Beta

Beta Awards 2024
Jury report Categories Built space (Residential S, M, L / Non-residential - interventions on existing and New), Interior space(Interior design / Temporary Design), Public space (Urban design / Urban Studies / Temporary installations), Graduation projects, Endeavours.

Jury members: Cosmina Goagea, Corvin Cristian, Csaba Nagy, Iva Čukić, Victor Moldoveanu.

Total number of submitted works (for all 7 categories): **405**
Total number of submitted works for categories 1-5: **335**
Number of works from Romania: **305**
Number of works from Serbia: **29**
Number of works from Hungary: **71**

Distribution of the submitted works on categories:
Built space: **82**
Interior space: **82**
Public space: **42**
Graduation projects: **80**
Endeavours: **48**

Disqualified works:**2**
Number of evaluated works (for all 7 categories): **403**
Number of evaluated works for categories 1-5: **334**

Number of projects selected for the exhibition **102**
Built space: **38**
Interior space: **18**
Public space: **15**
Graduation projects: **15**
Endeavours: **16**

Number of projects nominated in the categories 1-5: **36**
Built space: **15**
Interior space: **5**
Public space: **7**
Graduation projects: **5**
Endeavours: **4**

Beta

Introduction / General info

This report outlines the common judging criteria applied by the jury during the Beta Awards 2024 evaluation process. These criteria were derived from the jury's observations and decisions across all categories and served as a framework for assessing the submitted projects.

1. Innovation and Creativity
   - The jury evaluated how projects demonstrated originality in design, execution, or conceptualization.
   - Thoughtful reinterpretations of existing spaces and innovative proposals for new developments were highly valued.
2. Contextual integration
   - Projects were assessed on their sensitivity to their surroundings, including integration with local environments, history, and culture.
   - Successful entries blended harmoniously with the urban or natural landscapes they inhabited.
3. Functionality and Usability
   - The jury reviewed how well designs met the practical needs of users, ensuring comfort, accessibility, and functionality.
   - Inclusivity was emphasized, with projects evaluated for their ability to accommodate diverse user groups and foster equitable access.
4. Sustainability
   - Submissions were analyzed for their environmentally responsible approaches, such as the incorporation of green infrastructure and sustainable building practices.
   - Projects were commended for their positive contributions to ecological balance and long-term environmental health.
5. Community impact
   - The jury considered the extent to which projects fostered social interaction and community engagement.
   - Designs that enriched public life and created shared spaces for people to connect were prioritized.
6. Design excellence
   - High aesthetic and technical quality was a key factor in the jury's evaluation.
   - Attention to detail, material selection, and spatial articulation were critical in defining the success of a project.
7. Cultural and Symbolic Relevance
   - Projects were reviewed for their ability to enrich or reflect the cultural identity of their context.
   - Submissions that incorporated meaningful narratives or symbolism resonating with communities were given special consideration.
8. Adaptability and Flexibility

- The jury examined how designs anticipated and accommodated future changes or evolving needs.
- Versatility in usage and reconfiguration was seen as a significant strength.

9. Educational and Inspirational value

- Projects were recognized for their potential to inspire other communities, professionals, and stakeholders.
- Contributions to architectural discourse and broader societal conversations were highly regarded.

These criteria guided the jury's decisions throughout the Beta Awards 2024. By applying this framework, the jury ensured a consistent and fair evaluation of all submissions, recognizing projects that excelled in creativity, functionality, inclusivity, and sustainability while making meaningful contributions to their communities and contexts.

Phase 1 - selection of the exhibited projects

During the first phase of the evaluation process, the Jury members individually studied each of the 334 works remaining in the competition after the preliminary analysis, based on a set of personal criteria. The selection of projects exhibited in the public space of Timișoara took place in two sessions, during these meetings the Jury established the way of the selection process and discussed each member's general views regarding all of the categories and the proposed evaluation methods.

After the individual study of the projects, the jury gave points from 1 to 10 to each project, all of the points given by the individual members were centralised, and the projects that had a difference bigger than 3 points were submitted to further debate until the Jury members were able to reach a unanimous decision. The overall conclusion after this Jury session was that the works presented in different categories show a large diversity of approaches and thematics.

Considering the large amount of selected projects, the jury decided to study even more in-depth the selected projects and propose a list of nominees, which were invited in Timișoara for more discussion with the jury.

Phase 2 - selection of nominated projects

During the second phase of the evaluation process, each Jury member made a list of a maximum of 4-5 proposed nominees for each sub-category.

