

PAM-MBSP ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN IDEAS COMPETITION- FOR PASAR  
AWAM BUKIT MERTAJAM

# QUERIES & ANSWERS

29 Sept 2023

To all participants,

At the close of registration on Monday, 25 September 2023, we had received a total of 95 registrations. We thank you for your support and interest in the Competition.

At the close of the Queries period on 25 September 2023, 5pm, we received queries from a total of 34 registered participants. We provide here in this document the answers to the queries submitted by the participants.

Thank you.

Competition Convener: Ar Amzar Ahmad

Competition Co-Convener: TPr Mohd Ridzal bin Abdul

PAM - MBSP Pasar Awam Bukit Mertajam Organising Committee

## 1.0 SITE

Q 1: To clarify the site for competition, Does it involve only the plot of the current Pasar Awam or does it include the plot marked “ Tapak Cadangan Pembangunan Tempat Letak Kereta Awam dan Rumah Mampu Milik’ as shown on pages 1& 3 of Appendix G

**A 1: Pasar Awam Site only for this competition**

Q 2: The given CAD drawing also include drawings for both of the plots mention above. Does it mean that we have to design for both plots?

**A 2: Pasar Awam Site only for this competition**

Q 3: What is the extent of the site for the development? Does it include and involve only lot 502,503,504.724 and 1034?

**A 3: Yes**

Q 4: How much is the building setback?

**A 4: 2 Meters**

Q 5: Are the quarters also part of the site for development? Is the land Kuarter Kakitangan kerajaan part of the project site? It is necessary to us to create a design for the government quarters site?

**A 5: Not included in the competition**

Q 6: It is possible to use the quarter’s site as carpark spaces?

**A 6: Not included in the competition**

Q 7: Is there a clear site demarcation, existing building height/section and elevation for the old pasar awam bukit mertajam?

**A 7: No as-built drawings only floor plan provided**

Q 8: If the ground area is not enough, can we propose the wet zone on level 1 instead?

**A 8: No restrictions on the planning of the areas**

Q 9: Should for public parking facility and affordable housing mentioned in the competition brief?

**A 9: No**

Q 10: Can we confirm the proposed boundary line for the new market annexe?

**A 10: Lots 502,503,504,724 & 1034**

Q 11: Is the demarcated road/circulation on both site fixed, or can it be reviewed with the boundary line?

**A 11: Yes up to the participant’s proposal.**

Q 12: What is the extent of upgrading the existing market such as its structure and internal layout?

**A 12: Please refer to Appendix G: The building in yellow is to be retained and the building in pink could be demolished and/or retained**

Q 13: What is the program mix for the new 2 storey building? If there is do we need to comply to the building mix indicate on the site plan?

**A 13: Yes required to provide 400 stalls and to strictly follow the competition brief. Participant may propose more than 400 stalls if they choose to do so.**

Q 14: What are the demographic of market user? What is the current total number of local vendor in the existing market? Can we have the design report done by yokohama city? What are market operation hour?

**A 14: Yokohama City Design Report is not relevant for this competition**

**Market Operation hours: 4 am-1 pm**

Q 15: Do we need to comply all 400 nos of market? Can we propose activities in the dormant shops? Can jalan pasar be pedestrian during certain hours?

**A 15: Please refer to A 13 above.**

**Participant could propose as there are no objections from MBSP  
Jalan Pasar cannot be closed**

Q 16: Can the existing pasar awam demolish and rebuild the new one? Or it has to be retained and refurbished upgraded only?

**A 16: Please refer to A 12 above**

Q 17: Where is the site for the new 2 storey building?

**A 17: Please refer to Appendix G: The new building could be sited where the existing building (in pink) is located**

Q 18: To confirm on the area for surau facilities is it 210 m2 (2260 sq.ft)

**A 18: Surau facilities confirm as 210 sqm**

Q 19: What is the relations between the new storey and pasar awam bukit mertajam?

