

Questions and answers 140- 149

140. In point 3.2.5 is written that “The area to be comprised in the study adds up to 17,095 square metres”, However, when we calculate the new area of the study provided in Appendix 11 & 12 (in Dwg format), the resulting area of the “border study area” adds up to 43.803 square metres. This is a big discrepancy. What is the actual size of the study area?

Zone 003-M/U31/KS, as shown in Appendix No. 13 is 17,362 sqm in area, and this is the land designated for the location of the Museum. **Therefore, this zone should be treated as the Museum building plot.**

The area sized 43,809 sqm represents the study area as given in Appendix No. 11, i.e. comprises the Museum building plot plus its immediate vicinities where drive-ins, pavements, the green, street architecture, etc. should be located.

The Organiser permits the design solutions adopted for road transport and land development to spread over the study area enclosed within the borders shown in Appendix 11, though the Museum together with all its elements required in the specification must be fitted inside the building plot (zone 003-M/U31/KS), which is the property owned by the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk.

Within the borderlines of the study area, though outside the building plot, i.e. outside zone 003-M/U31/KS, you will find elements of the traffic system and the Radunia Canal. These elements will obviously remain the property of the City of Gdańsk and must not be utilised to achieve the museum development solution. Any changes to the traffic grid within the borderlines of the study area, that might be required because of the positioning of the Museum, should be proposed in compliance with the stipulations of the valid local spatial environmental plans as contained in Appendix 13. *Also see: reply to inquiries 68,69, 93, and 117.*

141. What is the maximum permissible depth for underground construction in the site? Is an underground parking facility allowed in the rules of the competition, if yes which is the maximum depth? Given the special conditions of the site facing the waterfront we would like to know if the organizers of the competition have any comments about this topic.

The decision about the maximum depth of the underground section of the planned building should be made by the Competition Participant in consultation with specialists in the field and based on e.g. the information contained in Appendix No. 17 (Geotechnical documentation of the base ground tests).

Since building plot of the Museum is zone 003-M/U31/KS referred to in plan 1152, the Competition Organiser suggests that the parking facility be located in the same zone.

142. Appendix 12 delimits the area to be comprised in the study / its borders, and the question is: can the design of the building extend to the other bank of

the Radunia taking advantage of the plot on the other side? Alternatively, must the rough borders of development run along the Radunia itself and Stara Stocznia Streets - which would stem from the stipulations in the study of the area development conditions?

Zone 003-M/U31/KS shown in Appendix No. 13 is 17,362 sqm in area, and this is the land designated for the location of the Museum building. **Therefore, this zone should be deemed the Museum building plot.**

The roads and the Radunia Canal around zone 003-M/U31/KS will remain the property of the City of Gdańsk, and cannot be utilised to achieve the Museum development solution. That is why, it is not permissible to locate either the Museum building, or any fragments thereof on the south-western bank of the Radunia Canal, or on the plot of Stara Stocznia Street. *Also see: the replies to inquiries: 11, 26, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 43, 44, 45, 73, 94, and 140.*

143.
There is no way the whole site fits into a horizontal single pannel at a 1:200 scale. So, our cross sections and plans are going to be wider than the width of a single horizontal panel, while you just switched them from horizontal to vertical. Which solution do the authors and the jury have in mind ?

Once again, let us explain that on 28 June 2010 point 4.2.1. E was only amended to the extent of the way the 6 panels are to be arranged in the event they are combined to a single compositional unit.

