area. The local landscaping for this park does not enhance its importance within the general solution.
117	49,21	The team proposed some facilities along waterfront public spaces and parks showing a concern for providing the community with certain public facilities. There are too many built interventions in the Petricani ecosystem area. The general scheme is concerned with the connection with the urban tissue and suggests linking the banks in different ways. On other hand the proposals completely disregarded some existing urban areas and the bike lane looks curvy on too many segments to be comfortable.
105	47,00	The jury appreciated the quality of the graphic representation, particularly on the scale of the concept. The overall scale of the project is well understood, both in terms of the continuity of the public spaces and the relationship with the urban environment. On the other hand, at the plot level, the design of public spaces is inadequate, particularly in the parks. The public amenities are clearly improved, but the jury regrets the lack of nature-based solutions. More generally, the design of these parks appears to be too interventionist. Although interesting and rich in ideas, the overall design is insufficiently characterized to drive large-scale renewal of the site.
115	46,67	The solution aims for an integration in the natural and built environment, without creating a coherent and harmonious landscaping proposal. The jury



		<p>appreciates the creation of attraction points. Nonetheless, crowding them on the riverbanks has the opposite effect - that of creating a minimum interest. The graphic of the boards shows no particular concern to detailing the connection between the existing built and natural environment. The lack of quality and clarity in the representation does not support the concept.</p>
109	44,83	<p>The project proposes solutions for all three lots, trying to establish connectivity along the banks and in relation to the immediate neighbourhoods. Unfortunately, a unitary concept for the entire studied area is not highlighted, nor are there any particularizations of the layouts depending on the character of the place and the neighborhoods. The project does not deepen the landscape component requested by the competition theme and focuses more on anthropic interventions and urban design. The jury considered the proposed network of crossings and walkways on the surface of the water excessive, which risks affecting the natural character of the lakes and presupposes complicated and expensive constructive interventions.</p>
110	44,70	<p>The jury appreciated the in-depth study of the project for each lot. The project is rich in the offer of proposed facilities, trying to provide attractive amenities and facilities in relation to water for each area studied. The jury, however, considered certain arrangements as excessive, such as circular pavilions, concrete platforms, etc., which risk anthropizing the existing natural setting. The system of alleys and platforms are generic and formal, without adapting in terms of geometry in plan and materiality to the different character of the studied areas. Although the project proposes landscaping along the entire studied route, there is no single concept assumed, which would later be customized according to the nature of the intervention area.</p>
120	40,87	<p>The proposal has little concern for urban integration, proposes no functional attractors and has a weak</p>



		relation to the surrounding neighborhoods. The idea for the eight rooms has some potential but lacks conceptual consistency. It is also not clear how it relates to the city as a whole. The proposed architectural objects are invasive and hard to integrate. The proposed vegetation scheme is not well articulated with the various urban sequences. The graphic presentation does not add value or clarity to the project.
112	39,14	The team proposes a „layered city”, a superposition of actions and places. However, the places are rather locations on a map and not spaces (in terms of being defined by shape, materials, boundaries and connections etc.).
113	37,68	A network of viewpoints would raise awareness of the area and attract the people of Bucharest. The proposed interventions for Verdi and Plumbuita Parks come into conflict with the scale, the green character and, for Plumbuita, the historical elements.

7. LOT 2

7.1. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS LOT 2

Lot 2 General Jury Comments

This lot addressed the relationship of Plumbuita Park to the monastery and the surrounding neighbourhoods. More successful projects addressed the social needs and community use of this parcel. The area of implementation within this lot also included the rivers Colentina and Saulei confluence. The best projects proposed to enhance this area by introducing productive landscapes that occupy the territory in the joint area of the river and the lake.