**A 19: Both buildings should be interconnected**

Q 20: Do we have to include the adjacent lot proposed RMM & CP to the overall proposal?

**A 20: No**

Q 21: Can we have the existing building height, building façade, building dimension, floor plan, section and elevation? Any CAD drawing?

**A 21: No as- built drawings**

Q 22: Inquire the possibility of adding a new mezzanine block on top on the existing market is this permitted?

**A 22: No additional floor to be added to the existing market**

Q 23: Is there any extension vertically allowed and any height limit on the vertical extension?

**A 23: Building height limited to 3 storeys.**

## **2.0 COMPETITION BRIEF**

Q 24: Referring to item 5.0 Competition brief (page 4) of the competition brief the “construction of a new two-story building that connects to the Pasar Awam Bukit Mertajam’ is to be located on which site? The plot of the current Pasar Awam or the plot marked “ Tapak Cadangan Pembangunan Tempat letak kereta Awam and Rumah Mampu Milik? What type of building is this ie commercial?

**A 24: Please refer to A 17 above**

**Market building is categorised as commercial**

Q 25: The ‘market/hawker complex” and the program as listed in the table ‘summary of component for market design” on page 4 is to be located within the upgraded existing pasar awam bukit mertajam building or within the new two-story building?

**A 25: Up to participants to propose**

Q 26: The competition brief outlines impressions that the competition scope is within the main pasar awam and the area surrounding the main old structure. Appendix H only shows photos of an existing market. In Appendix D, the site highlighted is also the existing pasar awam. However we are confused as to the relevance of the Tapak quarters to this competition as mentioned in Appendix G and also provided in CAD DWG as well.

**A 26: The Tapak Quarters not included in this competition**

Q 27: Are we expected to design and include the pasar awam into this tapak quarters as well?

**A 27: No**

Q 28: Refer to item 5.0 No 1 &2, please mark the building to be upgraded and the building to be demolished and build 2 storeys

**A 28: Please refer to A 12 above**

Q 29: Is there a budget or cost cap allocated for the project?

**A 29: No costing required for this IDEAS Competition**

Q 30: Is there any sustainability standards or certification like GBI or etc that the project aims to meet?

**A 30: MBSP requires a minimum rating of GBI SILVER**

### **3.0 VISITING THE MARKET**

Q 31 Are all part of the market accessible or we have to make a special arrangement or request?

**A 31: All areas are accessible to registered participants**

Q 32 Will the organizer schedule a day for a site visit since the upper floor of the market is locked?

**A 32: The upper floor will be open for visits by the registered participants on Friday, 6 October 2023, 10 am- 4 pm only**

### **4.0 SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

Q 33: Referring to items 15a.ii (page 11) on the design statement, kindly confirm the word count limit for the design statement, i.e., is it 5000 words or 500 words

**A 33: One (1) A4 size (portrait) Design statement in PDF format not more than 500 words**

Q 34: Language for submission- please advise what are the languages to be used for submission

**A 34: Bahasa Malaysia OR English**

Q 35: Do we need to submit any hardcopy during the 1st stage of submission?

**A 35: No hardcopy required**

### **5.0 APPENDICES**

Q 36: Appendix G- No elevation and section were attached, please clarify the Plans have been distorted and please clarify if 'cadangan pembangunan tapak' in pink colour and the yellow colour road is only MBSP initial proposal for information only

**A 36: No as built drawings.**

**Yellow colour road is only MBSP's proposal for information.**

Q 37: Appendix E- Please mark the boundaries of the site for the design ideals

**A 37: Please refer to the revised Appendix E as attached**

Q 38: Appendix D- Please clarify why site survey for Kuarter is provide and please clarify if the site area marked in red on map is correct

**A 38: Not included in the competition**

Q 39: Appendix D indicates the certain boundary line are missing and unclear. Is there additional documentation or clarification available to define these boundaries more clearly?

**A 39: Please refer to the revised Appendix D as attached**