

Pachacamac Park



FAQs

Inquiries

The following are the competition FAQs up to March 4th, 2019. Our responses should be considered an extension of the Competition Brief. We have also included the e-mails sent to all registered participants before March 11th, 2019. We recommend that you download all competition files once again, since they have been updated on February 28th, 2019.

GENERAL

Q: Is there a tentative budget for the development and construction of the project?

A: Not yet. The budget is being prepared and construction will take place in 2020 and 2021.

Q: Is it possible that the winning team will be hired to develop the project and supervise its construction?

A: Yes. The winning team will have to participate in whatever procurement process the Ministry of Culture decides to hold for the development of the project.

Q: Is the project oriented more towards landscape or architectural design?

A: The primary focus of this competition is landscape design, not architecture. All architectural elements must be fully integrated to, or be a direct result of, the landscape and urban proposals.

Q: Does Grupo Centenario have any properties or projects in the area?

A: No. The nearest project is 15 kilometers away.

Q: How likely is it that the park will get built?

A: As the competition organizers, we cannot guarantee that the park will get built. However, given the project's inclusion in the government's official bicentennial agenda, as well as the agreement signed for the competition launch and the inauguration of the National Museum in 2021, it is clear that the park is a high priority for the Peruvian state.

Q: Will the presentation be printed by the competition organizers or will it be projected on a screen as a sildeshow?

A: All presentations will be projected, page by page, on a large screen. No proposals will be printed. The jury will have access to additional computers in order to review proposals individually.

REGISTRATION AND PREREQUISITES

Q: Projects developed under the employment of another office may count towards fulfilling the previous work requirement?

A: If the team leader was the project architect and was involved in all stages of said project, then yes.

Q: Does the team leader need to be licensed in Peru?

A: No.

Q: Why is there a previous work requirement?

A: The reason is two-fold. On one hand, the Ministry of Culture intends to build the park in the next few years, so the winning entry must not only be good, it must be backed by enough construction experience to make its design viable and realistic. On the other, the requirement is meant to encourage younger architects to partner up with more experienced offices, in order to produce fewer, better proposals.

Q: Why would a work of 1,000 m² or smaller not qualify one to participate as the team leader?

A: Given the scale of the park, we consider the 1,500 m² requirement is a bare minimum. Large-scale urban projects require a degree of coordination that smaller projects tend not to have. Of course, in an effort to be objective and not leave things up to interpretation, we have tagged this requirement to a specific number that may seem arbitrary, but this is meant to be low enough to encourage the participation of many local and international offices. That said, only the team leader must fulfill this requirement.

Q: Does the previous work requirement include design work that has not been built?

A: No. The project must be built or in the process of construction.

Q: May the 1,500 m² requirement be fulfilled by the sum of smaller projects or must it be represented by a single project? Does it include the project lot or just built areas?

A: The 1,500 m² must correspond to a single project and it only includes built areas.

Q: Must the team leader be licensed in Peru or can he/she be licensed in his/her country of residence?

A: The team leader must be a licensed architect or landscape architect in the country of his/her residence, according to the laws that govern the profession.

Q: How do we know if we are registered in the competition?

A: If your team received a registration code, then you are registered. In order to register for the competition, you must first create an account on the 20-21.pe.

Q: Is it necessary to include both an architect and a landscape architect (or similar) in the team?

A: Yes. But keep in mind that a single person may fulfill both profiles.

SITE BOUNDARIES

Q: May we intervene outside the site boundaries?

A: The brief does not exclude participants from making proposals that include areas outside the site boundaries, particularly within the city or along the site perimeter. However, any intervention, inside or outside the site boundaries must fulfill the competition objectives and avoid any negative impact on the archaeological remains and landscape attributes of the site. Moreover, participants should consider that the Ministry of Culture's jurisdiction stops at the Pachacamac Sanctuary's borders. Any intervention beyond this must be approved by local municipalities.

Q: Should we aim to occupy the area within the site boundaries completely?

A: No. The site boundaries are only meant as a guide. The park's width and total area will be left to the participant's discretion and should be largely determined by the proximity to, or distance from, archaeological remains.

Q: May we propose an intervention along Lima Ave?

A: If the interventions are superficial and help prevent the entrance of vehicles into the Pampa de Atocongo, you may intervene the road edge or shoulder.

