# CAMERIMAGE

Toruń, 11.05.2021

## Concerning:

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

## EXPLANATIONS 10 TO THE TERMS OF THE COMPETITION REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF STUDIES (QUESTIONS 62 through 81)

## **QUESTION 62**

Please explain whether the scene should be equipped with a so-called Fly Tower - space above the scene, where guide strips are hidden, together with elements such as curtains, lights, decorations, sometimes people.

#### **ANSWER:**

The space, to which the Participant refers in the question has been described by the Organizer as the "stage superstructure" in Appendix 7b to the Regulations, in the Program Table in item I and 1.

## **QUESTION 63**

Please explain the provision from point 1 of Appendix 7b to the Competition Regulations and Regulations\_(PDF), quoting: "... it is necessary to provide for a pedestrian passageway outside the ECFC building..." - is the passageway referred to in point 1 to be made exclusively as an external passageway – outside the ECFC building, is it possible for it to be routed inside the building in the form of an internal passageway / crossing?

## **ANSWER:**

The passageway should be primarily routed outside the ECFC building according to the provisions of Appendix 7b item I pt. 1 (page 1), i.e.:

On the southern side of the investment site, the Designer should foresee the possibility of using a pedestrian route to travel on foot outside the ECFC building, near the John Paul II monument, pass by the junction of ul. Waly gen. Sikowskiego - al. św.

Jana Pawła II to the Grand Square in front of the ECFC building, and travel further, along CKK Jordanki to al. Solidarności. To ensure the continuity of external passage through the site, the Organizer has foreseen the possibility of crossing the ECFC

building through a "gate" or a "clearance" between its individual sections. Alternatively, as an intermediate solution, the Designer may also partially lead the pedestrian route to the inside of the ECFC building."

The Organizer additionally advises that, for instance, a part of one passageway track can be routed inside the building, while the other is routed outside, thus providing public, unrestricted pedestrian access from the monument of John Paul II and the Park at the junction of ul. Wały gen. Sikorskiego and al. św. Jana Pawła II to the Grand Square in front of the ECFC building, and further on, along CKK Jordanki to al. Solidarności. A gate or clearance created in the ECFC building, which would provide a safe passage, does not necessarily be located between the market and the Education Center (in Appendix 7b, this is only provided as an example). Such a passage may be located in any part of the ECFC building, depending on the concept adopted by the Participant.

The Organizer would like to remind all Participants that the spatial and location instructions of the development elements shown in Fig. 1 in Appendix 7b should be treated as a set of recommendations rather than literal boundaries and routes. In the case of a passageway, the general principle is that it connects the eastern part and the western part of the site.

#### **QUESTION 64.1**

On page 31 of the Regulations, section 4 - point 3.1.b states that we must send you a paper version (hard copy) of our Study "with confirmation of receipt of the Study constituting Appendix 4a to the Regulations". We have not understood whether Appendix 4a referred to by the Organizer is something that we have to receive from the Organizer as proof of delivery or whether it is a document that we have to send to the Organizer. Moreover, if we send a paper version of our Study, how can we obtain Appendix 4a signed by you as proof of delivery?

#### **ANSWER:**

The method of submitting Appendix 4a is described in Section IV, point 3.7.

## **QUESTION 64.2**

Can the Organizer provide more information about the location of the Investment: 3D model of location context and/or location sections?

## **ANSWER:**

The Organizer does not have a 3d model. All information concerning the context of the competition site and its surroundings has been made available on the Competition website (http://konkurs.ecfcamerimage.pl/) as Appendices to the Regulations No. 7a through 7l.

## **OUESTION 64.3**

On page 31 of the Regulations, section 4 - point 2.3 states that "the descriptive part should contain preliminary assumptions concerning the area of the ECFC building – an estimate, overall building surface balance and site balance". What does the Organizer mean by "balance"? Do we need to compile and show the economic balance of our proposal already at this stage of the competition?

#### **ANSWER:**

The notion of "balance of the building's surface area and site balance" should be construed as the summary the surface areas of individual sections and rooms of the building and the areas related to land development.

