

Your ref.:

Date:

Ref. No.: SMO/802776/18/VZKU/Rich

File No.: S-SMO/439978/18/VZKÚ/43

Client's profile

Executed by: Ing. Kateřina Richterová

Telephone: +420 599 443 018

E-mail: krichterova@ostrava.cz

Date: 12.12.2018

AMENDMENT AND CLARIFICATION OF TENDER CONDITIONS No. 7 COMPETITION FOR THE DESIGN OF THE "OSTRAVA CONCERT HALL"

The client hereby informs the contractors that on 20th November 2018 it decided to amend the competition terms. This amendment of competition terms includes a change of the secretary and tenders reviewer for the competition and change of the dependent section of the jury.

Ing. arch. Filip Bačuvčík was approved as the new secretary of the competition instead of Ing. arch. Jan Malík, and Ing. arch. Hana Pačlová, Ph. D was approved as the new reviewer instead of Ing. arch. Filip Bačuvčík.

JUDr. Lukáš Jansa was named the new regular member of the dependent section of the jury instead of Ing. Petra Bernfeldová. Mgr. Zuzana Bajgarová was named the new substitute member of the dependent section of the jury instead of Ing. Břetislav Riger.

In Appendix No.1 the client provides to the contractor the full wording of the competition terms with the highlighted amendments.

- 1. P.08 Drawings of the existing Ostrava Culture House building: Please clarify the locations of current freight elevators. There seems to be one by the loading dock but only on 1st lower level. Is it in use and what other floors does it serve? Are there any other freight elevators?**

There are two freight elevators in the OCH (Ostrava Culture House) building. One is dedicated for operation of the theatre providing for the 1st lower level (A 01.022) and 1st above level (A 1.46) with the machine room located in the 2nd above level (A 2.15, A 2.16). The second elevator caters for the 1st lower level (A 01.094), 1st above level (elevator cabin accessible from A 1.22), 2nd above level (A 2.38) and 3rd above level (elevator cabin accessible from A 3.07). The numbers of the said rooms correspond to the marking used in *P.08 Drawings of the existing OCH*. Entrances to the OCH building and their link to freight elevators are marked in Appendix No. 2 and 3 of this clarification of competition terms. Both elevators are functional.

- 2. P.08 Drawings of the existing Ostrava Culture House building: There are three loading docks in the back with a small private parking. Is this currently the only service & delivery access to the building?**

The current service entrances, supply and public entrances were marked in Appendix No. 2 and 3 of this clarification of competition terms.

3. **P.01 Building-program: The brief calls for a set of tuning rooms and for a larger guest group background that can double-function as tuning rooms. Can these tuning rooms be consolidated into one group of rooms that can also serve large groups?**

Yes, this solution is also acceptable.

4. **P.01 Building-program: Can performing artists use some of the musicians changing rooms?**

No, the changing rooms for musicians (i.e. employees of JFO Janáček Philharmonic Ostrava) are used permanently only for the employees.

5. **P.01 Building-program: What requirements are there for the Czech TV truck? What is the maximum distance from stage?**

In the case of the Czech TV truck, space must be provided for a semi-truck with semi-trailer/trailer with overall dimensions: 13.6 m length (including semi-truck), 2.55 m width (collapsed box) / 3.75 (extended box), 3.9 m height. The distance from the podium depends on the equipment of the TV truck given by the respective length of cables which ranges from 50 to 100 m.

6. **P.01 Building-program: Among the listed rooms, which ones need to be placed in the existing building and which ones in the new annex? Which rooms must be DIRECTLY linked to the new Concert Hall? Which ones to the Chamber Hall (in the existing building)?**

With respect to the question of dividing the building program between the current building and newly designed annex, please see the clarification of competition terms No. 6 dated 23rd November 2018, Art. 8.

With regards to the operational links the primary concern must be the consequences of the location of the building program with respect to logistics (e.g. musicians shall walk to the new concert hall from their changing rooms in the current OCH building several times a day; logistics must be thoroughly thought out in this regard).

Requirements concerning the direct connection of the Large Concert Hall and Chamber Hall are set out in P.01 Building Program. Facilities which must be directly linked to the Large Concert Hall are set out in Art. 1., P.01 Building Program. Art. 5. of P.01 Building Program sets out the requirement for the vicinity of the artists' changing rooms (changing rooms of soloists and conductor) in relation to both podiums (Large Concert Hall, Chamber Hall).

7. **P.05 Cut-out from land-use plan: Does the building regulation impose a maximum height and a maximum low? Said you can build two floors below ground level, how many meters can we actually excavate?**

Building regulations only stipulate general requirements in terms of the height regulation of buildings in relation to their mutual clearance (see clarification of competition terms No. 6 dated 23rd November 2018, Art. 15.).