Q: What kind of interventions are allowed in the restricted area (according to the updated Site Plan)?

A: Any intervention in this area must happen above grade (above the surface of the terrain, that is). It must also be completely reversible. This area is included in order to connect the northern and northeastern edges of the park.

Q: Are there any restrictions along the Old Panamerican Highway? May we propose a connection from the eastern edge of the park to the western edge?

A: Given the density of archaeological structures in this area and its proximity to the Monumental Sector, we have excluded any possible interventions along the Old Panamerican Highway. Moreover, the visual continuity provided by the arid landscape that cascades down from the North Sector to the South Sector should not be broken.

Q: Are all below-grade interventions (i.e. beneath the surface of the terrain) ruled out?

A: Generally speaking, no construction should happen beneath the surface of the terrain. We realize, however, that some building foundations may be required. This should occur as little as possible, particularly near the north and northeastern borders of the site.

ARCHAEOLOGY

Q: How will the project deal with archaeological findings?

A: All construction will take place after an archaeological survey of the site, followed by a strict supervision plan. In the event that any remains are found, they will be protected and integrated to the project. The Ministry of Culture will determine what to do in such cases. No CIRAs (Certificate for the Inexistence of Archaeological Remains) will be issued.

Q: Should we aim to minimize or avoid any soil movements?

A: Yes. Proposals should avoid any interventions that may have a destructive effect on the archaeological remains that may be found.

Q: Should proposals embrace the research, conservation and protection efforts led by the Site Museum and find ways of integrating them to the design of the park?

A: Yes.

Q: Are any archaeological surveys scheduled for the North Sector?

A: No.

Q: Will any archaeological findings be subject to relocation or will they remain on site?

A: According to law, all archaeological structures must remain in place. Loose fragments and objects will be salvaged and stored by the Site Museum.

PARK—CITY RELATIONSHIP

Q: Should we try to integrate nearby public spaces to the design of the park?

A: Yes. The competition favors the integration and improvement of existing public spaces, including sports fields. However, any intervention in the city will need to be approved and carried out by local authorities, since these areas fall outside the Ministry of Culture's jurisdiction.

Q: How do you expect to limit the height of buildings along the Sanctuary's border?

A: Even though the Pachacamac Master Plan specifies a maximum building height for areas abutting the Sanctuary, local municipalities have not, as yet, incorporated these guidelines into their urban or building codes. The Pachacamac Park project offers a key opportunity to coordinate efforts between the Ministry of Culture, the Municipality of Lima and local municipalities to improve the relationship between the city and its archaeological sites. That said, proposals may include recommendations and mechanisms (TDRs, open space requirements, etc) that may help limit the growth of the city in close proximity to the Sanctuary.

Q: What kind of fence or perimeter wall should we consider for the exterior edge of the park? May we propose topographical changes or green fences in lieu of a hard perimeter wall?

A: While a perimeter wall or fence will be required initially, it is conceivable that, with a prolonged use of the park as a public space, the outer perimeter may become more and more porous. The perimeter may be softened, from the outset, by design elements on either side of the wall or fence.

Q: Should the inner perimeter of the park be fenced, or may we propose alternative measures?

A: Assuming that this question refers to the park edge that abuts the Sanctuary and not the city, the relationship should be as open or diffuse as possible. Rather than proposing a hard edge we encourage the design of unobtrusive elements that may prevent visitors from entering the North Sector, while creating a seamless visual transition between the park and the desert plain.

Q: How many inhabitants live near the park?

A: There are some 500,000 people in the districts of Villa el Salvador, Lurin and Pachacamac. Within these, there are 18 neighborhoods, totalling some 15,000 people, in close proximity to the Sanctuary. If we consider the neighboring districts, namely Villa Maria del Triunfo, San Juan de Miraflores, and Chorrillos (Lima Sur), the potential user population rises to 2 million people.

Q: How should the park benefit the local population?

A: We expect the park to significantly improve the local population's quality of life by offering greater access to culture and recreation, and improving environmental conditions.

Q: Do you expect any changes in zoning and/or building restrictions along the Sanctuary?

A: The Pachacamac Master Plan proposes a 300 meter buffer, adjusted to block sizes and urban morphology, where municipal authorities will limit the height of buildings.