Therefore, the vertical layout relates solely to the way of putting the display together. Therefore, it is recommended that the panels be displayed in the following arrangement:

- in width: 2 panels adding up to the aggregate width of 2x100 cm = 200 cm
 - in height: 3 panels adding up to the aggregate height of 3x70 cm = 210 cm,
- as shown on the enclosed diagram:

1.	2.
1:500 Landscape site development	1:200 Plan drawings
1:500 2 contextual cross-sections	
[format: 70x100 cm]	[format: 70x100 cm]

3.	4.
1:200 Plan drawings [format: 70x100 cm]	1:200 Plan drawings 1:200 2 cross-sections [format: 70x100 cm]
5.	6
1:200 External walls 1:50 Architectural detail of the external walls [format: 70x100 cm]	Minimum 3 visualisations, perspective or axonometric views. Perspective views or visualisations of the interior. [format: 70x100 cm]

The layout of a single panel remains unchanged i.e. individual panels should be orientated horizontally with panel sizes w= 100cm, h= 70 cm.

a) Is the 1:200 scale final, and are we expected to split any single wide drawing on several vertical panels - which worries us, quite honestly ?

It is permissible for a part of the drawings of lesser significance for portraying the architectural concept, e.g. the plan of the garage floor, to be depicted in a scale smaller than 1:200, though no smaller than 1:500.

It is permitted to combine individual panels so as to form a single compositional unit and to spread the drawing over 2 panels. *As concerns panel arrangement – see above (question 143).*

b) Adopting the 1:250 scale instead of 1:200 would solve the problem. Is this out of the question, or is the 1:200 scale going to be reduced to 1:250 ?

It is permissible for a part of the drawings of lesser significance for portraying the architectural concept, e.g. the plan of the garage floor, to be depicted in a scale smaller than 1:200, though no smaller than 1:500.

144. Referring to the Rules of Procedure of the Architectural Competition for the Design of the Second World War Museum in Gdańsk, Chapter V – Competition Procedure, point 1 – Query Reply Procedure (5.1.2 and 5.1.3), please provide exhaustive replies to the following questions:

a) The proposed functional and use programme of the Museum, point 3.7.9.B, requires locating a parking facility for 280 cars. It is presumably a certain minimum level. What is the maximum capacity of the parking facility that would still satisfy the prerequisites of the Competition?

The capacity of 280 cars and a 5 coaches required for the parking facilities in the Rules of Procedure represents the overall parking space available, whether in the building and/or in the open ground. No ceiling is set for the capacity of the parking facilities. *Also see: the replies to inquiries 114 and 141.*

b) The formal aspects of development of the competition entries, point 4.2.1.E, it is required that the description of the rooms, including their sizes, be placed on the plan drawings of the building. Can we accept that the room numbers (following Appendix No. 10a) will be marked directly on the drawings, and next to them a legend is fitted giving the rooms numbers, their titles, and areas, plus the area of the traffic passages.

The suggested solution is permissible, even though the Organiser does recommend placing the names and floor areas directly on the plan so as to facilitate the work of the Competition Jury (considering the high number of entries anticipated).

c) Is it permissible to include diagrams, and functional and conceptual drawings on the panels to contain the graphic component so as to present the design clearly?

In their evaluation of the entries the Jury will primarily take into account the elements required in point 4.2.1.E of the Rules of Procedure. Placing other elements is permissible, provided the required scope of the study is presented. In other words, with the above condition met, it is permitted to supplement elements and drawings other than those required in the Rules of Procedure, if the Participant deems them necessary to visualise the architectural concept.

d) In the additional conditions of architectural and city-planning nature, point 3.3.1.A, it is made admissible to introduce an architectural accent of up to no more than 40 m in height. Please, specify, and please answer it straightforwardly and precise, what percent of the view (or bulk) of the Museum building can fall within the height range of 25 – 40m without infringing on the terms of the Competition.

The architectural accent referred to in point 3.3.2.A can account for no more than 10% of the building plan maximum.

