



**MUREȘ PARKS, TÂRGU-MUREȘ**  
INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION

*„HIPPODROME PARK, MUNICIPAL PARK, TURBINEI CANAL BLUE-GREEN ENSEMBLE”,  
Reference number issued by the Contracting Authority: 4322823\_2022\_PAAPD1586510*

**JURY REPORT**

**DATE:** 24-27.04.2026

**LOCATION:** Târgu Mureș, Festivity Hall of Europa Elementary School / Európa  
Általános Iskola bilingual school

**1. JURY**

**Full members:**

- land. arch. Sarah Anne Cowles
- land. arch. Julie Lilas Martineau
- arch. Bogdan Severus Demetrescu
- land. arch. Albert Fekete
- arch. urb. Angela Kovacs
- arch. Daniela Florina Miheț – Representative of AC
- land. arch. Henri Bava

**Deputy members**

- land. arch. Ada Diana Codrean
- arch. urb. Tamas Iszlai

**2. ORGANIZATION OF THE JURY**

The Jury members met in Târgu Mureș on the 24<sup>th</sup> of April. Landscape arch. Albert Fekete (full member of the Jury) and arch. urb. Tamas Iszlai (deputy member of the Jury) announced that, for personal reasons, they could not be present for the Jury sessions. In accordance with the Competition Rules, art. 1.5.4., landscape arch. Ada Diana Codrean (deputy member) became a full member of the Jury, through the jury's decision.

All the other members of the Jury were present for the Jury works and landscape arch. Henri Bava was unanimously elected as President of the Jury.

The following persons were present next to the jury:



- Competition Coordinator: arch. Mirona Crăciun
- President of the Technical Committee: arch. Raisa Parpală
- Professional advisors: arch. Mircea Munteanu and land. arch. Ana Horhat
- Jury Secretary: urb. Louisiana Stoica

There were **23** projects submitted in the competition. All projects complied with the provisions of the Competition Rules regarding the works of the Reception Secretariat. Therefore, **23** projects were admitted to the Technical Committee 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. **Project no. 101** does not present the document Financial Proposal, and does not present the identity symbol written on the sealed envelope, **infringing articles 1.4.3., 3.6.2., 2.2.1. and 3.7.1 of the Competition Rules**. Therefore, the Technical Committee proposed to the Jury, on the basis of article 2.3.4 of the Rules, the disqualification of the project with competition number 101.

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

A total of **22** projects have been admitted to the Jury proceedings.

### 3. DESIGN EVALUATION CRITERIA

In assessing the designs, each criterion will be awarded points between 0 and a maximum expressed for each criterion. The criteria that will form the basis of the proposed solutions evaluation are the following:

**A FULFILLING THE FUNCTIONAL, TECHNICAL, LANDSCAPE, AND ARCHITECTURAL REQUIREMENTS 60 points**

**A1 Landscape – ecological – sustainable criterion 30 points**

The criterion assesses the capacity of the proposed design to use local geographical and landscape resources and to contribute to urban climate resilience. Several aspects will be taken into account for the evaluation of the criterion, such as:



- use, protection, and enhancement of existing geographical and landscape elements: vegetation, habitats, topography, hydrology, wetlands
- correlation of plant proposals with local climate conditions
- ecological added value of the proposed plant communities
- contribution to reducing the urban heat island - degree of tree canopy coverage and other nature-based solutions
- connectivity of the proposed blue-green interventions with the existing green network.

**A2 Functional criterion**

**15 points**

The criterion evaluates the capacity of the proposed design to meet functional requirements in terms of:

- efficiency and safety of pedestrian and bicycle travel
- efficiency and safety in operation
- versatility and capacity to adapt proposals to changes in context, optimization of space use (functional changes or carrying out activities depending on the time of day or year); capacity to form functional (zonal) sequences; adaptation of details and finishes to the specific needs of each program/function
- correlation of functions with each other so as not to negatively influence or disturb each other during operation
- accessibility for all types of abilities and age groups for the proposed functions in the intervention area, as well as for those existing on the intervention boundary
- specific design of the proposed functional units/areas for all proposed activities

**A3 Technical and management criterion**

**10 points**

- characteristics of the designs presented in terms of resistance, durability, and maintenance over time, use of Nature-Based Designs, meeting the nZEB standard
- quality of details and feasibility of the designs
- degree of differentiated management of planted (or built) areas, so that the intensive use of limited areas in the park

is counterbalanced by minimal management for other generous areas, left to develop almost entirely naturally

- use of different planting standards to correctly calibrate the initial investment with the need for areas with a clear atmosphere, right from the start.

**A4 Financial criterion**

**5 points**

The following will be scored:

Compliance with the investment and cost estimate indicated in the competition documentation.