Q: Does the Municipality of Lurin have a district plan?

A: Yes, you may find it online. It does not, however, mention the Sanctuary or how the city should relate to it.

Q: Do you have topographical plans of the areas adjoining the Sanctuary?

A: No.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND MOBILITY

Q: May we propose a pedestrian bridge across Lima Ave?

A: Yes. It may connect the northern edge of the park and serve both pedestrians and cyclists.

Q: How do you reconcile the construction of a pedestrian bridge, connecting the North and South Sectors, with accessibility requirements?

A: If contestants wish to propose a pedestrian bridge across the Old Panamerican Highway, it must be fully accessible. However, the bridge option should be carefully considered, given its potential impact on the landscape. It may be preferable to create a pedestrian crossing at grade by properly managing vehicular traffic.

Q: In order to calculate parking requirements, what is the Sanctuary's visitor capacity (including the Site Museum and the National Museum)?

A: The Site Museum (MSPAC) has an occupant capacity of 580 people. We have no information regarding the Sanctuary as a whole. The parking lot at MSPAC is small: 20 cars and 4 buses. Proposals must give preference to public transport.

Q: How many parking spots should we include in our proposals?

A: This is left to the participant's discretion. At this stage, we are less interested in precise calculations of parking capacity, and more on the chosen location(s) and the way parking areas may relate to the park and the city.

Q: What public transport routes connect the Sanctuary to the rest of the city?

A: Three bus lines stop near the Site Museum and the MUNA, heading south. Several lines run along the Lima Ave from Lurin to Villa María del Triunfo. There is a bus station near the María Reiche Ave where the bus company "El Chino" operates a bus line that travels north, through Villa El Salvador.

Q: Is it possible to relocate the roads that cross the Sanctuary? If so, how far should we develop our road proposals?

A: The removal or relocation of both Lima Ave and the Old Panamerican Highway, while ideal, is highly unlikely in the short and medium term. We recommend that proposals do not count on this. Participants are welcome to project the development of the park to a more distant future, where the roads may in fact disappear. However, the design of the park and its proper functioning should not be contingent on this happening.

Q: May we propose transport or mobility schemes that go beyond the site boundaries?

A: If these are meant to improve access to the park and protect the Sanctuary's landscape and heritage, you are welcome to propose changes beyond the site boundaries.

Q: When you speak of a dedicated bus circuit, do you mean a small fleet of electric buses (or similar) that may help connect the site to nearby mass transit stations?

A: Yes. This should be integrated to the site plan. It should not, however, distract participants from the competition's objectives.

Q: The brief does not specify any vehicular or pedestrian points of access to the site. Should we propose this?

A: Yes.

Q: Are there any mass transit stations projected for the site?

A: According to recent news reports, the Ministry of Transport and Communications has requested the extension of Lima's north-south metro line, Linea 1. This would arrive in Lurin and offer connections to the future Linea 5 and the future commuter train to Ica. The tentative location of this station, however, is not near the Sanctuary.

PROGRAM, BUILDINGS AND USERS

Q: How many people visit the Sanctuary every year and how many are projected for the next 10 years?

A: In 2018, the Site Museum received approximately 153,000 people. This represents a 2% increase since 2011.

Q: What is an ecological market? Do you have an estimated area or possible location for this program?

A: The market should be space of temporary use, preferably open during weekends, meant for the sale of local products. The program area has not been determined. An initial location, along the northwestern border of the Sanctuary, connected to Villa El Salvador, was discussed, but this, as well as the area, is left to the participants' discretion.

Q: Will the guard stations also act as checkpoints or surveillance platforms?

A: Stations should be strategically located along the park to help facilitate surveillance of the North Sector.

Q: May you provide a further breakdown of the required program, including areas?

A: We do not have a further breakdown of the program. Given that the competition is focused mainly on landscape architecture, we expect proposals to include only the essential programmatic elements to encourage active recreation in the park. The development of such elements should not distract participants from the competition objectives. In this sense, the location, area, and characteristics of the proposed program, is left entirely up to each team.

LANDSCAPE

Q: What is more important, the park's formal qualities or the landscape strategies that it proposes?