## **QUESTION 64.4**

Appendix 7b, page 1, point 11, mentions 4 access points to the underground garage: 2 through existing ramps and 2 new ramps. Although we found the location of the northern ramp on page 8, we were not able to locate any indication of the new southern ramp. Can the Organizer explain where the southern ramp should run?

#### **ANSWER:**

The proposed location of a new ramp on the southern side is marked with the symbol "KW" in Figure 1 in Appendix 7b

#### **QUESTION 64.5**

Can the communication link/road 'K0' be covered - like a 'tunnel' - or must it be completely open?

#### **ANSWER:**

See the answer to question 32 (Explanation 7 to the Competition Regulations), i.e.:

"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 64.6**

Can we place a communication link/road 'K1' in area 'A1'? Can we place the 'SD' zone in the 'A1' area?

#### **ANSWER:**

No.

According to the description in the instructions for area A1 in the legend to Fig. 2 in Appendix 7b, it is only possible to locate above-ground development in this area in line with the current use, i.e. green areas and pedestrian traffic.

## **QUESTION 64.7**

Can we change the topography of the 'A1' area, provided that there are only green lines and pedestrian traffic are designed there (i.e. without buildings)?

#### **ANSWER:**

Yes, provided that the valuable tree stand adjacent to area A1 is preserved and the continuity of pedestrian routes is maintained in the current functionality.

#### **QUESTION 64.8**

Can we propose a park landscape design on the western side, outside the boundaries of the plot?

#### **ANSWER:**

The participant may propose solutions outside the scope of the competition design, but in accordance with the provisions of the Competition Regulations Section IV item 2.7., materials not covered by the scope of the Competition shall not be taken into account when assessing the Studies and Competition Designs.

## **QUESTION 64.9**

Can we cover (in whole or in part) the communication route (K0 and K1) - for example by creating a 'tunnel' - or must it be open? If we can cover these communication routes, is there a minimum height requirement?

#### ANSWER:

See the answer to question 32 (Explanation 7 to the Competition Regulations), i.e.:

"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 64.10**

Appendix 7b, page 8, contains a plan with the limits of the suggested items of the required program. Do we have to maintain the shift of Area "03" from the dashed line presenting the boundaries of the design? (i.e. is there a minimum distance that we have to take into account when placing buildings or can we build on the very edge of the site?)

## **ANSWER:**

In accordance with the laws and technical conditions applicable in Poland.

#### **OUESTION 64.11**

Appendix 7b, page 2, states that the administration of the ECFC should be situated between the Festival Center and the Market and that both buildings should be connected both on the ground floor and at the first level; it is also mentioned on the same page that there should be a public crossing in the same area (between the Festival Center and the Market). This seems to be a contradictory requirement. Could the Organizer clarify this?

#### **ANSWER:**

There is no contradiction because the passage can be opened inside the building at a time when events held in the Market and the Festival Center are not related, or when there are no events in both or one of these functional zones. The designer should provide for such a communication solution which would allow for the connection of the ground floors of the Market and the Festival Center or the separation of the passage between these zones.

See the answer to question 63 concerning the location of the passageway (public passage)

#### **QUESTION 64.12**

Appendix 7b, page 1, point 8, mentions the stage for outdoor events next to the façade of the southern wing or the façade of the Festival Center. What exactly does the Organizer mean and where exactly should this space be located? Is there also a link between this space and the amphitheater in the design of the northern side of the competition site?

#### **ANSWER:**

The scene suggested by the Organizer should be located on the main square in front of the Festival Center. It may be part of the facade. Balcony, a terrace associated with grand stairs leading to the Piano Nobile.

## **QUESTION 64.13**

Appendix7b on page 4 mentions that the Market should be located on the southern side, with the entrance "from the northwestern corner of the square". If it is to be situated from the South, could the Organizer explain how the entrance can be situated on the northwestern side?

#### **ANSWER:**

There was an error in the translation of Appendix 7b – the correct provision should read as follows: "4. Entrance from the southwestern corner of the square in front of the Festival Center.