The proposals of nominated projects were centralised, and each proposed nomination was discussed in-depth with all the jury members until the Jury reached a unanimous decision. A key factor in selecting the nominated projects was to achieve a varied and comprehensive selection of projects that would provide a strong foundation for discussion in the following phase.

Beta

Phase 3 - selection of the winning projects

The third part of the Jury evaluation involved live presentations and Q&A of the nominated projects, taking place at Archa in Timisoara. Over the two days of presentations, which provided additional details about each work, a valuable dialogue began between the authors and the Jury. Based on this, for the first five categories, the Jury decided to offer 10 Mentions and 9 Awards.

In awarding the 10 Mentions and 9 Awards, the jury carefully evaluated projects within each category while also comparing them across the entire competition. This thorough approach ensured that all recognized projects met the jury's criteria and maintained a consistent level of quality throughout the competition.

Built Space

Residential (S / L)

In the Residential category, 4 Small projects and 3 large projects. After the discussion with the authors, the Jury decided to give two awards and no mentions in the Residential S category and an Award and one mention in the residential L category, as follows:

Residential S

Award:
Project: House with Many Gardens
Author: Daniel Laszlo Balo
The shifted plan on the plot is opening up diverse sorts of gardens, each one with its distinct atmosphere. The articulation of the 2 parts of the house with the intermediary winter and summer living room promises a very high quality of living for an extended family.

Award:
Project: House for a collection
Author: Attila Kim, Alexandru Szuz Pop, Adina Marin
The jury found valuable the approach within this project, which involves recovering the architect's intentions from the design phase and bringing the building to this ideal shape that was never built before. Changing the interior spatial configuration and adding a courtyard of light ensures a good quality of living.
The careful curation of the pieces of furniture completes the collection in a coherent and inspired way.

Residential L

Beta

Award: Urban Spaces 5 / Sfinții Voievozi 22-24
Authors: Andrei Șerbescu, Adrian Untaru, Bogdan Brădățeanu, Petra Bodea, Valentina Țigără, Elena Zară, Mihail Filipenco
The jury appreciated how the building enhances the identity of the Bucharest neighborhood it is located in, a rather diverse, irregular, and fragmented one. Its insertion into the built context is nuanced and resonates with volumetric elements, historical plasters, textures, and colors from the neighborhood. Beyond the good quality of the living proposed, and the rich and diverse typologies of the apartments, the building brings an extra urbanity through the open ground floor and at the same time tries to recover a certain elegance specific to Bucharest modernism.

Mention
Project Title"Zhero Residence" Zalau
Author: Sergiu Tîrziu
The jury appreciated the way the building brings balance and harmony in a crowded and irregular urban context, immediately becoming a landmark in the city. The diverse commercial spaces on the ground floor create a vivid urban plinth. The project also sets a good quality standard of collective housing for the small town in which it is located.

Built Space - Non-residential (New & Intervention on existing)
The jury appreciated the diversity of programs in this category: churches, office buildings, campuses, lookout towers, etc. New buildings with a new identity, new buildings with historical identity. Historical buildings with a new identity. These things happened after long discussions mainly on theoretical questions based on the relationship with the client: ,,Is the project good for only the client's purposes or is it good for the city, and the community as well?" ,,What is the architects' role in it?" The jury found that the projects in these two categories respond to the same question and have common judging criteria. Considering this, the jury decided to judge together projects from Interventions on existing and New, under the Non-residential subcategory.
Finding the winner was easy and clear for all of the jurors. The process of finding the first mention was also based on a unified opinion.
The only dispute was about a building that ended up remaining in the nominated category. Religious community, diaspora, and inclusion of contemporary appearance and historical building character each of the selected buildings had clear values for everyone. The buildings created new values for the environment, the city, the street, or the landscape so that the community and the users also received an excellent building without any doubt.
The jury decided to give one Award and three mentions as follows:

Beta

Award:
Project: New educational building for Semmelweis University – Faculty of Health Sciences
Authors: Imre Bődi, Zsolt Frikker
The Semmelweis University building extension is one of the most successful buildings in recent years. It started with an open competition and after the realization it ended with recognitions and awards.
The basic design principles are based on the dialogue with the existing building and have been developed from it. The addition creates a completed inner courtyard. The two buildings are connected on every level and the interior spaces are organised by a central atrium which is the main spatial element of the new wing.
Due to the narrow street, the main facade can be seen only by side. So the zig-zag geometry creates the shadow effects between the historic buildings and gives the building a uniqueness of the facade that indicates a public building function. The entrance arch is symbolic, it leads to the house of eternal knowledge and learning.

