# CAMERIMAGE

Toruń, 16.04.2021

## Concerning:

"Competition for development of architectural concept for the European Film Center CAMERIMAGE building in Toruń"

## EXPLANATIONS 7 TO THE TERMS OF THE COMPETITION REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF STUDIES (QUESTIONS 1 through 34)

#### **QUESTION 1**

How and when will appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be made available to competition participants?

#### ANSWER

Appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be published until 20.04.2021.

## **QUESTION 2**

According to Appendix 7b to the Competition Regulations, the proposed area of the Festival Center is  $8633 \,\mathrm{m}^2$ , but after adding individual counterparts of the Center, i.e. The Main House, the Foyer and the ECFC Administration, the total area is  $9302 \,\mathrm{m}^2$ . Which of these values should be adopted? Please specify the expected Festival Center area.

#### **ANSWER:**

The program table included in Appendix 7b, i.e. the total area calculations for the Festival Center - item I of the table, states the area of the Main House - field 1. in the table, and the area of the Foyer (total) - field 2. in the table. The area of the ECFC Administration - item 3 in the table - functions separately (which is why it has not been included in the total area of the Festival Center). Therefore, it should be assumed as follows:

The total area of the Festival Center is:  $2852 \,\mathrm{m}^2$  (Main House - item 1) +  $5781 \,\mathrm{m}^2$  (Foyer - item 2) =  $8633 \,\mathrm{m}^2$ , as before, plus the area of the ECFC Administration (item 3) =  $669 \,\mathrm{m}^2$  Therefore, item I. in the table in Appendix 7b - Festival Center, should be  $9302 \,\mathrm{m}^2$ . This correction, however, does not change the total, final area of all spaces covered with the functional

## **OUESTION 3**

According to Appendix 7b to the Competition Regulations, the proposed area of the Market is 2317m<sup>2</sup>, whereas after adding all component areas of the Market, we have obtained a total area of 2407m<sup>2</sup>. Which of these values should be adopted? Please specify the expected area of the Market.

## **ANSWER:**

The program table in Appendix 7b - item II.2 (Exhibition room 1) and item II.3 (Exhibition room 2) erroneously states:  $550m^2$ , for each room. However, the correct values should be:

II.2 (Exhibition room 1) - 505m<sup>2</sup>

program - the complete ECFC.

II.3 (Exhibition room 2) - 505m<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, the complete area of the Market is 2317m<sup>2</sup>.

## **QUESTION 4**

The Organizer stated that Appendices 7e, 7f, 7g, 7 will be published after Participants have been qualified to the competition. Can you specify when will that be (exact date)?

#### **ANSWER:**

Appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be published until 20.04.2021.

## **QUESTION 5**

As regarding the Study developed in Phase I of the Competition, does the Organizer foresee any participation in the expenditure incurred by the Participant?

#### **ANSWER:**

No.

#### **OUESTION 6**

Where can I find the individual identification number of the Study assigned to me?

#### **ANSWER:**

The identification number of the Study is individually assigned by the Competition Participant.

## **QUESTION 7**

If the total area is maintained and each of the functional blocks is fulfilled within the complex, can the designer adopt some deviations from the requirements pertaining to mutual relations among individual elements (cinema auditoriums, the market, the museum, etc.) - if the architectural concept would require this?

## **ANSWER:**

Yes, but the Organizer has thoroughly analyzed their needs and the resulting functioning of the ECFC building on this specific site and in these specific spatial conditions. Therefore, the recommendations for mutual relations among individual functional and program elements of the buildings, as well as the relations with neighboring areas and their development, as stated in Appendix 7b, should be treated as suggested by the Organizer. Of course, the Competition Participant is free to suggest their own vision of these suggestions, which will be evaluated by the Competition Jury together with its justification. Rationally, from the functional point of view, different proposals will not disqualify the design.

## **QUESTION 8**

Question to Appendix 7B to the Competition Regulations, page 1: To what extent spatial guidelines need to be observed? For instance, item 1 refers to a passage "on the southern side of the lot", or item 3 refers to a square in front of the entrance - i.e. a northeastern location. To what extent are these guidelines binding and can they be deviated from?

## **ANSWER:**

See the answer to question no. 7.

#### **QUESTION 9**

Are the competition assumptions perhaps mutually contrasting? On the one hand, the Organizer expects the expression of unshackled architectural imagination, but, on the other hand, very specific relations of individual groups of spaces and their locations within the building and on the site are stated - which significantly determines the design. To what extent is the spatial layout of the investment binding (page 8, appendix 7b)?

See the answer to question no. 7.