## **QUESTION 64.14**

In Appendix 7b, pages 5 and 6, the Organizer mentions that there should be a connection between the "eastern" wall of the ECFC (for both the Market and the Education Center) and the "western" wall of the new wing of the CSW building; although we understand that the link must be located on the western wall of the new wing of the CSW, why and how can it be connected to the eastern wall (on the opposite side) of the ECFC? Can they simply be connected on the western side of both buildings?

#### **ANSWER:**

It is the Organizer's intention to connect the western façade of the building of the new CSW wing with the ECFC building through an aerial link proposed by the Participant and marked in Figure 1 in Appendix 7b with the symbol "Ł". This appears to be possible only on the eastern façade of the ECFC building, which protrudes to the South and is connected to the Market over the fire service road from the West and South of the planned ECFC building.

#### **QUESTION 64.15**

In Appendix 7b, the Organizer repeatedly mentions that the entrances to many buildings requested by the Organizer should be accessed from the Grand Square, in the southwestern corner of lot no. 6/10 - acute angle of the lot at its border with lot no. 6/18. Although the first entrance is clear, could the Organizer explain where exactly the second entrance should be?

#### **ANSWER:**

The entrance accessed from the Grand Square, in the southwestern corner of lot no. 6/10 (acute angle of the lot at its border with lot no. 6/18 – the area marked in Fig. 2 in Appendix 7b with the symbol "A2.1") applies only to the entrance to the House of Cinema.

## **QUESTION 64.16**

With reference to the answer to question no. 35.14, please verify the Principal's position with regard to the possibility of executing roofing or canopies in relation to the impassable development line. The draft Zoning Plan defines the development line in the following manner:

[...]

impassable development line - shall mean a line marked on the site map or in the plan, which shall not be crossed by any walls of the above-ground parts of the building (towards the neighboring areas as separated by boundaries), excluding such architectural elements of the building as: external stairs, delivery ramps, canopies above entrances, cornices, pilasters, eaves, balconies, ramps for the disabled, entrances and exits from underground garages, etc. as well as such structures as: earth structures.

monuments, etc., unless stated otherwise in the provisions pertaining to individual areas;

[...]

Further to the above, execution of roofing/canopies in:

- Area A.1,
- a fragment of area A, beyond the development line, does not conflict with the draft Zoning Plan.

Please confirm that the above analysis is correct and that the Principal will accept studies, in which elements which are not classified as buildings (particularly roofing elements or canopies) will be located outside the impassable development line.

#### **ANSWER:**

With regard to question 35.14, the development possibilities associated with the area assumed by the draft Zoning Plan are subject to restrictions resulting from the provisions of this Zoning Plan, including restrictions resulting from the established, impassable development line. The definition of an impassable development line resulting from the provisions of the draft Zoning Plan contains an open catalog of architectural elements which are exempt from the restrictions imposed by the impassable development line. Execution of a roofing element or canopy, to which this question refers, is consistent with the provisions of the draft Zoning Plan, provided that this roofing element or canopy is proved to be exempt from the said restrictions. At the same time, it is necessary to remember the restrictions set out in Figure 2 (Appendix 7b) in the development of individual areas indicated there and described therein related to the properties of individual areas.

"Lot A is: "[...] the area intended for locating the main elements of the Investment program. The site is owned by ECFC". Due to the nature of ownership of the property, the current and future nature and manner of development of area A in the northern part (in the part beyond the impassable development line), construction of architectural elements of the building complying with the definition of the impassable development line set out in the draft Zoning Plan is permitted in this area (beyond the development line).

Area A.1 is: "made available by the City of Toruń for the ECFC investment together with an indication of the investment possibilities attributed to this area". And: "Area where underground development only can be located [...] Above-ground development according to the current use - green areas and pedestrian traffic." Therefore, it is not recommended to introduce any above-ground elements, including canopies, in area A.1.

## **QUESTION 65**

We did not receive a clear answer to the previous question (QUESTION 24 / Question 1.3.) The question concerned the possibility of introducing above-ground development in areas A, A.1.1, A.1.2., A.2.1. , within the limits, that is, within the so-called strict zoning, and we'd require such answer. This is quite obvious within the northern and western boundaries (impassable development line established by the draft Zoning Plan), completely unclear within the eastern and southern boundaries with CKK Jordanki, the Voivodeship Office, the Bank and CSW building.