The Organiser draws attention to the stipulation of point 3.3.2.A of the Rules of Procedure: „The designers should seek compositional and city-scape links with the elements of the neighbouring complexes by: A) maintaining the appropriate scale of

their development while recognising superiority of the dominant landmarks of the church and city hall towers. **The building height cannot exceed 25 m measured from the terrain to the uppermost elevation of the roof. It is admissible, though, to introduce an architectural accent of up to no more than 40 m in height”.**

145. There is a major problem with the presentation boards allegedly including all plans and sections scaled 1:200 (boards #2,3,4,5). The area of the building plot scaled 1:200 occupies the entire surface of one 70x100cm board, thus it is impossible to fit more than one single plan drawing in each board.

It is not required to show the entire plot scaled 1:200 on all plan-displaying panels. The plot in its entirety should be presented in the scale of 1:500 and only on the panel reserved for the area development.

- a) After your reply to question #100, where you mention that we cannot increase the number of boards above 6, we see that the only feasible option is to present the main level in 1:200, and the rest in 1:500. If that option is not permissible, what other alternative do you suggest?**

There is no option of increasing the number of panels. Permissible, though, is for some of the drawings of lesser significance for portraying the architectural concept, e.g. the garage floor plan, to be shown in a scale smaller than 1:200, though no smaller than 1:500.

It is permitted to combine individual panels so as to form a single compositional unit and to spread a single drawing over 2 panels. As concerns panel arrangement – please see the reply to query 143 and below (145b).

- b) Furthermore, in your reply to question #100, you state that the content of each of the 6 boards is ‘suggested’. Does this allow us the liberty to provide all the required content, but in other configurations? In the same spirit, are we allowed to add more content to blank areas of the boards that will show the plans (i.e. 3d renderings, sketches, explanatory drawings, text etc), or are the individual boards meant to show only the required plans and nothing more?**

The arrangement of the drawings on the panels, suggested in point 4.2.1.E of the Rules of Procedure is not mandatory.

Nevertheless, in anticipation of a high number of entries, the Competition Organiser recommends that the there defined arrangement of the graphics is followed in order to ease the job of the Competition Jury .

When evaluating the entries, the Jury will primarily consider the elements required in point 4.2.1.E of the Rules of Procedure. Adding other elements is permitted, provided that the scope of the study is presented as required. This means, that with

the above condition met, it is admissible to include other elements and drawings than those required in the Rules of Procedure in the presentation, if the Competition Participant deems them indispensable to picture the architectural concept.

Let us also remember that the Competition Participants can link the panels together, provided the required arrangement of the panels themselves is retained:

- the panels should be arranged horizontally, i.e. individual panels should be oriented horizontally (the panel width: 100 cm, the panel height: 70 cm).

In the event the panels are combined into a single compositional unit, we recommend to display the panels in the following arrangement:

- in width: 2 panels adding up to the aggregate width of $2 \times 100 \text{ cm} = 200 \text{ cm}$
 - in height: 3 panels adding up to the aggregate height of $3 \times 70 \text{ cm} = 210 \text{ cm}$,
 as shown on the enclosed diagram:

<p>1.</p> <p>1:500 Landscape site development 1:500 2 contextual cross-sections</p> <p>[format: 70x100 cm]</p>	<p>2.</p> <p>1:200 Plan drawings</p> <p>[format: 70x100 cm]</p>
<p>3.</p> <p>1:200 Plan drawings</p> <p>[format: 70x100 cm]</p>	<p>4.</p> <p>1:200 Plan drawings 1:200 2 cross-sections</p> <p>[format: 70x100 cm]</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>1:200 External walls 1:50 Architectural detail of the external walls</p> <p>[format: 70x100 cm]</p>	<p>6</p> <p>Minimum 3 visualisations, perspective or axonometric views. Perspective views or visualisations of the interior.</p> <p>[format: 70x100 cm]</p>

146.

a) In presentation board #1, you suggest that we show a base plan scaled 1:500. Do you mean the plan of the ground floor or the top level (the roofs)? If you mean the former, do we have to present the same drawing scaled 1:200 in another board?