**\*Exceeding the maximum cost estimate will lead to the project being disqualified.**

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

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

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

a) For the lowest of the offered prices (denoted Price min.) 5 points are awarded.

b) For the other prices offered (denoted Price(n)), the score  $P(n)$  is calculated proportionally, as follows:

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

**B ADDED ARCHITECTURAL-ARTISTIC VALUE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION**

**40 points**

**B1 The manner of integrating and the relationship with the neighbouring built environment and with the city as a whole, respectively the contribution to urban quality both inside and outside the intervention boundaries**

**15 points**

The criterion evaluates the capacity of the green spaces proposed by the project to integrate and relate to the neighbouring built environment and to the city as a whole, respectively their capacity to



contribute to urban quality both within the intervention boundaries and outside them.

**B2 The appearance of the green spaces and the general atmosphere following the proposed intervention 15 points**

The criterion evaluates the qualities of the design of the network of blue-green spaces, capable of generating aesthetic values of its own and those of the project, which are leading at the same time to new ways of valuing the natural heritage, new ways of appreciating the landscape, and new ways of understanding public space.

**B3 Quality and clarity of the representation of ideas so as to illustrate the competitor's ability to implement the proposed project 10 points**

The criterion evaluates the quality and clarity of the representation of designs and ideas, respectively, the extent to which the competitor demonstrates the ability and professional experience to implement these designs proposed by the project.

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

**Calculation algorithm for criterion A**

$A=A1+A2+A3+A4=30+15+10+5=60$  maximum possible points awarded

**Calculation algorithm for criterion B**

$B=B1+B2+B3 =15+15+10=40$  maximum possible points awarded

**Calculation algorithm for the final evaluation:**

$A+B=60+40=100$  maximum possible points awarded

#### 4. JURY SESSION – WORKING METHODOLOGY

The working sessions of the Jury were preceded by a visit to the competition site. Then, landscape arch. Ana Horhat and arch. Mircea Munteanu, the Professional Advisors of the Competition, 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 **22** projects individually, based on the Award criteria and the set of requirements expressed by the Competition Brief and the Competition Rules. After this individual analysis, a collective debate took place, leading the Jury to discard the projects that did not offer a suitable or detailed enough response to the specific requirements of the Competition Brief.

During the debate of the Jury, elements related to the general concept of the entries were assessed: their approaches to designing the intervention area, the manner of integration and the relationship with the neighbouring built environment and with the city as a whole, respectively, as well as the contribution to urban quality both inside and outside the intervention boundaries, and the extent to which the functional and community needs were met.

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

The remaining **15** projects left after the first round were: **100, 102, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 117, 118, 119, 121, and 122.**

##### **Round II**

The Jury sessions continued with the analysis of each of the **15** projects that successfully passed the first round.

In this round, the jury proceeded initially with a new individual evaluation of the projects. Following this new session of individual analysis, the proposals were discussed collectively. In this round, the entries were assessed in a more detailed manner through the lenses of the two main chapters of the Award Criteria:

- *A – Fulfilling the functional, technical, landscape, and architectural requirements*
- *B – The added architectural-artistic value of the proposed intervention*

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

The remaining **10** projects left after the second round were: **102, 105, 106, 107, 110, 112, 113, 117, 118, and 119.**

### **Round III**

The jury evaluated the **10** remaining entries comparatively, identifying the ones that manifested a deeper understanding of the particularities of the area and offered a more solid response to its challenges, using the award criteria and referring to the requirements of the Competition Brief.

The jury focused its attention on the projects' ability to integrate the program and all its functions, in compliance with the competition brief, and alignment with the needs and wishes of the Contracting Authority, taking into consideration the specificity of the Mureş Parks in Târgu Mureş context, as an important cultural and identity landmark for the city.

Following this round of debate, **4** projects were eliminated.

The projects selected to go further in the fourth round are: **102, 107, 110, 112, 118, and 119.**

### **Round IV**

The jury continued the analysis of the **6** remaining projects over collective debates, comparing in depth, throughout the Award criteria and the requirements of the Competition Brief, the strong and weak points of each of the remaining proposals.

The remaining **3** projects left after the fourth round were: **107, 110, and 112.**



## Round V – Prize awarding

The jury unanimously decided:

The **I<sup>st</sup> prize**, in the amount of **228,199.50 LEI + TVA** and the **design contract** with an estimated value of **14,952,128.21 LEI + TVA**, were awarded to **project number 110**;

The **II<sup>nd</sup> prize**, in the amount of **177,488.50 LEI + TVA**, was awarded to **project number 112**;

The **III<sup>rd</sup> prize**, in the amount of **126,777.50 LEI + TVA**, was awarded to **project number 107**;

The **I<sup>st</sup> mention**, in the amount of **76,066.50 LEI + TVA**, was awarded to **project number 102**;

The **II<sup>nd</sup> mention**, in the amount of **76,066.50 LEI + TVA**, was awarded to **project number 118**.

The **III<sup>rd</sup> mention**, in the amount of **76,066.50 LEI + TVA**, was awarded to **project number 119**.