## **QUESTION 10**

Is the VIP zone in the circle of the Main House to include 35 seats of ca. 540 sqm? What function should the remaining area of the circle serve?

#### **ANSWER:**

In Appendix 7b, the program table erroneously states 35 seats in item I.1.2. The "number of seats" should be ca. 350. The Competition Regulations do not explicitly recommend the circle to be dedicated to a VIP zone. However, the designer may propose an additional VIP row in the circle. This will not disqualify the design proposal.

#### NOTE:

According to the Competition regulations, the central part of the middle sectors shall be reserved for VIP seats (ca. 300 seats).

## **QUESTION 11**

In the graphic part, can the Competition Participant prepare a digital visualization instead of a "schematic bird's view of the site (...) from the eastern side" (item 2.2. Section IV of the Regulations) together with possible, additional visualizations?

#### **ANSWER:**

Yes.

For the study, the Organizer will accept the graphic part to be executed in any technique, provided that it is legible, clear and explicit, and that the idea proposed by the Competition Participant is clearly presented.

## **QUESTION 12**

Do the requirements for the contents of the study and the thematic scope of the study (item 2 Section IV of the Regulations) state the minimum or maximum requirements, i.e. can be supplement the guidelines and/or provide additional information we have deemed useful?

#### ANSWER-

In view of the comparability of the Studies developed by Competition Participants, as stated in Section IV, the requirements for the formal and thematic scope of this Study should be treated as maximum ones

Any additional elements presented by the Competition Participant will not affect the evaluation of the Competition Jury, but will not disqualify the Study either.

## **QUESTION 13**

Please provide us with the following appendices:

Appendix 7e - Excerpt from the design documentation of the Jordanki Culture and Congress Center (CKK Jordanki) within a scope necessary for linking level -1 of its underground garage to the ECFC building.

Appendix 7f - Excerpt from the design documentation of the Center of Contemporary Art within a scope necessary for linking level -1 of its underground garage to the ECFC building.

Appendix 7g - Excerpt from the design documentation of the newly designed Center of Contemporary Art building within a scope necessary for executing a link to this building from the ECFC building at level +1.

#### **ANSWER:**

Appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be published until 20.04.2021.

## **QUESTION 14**

Please provide us with the following appendix:

Appendix 7j - A survey of green areas and greenery in the Jordanki area, including the competition area.

#### **ANSWER:**

Appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be published until 20.04.2021.

## **QUESTION 15**

According to appendix 7c to the Competition Regulations, the maximum development height on the investment site is 20m, with local super-elevations to 30m, in ordinate 83 m a.s.l., this will be allowed on 20% of the construction lot. To calculate these 20%, please confirm with us the spatial limitations we should be taking into account.

#### **ANSWER:**

The construction lot is the Investment site marked in Appendix 7a to the Regulations with the boundaries for design. The site is situated on lots no. 6/18, 6/20 and 6/22 in area 14 of ca. 1.85 ha in total area, which are owned by the Organizer, and a part of lot no. 6/10, a part of lot no. 6/21 and lot no. 6/9 and 6/17 of ca. 0.55 ha in total area.

This aforementioned area of c.a. 2.4 ha should be adopted in the balance of the investment site development design at the stage of the competition design.

## **QUESTION 16**

When and where will appendices 7e, 7f, 7g, 7j be published?

## **ANSWER:**

Appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be published until 20.04.2021.

## **QUESTION 17**

Please confirm if we have correctly understood the terms of the competition: For the Study developed in Phase I, we are obligated to submit a design for the "Studio" part of the construction program, which is marked as "05" on the map.

#### **ANSWER:**

According to Section IV item 2.2 pt. 1) of the Competition Regulations, the Study must present the whole scope of the competition design, according to appendix 7a to the Regulations.

According to the provisions of Section II, the "Studio" building is Phase I of the overall Investment consisting in the construction of the European Film Center CAMERIMAGE, and NOT Phase I of the Competition, i.e.:

"The Investment consisting in the construction of the ECFC Building will be divided into two phases, which should be taken into consideration when developing the competition design.

Phase I concerns the construction of a Studio in the southeastern corner of the area belonging

to the Organizer, the majority of which constitutes record parcel no. 6/22. Access to this building will be provided through the existing access road from ul. Waly gen. Władysława Sikorskiego (or, possibly, from the North, through the existing entrance to the CKK Jordanki area).

Phase II concerns the construction of the building containing the remaining ECFC program, i.e. the Festival Center, the Market, the House of Cinema, the Education Center and the underground garages, as well as the development of the entire area around the ECFC.

The designer should incorporate a connection of the Studio with the building to be erected under Phase II of the Investment"

The Studio should be connected to the rest of the ECF Camerimage complex.

