

**TWO-STAGE, STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION ARCHITECTURAL AND PLANNING COMPETITION**  
**for the development of architectural concept with land development for the investment**  
**Phase A and Phase B of the investment**  
**“Construction of the educational and teaching building at ul. Bednarska 2/4”**  
**(Phase A of the investment is implemented within the Multi-annual Program**  
**called “Warsaw University 2016-2025”**

Warsaw, 3 October 2019

**ANSWERS TO THE PARTICIPANTS' QUESTIONS, PART 3**

**29.** Building alignment, including the informative passage is included in Annex 22. The passage alignment is also provided in MPWiK, and it is 5m from the canal axis. If we look at the canal axis in the graphic annex to the LOPE decision, it is very asymmetrical in relation to the line of the passage with width of 10 m. The canal axis is located in the distance of approx. 2.5 m from the northern passage wall, while it should be in the distance of 5 m, according to MPWiK guidelines. Should the difference of 2.5 m be considered as an error in the graphic annex? Which document has a priority?

*[graphic annex to question 29 submitted by the participant of the Competition]*

**Answer** The provisions of the functional guidelines, conservation recommendations and LOPE decision are unequivocal in this question. MPWiK conditions should be met, i.e. the required distance from the canal should be maintained, which does not exclude meeting the minimum 10m requirement from the Mariensztat street from the LOPE decision. In Annex 22, the dotted line on the axis of Mariensztat street is described (in the keys to the drawing) only as “informative location of the planned passage.” In 2.1 of the LOPE decision is it said that the glass passage is just one of the possible solutions, which does not exclude other design concepts. It is up to the participant of the Competition to propose a spatial solution for the mentioned requirements, which is the key task of this Competition.

**30.** Some of the existing trees are described as “valuable, selected for preservation without the possibility of replanting.” Their location collides significantly with the shape of the designed building and the entrance to the plot. Is it possible to remove some trees that collide with the entrance functionality?

**Answer** Greens Specification is an independent document that shows existing trees indicated to be preserved by landscape architects responsible for the inventory. The LOPE decision says that “you should aim to protect the existing stand” and “in the framework of the green management and necessary partial felling of trees the green areas should be supplemented by replacement and replanting trees, while any tree with great landscape and ecological value should be preserved - in accordance with Annex 1.” Provisions of the LOPE Decision are binding.

**TWO-STAGE, STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION ARCHITECTURAL AND PLANNING COMPETITION  
for the development of architectural concept with land development for the investment  
Phase A and Phase B of the investment  
“Construction of the educational and teaching building at ul. Bednarska 2/4”  
(Phase A of the investment is implemented within the Multi-annual Program  
called “Warsaw University 2016-2025”**

**31.** The LOPE only says about an impassable building alignment line along ul. Dobra, while on the drawing in Annex 1 an obligatory line is drawn along ul. Dobra. Please explain which provision should be observed. **Answer According to the LOPE decision, the line along ul. Dobra is an impassable line and such interpretation should be adopted for the requirements of the Competition at this stage.**

**32.** Chapter XI, item 2.2.5 provides the locations for obligatory perspective views. In accordance with the Terms and Conditions, one of the locations for a perspective view should be “from the Wisłostrada side.” However, in the scheme with the board compositions no. 1 (dwg 1) the description under the visualization says: “View from Wisłostrada.” As showing the building from the Wisłostrada side is not the same as showing the building from Wisłostrada, which provision is binding? **Answer The description on the board composition scheme is just a mental short-cut. The Client expects views from the Wisłostrada side, not necessarily from Wisłostrada itself.**

**33.** Please specify more precisely the term “druciaki” in the context of perspective views. Is “white render” without textures, but with the chiaroscuro a correct interpretation? Should we assume, that the Client wants linear drawings, as in the case of described S, M, L spaces in the brief, pages 87, 88, 89? **Answer The Client understands “druciaki” as monochrome linear drawings without the shades – drawings on pages 87-89 in WFU are one of the possible examples. The Client would like to focus on the evaluation of design concepts at this stage, not to assess the realism of the “renderings.”**

**34.** Should the presentation form be monochrome or are colours acceptable? **Answer Perspective views should be monochrome; it is however possible to use colours in two-dimensional drawings. The floor plans should have colour codes provided by the Client in Annex 10 to the Competition Terms and Conditions.**

**35.** Does the Client prefer separation of the building into two clear parts dedicated for individual faculties or is integration and elimination of boundaries between faculties the main concept of the building?

**TWO-STAGE, STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION ARCHITECTURAL AND PLANNING COMPETITION  
for the development of architectural concept with land development for the investment  
Phase A and Phase B of the investment  
“Construction of the educational and teaching building at ul. Bednarska 2/4”  
(Phase A of the investment is implemented within the Multi-annual Program  
called “Warsaw University 2016-2025”**

**Answer** The building should be designed as inter-faculty and flexible. Such rooms as the lobby, auditorium, dressing room, services, meeting rooms or reading room should be common and used by students and employees of both faculties. Academic and administration offices as well as smaller classrooms will be assigned to the faculties, however the separation line should be movable and flexible depending on the requirements and the situation, e.g. number of faculty students during the academic year. Special rooms, e.g. the radio or TV studio will be permanently assigned to the faculties.

