

## BETA 2016 competition – jury report

URBAN-RURAL DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC SPACE, INITIATIVES FOR ARCHITECTURE, ART IN PUBLIC SPACE and INFRASTRUCTURE categories

Árpád Szabó, Darko Polić, Klaus Birthler

Number of submitted works (all 5 categories): **13**

Disqualified works: **2**

Total number of works entering the competition: **11**

Distribution of the works entering the competition, on categories:

URBAN-RURAL DEVELOPMENT: **1**

PUBLIC SPACE: **1**

INITIATIVES FOR ARCHITECTURE: **4**

ART IN PUBLIC SPACE: **4**

INFRASTRUCTURE: **1**

Distribution of the works after the preselection, on categories:

URBAN-RURAL DEVELOPMENT: **1**

PUBLIC SPACE: **1**

INITIATIVES FOR ARCHITECTURE: **4**

ART IN PUBLIC SPACE: **2**

INFRASTRUCTURE: **1**

### 1. General remarks about the competition

The jury considered the competition in the 5 categories URBAN-RURAL DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC SPACE, INITIATIVES FOR ARCHITECTURE, ART IN PUBLIC SPACE and INFRASTRUCTURE successful although the number of entries were relatively small. Despite the moderate number of entries there were some projects with high merits that received prizes according to the valuation of the jury.

General remark is that the fields and tools of urban interventions became much more diverse in previous decades than ever before, while at the same time the clear border between the different fields became vague. Initiatives for architecture are happening on public space, it is impossible to draw a border between public art and public space, while large scale infrastructures define and deeply influence urban-rural planning. Based on that the number of categories could be lowered with a wider definition for all, but to keep the consistency of the competition they are kept for the jury report.

### 2. Criteria of judgement

The jury has made the decision that it is looking at the projects on the basis of three criterion:

#### Description of 1. IDEA - originality of the concept/approach/idea

The jury criterion deals with the various different aspects of the projects connected to their basic idea and originality. This means:

- Originality of the basic idea (especially in category: 9. Urban-rural development, 10. Public space, 11. Initiatives for architecture, 12. Art in public space)
- Appropriateness and sensitivity of the approach (especially in category: 9. Urban-rural development, 11. Initiatives for architecture)
- Freshness and creativity of the design. (especially in category: 9. Urban-rural development, 10. Public space, 12. Art in public space, 13. Infrastructure)



### **Description of 2. SPACE - context sensitivity / quality of design / quality of the process**

This criterion deals with numerous aspects of physical expression in the chosen spatial and social context, through all process from idea to final delivery, and includes:

- spatial sensitivity in the chosen urban(-rural) surrounding (especially important in the categories: 9. Urban-rural development, 10. Public space and 13. Infrastructure);
- physical design (especially important for categories: 10. Public space, 12. Art in public space and 13. Infrastructure) and
- sustainability of the process (important for categories: 9. Urban-rural development, 10. Public space, 11. Initiatives for architecture).

### **Description of 3. SOCIETY - proposed/realized social effect /involvement**

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)

## **3. Evaluation of the projects:**

### **URBAN-RURAL DEVELOPMENT** category

#### **DNA15**

##### **Erie Boulevard – Urban DNA**

**Author: Marius Găman**

**Co-author: Ana-Maria Branea**

A rather theoretical project with no clear reference to its implementation and not even to its possible implementation tools. The work lacks the originality of the concept and as underdeveloped, suggests the application of only a limited urban design toolbox. Project also failed to offer a concrete overview to other, complex urban-rural relationship of the analyzed area.

### **PUBLIC SPACE** category

#### **ADM23**

##### **Hidden Nest**

**Authors: Diana Giurea, Zoran Popovici**

An interesting spatial experiment very sensitively reacting on the issues of temporality, identity and space. The form is generated through several computer softwares from pedestrian flows. It is a fresh combination of different tools in producing quality design of public space art. Both the explanation and the presentation offered clear insight of the process. Physical production offers an added value in the context of the heritage site of Banat Village Museum from different aspects.