The base area development plan scaled 1:500 should picture the positioning of the buildings (their outer perimeters) on the plot and mark their entrances and drive-ins, land development including access lanes, pavements, street/garden architecture, the green, and other elements, not the storey floor plans.

b) Furthermore, in chapter 4.5.3.c in the Rules of Procedure (IV: Formal Aspects of the Competition Procedure), what do you mean exactly by “costs”? Where can we find up-to-date information as far as Gdansk is concerned?

The term ‘costs’ is understood to denote pricing information as referred to in point 4.4.1.D of the Rules of Procedure: „the fixed net price for the development of the documentation to the extent determined in contract to be signed with the author of the Best Competition Entry, as referred to in point VIII.4, and the authors’ supervision; the envisaged maximum net cost of executing the works based on the design documentation contemplated in the contract”.

The costing information concerning individual works can be found in the SEKOCENBUD price lists (<http://www.sekocenbud.pl>, NOTE! Fee-based service).

c) Also, when you say “area sizes”, do you mean surface or volume? (square or cubic metres?).

The 'area' notion refers to the size of the surface, be it of a room or building, and should be expressed in square metres (m²) [as opposed to the bulk (volume) expressed in cubic metres (m³)].

147. Referring to question No. 100:

After a preliminary analysis of the opportunities of rational and transparent arrangement of all drawings required in the Rules of Competition in their respective scales on 6 panels we feel obliged to advise the Organiser that although fitting in all drawings on the above-mentioned, limited number of panels is possible, the clarity and saturation of the panels with the drawing material will largely blur any transparent message. Therefore, we repeat the question (appeal) about/for the possibility of introducing an amendment to the Rules of Procedure and permitting presentation on 9 panels.

No option is envisaged to increase the number of panels. It is permissible for a part of the drawings of lesser significance for portraying the architectural concept, e.g. the plan of the garage floor, to be depicted in a scale smaller than 1:200, though no smaller than 1:500.

148. Referring to the Rules of Procedure of the Architectural Competition for the Design of the Second World War Museum in Gdańsk, Chapter V –

Competition Procedure, point 1 – Query Reply Procedure (5.1.2 and 5.1.3), please provide exhaustive replies to the following questions:

a) Chapter III, point 2-3.2.3 read: „The investment consisting in the erection of the Museum can be located on the following plots: Nos. 331/5, 331/7, 332/2, 333/3, 335/6, and 334, circuit 090, being the property of the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk”.

Chapter III, point 2-3.2.4 reads: „The area to be comprised in the study adds up to 17,095 square metres”.

NOTE FROM THE INQUIRER: The above provisions are contradictory to Appendix No. 11 - „ Map of the binding spatial arrangements”. The area of 17,095 sqm is not the area to be comprise in the study, but merely the area of the listed plots. The area to be comprised in the study adds up to ca 35,000 sqm to 40,000 sqm in accordance with the same area defined in Appendices Nos. 11 and 12 – Designer’s map.

Chapter III point 4-3.4.6 reads „Within the borderlines shown on the ‘Map of the Binding Spatial Arrangements’ - Appendix No. 11 – a celebrity approach to the main entrance should be designed to serve special occasions and the VIPs”.

Chapter III point 7-3.7.9 B) reads „About 2700 m² of the area comprised in the study should be reserved for open air expositions or historical reconstructions, or placing other devices and objects connected with the functions included in the programme of the museum. In the area comprised in the study and delimited with the borderlines shown on the ‘Map of the Binding Spatial Arrangements’ - Appendix No. 11 – a parking facility capable of taking 280 cars, plus a coach parking facility for 5 vehicles should be envisaged”.

Considering the above information, please provide immediately the precise answers to the following questions:

- I. is the area comprised in the study actually 17,095 sqm and corresponds to the area of the listed plots, or is it the area delimited by the borderlines of the study according to Appendix 11 and Appendix 12?