More detailed requirements for layout are set out further in the land-use plan tools, in this case namely the Ostrava Land-use Plan, which graphic cut-out is included in the competition terms. The text of the Ostrava Land-use Plan sets out in Art. 3.8.3 the requirements for layout regulation in built-up stabilized areas, however these conditions do not necessarily have to be observed in areas where for urbanistic reasons (visual exposure, linear perspective, creation of a dominant features, etc.) it is desirable to apply a new approach to the layout of buildings.

The Client is of the opinion that the Ostrava Concert Hall requires a new approach to the spatial layout of buildings and, therefore, as was said in clarification of competitions terms No. 5 dated 1st November 2018, Art. 1., it announced the architectural competition “for invited” architectural teams, which have adequate experience with these projects.

8. P.01 Building-program: Is it preferred that the new Concert Hall – in case it would be place “distant” from the existing building – have direct connections to the existing building?

Yes, direct operational connection is desirable also with respect to Art. 2.1 of the competition terms, which specifies the client’s objective of making maximum use of the current building “*culture house for all operations and background facilities related to the operation of the concert hall and to newly build only the necessary minimum facilities.*”

9. P.01 Building-program: Is there any preferred spot for the parking? Also, for the parking we can go maximum two levels underground?

For the first part of the question please see clarification of competition terms No. 6 dated 23rd November 2018, Art. 6.

For the second part of the question, there is no specific number of levels which must be observed.

10. P.08 Drawings of the existing Ostrava Culture House building: Is there any working goods lift in the Ostrava House of Culture?

For reply see Art. 1.

11. P.01 Building-program: In terms of functionality, is it preferred that the visitors enter to a “common foyer” (e.g. Ostrava House of Culture’s entry foyer) and then have access both to the Chamber Hall and to the Concert Hall? Or shall the Chamber Hall and the Concert Hall have separate and independent accesses? Shall the visitors that are going to the Concert Hall pass by the Chamber Hall as well?

A common foyer for both new halls is regarded as an acceptable and effective functional solution, however, in this regard the possibility of concurrent operation of events in the Large Concert Hall and Chamber Hall must be considered so that the events do not impact and disrupt one another.

12. Where the symphonic orchestra of “Philharmonic Ostrava” does at the moment perform?

The home hall of the Janáček Philharmonic Ostrava is the community hall of the Ostrava Culture House (see *P.08 Drawings of the existing Ostrava Culture House building*, room No. A 2.47). The philharmonic hosts subscriber concert cycles and other celebratory events here. For several years it has also played at the multi-functional auditorium Gong in Dolní oblast Vítkovice.

13.P.13 Binding opinion of the monument protection authority: Shall we preserve the “Youth Fountain” and the “Girl’s Secret Fountain” or they can be demolished?

These features, as well as the pair of flag masts, are subject to monument protection under the group of building of the Ostrava Culture House. Their demolition would be a direct breach of condition No. 2 of the binding opinion of the monument protection authority, ref. No. SMO/177560/18 dated 25th June 2018, which are an integral part of the competition terms.

14.P.08 Drawings of the existing Ostrava Culture House building: Of which material is composed the ceiling of the existing Theatre in the House of Culture?

The ceiling of the theatre hall is made from concrete with a plaster stucco suspended on steel rods from the ceiling structure.

15. P.01 Building-program: We cannot unzip the two following zip folders in any way: “P_11_3D_model_part_2.zip.002“ and “P_11_3D_model_part_3.zip.003 “. Could you please double check if there is any problem with them?

With respect to the problems related to extraction of the above said files, please see clarification of competition terms No. 6 dated 23rd November 2018, Art. 22.

16.Could you send us any information about the groundwater level?

Pursuant to Art. 3.3 of the competition terms there will be necessary surveys, including a hydrogeological survey, provided by the client in the subsequent order of project documentation for the Ostrava Concert Hall.

17.Do we have to expect subterranean voids due to earlier mining activities?

Pursuant to Art. 3.3 of the competition terms there will be necessary surveys, including a geological survey, provided by the client in the subsequent order of project documentation for the Ostrava Concert Hall.

However, the building is located in an area where, based on the generally binding statement of the regional authority, it is not necessary to secure the building against impacts of undermining.

18.P.08 Drawings of the existing Ostrava Culture House building: Could you send us plans and/or documents about the structure and foundations of the building (concrete structure, steel structure, type of foundations, etc.)?

The competition terms were supplemented with the scanned documentation of foundation structures and building sections in *.pdf format and these are accessible for downloading, together with other competition documents, at: <https://ulozna.ostrava.cz/data/public/1c4b72.php>

19.Could you send us any information about the fire stability of the existing building and its fire protection systems? Are there any structural or technical reinforcements necessary?