## 5. STATEMENT OF THE JURY

### International Design Competition for Mureş Parks, Târgu-Mureş, 2026

The jury thanks and congratulates the leadership of the municipality of Târgu Mureş and the Order of Romanian Architects for organizing a design competition for a new urban park system that will restore the connection between the city and the Mureş River. The elements of the park system include redesign, reinvigoration, and integration of the existing Hippodrome Park, Municipal Park, and Turbinei Canal into a Blue-Green ensemble, which will deliver social, public health, and ecological benefits to all inhabitants of Târgu Mureş.

The jury met over several days to consider, analyze, critique, and reflect on the many concepts, strategies, and solutions in the proposals submitted to the competition. The jury selected the most visionary, inventive, responsive, and vibrant projects that meet the contemporary challenges of cities.

The jury focused on concepts that provided the best solutions to several key challenges:

**A: Landscape architecture vision**

- To create a new living landscape infrastructure in the city, informed by geography, hydrology, and history, that will serve the city today and in future generations.

**B: Climate challenges and sustainability**

- To transform the current public open spaces that are impermeable and lack shade into sustainable open spaces by increasing permeable surfaces to infiltrate rainwater and regulate temperature.
- Institute new hydrological and biodiversity strategies in the open spaces within the project area.

**C: Urban connectivity**

- Increase the number of pedestrian and cycle connections between the city fabric and isolated parks with a clear vision.
- Propose safe alternatives to complex connection points, including main road crossings, rail tracks, and the canal, for access by all ages and mobility levels.

**D: Space quality and functionality**

- Preserve and amplify existing assets of heritage architecture, iconic views, and places.
- Preserve and amplify existing trees and planted areas.
- Improve hydrological function and new uses, while respecting technical-hydrological requirements.

**E: Feasibility and management**

The jury emphasized the importance of:

- Creating a clear urban structure that contributes to the renewed identity of the City of Târgu Mureş, and the Mureş River, its tributaries and canals.
- Proposing a sustainable and legible concept for the open spaces that is inviting to all.

- Integrating architectural elements of collective memory.
- Adhering to the technical guidelines of the Romanian Water Authority.

The complex nature of the competition brief elicited a diversity of responses from well-qualified participants, with submitted projects addressing the challenges outlined in the brief to varying degrees and emphasizing different aspects, perspectives, and priorities. This outcome is considered a testament to the quality of the competition conception and its brief.

After careful consideration and evaluation of all proposals against the competition requirements, developed to meet the city's specific needs, the Jury is proud and pleased to announce six prize-winning proposals. Each of these selected projects significantly fulfils the established criteria.

The winning scheme is a clear and ambitious proposal. The winning proposal:

- Reveals the island territory between the canal and the Mureş River by establishing a continuous park system.
- Establishes a vibrant, continuous space for pedestrians, from the city center to the Hippodrome Park, by separating pedestrians from vehicular circulation.
- In the Hippodrome park, it proposes a thoughtful combination of new woodlands, integrating scenographic and multifunctional clearings, with a clear geometry that refers to the symbolic idea of a hippodrome.
- Solves the issue of the railway crossing by creating a cleverly positioned tram/metropolitan train station that also serves the Hippodrome Park, the Municipality Park, and the surrounding districts.
- Creates a hydrological scenography for each entrance to the Mureş River bank.

The jury agrees that the winning design (1st prize) will:

- Contribute to the well-being of the inhabitants of Târgu Mureş and surroundings
- Unite a fragmented territory into new open spaces and connections
- Clarify and amplify the relationship between the city and the river.
- The project supports the city in adapting to climate change challenges and impacts and positions it as a regional—and global—model for climate-resilient urban development.

### **Recommendation of the jury for the Contracting Authority:**

This proposal must be supported by a strong strategy for biodiversity across multiple layers, including the role of nature-based stormwater management solutions in fostering emergent biodiversity processes.

## **6. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **PROJECT NO. 110 – FIRST PRIZE**

#### **Design Concept and Urban Gesture**

The overall concept is of a large island of public green space with a strong identity and program, becoming a vibrant public district in the city. The series of interventions can be extended along the river beyond the current project definition. The hippodrome plan reinforces the clear identity of its historical uses through a rational and functional geometry. The meeting of urban and natural systems is managed with spatial and geometric clarity, supported by strong structural planting. Pathways and new structures are at a human scale and appropriately distributed and located within the project. Pedestrian and auto circulation were safely segmented with intuitive wayfinding. The hippodrome is intelligently divided to provide spatial differentiation with a new urban woodland character, integrates the required equestrian program, and allows flexibility for diverse event programming.