**36.** Please provide the ordinate of the Lindley's canal in the ordinate system and on the map provided by the Organizer (plot ordinate ~84.5m).

**Answer** The Client does not have a cross section with the detailed ordinate of the Lindley's canal. Based on the archive construction documentation for an unrealized project on that plot it is possible to assess, that the Lindley's canal (its bottom) is located on the ordinate approx. 82.3m.

**37.** In relation to the information that says that it is required to maintain continuity in the operation of the radio station, please provide the guidelines related to temporary operation of the Kampus radio during the construction works.

**Answer** During the local inspection (25 September 2019) no additional binding information for the Competition participants were obtained. The Client does not provide any guidelines related to the temporary operation of Kampus radio station during the construction works, as it goes beyond the scope of this study. The Client would like to inform that Kampus radio station will work without any interruptions during the construction, as long as possible, without interference to the investment process.

**38.** In relation with the building facade works at ul. Dobra is there a planned change of the form of the lavatory facilities at the bus terminal (toi-toi next to the bus stop)?

**Answer** Beyond the scope of the Competition.

**39.** In relation to the information on the rubble in the Łaźnie building cellars, please confirm if it is possible to connect the underground part of the newly designed building with the old cellars?

**Answer** During the local inspection (25 September 2019) no additional binding information for the Competition participants were obtained. As in the LOPE decision - “it is acceptable to

**TWO-STAGE, STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION ARCHITECTURAL AND PLANNING COMPETITION**  
**for the development of architectural concept with land development for the investment**  
**Phase A and Phase B of the investment**  
**“Construction of the educational and teaching building at ul. Bednarska 2/4”**  
**(Phase A of the investment is implemented within the Multi-annual Program**  
**called “Warsaw University 2016-2025”**

**connect the newly designed building with Łazienki building with an underground or ground-floor connector to provide the maximum exposition of the northern building facade.”**

**40.** In the space specification in 5.3. there is a term “nest” – a scientific unit. Additionally, in 8.2.2. we have: S-type space (HOLLOW), M-type space (NEST), L-type space (HALL). Then on pages 86-89, in the description the names agora, salon and alcove are used. How do you understand these terms, what are their surface areas and what are the differences between spaces in annex 13 in both the space specification and the functional description: nest, alcove, hollow, salon, agora, hall?

**Answer** The term “hollow” should be treated - as in the table - as a scientific unit. The spaces in the zones have names taken from the BIPA UW document related to the university space standards – at first they were really called: S-type space (HOLLOW), M-type space (NEST), L-type space (HALL), however these names were replaced by: S-type space (alcove), M-type space (salon) and L-type space (agora). In the table of floor spaces (pages 67- 76 WFU, annex 13 to the Competition Terms and Conditions) the old names were used erroneously.

**41.** Should the color markings on the projections be provided in accordance with the colours provided in the space specification or with the real room function (e.g. social premises for the entire building can be found in the specification in “learning centre” tab, however they are not functional rooms within the “learning centre”)?

**Answer** Colour markings on the projections should be used in accordance with the colours in annex 10 to the Competition Terms and Conditions – therefore e.g. all meeting rooms will be green, even if they are located on various floors and/or various locations within a floor in the specific design concept.

**NOTE: the information for the Competition participants is provided on request of the Competition Jury**

The Competition is based i.a. on the LOPE decision (annex 22 to the Competition Terms and Conditions) that enables staging of the investment with Phase A and Phase B.

Phase A is entirely located on the plot that belongs to the Warsaw University (registered plot no. 35 of the 5-04-01 area) and the decision on construction is made by the Warsaw University. Phase A should be designed in a way that enables independent operation.

Phase B is located on the part of the plot that belongs to the Polish State Treasury and that is also a road - ul. Wyrżeże Kościuszkowskie (registered plot no. 8 of the 5-04-01 area). The Warsaw University

**TWO-STAGE, STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION ARCHITECTURAL AND PLANNING COMPETITION  
for the development of architectural concept with land development for the investment  
Phase A and Phase B of the investment  
“Construction of the educational and teaching building at ul. Bednarska 2/4”  
(Phase A of the investment is implemented within the Multi-annual Program  
called “Warsaw University 2016-2025”**

currently has no right to use the property for construction purposes. The decision on construction can be made solely by the Warsaw University. Phase B should be treated as a study part of the Competition described in WFU (Annex 13 to the Competition Terms and Conditions).

The Competition Organizer expects realistic program and architectural proposals from the participants that include i.a. conservation guidelines and other legal and technical conditions (limitations related to location of construction structures on the road). It is up to the participant of the Competition to propose how to respond to the Investor's needs and fulfil the conservation recommendations for Phase B.

After settling the Competition the Warsaw University will make a decision on further actions related to possible execution of Phase B.

Marek Szeniawski  
Secretary of the Jury