**The project is awarded with an AWARD.**



## INITIATIVES FOR ARCHITECTURE category

### HBR76

#### **De-a arhitectura in my school: My Dream Classroom!**

**Author: Brîndușa Raluca**

**Co-authors: secondary school students, 5th and 6th year: Alexandra Codrean, Diana Budugan, Sarra Ruscu, Karina Faje, Ioana Văcaru, Alecs Sidea, Victor Rusu, Nadia Cramba, Emilia Nichiteanu, Colipcă Roxana, Fatima Habib, Mihai Burgheaua, Marco Dumitrascu, Sara Nicolae Sulea, Sary Habib, Maximilian Caraculea**

The jury considered this project the most successful and the most comprehensive project in the INITIATIVES FOR ARCHITECTURE category. Educational approach to awareness development of young students to the spatial contextualization in their everyday surrounding is a very important task. This initiative organized young students at an individual level, in order to imagine their own perfect working space, and at a community level to refurbish their classroom together using ecological materials. It is a project/process which has very simple but very clear goals. The processes generated by it together with its tools are realistic. The implementation also seems impressive in the sense that it could reach its goals and really contribute to the environmental education of these group of students. The very clear "tool" of learning/experiencing-by-doing appears very well in the transformation of the direct and close environment of the school students. The transformation of the classroom not only creates a new better environment for their daily activities but it also gives them the positive experience of transforming their "own" space.

Success of the initiative opened up possibilities for its implementation in both Romania and in the region.

**The project is awarded with an AWARD.**

### SEB35

#### **Social +**

**Author: Dragomir Drăgan**

**Co-authors: Avramescu T., Bărbăței I., Luca A., Marin A., Matei A., Ocolișan B., Petrașcu D., Pleșea O., Puțan M., Poloca D., Timuț R.**

Student workshop on redesigning of an old neighborhood used simple and flexible tools to improve communication channels in the local community. Although clearly structured in the design domain, it is not visible enough in the domain of the delivering process. Unclear relationship with the local community brings a doubt of the sustainability of the project in the future.

### IMA03

#### **Anina, Mine of Ideas**

**Authors: Oana Țiganea, Marius Barbieri**

**Co-authors: Ovidiu Micșa, Gabriela Pașcu**

Students' exploration project in the miners' city resulted in the wide range of redevelopment processes. The initiative has been a well-organized venture and a lot effort resulted in the quality information base suitable for the next stage of the future (successful) project.

### RAC79

#### **Consulting Services for the "Rehabilitation of Historic City Quarters in Timișoara, România" LOT 2: Architect and Engineering Expert Services**

**Author: Rudolf Gräf**

**Co-authors: Paul Buchert, Lavinia Popa**

Initiative proposed a complex approach to a long lasting problem of façade's refurbishment in the old city cores. Serious problem of neglected heritage has not been on the priority agenda in the transitional period, but it was brought to the focus with the help of special funds. The initiative has been seriously developed in the previous years and brought up together both a good will and helped establishing cooperation within all local actors. Disagreement of the national fiscal system and widely supported



initiative in the local level shows limitations and inflexibility of the present legal framework. However, it has established new practice of communication around an important issue within local community. The proposed process tackles a very important question, but it has - sadly - failed due to limitation of Romanian legal frame. Because of its highly valued goal and deeply elaborated and implemented process it clearly creates a sample for such initiations. Although the jury has questions how such an unsuccessful project can be handled in the context of the BETA competition, because of its merits it is a given a **MENTION prize**.

#### **ART IN PUBLIC SPACE** category

##### **FLI04**

##### **WHAT ABOUT YOU?**

**Author: Liliana Popa**

A sensitive art project responding to the locality of space and to the informal communication channels of society. With its temporary placement at specific locations it creates a very direct nevertheless site-sensitive dialogue with its direct environment making space users get in conversation with the installation. The realization of the project is with high standards and with its layout creates a pleasant object in public space even if at specific locations - if installed uncarefully - it can create barriers.

**The project is awarded with an AWARD.**

##### **CDF80**

##### **Trigona**

**Author: Constantin Flondor**

**Co-author: Fundatia Interart Triade**

The scientific/geometric approach of the project is highly interesting, nevertheless its connection to its actual context is not clear, moreover questionable. Although the final object seems very attractive on the images of the panel seemingly it does not get in dialogue with its surrounding and with possible users of the site.

#### **INFRASTRUCTURE** category

##### **FDI31**

##### **Pedestrian bridge over the Mures River in Arad**

**Author: Cornel Farcaș**

**Collaborators: Bogdan Demetrescu, Bogdan Isopescu**

A nice and correct piece of engineering construction. Its urban position shows interesting reactions to its context offering new relationship of between different urban functions in the city centre, nevertheless this aspect is not explained in the submitted panel. The construction is high quality, but is without extraordinary merits concerning its design approach.

Jury President,  
Árpád Szabó