## **QUESTION 18**

Fig. 1 in appendix 7b to the Competition Regulations presents the general Functional Zones of the EFCF building (01 through 05). Is this division mandatory? Or does is simply display an idea for location various Functional Zones?

#### **ANSWER:**

The program and spacial instructions presented in Fig. 1 in Appendix 7b, pertaining to both the Functional Zones of the building and the land development around it, should be treated as schematic guidelines for the sizes and mutual relations of individual functional zones.

The Organizer has thoroughly analyzed their needs and the resulting functioning of the ECFC building on this specific site and in these specific spatial conditions. Therefore, the recommendations for mutual relations among individual functional and program elements of the buildings, as well as the relations with neighboring areas and their development, as stated in Appendix 7b, should be treated as suggested by the Organizer. Of course, the Competition Participant is free to suggest their own vision of these suggestions, which will be evaluated by the Competition Jury and will not disqualify the Study.

## **QUESTION 19**

Fig. 1 in appendix 7b to the Competition Regulations presents the future, grand square in front of the EFCF building (PL). Can this square be placed and shaped differently? We would like to know if the location is binding, or presented to illustrate an idea.

#### **ANSWER:**

See the answer to question 18.

## **QUESTION 20**

In photograph no. 0050 in the "Drone photographs of the ECFC", we have noticed on a sign next to the entrance to the Jordanki underground garage that the clear height is 1.8m. Can the Organizer provide the sections of existing underground parking lots, with clearly marked heights and elevation ordinates?

## **ANSWER:**

Appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be published until 20.04.2021.

## **QUESTION 21**

Can the main access road and the grand square be located on the western side of the design area, thus transferring the communication zones (K0, K1, K2 in fig. 1 in appendix 7b) and merging them with the delivery and service zones for existing and future buildings?

This solution is advised against, since, according to the provisions of Section II of the competition regulations, the idea for the architectural and urban concept for the ECFC building, and the intention of the Organizer and the City of Toruń is to create a large public square serving as an element which would functionally and spatially integrate all cultural buildings situated in the Jordanki area, i.e.:

"It is the intention of the Organizer and the City of Toruń, which has actively participated in the ECFC investment, to create a center for cultural events in the Jordanki area, a melting pot for art initiatives, as well as a friendly and welcoming space. Authorial proposals for the ECFC concept should therefore aim to create interiors with a user-friendly atmosphere but an elegant and stately appeal (particularly the Festival Center), which, together with the yard surrounded by culturally significant buildings, would create the "salon" of Toruń. Creating a grand square will integrate the existing buildings and will serve as the place where cinema personalities and the participants of other cultural events will be welcomed with splendor. A grand entrance to the Festival Center should be designed on the building's axis, e.g. by reflecting certain canonical solutions which have already been applied in the entrance areas to similar festival venues and palaces in the world."

## **QUESTION 22**

When will appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be published?

#### ANSWER:

Appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be published until 20.04.2021.

## **QUESTION 23**

In describing the scenario in Appendix 7b (explanation no. 1 to the Main House), could the Organizer clarify what they meant by a "rotating mechanism"?

## **ANSWER:**

This is a stage design technology applying a rotating mechanism, in which a separated, round part of the stage or the complete stage can rotate. The rotating part of the stage must be flush with the rest of the stage and the wings.

## **QUESTION 24**

With reference to the Competition Regulations and the notification of our admission to participate in the competition dated 08.04.2021, we have compiled the following questions or request for clarification pertaining to the contents of the Competition Regulations, with regards to the procedure for preparing and submitting studies:

Fig. 2 (Appendix 7b) the Investment possibilities of individual elements to be developed as part of the competition design are determined by area "A" - the site where the main elements of the investment program are to be situated, including an underground part (the House of Cinema - the Museum/Art Gallery), and areas A1.1, A1.2 and A2.1 as the area of the underground and above-ground part of the investment.

Question 1.1. Why have these areas been separated?

Question 1.2. Why has an underground part in area "A" not been separated?

Question 1.3. Are the boundaries of these areas to be treated as the boundaries for

design and construction?

The enclosed land development plan only partially answers this question (the northern and western border).

Please provide a clear and explicit answer as to the borders with the Center of Contemporary Art, BNP Paris Bank Polska S.A., the Marshal's Office, and the Jordanki Cultural and Conference Center.

Question 1.4. The said land development plan does not determine the underground location of the House of Cinema / the Art Gallery.

Please explain this condition.

## **ANSWER:**

Ad.1.1.