PROJECT NO. 103 – FIRST PRIZE

Jury Comments

The 103 team have several poetic proposals for transforming the landscape which not only improve the quality of water and habitat but enhance the landscape experience for people. They have an evocative and ‘land art’ approach using relatively simple



easily understood ideas that have been tested in historical precedents. They reference the historical use of 'Chinampas' or floating productive gardens as a use for the rivers confluence in this Lot. The proposal would provide an interesting ongoing experiment with floating urban food production but also creates more organic nesting areas for birds. The reed beds can help to de-pollute the water and could be explored by kayak from the water.

This team has used a technical and functional landscape approach to create a very distinctive landscape which also has an educational component. The proposal of a tower would allow visitors to gain high level views of the rivers confluence and the lake in order to appreciate the landscape enhancements. The tower itself is of a scale that responds to the scale of the roadway and the rivers confluence and will become a landmark.

The proposal also suggests the repurposing of existing elements and creates simple geometrical forms for human activities which contrast with the replanting and more organic forms of the natural habitats. They have given thought to the structure of high, medium and low vegetation and suggest a very simple but poetic intervention to create a rectangular wildflower meadow cut from the forest. The glade in the park with its interactive water feature for children is in the same language of simple geometric insertions within an organic structure.

Jury Recommendations:

- Any vegetation proposed in the implementation area will respect and take into account the visibility toward the historical monument of the monastery as well as any other groupings of existing mature vegetation in the Plumbuita Park.
- The Plumbuita Park proposal is at the junction between two historic monuments, the park itself and the monastery. The competitors will take in to account the configuration of the water feature in light of the cultural character of the area and the historic importance of the monastery ie review the function of this space
- The proposal should try to strengthen and underline the connection and connectivity between the park and the monastery
- The architectural proposals for all of the constructions will take into account the integration of the buildings with the existing natural landscape as well as the landscaping that is proposed.

PROJECT NO. 124 – SECOND PRIZE

Jury Comments

The jury felt that this team presented a serious and professional project. The responses were respectful of the brief requirements and there is a good attention to

detail. The architectural elements need further refinement. The rendered images showed a sensitivity to design and illustrated well the landscape character proposed. The jury felt that some of the interventions were too discrete to create a strong identity for the project. The team proposed an interesting planting strategy. Water was used in a naturalistic way in Plumbuita Park. The jury felt that the scheme was however not as strong in concept or detailing as the winning team.

Jury recommendations:

The architectural proposals for all of the constructions will take into account the integration of the buildings with the existing natural landscape as well as the landscaping that is proposed.

PROJECT NO. 108 – THIRD PRIZE

Jury Comments

The jury commends this team for the approach to community engagement and consultation. The attention to the connectivity of the project to the wider urban context was also noted with a particular concern about the poorer neighbourhoods. The jury felt that the landscape response was not at the same level as the approach to engagement. The project was not very consistent and eclectic in its response. The jury found merit in the focus on productive gardens and educational community buildings but the level of design response was not convincing.

7.2. FINAL RANKING LOT 2

COMPETITION NO.	POINTS	OBSERVATIONS
103	92,27	1ST PRIZE
124	86,32	2ND PRIZE
108	78,25	3RD PRIZE
106	75,25	<p>MENTION</p> <p>This is a strong and coherent project which is sensitive to the surrounding environment. The proposal poses a series of questions which the team aimed to address, with a focus on nodes, portals and bridges. The jury appreciated that this scheme used</p>