Once again, can we design and construct within the strict zoning of areas A, A.1.1, A.1.2., A.2.1.?

#### **ANSWER:**

The Organizer hereby points to the provisions of the draft Zoning Plan and provisions related to the possibility of locating buildings and development from the boundaries of existing plots and buildings. The issue included in the question concerning the possibility of designing at the boundary of the lot is regulated by effective laws and the draft Zoning Plan for the area in question, which admit development directly at the boundary of the construction lot, provided that pertinent regulations are observed. The answer to the question asked is essentially related to the translation of existing and explicit laws in force. Such activities go beyond the scope of explanations provided for in the Competition Regulations.

## **QUESTION 66**

Refers to question 35.11 and area A2.

The answer is contradictory ("the Organizer admits the possibility of suspending a designed building above the subject area...") with the terms and conditions of the competition - only underground development and construction law - suspending a full-volume building will clearly generate development and development areas.

Please answer as explicitly as possible, if a full-volume building can be suspended over the area, or can we only design shelters, canopies and other elements which do not generate a development area?

#### **ANSWER:**

The Organizer allows for the possibility of designing a suspended building, including when it generates a development area, provided that other conditions set out in the Competition Regulations, among others those described in the legend to Figure 2 (Appendix 7b to the Competition Regulations) are observed. The Organizer also clarifies that there is no contradiction here, since the answer to question 35.11 amends the guidelines and does not contradict them (see Section I item 2.9.) "In each phase of the Competition, answers to requests of Competition Participants for clarification of the terms of the Regulations shall be sent to Competition Participants and published on the Competition Website and shall be binding to Competition Participants without the need to amend the Regulations".

## **QUESTION 67**

To what extent can we depart from the conditions set out in "Additional information/ Explanations" in point "6." concerning the auditorium and the number of seats?

## ANSWER:

The guidelines and recommendations presented by the Organizer should be treated as a set of preferred solutions. The designer should strictly and precisely accommodate the Organizer's expectations pertaining to the auditorium. The number of seats in the auditorium, either in whole and in individual sectors, should be designed according to the quantitative scopes specified in Appendix 7b in the Program Table. If the Participant of the Competition proposes a different number of seats and is able to justify it, the Competition Jury shall decide whether it is a reasonable design solution in the context of other solutions proposed for the Main House.

## **QUESTION 68**

To what extent can we depart from the conditions set out in "Additional information/ Explanations" in point "6." concerning the auditorium and the number of seats?

#### Note

The question was submitted three times in the same form and wording. The question is repeated to maintain the numbering of questions on the Electronic Communication Platform.

To what extent can we depart from the conditions set out in "Additional information/ Explanations" in point "6." concerning the auditorium and the number of seats?

#### Note

The question was submitted three times in the same form and wording. The question is repeated to maintain the numbering of questions on the Electronic Communication Platform.

## **QUESTION 70**

The stage is to be 30 m wide and 18 m deep. The wings are to be 6 m wide and 25 m deep. The backstage is to be  $20 \times 2.5 \text{ m}$ . What is the "depth of the wings"? Are we right to assume that the wings broaden the stage by 12 m (6+6) and increase its depth by 2.5 m?

#### **ANSWER:**

Yes. The wings broaden the stage by about 12m, and the backstage extends to about 2.5m. The wings need not be of equal width. They should be functional above all.

#### **QUESTION 71**

Should the stage superstructure of 30 m in height be limited to the stage only, or extend to the wings as well?

## **ANSWER:**

The purpose of the stage superstructure and the Main House with the stage is described in Appendix 7b to the Competition Regulations and in the answer to question 60.2. It is the Competition Participant's responsibility to design the stage of the Main House in order to ensure its correct functioning in line with its intended purpose. It is the Participant's decision as to how the stage superstructure will be organized, subject to the requirements set out by the Organizer in the Competition Regulations and explanations to Competition Regulations.

## **QUESTION 72**

What is the required size of one seat (seat width x row depth)?