These areas were separated on the account of their ownership and agreements made with the city of Toruń, which is their owner. Additionally, this division stems from the current development of the neighboring areas and the future use of these areas according to their current design. Ad.1.2.

By assumption, part A of the Investment area is primarily dedicated to the main elements of the investment program, including its underground part. An underground part was not separated because it will be the Competition Participant's job to determine the scope of the underground part related to the House of Cinema - Museum/ Art Gallery, cinema auditoriums and underground parking garage, as well as any other elements of the program if the Participant decides to place them in the underground part of the building. The investment part pertaining to the Main House of the Festival Center includes an underground story and above-ground stories. The part housing the House of Cinema/ Art Gallery includes a zone within the property, where both above- and underground stories can be built, and a zone where only an underground story can be built, together with forms of surface greenery.

The boundaries marked in Fig. 2 in Appendix 7b reflect the borderlines of individual lots in the land and mortgage register or their fragments, and point to the design scope of the Investment, which has been described in detail (the scope, to which the Investment can be implemented in given areas) in the Legend to Fig 2.

Ad.1.4.

The Land Development Plan determines that no above-ground structures can be built in the area beyond the impassable development line. However, underground building elements can be located there.

## **QUESTION 25**

Location of the House of Cinema - Museum/ Art Gallery according to Fig. 1 (Appendix 7b) The spatial and program guidelines for the design area (...) foresee that the House of Cinema - Museum/ Art Gallery should have around 2000 m2 underground.

The program table states a much larger area 3959 m2, which is 100% larger.

Please correct the program guidelines or provide clear instructions that the Museum / Art Gallery can be located directly under the House of Cinema - Cinema Auditoriums, at the cost of parking spaces.

#### **ANSWER:**

The Competition Participant will determine the scope of the underground parts of individual program and functional zones of the ECFC building (including the House of Cinema - the Museum / Art Gallery, Cinema auditoriums, underground parking lots). Therefore, the Organizer obviously admits the location of e.g. the Museum / Art Galleries under the House of Cinema - cinema auditoriums or other spaces required by the program underground or directly under other parts of the building, depending on their design decisions.

#### **QUESTION 26**

The area specified by the Terms of the Competition, intended for the project and the construction of the European Film Center Camerimage, appears to be insufficient for the program, both horizontally (boundaries) and vertically (elevation). We would like to propose larger tolerances to the size of the required program, +/- 10% for the Main House of the Festival Center and +/-25% for the remaining ECFC program.

The Organizer hereby advises that the investment possibilities have been thoroughly analyzed in the context of the design area and the recommended program and functions of the ECFC building. A detailed capacity analysis was conducted which indicated that the program specified for the competition (assuming areal tolerances of +/- 5% of the Main House of the Festival Center and +/- 15% for the remaining ECFC program) is viable and implementable within the design area. Further to the above, there are no legitimate grounds for changing the size tolerances for the program, which were stated in appendix 7b to the Competition Regulations.

## **QUESTION 27**

Can area "PL" (appendix 7b) Program and spatial guidelines for the competition design area (...) intended for the grand square in front of the ECFC building be developed and built-up in any way, in order to evoke this grand character, instead of leaving a random, open space remaining in chaotic relations with the existing buildings.

#### **ANSWER:**

The program and spatial layout presented in Fig. 1 should be treated as an illustration of a certain idea for the functioning and for the spatial and program relations of the ECFC building and its development. These are not rigid boundaries of the locations of individual building zones or spatial solutions. They should not be used to directly determine any sizes or volumes. This layout serves as general guidelines stemming from analyses and a definition of the Organizer's needs with respect to the functioning of the ECFC building.

#### **QUESTION 28**

Can the proposed link at level +1 between the ECFC building and the new CSW building be otherwise routed?

## **ANSWER:**

No.

The location of the link was partially discussed and agreed on with the designer of the new CSW building. The designated point of connection to the new CSW building is also determined by the location of the designed link between this building and the existing CSW building.

## **QUESTION 29**

Please consider the following remarks and doubts concerning the competition deadlines.

- 6.1. According to the Terms of the Competition, appendices 7e, 7f and 7g which are necessary for creating solutions for links between the ECFC building, the Center for Contemporary Art and the Jordanki Cultural and Conference Center, are to be made available after the competition participants have qualified to the competition, i.e. a month before the deadline for submitting studies which is very late and unnecessarily so. These studies have still been unavailable.
- 6.2. Answers to questions regarding the competition procedure can be expected after 19.04.2021, which is days (!) before the deadline for submitting studies.

Apart from this, the international character of the Competition, the SARP recommendation and its sheer size - probably the largest design competition after 1989 (combined with the pandemic), further reinforce the argument for a reasonable schedule.