Mention:
Project title: Revitalization of the Firefighters' Tower
Authors: Vlad Sebastian Rusu, Octav Silviu Olănescu, Anamaria Olănescu
Reuse, reuse and reuse again. The tower, built in the last decades of the 15th Century, as a part of the medival citywall.
In 1870   the city council voted to transform it into a firefighters tower instead of demolishing this tower of the fortified enclosure.
In 1985 the tower was transformed into an astronomical museum, with reinforced concrete floors and ramps stairs, and with a glass pyramid on top .
In 2017 the restoration and revitalization project of the lookout tower and city museum commenced. After the removal of all reinforced concrete elements, the new translucent core has been implemented. which facilitates accessibility to the upper level, allows visiting the interior space and gives structural rigidity as well. The new tower cover provides a protected view of the city while iconically displaying the new identity.

Mention
Project title: Pauline Monastery
Authors: Macalik Arnold, Lázár Csaba, Szilágyi-Bartha József
A spectacular building even at first sight innovative and creative solutions, a contemporary unique appearance a desire for timelessness
The building's formula is a strong multilevel core, with the chapel—library-kitchen—and the monastic cells around it linked in a "house in a house" formula. The cold alpine climate in the Hargita explains the internal cloister circulation. It is a hard mass-like building with small openings, artistic forms, and innovative use of natural materials. A curved option of a chapel looking up to the sky represents the

abstract connection to the transcendent world, a building with an inner meaning even on the first impression.

Mention
Project title: Tandem Office Building
Authors: Andrei Șerbescu, Adrian Untaru, Bogdan Brădățeanu, Esenghiul Abdul, Tiberius Tudor, Laura Oniga, Cristina Budan, Madalina Andrei

In the works of the ADNBA office, fitting into the environment is always an important design aspect The Tandem building, together with the Millo building, form a large-scale. The recent intervention tries to restore a balance into a heterogeneous urban image. Like the building that previously stood on the site and belonged to the Palace of Telephones, the Tandem building sets back from the street leaving room for a public square.
The ground floor opens up to the city, while on the second level, a series of terraces reduces the volume towards its upper part. The sequences of vertical and horizontal metal profiles give depth to the facade and offer an additional layer of perception that changes depending on the direction from which the building is viewed. High quality contemporary office building that fits into the environment.

Interior space - no awards

Despite the jury's appreciation for the diversity of approaches within the Interior Design category, none of the projects met the level of quality or fulfilled the criteria to the same extent as those in other categories. While the nominated works showcased thoughtful design, they lacked the overall impact required for an award. This decision underscores the jury's dedication to upholding the high standards of the Beta Awards.

Public space: Choosing the award winners was a challenging decision, as all the nominated works showed exceptional quality and creativity. In evaluating the quality of public spaces for this award, the jury considered several key factors contributing to their success and impact on the community. Accessibility for all, regardless of age or mobility, was essential, as was creating inclusive environments where diverse groups feel welcome. The members of the jury looked for spaces that promote both physical and psychological safety while providing comfort through thoughtful amenities like seating, shade, and restrooms. The aesthetic and design quality, including the integration of local culture and history, also played a significant role, alongside each space's ability to encourage social interaction and community engagement. The jury also prioritized sustainability to ensure these spaces positively contribute to both people and nature. These criteria reflect the commitment of the jurors
 to recognize public spaces that truly enrich urban life.

Beta

Public space - Temporary installations
Award:
Project title: QUAY
Authors: Cecília Lohász, Dániel Nyitray, Flóra Madácsi, Gábor Góbi, Janka Bulath, Kata Balogh, Miklós Tömör

The Quay stands out for its exceptional ability to bring people together and foster a strong sense of community. By providing thoughtfully designed spaces that encourage social interaction and shared experiences, it serves as a vibrant hub for gatherings. In doing so, it sets a powerful example for similar initiatives, both within Budapest and beyond.

Mention:
Project title: Unfolding Pavilion: #OPENGIARDINI
Authors: Daniel-Tudor Munteanu, Davide Tommaso Ferrando

This installation is being recognized for its bold critique and thought-provoking questioning of what truly constitutes 'public' space. Its provocative approach challenges conventional ideas and sparks important conversations about access, ownership, and the political dimensions of public spaces - making it not only a work of architecture but a powerful statement.