## **ANSWER:**

The size of the seat, seating position and parameters such as, for example, the row depth should be determined by the design solution proposed by the Participant, which is to demonstrate, among other things, Participant's knowledge of design of buildings of this type and function. The Organizer's intention is to obtain a seat which would fulfill the role stated in appendix 7b to the Competition Regulations: The seats shall be comfortable, allowing for several consecutive spectacles or screenings to be viewed in comfort (this is particularly important in the case of festival and conference events which typically last a whole day or more).

"If possible, a staircase raising the rank of the entrance to the Center

should lead from the Grand Square to the piano nobile of the Festival Center." One of other points ("9") the Organizer states:" ...on the axis, behind the grand stairs. Behind it, there should be a spacious and comfortable Front Desk of the Festival Center..." etc.). In turn, the front desk, gates, etc. should be located

at the Foyer - ground floor level (item 2.1.)

This is a clear contradiction.

Please clearly define the functions at these levels in conjunction with grand staircase.

At which level should the main entrance be situated?

## **ANSWER:**

The functional program concerning the Foyer system should be implemented in accordance with the guidelines from the Program Table in Appendix 7b - second column named: 'Room name' and the proposed breakdown into floors. Therefore, the entrance zone with main entrance, front desk, cloak room, internal stairs, etc. should be located on the ground floor. If possible, the grand, external stairs leading directly from the Grand Square to the piano nobile, could serve as an additional, independent entrance to the Festival Center. The Organizer's intention is to organize a grand space in front of the Festival Center. External staircases resembling the staircase in Cannes can be replaced by other solutions that will allow for honoring the great cinematic personalities coming to the Festival and, at the same time, enabling the organization of stage events on the square.

## **QUESTION 74**

The part of the competition area marked with the symbol A5 (Figure 2 in Appendix 7b) is described as "Location of above-ground part of the ECFC Investment..."

Does this mean that the ramp to the underground garage or any underground part of this garage cannot be located in this area?

Can any above-ground part of the proposed building (carried out in the first or second phase) be located in this area?

## **ANSWER:**

Only the above-ground part of the ECFC Investment can be situated in area A5 to provide communication service.

## **QUESTION 75**

According to the answer to questions 35.11 and 35.12, in the area marked with A2, it is possible to locate both suspended parts of the ECFC building and canopies. Therefore, if the current function of the site is fully restored, i.e. an amphitheater is re-established, can certain areas of the ECFC building be located underneath it?

## **ANSWER:**

Yes, as such areas will be treated as underground, which is in line with the general intention of the Organizer in relation to the land development of area A2.

#### **QUESTION 76**

Unfortunately, our office will not be able to take part in the competition. I would like to know how we should formally withdraw our application.

#### **ANSWER:**

The competition participant does not have to formally withdraw from the Competition. Failure to submit a Study is tantamount to resigning from further participation in the Competition.

## **QUESTION 77**

We kindly ask you to share a drawing of the Zoning Plan related to the annex to the Center for Contemporary Art. The drawings made available to us so far show the gate on the ground floor from the East of the new building, which is well below the current parking level, which suggests changing the access profile from Wały Gen. Władysława Sikorskiego.

#### **ANSWER:**

It should be assumed that the gate is at the level of the current parking garage. The ordinate of the ground floor of the new CSW building is 50.68.

## **QUESTION 78**

Please specify:

- the estimated area (dimensions) of the orchestra pit
- the required depth of this pit
- its location whether it should be incorporated in the stage (18 x 30 m)

(as set out in the detailed program guidelines and functional and spatial guidelines) or whether it should be situated outside the stage?

- required platform, passage on the axis of the house divides the space of the orchestra pit into two areas. Should the orchestra pit be located on both sides of this platform, (thus divided into two parts), or perhaps only on one side?

Can this platform be lowered when the orchestra is set up in the pit?

## **ANSWER:**

The size of the orchestra pit should be determined by the design solution proposed by the Participant, which is to demonstrate, among other things, Participant's knowledge of design of buildings of this type and function.