#### **Landscape Strategy**

The addition of new canopy and allée plantings defines the landscape identity. Access is provided in the meander, but it is not overwhelmed by programming, which provides habitat benefits and highlights a differentiated park experience from the other zones. Interventions along the River Mureş bank enhance public access without interfering with flood control. The proposed planting along the canal will provide an inviting microclimate in hot summers and inviting textures in the winter. The turbine building is smartly re-framed as a point of interest in the scheme, with a naturalized fish ladder, a moment that enhances the hydrological scenography of the proposal.

## **Sustainability**

New zones defined in the project provide space for events that can generate revenue for the city and support local businesses. The planting scheme increases biodiversity and diversifies the spatial experience. The hydrological system forms a strong urban design element, and there is a clear increase in permeable surfaces and stormwater management.

## **Urban Connections**

The urban connections are well detailed and in logical locations, and the jury appreciated the extension of the scheme to the southern neighborhoods. In particular, the metropolitan rail station at the junction of the municipal park and the Hippodrome was recognized as a smart solution to increase the safety of this intersection, that could be enhanced as a transit node with additional bus or shuttle stops.

## **Technical Feasibility & Management**

Bridges and constructed elements are well scaled and present a unified set of urban interventions that can quickly enhance the value of the canal as a public greenway.

## **Jury recommendations:**

- Enrich the ecological and hydrological scheme to develop a more self-sustaining approach to building biodiversity in addition to the proposed structural plantings, such as increasing and varying the vertical heterogeneity of the planting scheme, “recruiting” plant material from nearby sources to sustain processes of biodiversification in the saturated zones.
- Should take into consideration developing a system to integrate green waste from other city projects into the maintenance plan to reduce costs.
- For the area in front of the sports hall it’s recommended to develop a more comfortable microclimate (canopy planting, permeable paving, surface stormwater systems and play or cooling elements, etc).
- Consider creating more spaces by the canal that facilitate social interaction.
- Consider traffic calming elements on vehicular roads on the approach and site of intersections with pedestrian and equine circulation.

## **PROJECT NO. 112 – SECOND PRIZE**

### **Design Concept and Urban Gesture**

This project proposes a new landscape structure for the city based on a hybrid of urban and natural river morphology as an “urban meander” or a new “hydrological milieu.” The robust and well-considered vegetation scheme increases biodiversity and spatial experience at the urban scale across diverse conditions. However, the jury noted a lack of hierarchy in the spaces within the Hippodrome park and a lack of iconic moments at urban intersections, and in the park, that would fully realize the design intent.

### **Landscape Strategy**

The “urban meander” would evolve into a coherent landscape identity that would enliven the city potentially attracting new human and non-human residents. The project’s biodiversification scheme, unfolding over time under different conditions, reconnects citizens to the local urban ecology, allowing them to witness the evolution of the landscape over many years. However, the landscape sections did not map accurately to the plan, were under-annotated, and did not reinforce the intelligence otherwise depicted in the project. The jury noted that the “serial” treatment of the Mureş riverbank interventions was too repetitive, but the irregular swales would result in biodiversification and create more habitat niches. The municipal park was carefully rethought, resulting in new, more functional spaces and improved microclimates.

### **Sustainability**

The project’s foundation in ecological principles would jump-start self-sustaining processes that would economically increase biodiversity. Increased permeability, at large and small scales, will benefit managing intensive rain events.

### **Urban connections**

The jury appreciated the project’s extension to the southern neighborhoods.

Some connective elements appeared overbuilt in relation to their location. The connection between the hippodrome and the Municipal Park was unclear. The addition of the museum next to the turbine building detracts from the heritage urban composition.

## **Technical Feasibility & Management**

The simple earthwork in the hippodrome (cut and fill) will increase biodiversity, and the same techniques could reduce the number of built elements in the park, such as the “canopy walk”. Finally, the jury was concerned that the local maintenance team may require additional technical training to manage the new ecological patches and self-sustaining ecosystems.

### **Jury recommendations:**

- Revise the Hippodrome scheme to allow a larger open gathering area.
- Revise and simplify the composition around the Turbine for a better framing of the heritage building.
- Reconsider the connection between the Municipal Park and the Hippodrome for better accessibility.
- Reconsider the canopy walk.

## **PROJECT NO. 107 – THIRD PRIZE**

### **Design Concept and Urban Gesture**

The jury primarily appreciated the rhythm of nodes urban connections, both along the river and canal, and also across the city, with the potential to define a new identity for a new district through landscape interventions. The project considers the multiple ways to plug ecological intelligence into the city. The site-wide attention to the ecological connectivity and spatial qualities would greatly enhance habitat potential. But overall, the project was perceived by the jury as a nature park rather than a multifunctional park. The renders did not reflect the specific and local qualities.

### **Landscape Strategy**

Clear investigation into the application and self-sustaining ecological processes that will lead to greater biodiversity. The hippodrome included diverse ecological character, but lacked a clear hierarchy and legible spaces. The sections suggested a varied topography that was not reflected in the plan. Many novel ecological elements are introduced in the hippodrome, such as mycoremediation and rhizofiltration, but they were isolated, idiosyncratic and did not always scale into a systemic application that would produce network effects or legible

landscape conditions for park users. Finally, the jury did not see a justification for the phytoremediation patches.