Mention:
Project title: Zilele Caleido, Ferentari
Authors: Alexandru Belenyi, Irina Niculescu Belenyi

The space is distinguished by its remarkable capacity to foster social interaction and community engagement, creating a vibrant environment where people come together to share, connect, and build stronger relationships.

Public space - Urban design
Award:
Project title: Revitalization of the Feroviarilor Park
Authors: Vlad Sebastian Rusu, Octav Silviu Olănescu, Anamaria Olănescu

This space is defined by its strong commitment to sustainability, where green infrastructure and environmental management are seamlessly integrated into the design. It stands as an excellent example of how nature and urban design can coexist harmoniously, creating an environment that respects and enhances the surrounding natural elements while meeting the needs of modern urban life.

Beta

Award:
Project title: Inclusive public space. Promenade on the Danube
Authors: Iulian Canov, Marius Vasile, Iris Popescu, Monica Săbău

This public space stood out for its exceptional accessibility and inclusivity, ensuring that it welcomes all members of the community, regardless of age or ability. By prioritizing the needs of the community in design, it sets a new standard for creating welcoming, functional spaces for all.

Mention:
Project title: River Someș
Authors: Jaime Daroca, José Mayoral, José Ramón Sierra

This space is a testament to a forward-thinking commitment to sustainability, skillfully incorporating green infrastructure into the fabric of the urban environment. It exemplifies how nature can be seamlessly embraced in city planning, fostering a lasting positive impact on both the environment and the community.

Graduation Projects

Award:
Project title: Repurposing the Railway Infrastructure Topolog Valley
Author: Afloarei Ioana

The project focuses on the revival of an abandoned transport route nestled deep within the Romanian countryside. Initially designed by a communist lost industrial dream to build infrastructure that conquers man and nature, this graduation project turns this on its head and does the exact opposite. Sunken into the spectacular and almost surreal natural landscape, the author has a personal human-level dialogue between structures and territories, which concludes into a sensitive site reading. The result is a refined design strategy of inhabiting infrastructures and proposing ten places tied together, like a string of pearls that bring hope to visitors and the local community alike.

Mention
Project title: Petrified Thread: Liminal Spaces of Stone Weddings
Author: Tijana Pejić

This project presents a compelling narrative about the immaterial, proposing a global network of special places that exist within myth and legend. The student demonstrates a deep understanding and passion for transforming forgotten dreams into built environments. Through the use of emotions, she crafts enduring architectural tectonics that speak to the heart. The design weaves together themes of curses,

hopelessness, love, and nature, merging them into a soft, intricately layered representation. This work beautifully showcases the incredible potential of architectural storytelling, emphasizing its power to convey profound human experiences.

Mention
Project title: Renovation of the Esztergom Coal Loading Tower and Revitalization of its Surroundings
Author: Dániel Péter Klenóczky

This project celebrates the unique industrial heritage of a coal loading tower, once a symbol of technological advancement in the industrial era. Originally a purely utilitarian structure, the proposal focuses on restoring and breathing new life into this lost icon. The simplicity of the design is conveyed through precise drawings and results from an elegant and articulated intellectual approach. It references the dark and oppressive hardship of coal mining labor, which we are fortunate not to have experienced in our lifetime. In this line, in a very intelligent and ironic way, the user becomes the former cargo.

Endeavaours

Award:
Project title: Rehabilitation of the Pelican Boat
Authors: Bogdan Demetrescu, Dan Crâsnic

This project brings a new perspective on how people relate to water in our region: a new way of reading the city which becomes a device to contextualize Timisoara with its surroundings. This is not only a telling about restoring a forgotten boat hull to its former glory, but it's a narrative about restoring our perspective to the vital elements of everyday life: connecting back to our nature, connecting back to our neighbors, and transcending the borders of political and ideological ambitions.

Mention:
Project title: The Shape and Measure of Space
Author: Matei Eugen Stoean

This study focuses on the ecclesiastical architecture of rural communities and proposes a tool that enables us to read this type and this part of our common history. This impressive study looks at both built form and void and documents this relationship in various intriguing forms of representation that pose a strong and valid question about religious buildings not only in rural but also in urban contemporary environments.

Public Choice Award
For the first time in this competition, the Public Prize was introduced to strengthen the connection between architects and the general public, emphasizing the importance of architecture that directly

addresses the values and needs of society. Thus, this project won after receiving 230 votes from the public.

Project title: The interconnection of the Bistra Valley through a cycling route, which links the region, villages and landscape.

Authors: Baila Cristina Florina