Zone 003-M/U31/KS, as shown in Appendix No. 13 is 17,362 sqm in area, and this is the land designated for the location of the Museum. **Therefore, this zone should be treated as the Museum building plot.**

The area of about 2700 sqm, designated for open-air expositions, should be located within zone 003-M/U31/KS.

The land 43,809 sqm in area represents the study area as given in Appendix No. 11, which means it comprises the Museum building plot and its immediate vicinities where drive-ins, pavements, the green, street architecture, etc. should be located.

The Organiser permits the design solutions adopted for road transport and land development to spread over the study area enclosed within the borders shown in Appendix 11, though the Museum together with all its elements required in the specification must be fitted inside the building plot (zone 003-M/U31/KS), which is the property owned by the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk.

Within the borderlines of the study area, though outside the building plot, i.e. outside zone 003-M/U31/KS, you will find elements of the traffic system and the Radunia Canal. These elements will obviously remain the property of the City of Gdańsk and must not be utilised to achieve the museum development solution. Any changes to the traffic grid within the borderlines of the study area, that might be required because of the positioning of the Museum, should be proposed in compliance with the stipulations of the valid local spatial environmental plans as contained in Appendix 13.

II. do all of the following land development functions, i.e.:

- private car parking facilities,
- a parking facility for 5 coaches,
- the celebrity approach,
- the open exposition area,
- other facilities and structures connected with the functions embraced in the museum programme, especially all the required traffic solutions, to name the land occupied by access routes to the listed functions, have to be fitted in the area of the 4 listed plots, or can they be arranged over the land within the borderlines of the study as given in Appendices 11 and 12 in compliance with the binding terms of Competition?

● To quote after point 3.4.6 of the Rules of Procedure: *'In the area comprised in the study and delimited with the borderlines shown on the 'Map of the Binding Spatial Arrangements' - Appendix No. 11 – a parking facility capable of taking 280 cars, plus a coach parking facility for 5 vehicles should be envisaged. Point 9.2 in Area Chart 003-M/U31/KS of the Local Spatial Environmental Plan reads: 'parking facilities: to be included within the investment borders consistent with § 5 of this resolution, subject to point 17'. Point 17: 'in the event the museum to commemorate World War II is erected, the regulations set in points: 6.2.a, 6.2.b, 6.2.c, 6.2.d, 7.7, 7.8, 9.2, 10.2.a, 10.2.b, 10.2.c, 10.2.d, 10.3.a, 11.1, 11.2, 12.3, and 14.2 shall not be mandatorily valid'. Hence, it is permissible to locate parking facilities within the borderlines of the study area, though outside the Museum building plot. Nevertheless, because the Museum-designated building plot is zone 003-M/U31/KS of plan No. 1152, the Competition Organiser recommends fitting in the parking facilities (taking in 280 cars and 5 coaches) within the said zone.*

● In accordance with point 3.4.6 of the Rules of Procedure: *'Within the borderlines shown on the 'Map of the Binding Spatial Arrangements' - Appendix No. 11 – a celebrity approach to the main entrance should be designed to serve special*

occasions and the VIPs'. A celebrity approach is an element of the traffic system, therefore it is permissible to design it within the borderlines of the study area, but outside the building plot, that is zone 003-M/U31/KS of plan 1152.

- According to point 3.7.9 of the Rules of Procedure: *'About 2700 m² of the area comprised in the study should be reserved for **open air expositions** or historical reconstructions, or placing other devices and objects connected with the functions included in the programme of the museum'*. **However, considering that open-air expositions are to be arranged within the space belonging to the Museum (on the Museum plot) and not in the surrounding public space, the Competition Organiser recommends fitting the open-air exposition ground within the borderlines of zone 003-M/U31/KS of plan 1152.**

- Other facilities and structures connected with the **functions embraced in the museum programme** should be located within zone 003-M/U31/KS of plan 1152. The roads around zone 003-M/U31/KS and the Radunia Canal will remain the property of the City of Gdańsk and must not be utilised to achieve the Museum development solution.