### **Sustainability**

The jury appreciated the systematic de-paving scheme for the stormwater management. Much of the planting scheme was designed to reach self-sustaining conditions, but the jury questioned whether the city could maintain some of the overly specific, idiosyncratic patches/gardens.

### **Urban Connections**

The systems of urban connections were inventive and well-detailed, with a core spine and points of interest that would increase social interaction and accessibility to the green corridor. Overall, the jury noted a generous attitude toward the urban environment. There was a lack of attention to the riverbank, as they were considered nodes in the urban system but ended up as something of dead ends.

### **Technical Feasibility & Management**

The jury recognizes the potential to start a self-sustaining ecosystem, but it could be difficult for the city to maintain the novel patches, such as “rhizo-filtration”. Implementing, maintaining, and protecting these patches would require highly-trained staff.

### **Jury recommendations:**

- Reconsider the specific patches in the Hippodrome Park and rationalize their application.
- Reconsider the observation towers as simple earthwork overlooks or other slightly raised areas.
- Reconsider the connection between the municipal park and the Hippodrome Park for better accessibility
- Reconsider and reduce the Mureş riverbank elements.



## 7. FINAL RANKING

COMP. NO.	PT.	COMMENTS
110	90,45	<b>1<sup>ST</sup> PRIZE</b>
112	84,95	<b>2<sup>ND</sup> PRIZE</b>
107	79,95	<b>3<sup>RD</sup> PRIZE</b>
102	75,00	<b>1<sup>ST</sup> MENTION</b>  <b>Design Concept and Urban Gesture</b>  The jury appreciated the gradient from the riparian zone to a zone between meadow and bosque, reinventing the lost river pattern. The hippodrome plan was very legible and coherent to the jury and had a scale at which the ecological dynamics would function well. Junctions were well placed but the monumental built elements seemed over scaled relative to the potential use and effect.  <b>Landscape Strategy</b>  The jury noted the clarity of the landscape strategy through Miyawaki patches, where new plant communities emerge and quickly become legible as a regenerative strategy, engaging public attention. The jury recognized that the plan to increase the surface between ecotones and hydrological conditions would increase biodiversity. The jury felt the Riverbank interventions were somewhat repetitive in the experiences. The rendered images did not reflect the scheme's emergent potential.  There is much in the text that could have been better represented in elaborated diagrams for the site. The jury found the bridge over the pond near the horse stables as extraneous.  <b>Sustainability</b>  The authors defined self-sustaining plant communities through topographic manipulation and the creation of new patches, which provide an ecological and economic



		<p>alternative to traditional planting. The potential of the new “Floodplain” 's ephemeral wetlands was not elaborated, but they would increase amphibian and insect habitat. The sponge city concept did not seem tied to the city.</p> <p><b>Urban Connections</b></p> <p>The jury questioned the parking set next to the turbine building, which is an iconic element of the new park system. The jury questioned the relocation of the tennis courts to the link between the hippodrome and the municipal park. The river connection is unclear, and the jury was unsure if it would be technically feasible.</p> <p><b>Technical Feasibility &amp; Management</b></p> <p>The jury appreciated the economical strategy of cut-and-fill for a more ecological function and for the urban connection to the river. The hydrological system, while ambitious, would require further elaboration and evaluation to assess feasibility.</p>
118	72,91	<p><b>2<sup>ND</sup> MENTION</b></p> <p><b>Design Concept and Urban Gesture</b></p> <p>The urban connections are well-articulated. The paths in the Hippodrome park frame the landscape, while views are framed from new access points. The grading of the low areas brings a well-scaled geometry in the plan and section. The jury appreciated the traffic calming on the riverbank edge, and the formalizing of the edge gestured to the future integration of the Romgaz sports campus. However, the project lacks a clear ecological strategy. The project geometries are quite intensive and somewhat relentless, and are not paired with, nor contrast with, any new ecological systems that might lead to greater biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Landscape Strategy</b></p> <p>The landscape strategy breaks down the spaces of the hippodrome intelligently and establishes new viewsheds in the park, with groves of trees framing the scenography, a kind of geometric picturesque. The large street that dominates one side of the hippodrome lacks articulation in the section, such as shade trees or swales. The underpass connecting the municipal park of the hippodrome is complex but generous. The jury noted that parking should not be</p>