The competition terms were supplemented with assessment of the fire stability of the building in *.pdf format and these are accessible for downloading, together with other competition documents, at: <https://ulozna.ostrava.cz/data/public/1c4b72.php>

The client adds that the building's current fire switchboards are at the end of their life span. The theatre and large concert hall are not equipped with a sprinkler system.

20. In the existing building; are the building regulations respected or up-to-date?

The current building of the Ostrava Culture House was approved for use in 1961 and as such, it was built according to the then valid legal regulations. However, the subsequent building modifications had to respect the newer legislation, but it must be remembered that they applied only to the newly built parts.

Therefore, it must be said that the current OCH building does not correspond fully to currently valid building regulations, e.g. Regulation No. 398/2009 Coll. on general technical requirements for providing barrier-free use of buildings (reserved parking spaces for vehicles transporting persons with serious motion handicaps, hygienic facilities and changing rooms, etc.), or Regulation No. 268/2009 Coll. on general technical requirements for buildings (shoulders and parking spaces, energy savings and thermal protection, elevators, etc.). It must be noted that the current valid building regulations were implemented almost 50 years after the commissioning of this building.

21. We have a request concerning the layout of the presentation panels: According to chapter 6 of the competition terms, 4 panels B1 are required. In chapter 6.2.2 till 4, the details are stated. By respecting literally these details, the first panel will be charged with a lot of information for a B1 format, four exterior views and a mass plan scale 1:500. The views will be quite small and difficult to read. Do you confirm that if we provide all required elements, we are free in the composition of the layout of the four panels, for example one exterior view per panel?

Failure to observe the graphic part as is stipulated for each panel according to Art. 6.2.2 to 6.2.4 of the competition terms, shall be reason for disqualification of the tender from review by the jury pursuant to Art. 6.16.1 par. a) of the competition terms. In the case of the PANEL 1 layout we would like to emphasize the fact that scale 1:500 for an isometric top view of the design is only a recommendation. The description of the design in PANEL 1 is expected to be brief, the complete description of the design to be included in the text section pursuant to Art. 6.3.1 par. c) of the competition terms.

To conclude this clarification of competition terms the client informs the contactors as follows:

Based on the questions of the competitors we are under the impression that it is necessary to expand on the content of the building program of the concert hall. The client's objective is to obtain, through the architectural competition, a design of the concert hall which shall be solved as an annex to the current culture house, reconstruction or other form of structural solution. The competition terms do not specify a binding solution, or demarcation of land in the design (in front of, behind or by the culture house) and, with respect to the expertise and creativity of the invited competition teams, it leaves up to their discretion which of the possible solutions they shall apply in their designs also with regards to the significance of the culture house. For the solution of the concert hall the client has chosen the connection to the current monument-protected building of the culture house; citing rejuvenation and re-involvement of the facility in current urban life, as the culture house is presently almost unused and is finding it difficult to find utilization for cultural purposes. Therefore, the competition terms speak of a "concert hall" and also "reconstruction of existing culture house". The competition terms presume that, for reason of re-involvement of the culture house in urban life, the maximum scope of facilities shall be integrated into the culture house and only those parts of the concert hall that cannot be integrated into the culture house (e.g. the concert hall itself) shall be solved outside the culture house. At the same time, the competition terms determine the maximum price for realization of the project, which must be respected. With respect to the actual

building program, it must be said that it sets forth only the contents and operation of the “concert hall”. The building program is based on current experience with operation of a concert ensemble, which is resides at the culture house, and its operational requirements. However, the client does not inhibit the application of the expertise of competition teams in design and operation of similar projects and thereby with allocation of facilities over and above the set building program while maintaining operability of the whole building. The client presumes that the building program of the actual concert hall shall not fill the entire spaces of the culture house. Here, the client leaves room to the competitors for their discretion and expertise, to determine for what purpose the culture house spaces shall be utilized. There is the possibility of using the current restaurant and maintaining it for daily operation even outside the concert hall programmes. Also, some vacant spaces can also be used, e.g. for a gallery, or other cultural utilization. However, at this stage it is not a binding use which the client would set strictly in the competition terms, also with respect to the fact that at this stage one cannot predict what designs the competitors will submit and, therefore, how much vacant space will remain in the culture house. The client presumes that based on the submitted designs, the extra use can be detailed and included in supplemented competition terms for a second competition round.

Yours sincerely

Ing. Eva Sebořská
Manager
Public Tenders and Capital Interest Department

“signed electronically”

Appendix No. 1 – Competition terms with highlighted amendments
(„*Soutezni podminky verze2.docx*“, “*Competition_terms_version2.docx*”)

Appendix No. 2 – Drawing 1.PP

Appendix No. 3 – Drawing 1.NP