		<p>nature-based solutions in the landscape approach and considered a bigger area of intervention in the conceptual approach. The team sought to preserve local memory by re-using and re-animating existing structures and elements such as the pools. The overall quality of the graphics and images were professional, and the jury appreciated the simplicity and thoughtfulness of the interventions.</p> <p>On Lot 2, the jury appreciated the coherence of the project and the subtlety of the proposed interventions. Nevertheless, on this part the project, the scheme is a bit less convincing compared to the other lots, particularly regarding the Plumbuita monastery park, where it is more difficult to identify the new proposed uses necessary to improve the attractiveness of the shores.</p>
100	74,25	<p>MENTION</p> <p>The general comments for Lot 1 apply to this Lot.</p> <p>The jury appreciates the idea of recreating and extending the fish farms, and also the approach proposed for the Plumbuita protected area by creating a good junction element between the two existing parts of the site, with a fluid pattern of alleys, as an integrative landscape solution.</p> <p>Unfortunately, for Lot 2 the project proposal integrated a heavily overworked bird tower located in Valea Saulei, which does not show the proper respect for the ecological value of the site. Also, even though the project has a holistic and integrated approach at urban level and in relation to the heritage value of the site, it does not succeed in expressing that for Lot 2 and does not integrate the social aspects and local community needs.</p>
123	70,25	<p>MENTION</p> <p>The people seem to be as much part of the proposal as the landscaping and ecological measures. Inclusive public spaces and community-oriented facilities, water cleaning and conservation are clearly</p>



		<p>present on most of the implementation area. In several places, though, the actual interventions contradict the philosophy and coherence of the proposal. The design for the structures, other constructions and the furniture does not reach, in the jury's opinion, the same level as other features of the project.</p> <p>On Lot 2, the social aspects of the proposal find their most fertile grounds. The urban beach orientated both towards the Plumbuita Lake and towards a closed-in and accessible strip of water and the present shore was strongly appreciated by the jury. This feature could well be replicated in several other places along the lakes. The formal proposal for the park itself misses a stronger connection with the neighbouring street grid. The intervention on Valea Saulei is quite intensive for a protected area and does not display an adequate level of detailing.</p>
102	63,62	<p>The jury appreciated the quality of the graphic representation. However, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the proposed interventions from the existing buildings.</p> <p>The overall scale of the project is well understood, in terms of continuity and the link with the urban environment. On the other hand, the design of the public spaces on a plot-by-plot basis is inadequate, particularly in the parks (insufficient consideration given to natural ecosystems).</p> <p>The project proposes softer interventions that respect the natural environment, without however conferring an identity that is sufficiently assertive to drive a distinctive renewal of the site.</p>
116	59,39	<p>The project embodies most of the qualities of Lot 1, particularly in its focus on nature-based solutions. Nevertheless, the proposals for form and uses, particularly in the Plumbuita Monastery Park, fail to address local issues and at the scale of the project as a whole. The graphic expression used in the</p>



		<p>perspectives illustrates the ambiances well, but does not provide enough details in terms of design.</p>
111	56,34	<p>The proposal has a good approach of the different sequences of landscape on the entire site and of their relation with the city, and also shows respect for the vegetation details. The project unfortunately lacks an in-depth vision of the existing elements, both at city level and at local level, and does not succeed in creating a holistic approach of the entire implementation area and a landmark at city level.</p> <p>For Lot 2 the design is not a representative one and also does not create the necessary transition between the two important elements of the site - the monastery and the Plumbuita Park.</p>
104	53,25	<p>The jury noted the quality of the inventory and diagnosis, and its graphic expression, which was very precise and technical. Special mention was made of the axonometries and topographical sections.</p> <p>However, this detailed expression does not make it possible to understand the proposals for path continuity, the link with the urban environment and the use of nature-based solutions. The jury regrets not being able to discern the original concepts and ideas.</p> <p>Particularly as the atmospheres depicted in the perspectives do not provide any additional information.</p> <p>In conclusion, the project appears to be too neutral, insufficiently original and singular to be attractive on the scale of the project.</p>
117	47,89	<p>The team proposed some facilities along waterfront public spaces and parks showing a concern to provide the community with certain public facilities. We could see a biodiversity intention in Saulei natural area. The general scheme is concerned with the connection of the urban tissue and suggests</p>