		<p>located next to the turbine building. The Municipal Park appeared less considered in terms of spatial quality and re-vegetation. The views reflected the landscape scheme well.</p> <p><b>Urban Connections</b></p> <p>The urban connections, though robust, were seen as over-detailed. The jury did not think one of the main pedestrian connections in the scheme, from the Mures river, across the hippodrome to the city, via Pocloş river, would be feasible or provide a quality experience.</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <p>The simplified vegetation lacked habitat potential. The landscape/plant communities were listed but it was unclear where and when they would be applied to the project. There was a lack of attention to landscape ecological connectivity. The hydrological system was perfunctory and missed the potential for this water to instigate new ecological processes.</p> <p><b>Technical Feasibility &amp; Management</b></p> <p>The project appeared straightforward to implement and manage.</p>
<p><b>119</b></p>	<p><b>70,15</b></p>	<p><b>3<sup>RD</sup> MENTION</b></p> <p><b>Design Concept and Urban Gesture</b></p> <p>The potential of the project is exuberantly depicted in the axonometric friezes, which illustrate how the scheme would activate the new green-blue corridor in the city. The jury appreciated the gateways and “learning circuits” that engage humans and other species. They noted methods for jump-starting biodiversification and creating new habitats for the city at large, but were unable to clearly align these processes with the resulting drawings.</p> <p><b>Landscape Strategy</b></p> <p>The project presents a well-detailed, well-researched explanation of plant communities and their implementation in the parks and corridors. The jury appreciated the diversity of landscape conditions, but was not convinced that it would be legible to the park visitors. The large space of the</p>



		<p>hippodrome was subdivided many times at the expense of retaining a large, flexible open space.</p> <p><b>Urban Connections</b></p> <p>Urban connections are numerous and well located, but the jury found it difficult to understand the circulation patterns at the points where paths meet the larger roads and the railways.</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <p>Maintenance is well thought out, with clearly zoned ecological corridors treated separately from the high-maintenance areas. Stormwater management is well thought out, but it misses the potential of these new hydrological elements as biodiversity generators. The artificial lake seems to contradict the overall hydrological strategy. The jury appreciated that the Miyawaki method of afforestation is economical and systematic.</p> <p><b>Technical Feasibility &amp; Management</b></p> <p>The Hippodrome park spaces are over-determined, meaning less flexible programming is available to the city and citizens. The railway connection is overthought. Viewing platforms could be scaled down.</p>
113	66,28	<p>The jury appreciates that the project takes the river's meander as a major project element, establishing a connection from the river to the town through a path network inspired by river meandering form, running along an open meadow. The ecological approach is a relevant and interesting starting point but remains insufficiently translated into the spatial dimension of the project. It is difficult to understand how the idea is translated into materiality and space, and what it would actually look like. Furthermore, the technical aspects are not developed or defined to a sufficient level of detail to assess the feasibility of the project.</p>
106	64,76	<p>Only one conceptual idea has been developed out of the three proposed (the activity corridor). The project demonstrates a clear focus on programming and uses across the full length of the site; however, a significant gap remains between the intention and the proposals themselves. The element intended to be the project's most prominent and attractive feature lacks realism: its design draws on precedents that are out of context and fails to account for the</p>



		heritage landscape in which the project is situated. Detailed plans or sections are missing to allow an assessment of the feasibility of the built elements. Furthermore, the treatment of the green corridor is not addressed in the project. Finally, the quality of the visuals does not do justice to the project as a whole.
<b>105</b>	<b>61,95</b>	<p>The main image depicts a classic, English-style park, yet it lacks any real distinctive character. The overarching conceptual idea is not clearly legible, the project reads as an accumulation of small programmes and isolated objects that fail to convey spatial consistency. The jury acknowledges the ambition of the large pontoon along the Mureş River; however, as the project's central feature, it would have warranted a significantly higher level of technical details. The pedestrian connection to the town via a bridge over the railway appears oversized and unrealistic within this context. Finally, biodiversity considerations do not appear to have been meaningfully integrated into the design.</p>
<b>117</b>	<b>60,45</b>	<p>The Hippodrome Park demonstrates a clear design intention; however, the extension of the woodland fails to express the variety of vegetation types and habitats present on the site. Furthermore, the project does not comply with a key requirement of the competition brief: as the dyke cannot be breached, the concept of a floodplain is fundamentally unworkable. The buildings and infrastructures are oversized and ill-suited to the site. The diversity of architectural language proposed by the project is questionable and insufficiently justified within the given context, and the functional and technical solutions put forward remain inadequate.</p>
<b>121</b>	<b>57,99</b>	<p>The project presents a clear concept of a woodland accommodating sports programmes within clearings; however, the project creates obstructive barriers between the designated spaces, effectively preventing other activities from taking place. The number and size of infrastructural concrete elements is excessive and poorly justified. Proposals must respond to human uses and wildlife habitats. In the project, biodiversity considerations are significantly constrained by the infrastructure design.</p> <p>Furthermore, the newly introduced elements — whether pavilions, ramps or urban mobility structures — bear little relation to the context and look out of scale with the site.</p>



