

## Beta Competition 2022 Jury report Categories 1-7

### Categories:

Built space, Interior space, Public space, Graduation projects, Initiatives / Experiments / Visions, Essay, Photography

### Jury members:

**Categories 1-5** András Cseh, Bogdan Ciocodeică, Evelina Ozola, Mark Randel, Milka Gnjata.

**Category 6 - Essay** Cecilie Sachs Olsen, Chiara Dorbolò, Ross Exo Adams

**Category 7 - Photography:** Alexandra Țîmpău, Miguel de Guzman, Miloš Martinović

Total number of submitted works (for all 7 categories): **95**

Total number of disqualified works: **18**

Number of evaluated works: **77**

Number of works from Romania: **70**

Number of works from Serbia: **4**

Number of works from Hungary: **3**

Distribution of the submitted works on categories:

Built space: **13**

Interior space: **14**

Public space: **4**

Graduation projects: **19**

Initiatives / Experiments / Visions: **11**

Essay: **4**

Photography: **12**

Selected works for the second phase: **41**

Distribution of the **41 selected works**, on categories:

Built space: **5**

Interior space: **2**

Public space: **3**

Graduation projects: **9**

Initiatives / Experiments / Visions: **6**

Essay: **4**

Photography: **12**

The jury appreciated the overall quality of the submitted works. The diversity of the projects even within the same category made the selection process challenging and sparked a series of complex discussions between the jury members.

We were very pleased to accept the invitation of the BETA competition organizers to personally meet the authors of the selected projects and to be able to start a dialogue about the presented works and further understand their depth.

The key criteria used in judging the works was a series of common values that the jury shares and finds crucial for every architecture intervention whether it is building a space, designing its interior or planning for the future. Functionality that dictates the logic of spatial layout and correspondence to users' needs; aesthetic and emotional impact of the project, sustainability of resources used; social and cultural impact; relevance for the local context; together with clarity and attractiveness of visual communication, were only a few of the indicators used in judging and realizing a hierarchy between the shortlisted projects.

The jury applauds and congratulates all the participants, recognizing the importance of their work, regardless of scale or function, in shaping the spaces we share, thus shining a light on the city as a common god for present and future generations.

## **1. Built space**

In the category built space we have evaluated 13 projects in the first phase and have selected 5 for the second phase. Before giving our votes each of the jury members has defined a list of criterias. We have not only discussed the architectural quality of the outcome of the projects but also the result in relation to the complexity of the task and the circumstances of the project. This is sometimes not easy to compare.

We all agreed that one project is standing out from all others and this was confirmed by the presentation. And this project is "Faber" initiated and realized by a large group of people with the same desires to create a lively place for cultural events, working and meeting.

The project is an excellent example of how former industrial sites can be revitalized and reintegrated in the city life. In this case this was not just done by making the space usable for a new program, but also by giving it an entirely new lively and inspiring face, designed with clarity and creativity.

In addition to the award we are happy to announce an honorable mention to a small project of different scale to Timea Kos for the brick house in Ostrov!

The jury enjoyed the careful positioning of the house on the plot by respecting existing trees, as well as the great sense of care in the details. The design and the selection of materials are a good example of how a new building can be respectfully integrated in a historic context while clearly having its own identity.

**Mention** - Timea Kos - House in Ostrov  
**Award** - FOR - Faber

## 2. Interior space

This year, in the interior design category, the jury has shortlisted only two projects in the desire to promote and encourage the highest quality practices. Both projects manage to transform the designated spaces, to reshape the inner volume of the existing construction and to offer the end user the best version of itself. The jury appreciated the level of creativity, attention to details and approach, going the extra mile and realizing projects that are not simple decorative interventions, but complex interior architecture visions.

The selected proposals have a complex understanding of the impact an architectural gesture can have on a space and skillfully base their narrative on that aspect. That being said the jury feels that even though the two designs have different functions and target different parts of the local communities, with different outcomes, are equal in value and will each be awarded a mention, thus encouraging and supporting the authors in realizing quality projects in the future, meaningful and impactful for the individuals and the community.

14 works evaluated, 2 selected for the second phase

**Mention** - Alexandru Buftea, Laurențiu Isopescu, Ariana Țuțuianu - Headoffice  
**Mention** - Vinklu - Comun Cafe

## 3. Public space

The works in the public space category demonstrated care for the users and the environment, a good understanding of various flows in the city, and an ambition to create inclusive, attractive, and resilient spaces for future use. Above all, the works strive to humanize the city, each in its own way — with flexible programming and new tools for urban planning, changes in street profiles and paving materials, or designing a public square as the heart of a new development. One entry clearly stood out with its complexity and scale, thoughtful integration of urban and green environment, a healthy mix of various functions and users, and sustainable engineering solutions.