		linking the banks in different ways. On other hand the proposals completely disregarded some existing urban areas and the bike lane looks too curvy on too many segments.
118	46,35	The waterfront promenade has a green approach. Plumbuita park has a simplistic scheme connected to the surroundings. The location of the urban plaza next to Petricani street is placed in a very polluted and noisy area. The images presented for Saulei natural area look like a biodiversity area but this cannot be seen on the plans.
110	43,27	The jury appreciated the in-depth study of the project for each lot. The project is rich in the offer of proposed facilities, trying to provide attractive amenities and facilities in relation to water for each area studied. The jury, however, considered certain arrangements to be excessive, such as circular pavilions, concrete platforms, etc., which risks human activity of overwhelming the existing natural setting. The system of alleys and platforms are generic and formal, without adapting in terms of geometry in plan and materiality to the different characters of the studied areas. Although the project proposes landscaping along the entire studied route, there is no single concept assumed, which would later be customized according to the nature of the intervention area.
125	42,00	The project has a clear presentation, takes into account the connectivity needs of both sides of the river and creates plausible functional attractors in relation with the city. The proposal fails to solve in a satisfactory manner the articulation of the implementation area with its immediate vicinity. The concern for the social problems of the area is weak. The detailed areas exhibit neither convincing architectural or landscaping solutions nor an integrating formal concept.
120	36,50	The proposal has little concern for urban integration, proposes few functional attractors and has a weak



		<p>relationship to the surrounding neighborhoods. The idea for the eight rooms has some potential but lacks conceptual consistency. It is also not clear how it relates to the city as a whole. The proposed architectural objects have not been sensitively integrated. The proposed vegetation scheme is not well articulated with the various urban sequences. The graphic presentation does not add value or clarity to the project.</p>
109	36,42	<p>The project proposes solutions for all three lots, trying to establish connectivity along the banks and in relation to the immediate neighbourhoods. Unfortunately, a unitary concept for the entire studied area is not highlighted, nor are there any particularizations of the layouts depending on the character of the place and the neighborhoods. The project does not deepen the landscape component requested by the competition theme and focuses more on anthropic interventions and urban design. The jury considered the proposed network of crossings and walkways on the surface of the water excessive, which risks affecting the natural character of the lakes and presupposes complicated and expensive constructive interventions.</p>

8. LOT 3

8.1. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS LOT 3

Lot 3 General Jury Comments

Lot 3 covers the largest area of the site. This lot includes the design proposition for Cosmos Park and the strengthening of the connectivity along the Fundeni, Doboesti and Pantelimon lake edges. The more successful projects introduced activities along the river while at the same time addressing the river edge and the relationship between the shore and the lake.

PROJECT NO. 103 – FIRST PRIZE

Jury Comments

The proposal includes a public beach which is an interesting idea that needs to be studied to ensure that it is not encroaching on the waterway. The location of the beach facility is in an appropriate location as it is located near to Cosmos Park and other sporting and leisure activities. The jury appreciates that the proposal does not significantly alter Cosmos Park as it is relatively newly built which is a sustainable and economically sound approach. Simple pavilion structures are proposed including belvederes to the existing sport pitches. The project includes several bridges with a simple and elegant design. The architectural elements are simply and well designed and complement the landscape proposals.

Jury Recommendations:

- The team needs to test the feasibility of the beach proposed and adapt the solution with regard to the land survey and topography of the area and other constraints

PROJECT NO. 124 – SECOND PRIZE

Jury Comments

This team proposed discrete, neutral interventions which the jury felt were feasible and realistic schemes. The careful insertion of the built elements in the natural environment was noted. The proposals illustrated good connectivity to the surrounding neighborhoods. The response to the canal portion of the project was appreciated as intensifying the visitor experience and enlarging the space at the end of the canal. The response to Colentina Park showed a good balance between the existing and the proposed. This team found hidden spaces within the scheme to activate and enhance. Overall, the jury felt that there was not enough innovation and original thinking in this scheme compared to the winner.

Jury recommendations:

- The architectural proposals for all of the constructions will take into account the integration of the buildings with the existing natural landscape as well as the landscaping that is proposed.
- The Cosmos Park needs to create a transition between the boulevard and the lake as a landscape proposal.