		<p>They read as oversized built interventions and fail to demonstrate technical feasibility.</p>
<b>115</b>	<b>55,50</b>	<p>The location of a large car parking area at the main access point to the Hippodrome Park, from the Municipal Park, is not considered a correct urban design decision, generating a functional conflict between pedestrian flows and car traffic, right in the main access point to the Hippodrome Park. The same locating problem is identified in the case of the parking lot next to the former Power Plant, across Turbinei Canal, where additionally, the density of vegetation proposed for car screening is obstructing a valuable perspective on the industrial heritage site.</p> <p>The proposed pedestrian walkway considerably lengthens the pedestrian route, instead of facilitating their easy connection between the site's two objectives.</p> <p>The minimal intervention on the relict meander of the Mureş is positively noted, as a respectful approach to the existing urban nature setting. Although the intention to create multiple junction and access points between the Hippodrome Park and the left bank of the Mures River might work in a different given context, the current solution seems numerically oversaturated, risking excessively fragmenting the landscape solution as well as the car traffic on Insulei Street – this might've worked if this street were to become a shared one, with pedestrian priority (however, this is not possible at the moment, as stated in the brief).</p> <p>The concept behind the proposed solution for the Mures riverbank is insufficiently clarified. The placement of the small pontoons is an appreciated initiative, but their frequency and rhythmic arrangement, at equal distances, creates an effect of visual monotony.</p> <p>The biodiversity remains shallow and insufficient, given the current and potential value of the site.</p>
<b>100</b>	<b>51,41</b>	<p>The proposal oscillates between divergent formal registers - organic winding paths, circular and oval configurations, but also accentuated diagonals - without a unitary spatial treatment, that clearly articulates the landscape identity of the overall site.</p>



		<p>In the area of the five abandoned tennis courts, a generous parking space is being proposed, without clear functional accessibility.</p> <p>Accessibility and circulation - both car and pedestrian - remain unclear and insufficiently studied. The following are not explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- access and route flows within the site connectivity with the Municipal Park (access from objective no. 1 is obstructed by the proposed parking lot)</li><li>- the landscape and functional connection with the left bank of the Mureş is not optimally addressed</li></ul> <p>Appreciated elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Additional pedestrian crossings over the Turbinei canal - improves the permeability of the site</li><li>- The reconversion of the historical power plant – historical monument - into a hydraulic museum - pertinent added-value of the industrial heritage</li><li>- The (micro-)botanical garden programme on the site of the former swimming pool (adjacent to Baia Evreiască building)</li></ul> <p>Ecological approach: The orientation towards naturalized solutions (NBS) is mentioned but remains insufficiently explained and detailed. Also, the excessive number of swales on both banks of the Mureş River is a repetitive formal gesture, without a clear hydrological or landscape justification.</p> <p>There is no clear correlation between the technical and textual parts and the CGIs (renderings).</p>
<b>111</b>	<b>49,67</b>	<p>There is some lack of coordination between the technical solutions in the technical plans and the graphic visualizations, which fails to reflect the spatial proposal. This lack of correlation, doubled by a stylistic fragmentation, affects the overall concept and the clear understanding of the entire project. The water management strategy raises some questions, such as technical feasibility - the proposal of an island on the private Romgaz site appears to be an excess and unjustified intervention, given the context. Although the connection between the Hippodrome Park and the Mureş Riverbank is being addressed, the articulation between Objective 2 and Objective 3 remains insufficiently thought. The railway crossing and the access to the Municipal Park</p>



		<p>require a better solution; despite the proposed footbridge, this currently fails to ensure a pedestrian-friendly and an inspired visual connection between the two areas.</p> <p>The historical reference of the swimming pool in the vicinity of the Jewish Baths building and the protection of the visual perspectives towards the former Power Plant are positively noted, gestures that demonstrate respect for the memory of the place. Also, access plaza to the Sports Hall (Turbine Square) is balanced, offering a decent and functional spatial transition. The project is sensitive to ecosystems, at a conceptual level, and the graphic representation is appreciated, but it is insufficiently harmonized with the technical solution.</p>
<b>122</b>	<b>45,95</b>	<p>The general concept is transposed into a narrative thread that is insufficiently explained graphically. Not enough diagrams were presented to stylistically justify the proposed pedestrian paths. From an urban point of view, there is a need for a deeper understanding of the existing context, given that accessibility is approached in a simplistic manner, without emphasizing key access points, lacking innovative solutions or adapted to the local specifics. The context of the site seems to be insufficiently understood in places, a fact reflected in the lack of a fluent and functional connectivity between the three main objectives, as well as between the three sub-areas of the first objective (Hippodrome Park, Mures river left bank and the Relict Mures River meandre).</p> <p>Although the jury notes and appreciates the general continuity of the pedestrian routes and their fluidity, it notes that, in places, the language becomes unjustifiably poetic, to the detriment of functional clarity, and does not take into account the existing topography or the physical barriers of the site (the railway, streets etc.), which required greater attention in the solution.</p> <p>The lack of invasive interventions in the meander area (the Relict Mureş River) is appreciated, but a more detailed approach would have been expected, both for this area and for others, highlighted in the project brief (Municipal Park - access to the Sports Hall, lack of proposals across the road from the former power plant building - historical monument).</p>