4 works evaluated, 3 selected for the second phase

**Award** - Marius Găman, Ana-Maria Branea - Living Heritage - Urban regeneration of the Trigel Zuid area

#### 4. Graduation projects

The largest number of entries (19) were submitted in the graduation projects category of BETA 2022. Due to the generally high quality of the designs 9 of them were selected to be exhibited for the public to promote analytical, thought-provoking and careful architecture and to be further investigated at the presentations.

The personal introduction of the works revealed either unexpectedly thorough research or the elaboration of attentive and consequent details (sometimes both) in 5 of the presented diploma projects so the jury was pleased to award all 5 possible prizes in one category: two nominees, two mentions and the award.

The Nominees:

Regina Tábori - Mill Lake Picnic

Regina introduced her historical and multi-layered site in the heart of Budapest in an almost poetic presentation. Her decisions for the subtle interventions continued to weave the rich spatial texture of the space, with both her architectural design and its visual representation at an exemplary level.

Rebeca Ioana Faur - Ineu Citadel Ensemble

Rebeca presented a deep understanding and care for the built heritage of the citadel, transforming it from a closed space for protection into an open one for a new public scene with a subtle architectural toolkit of access. The proposed scenarios balance carefully between the framework of contemporary urban life and the yet unknown needs of future experimentations.

The Mentions:

Eszter Vörös-Grigoriu - Mighty Fortress - Early Intervention Center for Autistic Children

Eszter's main two layers of research: the spatial and social inquiry of the site and the environmental psychology behind spaces for autistic children provided a steady foundation for a complex scheme. The simply constructed spatial layout provides a safe place and easy spatial control for its users, while the richness of details and materials invite for a close and nourishing contact with the built and natural environment.

Andrea Cseke - The living artery of Oradea

Through her project Andrea created an essential example of how carefully gathered and evaluated data can safely guide us to develop strategies to re-connect with nature even in dense urban environments. The general scheme is strengthened by the strong spatial proposals of the chosen sites, nevertheless they would provide enough space for growth for both their further, architectural development and the involvement of future users.

The Winner:

Andrei Cîra - Revolution Memorial

Andrei presented a diploma project that demonstrate his spatial awareness and promotes exemplary architecture on numerous levels. The understanding and subtle continuation of the complex urban context at one of the key locations in Timișoara, the architectural articulation of the interventions and the interior design solutions create a comprehensive and immersive spatial structure, that he even starts to inhabit with a memorial gesture, an art-piece of remembrance to be created by the community. For the consequent professional attitude in all its layers and the high quality visual representation of these, he is awarded the main prize in the Graduation Projects category at BETA 2022.

19 works evaluated, 9 works selected for the second phase

**Nominee** - Regina Tábori - Mill Lake Picnic

**Nominee** - Rebeca Ioana Faur - Ineu Citadel Ensemble

**Mention** - Eszter Vörös-Grigoriu - Mighty Fortress - Early Intervention Center for Autistic Children

**Mention** - Cseke Andrea - The living artery of Oradea

**Award** - Andrei Cîra - Revolution Memorial

## 5. Initiatives / Experiments / Visions - Milka Gnjato

All of the eleven received works in this category were very different in their idea and intention. Being fully aware of the importance that initiatives, experiments, and visions carry with them, sometimes being driving forces for the development of neighborhood, community, and society, and the enthusiasm and abilities they require to be implemented, it wasn't easy for us to evaluate them.

Due to the variety of motivations, visions, and needs from which they originated, we have discussed works highly appreciating the range of impact of the presented idea, feasibility, usefulness of the results, applied methodology, thoroughness, innovativeness, and relevance. The jury shortlisted six works for the second round that are widely plausible and with general relevance, so they could be further analyzed by the public and perhaps provoke public discussion and further actions.

It is never enough to emphasize the importance of student participation in the process of education and developing their awareness about the space in which they live, work and learn. Considering already achieved results, precise but inspirational methodology of implementation, and the great benefit that this initiative brings to the students, its universal language, and potential for further implementation, we awarded with Honorable Mention

the initiative „My school can be cool CNTRL“, Brindusa Raluca Havasi.

The second Honorable Mention goes to the initiative „Industrial Photography Saloon“, Muzeul Cineastului Amator. We appreciated the inspirational vision highlighting the significance of taking action and raising awareness of our heritage in our closest environment. We valued their capability to involve the community in this specific action, making the Industrial Photography Saloon living, and that way enriching the cultural contents of their town. We hope that this award will help this initiative to bring attention and to include institutions, professionals, and authorities in further development.

Considering the huge scope of the study, its thoughtfulness, the results collected so far, the thoroughness of the applied methodology, the great potential for further development, its relevance due to the importance of preserving heritage in a way that accentuates its complex variety, and above all its potential for implementation through planning documentation, especially considering the potential for a similar principle to be applied in other regions, we are glad to announce the main award for „Cultural landscapes in Banat“, Gabriela Domokos – Pașcu.