The Organizer additionally explains that:

- the depth of the orchestra pit of approx. half of the story should be construed as a suggestion, which means that this depth should result from the entire layout of the Main House adopted by the Participant.
- The guidelines also set out the following recommendation: "A small orchestra pit in front of the stage. It should be possible to cover it, thus extending the stage. "Flame-proof curtain at the edge of the stage and the orchestra pit". The orchestra pit can be situated outside the stage, provided that other recommendations for the Main House functions are observed.
- The platform running on the axis of the House, from the stage to the VIP sector, was described as an optional solution. It is important to maintain the transition from the VIP sector to the stage on the axis of the House.
- If the orchestra pit is not used (the pit is covered), stage entry will take place on the axis of the House, on the stairs or using an optional platform directly from the VIP sector.
- If the orchestra pit is in use (an orchestra event), stage entry may take place on the axis of the House, both using stairs and when the platform is used directly from the VIP sector for instance, on a narrow gangway set up above the orchestra. As a supplementary measure, the designer may consider using only the entrances on the sides of the stage (with perimeter access points to seating sectors closest to the stage).
- The Orchestra can be located on both sides of the possible platform, provided that it is possible to conduct orchestra. The designer should foresee the possibility of lowering/retracting the platform for orchestra events.

Refers to the answer to QUESTION 52.

In response to this question, the answer to question 24 was also addressed.

As the person asking this question (question 24), we declare that we have not received an answer to it. Once again, is it possible to design development on competition areas "A" and "A2.1" directly at the boundary (strict zoning) with the areas of CKK Jordanki, the Marshal's Office, the Bank and the CSW building?

#### **ANSWER:**

See the answer to question no. 65.

## **QUESTION 80**

How does the Imagine imagine meeting its own intention to "locate ECFC Offices in a layout perpendicular to the Grand Square above the level of piano mobile, so that the windows of office spaces oversee the piano mobile of the Market", for which the Principal envisages a location without connection with the square, additionally separated by the Education Center?

Are the offices supposed to be somewhere in a separate building, the windows of which will open up to the piano nobile (not to mention the Market!).

Does "perpendicular" mean going into area "01" (Festival Center)!?

Please specify in detail the Principal's intention to locate ECFC Offices.

#### **ANSWER:**

Administration - ECF Camerimage should be established in a separate, internal structure built into the "01" area, between the foyer of both stories of the Festival Center and the Market. It should be a 'building inside the connected spaces of the Festival Center and the Market'. Entry into the ECF Camerimage Administration area should be from the square in front of ECF Camerimage. The ground floor of the ECF Camerimage Administration area should include a front desk and lifts and stairs to the floor/where offices will be located. The floor/s should be located above the foyer level (Piano Nobile) of the Festival Center and the Market floor level. Some of the ECF Camerimage offices should have windows to the Foyer Center's interior to Piano Nobile, and some should open up to the Market interiors. Administrative management windows should be located at the facade of the building and should oversee the square in front of the ECF Camerimage building.

## **QUESTION 81**

Does the organizer allow for a slight correction of the size of cinema rooms, including the Main House, in order to ensure even better quality of seating in relation to the screen? - assuming the unchanged size of the screen and the unchanged number of seats in the room?

## **ANSWER:**

In accordance with Appendix 7b, p. 2, point II:

The Organizer admits certain tolerances in the size of a given program at the following levels:

- for the Festival Center's Main House +/-5%,
- for the remaining ECFC Building program +/- 15%, maintaining the recommended functionality of the building space and the land development".

If the Participant wishes to make larger adjustments to the areas specified in the Program Table in Appendix 7b, they may do so, provided that they are able justify the solutions adopted and that this does not affect the overall functionality and use of the cinema rooms and other areas of the ECFC building established by the Organizer.

## **GENERAL REMARK FROM THE ORGANIZER**

All detailed guidelines concerning the ECFC building and its development specified in the Competition Regulations and Appendices to the Regulations are instructional and not strictly effective. The Competition Participant may creatively interpret these recommendations while maintaining the general idea of functioning of the ECFC building space and propose, in their opinion, a functional and spatial solution.

The task of the Jury will be to assess these overall proposals and to select the best solution on the basis of the criteria described in the Regulations.

Rafał Mroczkowski Competition Secretary