		<p>The lack of clear inflection points along the routes makes the spatial experience remain linear, without well-defined moments of urban emphasis.</p>
<b>114</b>	<b>42,96</b>	<p>The three tunnels proposed to ensure the pedestrian connectivity between Objective 1 and Objective 2, noted as Wildlife Passes, is considered massive and excessive. Beyond the invasive visual impact, this solution raises serious issues regarding user safety, as evidenced by the current representations (lack of a protective railing).</p> <p>Hippodrome Park is perceived as a space with multifunctional and multi-purpose potential. This approach would allow the adaptation of the land for various activities and events, maximizing the utility of the public space without compromising its landscape integrity. The omission from the project of the paddock intended for equestrian training, an essential functional element in the configuration of this park, requested by the brief is noticed.</p> <p>Although an elevated viewpoint is proposed, it remains an isolated element, located far from the protective slope of the Mures River. This doesn't bring a coherent and articulated connection to the existing river- the opportunity to create an easy link between the high elevation point and the watercourse is thus missed.</p> <p>The proposed tree density and the protection measures for the existing vegetation are appreciated, demonstrating a concern for the conservation of the existing natural heritage. However, this is not supported by a sustained biodiversity and technically justified water-management strategy, or by graphic explanations regarding the proposed maintenance solutions. The architectural objects show a lack of stylistic unity, not presenting a common language neither among themselves nor in relation to the identity of the site.</p>
<b>104</b>	<b>40,46</b>	<p>Although the project provides clear and detailed information regarding the proposed interventions, it lacks an identity-defining concept, merely addressing the brief requirements on a point-by-point basis, without establishing a correlation between the various objectives. Furthermore, the design remains generic and demonstrates limited sensitivity towards the natural habitat, while the proposed infrastructure is out of scale and not integrated into the context.</p>



<b>120</b>	<b>36,96</b>	By prioritizing the site as a strategic asset for a new waterfront district rather than a green infrastructure, the design vision contradicts the competition brief and adopts a conservative approach. The proposals are minimal, particularly in the Hippodrome area, which is treated as a green void and a programmatic diagram for future development, without consideration for biodiversity or urban climate resilience. Furthermore, the solutions proposed for the transportation system, blue-green infrastructure, and stormwater management lack sustainability, and there is no unified concept for the buildings or public spaces proposed.
<b>103</b>	<b>34,16</b>	The jury appreciated the unique concept of establishing the studied area into a living and breathing ecotone, where human movement is treated as water, shaping paths from rapid transit to slow, meandering routes. However, the technical execution of these pathways lacks the organic quality and integrative character required to fulfill the project's conceptual premise. The ecological and sustainable solutions proposed within the design are not substantiated by the level of detail presented. With a more rigorous approach to detail, the proposal would have resulted in a better resolved spatial and functional organization.
<b>116</b>	<b>32,45</b>	The intentions behind the proposal, such as viable solutions for pedestrian and cycling infrastructure in relation to sustainable water management, are noted. However, both the graphic and written documentation remain at a generic level, failing to provide a coherent and site-specific response to the complex issues outlined in the competition brief. Furthermore, there is a clear lack of connection between the evocative solutions illustrated in sketches or renderings and the level of transferring all these intentions to the technical drawings also.
<b>108</b>	<b>29,70</b>	The project appears unfinished, addressing the brief requirements schematically, from the connection of functional zones and their equipment to stormwater management and planting layouts. The proposal presents an insufficient level of detail across all scales and demonstrates a lack of engagement with the site's urban, natural, and historical context. Additionally, the proposal fails to totally comply with



		the competition brief, as multiple mandatory requirements remain unaddressed.
<b>109</b>	<b>26,46</b>	The concept for this proposal is developed around a network of orientation and observation towers. Beyond the proposed massive architectural structures, the concept does not present a viable solution to enhance the natural landscape resources and to bring a significant improvement to the study area, both functionally and from the perspective of the green-blue infrastructure network quality, leaving multiple brief requirements unanswered.

This Jury Report was drafted in two copies in Târgu Mureş, on 27.04.2026.

landscape arch. Henri Bava – President of the Jury

landscape arch. Julie Lilas Martineau

landscape arch. Sarah Anne Cowles

arch. urb. Angela Kovacs

landscape arch. Ada Diana Codrean

arch. Bogdan Severus Demetrescu

arch. Daniela Florina Miheţ – Representative of CA



**Professional advisors:**

landscape arch. Ana Horhat

arch. Mircea Munteanu

**President of the Technical Committee:**

arch. Raisa Parpală

**Jury Secretary:**

urb. Louisiana Stoica

**Competition Coordinator:**

arch. Mirona Crăciun