- Any required **traffic solutions**, including land designation for access routes to the listed functions, can be arranged within the borderlines of the study area given in Appendix 11, that is outside the Museum building plot or zone 003-M/U31/KS. Any changes to the traffic grid within the borderlines of the study area, that might be required because of the positioning of the Museum, should be proposed in compliance with the stipulations of the valid local spatial environmental plans as contained in Appendix 13.

b) Reference to Chapter II point 1-2.1.3 A). Is it possible to replace (the person listed in the request for participation in the competition) the person holding the licences to practise the profession of an architect and the unrestricted designer's licence in the special area of architecture? The question concerns the ultimate composition of the team of authors

Once the prequalification procedure has been completed, there is no possibility to introduce any personal changes on the part of the Competition Participant. Any such change would require that the Organiser go back to the stage of verifying the Participant's (joint Participants') compliance with the prerequisites of taking part in the Competition, i.e. both the qualifications and the experience. The verification steps were taken at the stage of admission to the Competition, therefore at the present stage there is no option of amending anything about the person of the Competition Participant.

Open at the present stage is the possibility of broadening the composition of the team engaged in the development of the Competition Entry, though this only applies to draughtsmen and other members, excluding the head designer. Moreover, the particulars of the persons already indicated in the Participant prequalification

process, i.e. in the Request to Participate in the Competition, must remain unchanged.

c) Reference to Chapter II point 1-2.1.3 E). How should we construe independence of the competition participant of the members of the Competition Jury? Please, provide the precise answer

Point 2.1.3. of the Rules of Procedure stipulates that participation in the Competition is open to those persons/entities who/which meet all of the there listed prerequisites, including e.g. the requirement of being independent of the members of the Competition Jury. Each Participant appended the Request to Participate in the Competition with the required declarations, also those contained in Appendix 2. The latter assure that the Participant is not liable to exclusion from the public contract award procedure contemplated in the Rules of Procedure under Art. 24.1 or Art 24.2 of the Public Procurement Law Act, or point 2.1.6. of the Rules of Procedure in the Competition. In this way the Participant has assured he/she is not an employee or contractual partner of the Competition Organiser, he/she is not a member of the Competition Jury, has not been directly involved in any actions connected with the preparation of the Competition, he/she does not use any persons that would participate in the preparation of the Competition or setting the terms thereof to develop the Competition Entry.

Moreover, the Competition Participant is deemed to be dependent on the members of the Competition Jury, if he/she is a relative by marriage, blood or affinity in direct line, or relative by blood or affinity in indirect line up to the second degree, or a relative by adoption, care, or guardianship of a member of the Competition Jury, and/or if at any time over 3 years before the date of initiating the public contract award procedure he/she remained in a relationship of employment, or freelance agreement with a member of the Competition Jury, and/or remains in such a legal or actual relationship with a member of the Competition Jury, which may raise justified doubts as to impartiality of those persons. Art. 17 of the Public Procurement Law Act applied as appropriate.

149. Referring to the reply to query No. 83 let me ask whether it is possible to produce the model that will include the immediate vicinities?

My question seems to be well-grounded, since the museum building will never stand „in the middle of nowhere". Additional support seems to stem from the recently resolved competition for the apartment estate, and the precisely defined nature and frontage lines defined in the plans for the neighbouring plots, which are included among the guidelines to the new museum design (included as appendices to the Competition).

The mock-up of the building **should** primarily visualise the architectural concept of the designed development plus land development within the study borders outlined on the 'Map of the Binding Spatial Arrangements', scaled 1:1000 – Appendix No. 11.

The Organiser **does not recommend** expanding the area captured in the mock-up model beyond the borderlines of the study area marked on the 'Map of the Binding Spatial Arrangements' – Appendix No. 11. *Also see: replies to queries 12, 19, 33, 74, 83, 112a, and 124.*