

INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION - MUREŞ PARKS, TÂRGU MUREŞ

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA		100	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122
A. FULFILLING THE FUNCTIONAL, TECHNICAL, LANDSCAPE, AND ARCHITECTURAL REQUIREMENTS 60 points	A1. Landscape – ecological – sustainable criterion: maximum 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	17,00	25,00	9,00	13,00	17,00	18,00	27,00	7,00	6,00	24,00	16,00	29,00	21,00	14,00	17,00	8,00	18,00	20,00	25,00	10,00	19,00	15,00
	A2. Functional criterion: maximum 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	7,00	7,50	5,00	5,00	10,00	11,00	8,00	4,00	3,50	15,00	7,00	10,00	9,00	5,00	7,00	4,50	9,00	12,00	9,00	5,00	8,00	6,00
	A3. Technical and management criterion: maximum 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.	4,50	6,50	5,00	4,50	5,00	5,00	7,00	3,50	3,00	9,50	5,00	8,00	6,00	4,00	5,00	4,00	4,50	6,00	5,20	6,00	5,00	4,00
	A4. Financial criterion: maximum 5 points The compliance with the maximum cost estimate for design services indicated in the competition documentation will be evaluated. 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, the score is awarded proportionally. $P(n) = [Price(min) / Price(n)] \times 5$ points The score $P(n) = \max. 5$ points is awarded as follows: a)For the lowest of the prices offered (denoted $Pricemin$) 5 points are awarded. b)For the other prices offered (denoted $Price(n)$), the score $P(n)$ is calculated proportionally, as follows: $P(n) = [Price(min) / Price(n)] \times 5$ points	2,91	3,00	3,16	2,96	2,95	3,26	2,95	3,70	2,96	2,95	3,17	2,95	3,28	2,96	5,00	2,95	2,95	2,91	2,95	2,96	2,99	2,95
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: maximum 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.	6,00	12,00	4,00	4,50	9,00	10,00	13,00	3,50	4,00	15,00	5,50	13,00	9,00	5,00	6,50	4,00	9,00	10,00	9,00	5,00	8,00	5,00
	B2. The appearance of the green spaces and the general atmosphere following the proposed intervention: maximum 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.	9,00	14,00	4,00	5,50	12,00	11,00	14,00	4,00	3,50	14,00	8,00	14,00	12,00	7,00	10,00	5,00	11,50	14,00	12,00	4,00	10,00	8,00
	B3. Quality and clarity of the representation of ideas so as to illustrate the competitor's ability to implement the proposed project: maximum 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.	5,00	7,00	4,00	5,00	6,00	6,50	8,00	4,00	3,50	10,00	5,00	8,00	6,00	5,00	5,00	4,00	5,50	8,00	7,00	4,00	5,00	5,00
TOTAL		51,41	75,00	34,16	40,46	61,95	64,76	79,95	29,70	26,46	90,45	49,67	84,95	66,28	42,96	55,50	32,45	60,45	72,91	70,15	36,96	57,99	45,95
		100	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122

land. arch. Henri Bava - President of the Jury

arch. urb. Angela Kovacs

Professional Advisors
land. arch. Ana Horhat

Competition Coordinator
arch. Mirona Crăciun

27.04.2026

land. arch. Sarah Anne Cowles

arch. Daniela Florina Miheţ

arch. Mircea Munteanu

Jury Secretary:
urb. Louisiana Stoica

land. arch. Julie Lilas Martineau

land. arch. Ada Diana Codrean

Technical Committee President:
arch. Raisa Parpală

arch. Bogdan Severus Demetrescu