- The proposal needs to improve the connectivity between the banks and the water in the area indicated in the brief which shows a 50m zone adapting it for its ecological potential

PROJECT NO. 106 – THIRD PRIZE

Jury Comments

This project creates an urban beach as an attractor and focal point which connects to the neighbourhoods at a strategic point. The gradual descent into the water was appreciated as this experience is not available in other locations along the river. The team proposed different typologies for the re-naturalising of the shoreline which was appreciated by the jury. The team proposed to re-use some of the existing facilities and added water to Cosmos Park. The design of the architectural and urban furniture was not as strong as in other projects.

8.2. FINAL RANKING LOT 3

COMPETITION NO.	POINTS	OBSERVATIONS
103	92,74	1ST PRIZE
124	87,79	2ND PRIZE
106	82,73	3RD PRIZE
100	77,73	<p>MENTION</p> <p>The general comments for Lot 1 apply to this Lot.</p> <p>For Lot 3 the project proposal shows respect to the existing natural elements through a soft approach, and it is one of the few projects which debated also the problematic of the other river bank, in Dobroesti, thinking about its connectivity and perception, even though it lacks the force to transform this into a landmark at city level. Also, the solution integrates the existing water ecosystem and proposes a pedestrian path. For Lot 3, the use of the same architectural object becomes even more redundant.</p>



101	74,73	<p>MENTION</p> <p>The project provides a coherent proposal and integrates various amenities for the city. Also, the solution resolves the connectivity between the banks of the lakes and has an ecological approach for the entire site, including the water ecosystem. The jury appreciated the diversity of solutions for the shoreline, which fit well together without being monotonous.</p> <p>For Lot 3, the jury appreciates the appropriate and detailed solution, and the canal and the connections between public spaces, as well as the activation of the urban fabric on both shores are strong points of the proposal. The solution succeeded in linking together both sides of the canal. The weaknesses of the proposal is the pedestrian path, which is too invasive in relation with the natural context. The scope of the intervention in Cosmos Park is also a problem, and will not succeed in the long term in bringing added value to the site.</p>
111	71,81	<p>MENTION</p> <p>The proposal has a good approach of the different sequences of landscape on the entire site and of their relation with the city, and also shows respect for the vegetation details. The project unfortunately lacks an in-depth vision of the existing elements, both at city level and at local level, and does not succeed in creating a holistic approach of the entire implementation area and a landmark at city level.</p> <p>For Lot 3 the project proposes viable public spaces, as well as a good bridge design. The jury appreciated the extension of the vegetation towards the canal, but unfortunately the urban and design quality in the other objectives (e.g. Cosmos Park) are not in relation with the existing natural elements.</p>
121	63,73	<p>The project has good connectivity with the city and within the implementation area, and proposes thematic trails that hold the solution together. It also proposes viable functional attractors. The jury has</p>



		<p>appreciated the quality of the sections and the concern for integrating the solution with the topography of the site. The project has failed to transpose this concern in the detailed proposals. The idea of vertically expanding the planted areas has been well received, but they would have better served the general idea if they were placed in areas devoid of green spaces.</p>
119	57,85	<p>This project has thought about soft solutions for ecological reconstruction and proposes a variety of functional and formal solutions, but with a weak and understated general concept. Although there is a stated concern for environmental solutions, some of the areas are excessively mineralized. The general concept is not well served by the graphic presentation of the project. The landscaping solution for Colentina park has the potential of an urban landmark, but, in its current formula, is overstated and invasive.</p>
104	45,73	<p>The jury noted the quality of the inventory and diagnosis, and its graphic expression, which was very precise and technical. Special mention was made of the axonometries and topographical sections.</p> <p>However, this detailed expression does not make it possible to understand the proposals for path continuity, the link with the urban environment and the use of nature-based solutions. The jury regrets not being able to discern the original concepts and ideas.</p> <p>Particularly as the atmospheres depicted in the perspectives do not provide any additional information.</p> <p>In conclusion, the project appears to be too neutral, insufficiently original and singular to be attractive on the scale of the project.</p>
117	45,29	<p>The team proposed some facilities along waterfront public spaces and parks showing a concern to provide the community with certain public facilities. The general scheme is concerned about the connection with the urban tissue and suggests linking</p>