A: Even though the formal qualities of the park are very important, the competition is looking above all for landscape strategies that may adapt to different formal configurations. In this sense, the organizers consider the design of landscape elements and strategies (eg, vegetation, topographical changes, pavement, curbs, benches, lightposts, shelters, etc.) to be more important than the final geometry of the park (which may, after all, need to change during the development of the project).

Q: Are there any limitations regarding the vegetation schemes we may propose for the park?

A: Both the arid landscape and proximity to archaeological remains suggests the use of xerophytes and other species that do not have deep or invasive root systems.

Q: Do you have a vegetation guide for the area?

A: No. But participants may consult the book "Árboles de Lima", published by SERPAR, as a reference: https://www.academia.edu/27845216/Libro_Arboles_de_Lima.

Q: Should the Urpiwachaq fen be visually or physically integrated to the Pachacamac Sanctuary?

A: Participants may propose both visual and physical continuities. Bear in mind, however, that the fen sits on a property that belongs to the Universidad del Pacifico, not the Ministry of Culture.

Q: How far have the Urpiwachaw recovery efforts gone?

A: The water volume has been slightly recovered and native species have been reintroduced along its edges. This is the result of a coordinated effort between the Ministry of Culture and the Universidad del Pacifico.

Q: What uses will the plant nursery have?

A: The nursery's main purpose is to provide plants for the park. However, it should also serve a pedagogical function, particularly for the use of native or dry climate species, and provide seedlings to the local population. The nursery also has the potential to create jobs in the area.

Q: What institution will be responsible for the park's maintenance?

A: It is very likely, and desirable, that the Municipality of Lima's Parks Department (SERPAR) will administer the park. The agreement signed by the Ministry of Culture, the Municipality of Lima and Grupo Centenario for the launch of this competition may serve as a foothold to sign a new agreement between SERPAR and the Ministry of Culture to this end (a previous agreement was signed in 2013 and is now defunct).

WATER

Q: Do you have information regarding the water treatment and provision systems in the area?

A: No.

Q: How developed should our water treatment systems be?

A: Proposals must set the general guidelines and technologies for the sustainable management and use of water on the site. These systems need to be developed in great detail.

Q: Are there gray water treatment programs run by local municipalities?

A: As far as we know, yes. The district of Miraflores uses gray water to maintain some of its parks. We have no information regarding Lurin or Pachacamac.

Q: To what extent or degree should water be treated?

A: Only to the degree that it may be used to water vegetation.

Q: Is there currently a water treatment system on site?

A: No.

Q: May we retrieve water from the Lurin River to water the park?

A: Given the distance and change in elevation, the cost of bringing water from the Lurin River would be prohibitively expensive.

Q: How deep is the water table in the site?

A: The water table varies from 8 to 20 meters in depth.

Q: Are there any sewage treatment plants in the area?

A: The construction of a sewage treatment plant for Lurin was announced in 2016, but the project is stalled.

Q: Does the MUNA have water access?

A: Yes.

ARCHITECTURE

Q: How far should we develop the architectural elements in our proposal?

A: The development of architectural elements should be focused on construction systems, siting strategies, flexibility, formal qualities and materials, not so much on the specific distribution of interior spaces. In this sense, we do not expect architectural elements to be developed in detail. We do expect, however, their proper integration to the landscape proposal.

Q: Should all architectural elements be minimally invasive or reversible?

A: Building interventions must be increasingly light and reversible the closer they are to the interior of the site. This does not exclude the possibility of proposing less ephemeral constructions near the north and northeastern edges of the North Sector.

E-mails

From: 2021: Bicentennial Projects <info@20-21.pe>
Subject: Parque Pachacamac: Change in site boundaries
Date: Monday, February 18, 2019, 5:47 pm

Dear participants,

Thank you for your interest in the Pachacamac Park Competition.

The Pachacamac Site Museum and the competition advisors have kindly informed us that the site boundaries described in the competition brief, published on February 11, 2019, were not in full compliance with the Sanctuary's Master Plan.

Based on these observations, we edited the site boundaries and the introductory video and uploaded a new version of the brief on February 13.

In the following days, we will also upload a plan of all archeological areas within the North Sector that participants should consider during the development of their proposals. All registered participants will be notified via email once the file is made available for download on the competition website.