11 works evaluated, 6 works selected for the second phase

**Mention** - BRINDUSA RALUCA HAVASI - My school can be cool CNTRL

**Mention** - Muzeul Cineastului Amator - Industrial Photography Saloon

**Award** - Gabriela Domokos - Pașcu - Cultural landscapes in Banat

Edited by

András Cseh

Bogdan Ciocodeică

Evelina Ozola

Mark Randel

Milka Gnjato.

## 6. Essay

The jury has decided that there will be no prize in the essay category this year. Very few essays were submitted, but the fact that there is no prize does not mean that these essays were all bad. On the contrary, the jury would like to commend the essays for addressing important issues relating to the city as a common good and also for promoting some important perspectives in this regard. In one way or another all the essays offered approaches to architecture that sought to move beyond a focus on the individual buildings, focusing instead on the relationship between architecture and its wider social context. This is a welcome focus and the essays pushed important agendas such as thinking about architecture as a site of social resistance, an architecture of becoming, of shared spaces and the multiplicity of space. The problem however was that these perspectives were not sufficiently developed into a proper essay discussion, structure and format. Much more work is needed to unpack, analyze and discuss the ideas presented in sufficient depth and with substantial

reflexivity and nuanced discussion. Essay writing takes time – it is not simply an add-on to practice such as the presentation of a project or an idea, nor is it simply a description of relevant theories. Rather essay writing is a way to discuss and analyze ideas in depth, and in so doing to enter into a dialogue between theory and practice. This means using theory to ask critical questions of practice, and the other way around using practice to shed new light on theory and push it in new directions. The essays submitted in this category are all great starting points to enter into this dialogue, but there is still a way to go to. There was a sense that the cases discussed in the essays either came as an after thought – as a supplement to the theoretical discussion without actually enter into dialogue with it and so it was hard to grasp the arguments made. Or the other way around: the analysis of the case study was too thin and not sufficiently discussed or connected to theoretical reflections and so the arguments made became too general. Nevertheless, the jury would like to emphasize that there is much potential here to be further developed. Hence, the jury wish to encourage the authors to keep developing their ideas in order to turn them into fully-fledged essays. This is also encouragement to the festival: the jury discussed the idea that the festival could maybe provide some kind of essay-writing mentorship for selected essays.

Edited by  
Cecilie Sachs Olsen

## 7. Photography

**Nominee** - Alexandru Todirică - Minimarket ABC

**Nominee** - Miljena Vučković - Common beauty

**Mention** - Andrei Drăcea - The city inside the living room

**Mention** - David Dumitrescu - User not found

**Award** - Alexandru Todirică - No man's playground

As this year's photography jury we were tasked with choosing the winners based on criteria set by each of us separately beforehand, nevertheless during the first jury meeting we realized that we all agreed in considering the concepts of the photographic essays and their connection to the theme of the biennial as a primary criteria in judging the works. The other criteria were the cohesiveness of the essays manifested in content and aesthetics, the compositions, technical abilities expressed and manner of editing the images.

The 12 submissions we reviewed were diverse and surprising, some were deeply sensitive and cohesive while some, although interesting series, were streaming away from the "architectural photography" topic. We appreciated all the works to be worthy of being installed in the exhibition precisely because of their diversity.

We were deeply impressed with the winners, mentions and nominees. In these essays we found a strong idea, a cohesive approach, sensitive compositions and some were also inspiring in their technical abilities.

Nominee - Alexandru Todirică - Minimarket ABC

This essay impressed a strong sense of responsiveness to one's context and was

appreciated for having studied a theme that is more local and contextual. The photos were well composed and the consistency in their sequence was also appreciated.

Nominee - Miljena Vučković - Common beauty

This project displayed a keen interest and sensitivity of its author for the behavior of people within their city during the COVID lockdown. We were moved by the photographer's awareness of her environment and hope she keeps developing the series further on.

Mention - Andrei Drăcea - The city inside the living room

This essay displayed a sharp eye for the candid but nevertheless important events in the common space observed on the streets, and rooftops of Nepal. We also appreciated the composition and consistency of the essay.

Mention - David Dumitrescu - User not found

An almost cinematic approach to photography, this series impressed a strong sense of observation and understanding of human behavior, subject and observer included. We appreciated the topic and its strong relevance to the theme of the biennial, its consistency, the aesthetic qualities of the images and their treatment.

Award - Alexandru Todirică - No man's playground

This year's winner essay meets all the criteria mentioned: strong conceptual connection to the biennials theme, inspired and controlled compositions, consistent aesthetics throughout the images. The topic of informally built playgrounds is fascinating and the balance between how these spaces were captured and the moments chosen by the photographer, namely when they are empty, creates a strong atmosphere easily read and felt by the viewer.

Edited by  
Alexandra Timpau