The proposed Competition deadlines are not sufficient for providing a full design response, even in the study phase.

Therefore, we hereby request the deadlines to be postponed by at least by 2 weeks.

The Organizer is considering the possibility of postponing the deadlines. The Organizer is currently analyzing the formal and legal implications of making such change to the deadlines in connection with the provisions of article 342 of the Public Procurement Act of 11 September 2019.

All Competition Participants will be notified about the changed deadlines until 19.04.2021.

## **QUESTION 30**

According to the competition regulations, 8.04 was the final deadline for notification of participants of their admission or rejection from the competition. Yet, we have not received any reply. I presume that the results were already announced. Can I therefore ask for any information about whether our company qualified to the next phase?

#### **ANSWER:**

Notification of admission to the competition was sent out via the Electronic Communication Platform to ALL Competition Participants admitted to participate in the competition on 08.04.2021. The Organizer suggest checking the "SPAM" folder in the mailbox, which may include the said notification. You are also reminded that an automatic notification is always sent by the Electronic Communication Platform to the Participant's e-mail address, stating that a message has been received on the Platform. The Participant must then log into their profile on the Platform and read this notification or download the file.

## **QUESTION 31**

The description of the stage (appendix 7b, explanation 1. to the Main House) states that the stage will be located at level "0" - ground floor of the ECFC building. Does the Organizer mean that the stage must be located at the same level as the Grand Square in front of the building, or would it be possible to lower it by one level?

## **ANSWER:**

The guidelines and recommendations presented by the Organizer should be treated as a set of <u>preferred</u> solutions, obtained through spatial and program analyses of the ECFC building and its locations. The Organizer is aware that many more spatial solutions are possible, which is why the Organizer announced a competition, leaving it to the Participant to finally design the program and the functions of the ECFC building and its land development, considering the general principles for the organization of spaces in the building, as stated in the Regulations and in the Appendices. The Organizer will accept a different level for the stage, if this reasonably stems from the logic of the entire design concept developed by the Participant, and if it is functional.

Furthermore, Section IV item 1.3. states that, in drawing up the Study, the Competition Participant should take into consideration the contents and guidelines of the Competition Regulations and the Appendices thereto, which means that this requirement is not obligatory. All materials presented in the Regulations are to familiarize the Participants with the Organizer's expectations as to the future ECFC building, and whether or not to apply them will be the decision of the Participant, which will be judged by the Competition Jury.

## **QUESTION 32**

Can the delivery road (from k0 to k2 in fig. 1 in appendix 7b) be located at a different level than the Main Square?

#### **ANSWER:**

It is the Competition Participant's decision, assuming that all requirements pertaining to technical conditions, fire service are observed, and that this will not deteriorate the general functionality of deliveries, nor cause any significant changes in the current land development of adjoining areas, particularly with respect to existing tree stand. The communication analysis provided in Appendix 7d to the Competition Regulations can serve as support here.

## **QUESTION 33**

The explanations to the Functional Program of the Festival Center are quite precise. Can the Organizer give an example of an Auditorium to serve as a point of reference for the design?

## **ANSWER:**

No.

The Organizer has thoroughly analyzed their needs and the resulting functioning of the ECFC building on this specific site and in these specific spatial conditions. Therefore, the recommendations for mutual relations among individual functional and program elements of the buildings, as well as the relations with neighboring areas and their development, as stated in Appendix 7b, should be treated as desired by the Organizer. Of course, the Competition Participant is free to suggest their own vision of these suggestions, which will be evaluated by the Competition Jury.

## **QUESTION 34**

## **QUESTION 34.1**

Does the Organizer foresee a specific function for the unmarked building which is to be connected to the planned CSW extension?

## **ANSWER:**

No.

The Organizer suggested that this could house a restaurant, a media zone, a VIP zone, but the final decision is to be made by the Participant. The Participant should remember, however, that this part is closest to the Center for Contemporary Art, where, according to the guidelines, the western entrance to the ECFC should be located (green area). Therefore, it would be justified to locate adequate functions and programs there.

## **QUESTION 34.2**

Please provide the design for the planned extension of the CSW building.

#### **ANSWER:**

Appendices 7e, 7f, 7g and 7j be published until 19.04.2021.

## **QUESTION 34.3**

Should the triangular area owned by the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship, situated between the planned grand square and the Marshal's Office, marked with a thin, orange line (dashed and a dot), marked in figure no. 1 in appendix 7b, be included in the sope of the study?

## **ANSWER:**

No.

Delà	M
	Rafał Mroczkowski Competition Secretary