

BETA 2016 competition – evaluation criteria in the judging process

The JURY 1, composed of Adrian Untaru, Goran Vojvodić and Balázs Marián had to evaluate **27 works** from the categories AMBIENT, SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING, COLLECTIVE HOUSING, COMMERCIAL, SERVICES, INSTITUTIONAL and HERITAGE, based on the following **assessment criteria**:

AMBIENT, Adrian Untaru:

- ability to improve the perception of an existing space;
- general aesthetic principles: power to create a pleasant environment;
- economical conditions of intervention, if the efforts serve its purpose.

AMBIENT, Balázs Marián:

- ambient and atmosphere creation, spatial organization;
- use of material, details, lighting, innovation.

AMBIENT, Goran Vojvodić:

- functionality - use value;
- originality and creativity;
- shaping - design space;
- relevance to the topic.

SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING, Adrian Untaru:

- the way the objects integrate in its own environment (built or not);
- quality of the conceived spaces;
- quality of living within its social & economical conditions.

SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING, Balázs Marián:

- relation between interior and exterior spaces, spatial organization;
- ambient and atmosphere creation;
- sense of coziness;
- use of material, details.

SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING, Goran Vojvodić:

- urban context (contextually);
- design excellence – creativity, aesthetic;
- functionality;
- innovative use of materials and/or technology;
- relevance to the topic.

COLLECTIVE HOUSING, Adrian Untaru:

- the integration in the existing urban fabric;
- the ability to create an object that improve the existing street perception, the neighborhood;
- the quality of the living spaces: natural light, intimacy, views.

COLLECTIVE HOUSING, Balázs Marián:

- appearance and accessibility from public spaces, context;
- relation between interior and exterior spaces, spatial organization;
- sense of coziness and intimacy;
- use of material, details.

COLLECTIVE HOUSING, Goran Vojvodić:

- urban context (contextually);
- design excellence – creativity, aesthetic;
- functionality;
- innovative use of materials and/or technology;
- relevance to the topic.

COMMERCIAL, Adrian Untaru:

- the ability to create an object that respects and improves the existing environment;
- functionality.

COMMERCIAL, Balázs Marián:

- integration into urban environment;
- appearance and accessibility from public spaces;
- relation between interior and exterior spaces, spatial organization;
- extent and usability of exterior and interior public spaces;
- flexibility and durability;
- use of material, structural solutions and details;
- innovation.

COMMERCIAL, Goran Vojvodić:

- urban context (contextually);
- design excellence – creativity, aesthetic;
- functionality;
- innovative use of materials and/or technology;
- relevance to the topic.

SERVICES, Adrian Untaru:

- the ability to create an object that respects and improves the existing environment;
- functionality.

SERVICES, Balázs Marián:

- external appearance;
- relation between interior and exterior spaces, spatial organization;
- ambient and atmosphere creation;
- use of material and architectural details;
- innovation.

SERVICES, Goran Vojvodić:

- urban context (contextually);
- design excellence – creativity, aesthetic;
- functionality;
- innovative use of materials and/or technology;
- relevance to the topic.

INSTITUTIONAL, Adrian Untaru:

- the ability to create an object that improve the existing environment
- as a public building, the resources should be rationally used, in concordance with the need of the community they serve.

INSTITUTIONAL, Balázs Marián:

- integration into urban environment;
- appearance and accessibility from public spaces;
- relation between interior and exterior spaces, spatial organization;
- extent and usability of exterior and interior public spaces;
- flexibility and durability;
- use of material, structural solutions and architectural details;
- innovation.

INSTITUTIONAL, Goran Vojvodić:

- urban context (contextually);
- design excellence – creativity, aesthetic;
- functionality;
- innovative use of materials and/or technology;
- relevance to the topic.

HERITAGE, Adrian Untaru:

- the ability to preserve the existing built heritage, either by interventions that respects and enlighten the existing structure or by means of increasing the public awareness of the existing structure.

HERITAGE, Balázs Marián:

- relation to protected environment, integration;
- relation between interior and exterior spaces, spatial organization;
- extent and usability of exterior and interior public spaces;
- use of material, structural solutions and architectural details;
- relation to time and remembrance: defining the spirit of time and place.

HERITAGE, Goran Vojvodić:

- memory of the place/space;
- design excellence – creativity, aesthetic;
- relevance to the topic.