Moreover, we take this opportunity to emphasize a critical point of this competition. The site boundaries do not imply that everything within the area described should be fully developed (with structures, public spaces or vegetation). On the contrary, the brief requests, above all, the development of design strategies for the preservation of the Sanctuary; strategies that will determine the type of relationship or separation that the park, and by extension the city, should have with its cultural heritage.

We thank the Site Museum and the competition advisors for their comments, since they have allowed us to improve the brief only two days after the competition launch.

Sincerely,

2021: Bicentennial Projects

From: 2021: Bicentennial Projects <info@20-21.pe>
Subject: Parque Pachacamac — IMPORTANT/E: Update/Actualización
Date: Thursday, 28 de febrero, 2019, 6:47 pm

Dear participants,

The following is a summary of recent updates made to the competition. Please read each point carefully, as some may have a significant impact on final submissions.

1) Regarding the DWG and AI files, we have added a layer showing the general location of archaeological structures or remains in the North Sector. Please download the updated .zip file, named FILES, in the user page. The General Site Plan in p.7 of the updated Competition Brief specifies what kind of interventions are allowed within some segments of the site boundaries. Generally speaking, the greater the intervention (i.e., the more site preparation/construction is required), the farther away it should occur from any archeological remains. Ideally, all significant interventions should happen within the city or near the north/northwestern boundaries of the site. Only surface interventions are allowed in the area that bridges the northern and eastern perimeters of the North Sector.

2) We have reduced the submission's required pages to 4. The fifth page is optional. The following is an updated list of deliverables:

Cover page

Page 1: General site plan (1:5000) + Concept diagrams

Page 2: Plan of an area chosen by participant (1:1000) + 1–2 sections (1:200)

Page 3: Additional drawings (plans and sections at any scale, diagrams, etc.)

Page 4: Perspectives / Renderings (minimum of 2) and any additional drawings

Page 5: Additional drawings (plans and sections at any scale, diagrams, renderings, etc.)

Project summary (as described in the Competition Brief)

We have decided that the 1:1000 plan showing the relationship between park, MUNA, and the Site Museum should be optional. The reason behind this is two-fold. On one hand, the specificity of this particular area —i.e. the urban complexities that need to be addressed at this scale— may distract participants from the more general landscape strategies required to protect the Sanctuary along its more vulnerable edges. On the other, the development of a 1:1000 plan may require more information than the museums are able to share, for security reasons. Having said that, participants who wish to develop a 1:1000 plan of the MUNA–Site Museum–Park connection may do so in the “Additional drawings” pages.

3) We have updated the competition brief to reflect these changes.

4) We have uploaded the Executive Summary of the Sanctuary's Master Plan, in Spanish. The Competition Brief includes most of the relevant information (for the development of proposals, that is) contained in this document. However, the Master Plan has been requested by several participants and it should be made available to all teams.

5) We have uploaded new photographs and videos to the competition's user page.

6) The number of participants registered in the 20-21.pe website exceeds the number of participants registered for the competition. To access the user page, which contains all additional documents, you must be registered in the Pachacamac Park competition.

7) Finally, although the inquiries will be answered on March 11th, one particular point should be emphasized beforehand: Participants may question or offer alternatives to the requested program, as long as their proposals have a positive impact on the Sanctuary and help protect it. This is, first and foremost, a landscape architecture competition, whose main objective is to produce a more positive relationship between the city, its landscape and its heritage. Architectural elements, although important, are auxiliary to this goal.

Sincerely,

2021: Bicentennial Projects

From: 2021: Bicentennial Projects <info@20-21.pe>
Subject: Parque Pachacamac — FAQs
Date: Monday, March 11, 2019, 5:00 pm

Dear participant,

We have uploaded the FAQs to the competition website (link). We have answered the most frequent or pertinent questions, received up to March 4th, at 11:59 PM (UTC-5).

The PDF also includes all emails sent to registered users before March 11th.

We have noticed a discrepancy in dates published online regarding the registration deadline, so we have decided to extend the deadline to the later date: March 15th, at 11:59 PM (UTC-5)

The email that your team has used to register is the most expedient way we have to communicate with you. We therefore recommend that you check this email periodically or have it automatically forward all mails to an account that you check on a regular basis.

Finally, given the high volume of inquiries we have received regarding specific or individual cases, we ask for your patience as we try to reply every email received before March 4th.

Thank you,

2021: Bicentennial Projects