		the banks in different ways. On other hand the proposals completely disregarded some existing urban areas and the bike lane looks curvy on too many segments.
114	41,93	The project has the qualities of analysis and strategy on a territorial scale, but the proposals on the Lot 3 are unconvincing. The plans are not sufficiently precise, and the aesthetic of the design seems a little naive. The project should have further developed the relationship with the city, beyond the lake shores.
125	40,39	The project has a clear presentation, takes into account the connectivity needs of both sides of the river and creates plausible functional attractors in relation with the city. The proposal fails to solve in a satisfactory manner the articulation of the implementation area with its immediate vicinity. The concern for the social problems of the area is weak. The detailed areas exhibit neither convincing architectural or landscaping solutions nor an integrating formal concept.
127	38,00	The jury appreciates the concern for integrating the proposal with the local topographical situation. Although the project tackles ecological issues, it does not pay enough attention to the urban integration of the proposal, especially in relation with the built environment. The territorial layout of the functional attractors does not exhibit a convincing integrating concept. The detailed solutions on Lot 3 do not generate added value for the ensemble of the implementation area. The proposed architectural objects have no concern for sustainability.
110	37,74	The jury appreciated the in-depth study of the project for each lot. The project is rich in the offer of proposed facilities, trying to provide attractive amenities and facilities in relation to water for each area studied. The jury, however, considered certain arrangements as excessive, such as circular pavilions, concrete platforms, etc., which risk anthropizing the existing natural setting. The system of alleys and platforms



		<p>are generic and formal, without adapting in terms of geometry in plan and materiality to the different character of the studied areas. Although the project proposes landscaping along the entire studied route, there is no single concept assumed, which would later be customized according to the nature of the intervention area.</p>
109	35,90	<p>The project proposes solutions for all three lots, trying to establish connectivity along the banks and in relation to the immediate neighbourhoods. Unfortunately, a unitary concept for the entire studied area is not highlighted, nor are there any particularizations of the layouts depending on the character of the place and the neighborhoods. The project does not deepen the landscape component requested by the competition theme and focuses more on anthropic interventions and urban design. The jury considered the proposed network of crossings and walkways on the surface of the water excessive, which risks affecting the natural character of the lakes and presupposes complicated and expensive constructive interventions.</p>
120	34,94	<p>The proposal has little concern for urban integration, proposes no functional attractors and has a weak relation to the surrounding neighborhoods. The idea for the eight rooms has some potential, but lacks conceptual consistency. It is also not clear how it relates to the city as a whole. The proposed architectural objects are invasive and hard to integrate. The proposed vegetation scheme is not well articulated with the various urban sequences. The graphic presentation does not add value or clarity to the project.</p>

This Jury Report was drafted in two copies in Bucharest, on 16.09.2024.

Jury – full members:

land. arch. Mary Bowman – President of the Jury

land. arch. Iris Chervet

arch. urb. Alina-Alisa Bratu

urb. Andreea Necşulescu

urb. hydrologist Christian Piel

arch. urb. Toader Popescu

arch. Vlad Sebastian Rusu

arch. Ştefan Ghenciulescu

Jury – deputy members:

arch. urb. Elena Stoian

arch. Felicia-Daniela Munteanu

Professional Advisors:

arch. urb. Sorin Manea

arch. Cătălin Berescu

**Competition
Coordinator:**

arch. Mirona Crăciun

Jury Secretaries:

arch. Raisa Parpală

urb. Louisiana Stoica