The JURY 2, composed of Klaus Birthler, Darko Polić and Árpád Szabó had to evaluate **11 works** from the categories URBAN-RURAL DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC SPACE, INITIATIVES FOR ARCHITECTURE, ART IN PUBLIC SPACE and INFRASTRUCTURE. Because of the low number of entries, **the jury has jointly decided to set up the same list of (personal) criteria:**

1. IDEA - originality of the concept/approach/idea
2. SPACE - context sensitivity / quality of design / quality of the process
3. SOCIETY - proposed/realized social effect /involvement

The 3rd criteria was further developed, as following:

The jury criterion deals with the various different aspects of the projects connected to their social effect and the social involvement they generate. This means:

- Usefulness: how the project effects its social environment, how it effects life of people? (especially in category: 9. Urban-rural development, 10. Public space);
- How it changes space usage of people? (especially in category: 10. Public space, 12. Art in public space, 13. Infrastructure);
- How the project reacts on the social context? How it uses its context to generate a message/interaction? (especially in category: 12. Art in public space);
- How the project generates tools to create social inclusion? What is the professionalism level of the tools the project uses to generate social interaction /participation? (especially in category: 11. Initiatives for architecture).

The JURY 1, composed of Ivan Kucina, Ștefan Ghengiulescu and Zsolt Vasáros had to evaluate **27 works** from the categories GRADUATION PROJECTS and ARCHITECTURAL VISIONS, based on the following **assessment criteria**:

GRADUATION PROJECTS, Ivan Kucina:

Following the idea from the book Three Ecologies by Felix Guattari, my judgment criteria are determined by three architecture ecologies – physical, social and mental:

1. - Physical ecology guides designing process toward responsible building practices, that includes local resources, adoptable building systems, easy maintaining, reduced consumption, renewable energy infrastructure, sustainability and regeneration;
2. - Social ecology articulates levels of relationships between private and public space by promoting culture of solidarity as a driver for social redevelopment and human emancipation;
3. -Mental ecology gains for a balance of personal ambitions and achievements that is reflected through enlightening encounters of being, things and stimuli.

GRADUATION PROJECTS, Ștefan Ghengiulescu:

- the author's position: a reading of the situation and needs (place, people, history) and an articulated, personal and sensitive proposition: ideas, strategy, ethics, innovation, relevance etc;
- the qualities of the work itself: space, structure, material, light, functioning, scale, authenticity, expression.

GRADUATION PROJECTS, Zsolt Vasáros:

- the relation between the site (environment) and the planned or (re)designed architecture
- the sensibility of the author and the architecture made by him;
- dealing with spaces: both inside and outside, influence and impression of the added or new designed interventions;
- the integrity of the topic, the site and the architectural concept.

ARCHITECTURAL VISIONS, Ivan Kucina:

My judgment criteria for Architecture Visions are the same as for Graduation Projects but sharpen. They are determined by three architecture ecologies – physical, social and mental according to the idea from the book Three Ecologies by Felix Guattari:

1. - Physical ecology guides designing process toward responsible building practices, that includes local resources, adoptable building systems, easy maintaining, reduced consumption, renewable energy infrastructure, sustainability and regeneration;
2. - Social ecology articulates levels of relationships between private and public space by promoting culture of solidarity as a driver for social redevelopment and human emancipation;

3. -Mental ecology gains for a balance of personal ambitions and achievements that is reflected through enlightening encounters of being, things and stimuli.

ARCHITECTURAL VISIONS, Ștefan Ghengiulescu:

- a good built architectural work is not just a good project, but a good one that has been saved and maybe even improved during construction. Non-built projects can obviously not show these qualities. Therefore, in order to be selected, they should be more than decent propositions: they have to show great ideas, ignite important discussions, include a lot of research and creativity.

ARCHITECTURAL VISIONS, Zsolt Vasáros:

- visions are certainly not for realizing, that's not a criteria;
- vision should represent more than an 'everyday' architecture, one waiting for more impact, creativity, expressivity, etc;
- a vision should be really a vision, a concept which is never seen before;
- a vision could be based on new materiality, on rare disposition, on novelty on use of space, on something extraordinary, unique or simple fancy.

The final list of the works selected for the 2nd stage of the competition can be found [here](#).
For visualizing the selected works, please consult the competition [website](#).

Elaborated by Alexandra-Maria Garomfir,
BETA 2016 competition coordinator