

INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION - COLENTINA LAKES, 2ND DISTRICT, BUCHAREST

ANNEX 1 of the Jury Report - Points table according to the award criteria - LOT 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA		100	101	103	104	106	109	110	111	114	117	119	120	121	124	125	127
<b>A. Satisfying the architectural - urbanistic functional – landscape needs – 60% of the final evaluation (maximum 60 points)</b>	<b>A1. Viability of the urban planning and landscaping intervention – maximum 15 points</b> - Integration of the intervention in the: - urban context, meaning the consideration of the relations 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 plant 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 complementarity of the proposals, expressed both at the level of the Conceptual Intervention Scheme and the Design Solutions.	14,00	12,00	14,00	10,00	13,00	6,00	6,00	12,00	7,00	8,00	10,00	5,00	11,00	13,00	6,00	6,00
	<b>A2. Coherence of the urban planning and landscaping intervention – maximum 15 points</b> - The way in which the proposals relate to the existing built and vegetal background (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 furnishing of zones and sub-zones (proposed constructions and urban furniture elements used).	11,00	11,00	14,00	6,00	13,00	6,00	6,00	11,00	7,00	7,00	8,00	5,00	9,00	13,00	5,00	6,00
	<b>A3. Functionality of the proposed solution – maximum 25 points</b> - 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.	21,00	19,00	24,00	9,00	22,00	6,00	7,00	18,00	9,00	11,00	13,00	6,00	15,00	23,00	9,00	7,00
	<b>A4. Financial Criterion – maximum 5 points</b> Compliance with the maximum cost estimate of the investment and design indicated in the competition documentation.	3,73	3,73	3,74	3,73	3,73	3,90	3,74	3,81	3,93	4,29	3,85	3,94	3,73	3,79	4,39	5,00
<b>B. ADDED ARCHITECTURAL &amp; ARTISTIC VALUE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION – 40% of the final evaluation (maximum 40 points)</b>	<b>B1. The plastic expressiveness and aesthetic value of the proposed intervention in itself and in relation to the surroundings - maximum 15 points;</b> - 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;	10,00	11,00	15,00	7,00	12,00	5,00	7,00	10,00	5,00	6,00	11,00	4,00	10,00	13,00	6,00	5,00
	<b>B2. The character, quality, and atmosphere of the proposed spaces - maximum 15 points</b> - 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;	10,00	10,00	13,00	6,00	11,00	4,00	5,00	10,00	6,00	5,00	6,00	6,00	8,00	13,00	5,00	6,00
	<b>B3. The quality and clarity of the representation of the ideas so as to illustrate the participant's ability to implement the proposed project - maximum 10 points</b>	8,00	8,00	9,00	4,00	8,00	5,00	3,00	7,00	4,00	4,00	6,00	5,00	7,00	9,00	5,00	3,00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>77,73</b>	<b>74,73</b>	<b>92,74</b>	<b>45,73</b>	<b>82,73</b>	<b>35,90</b>	<b>37,74</b>	<b>71,81</b>	<b>41,93</b>	<b>45,29</b>	<b>57,85</b>	<b>34,94</b>	<b>63,73</b>	<b>87,79</b>	<b>40,39</b>	<b>38,00</b>
		<b>100</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>127</b>

land.arch. Mary Bowman

arch. urb. Toader Popescu

Professional Advisors  
arch. urb. Sorin Manea

16.09.2024

land. arch. Iris Chervet

arch. Vlad Sebastian Rusu

Competition Coordinator  
arch. Mirona Crăciun

arch. urb. Alina-Alisa Bratu -  
representative of the CA

arch. Ștefan Ghenciulescu

urb. Andreea Necșulescu

arch. urb. Elena Stoian

Jury Secretary  
arch. Raisa Parpală

urb. hydrologist Christian Piel

arch. Felicia-Daniela Munteanu - reprezentant AC

urb. Louisiana Stoica