



URBIS

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION REPORT

Green Square Integrated
Community Facility and School

Prepared for
SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE NSW AND CITY OF SYDNEY
5 March 2020

URBIS STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS REPORT WERE:

Director Sarah Horsfield
Senior Consultant Simon Gunasekara
Project Code P14337
Report Number FINAL

JURY MEMBER ENDORSEMENT

Name	Signature	Date
Richard Johnson (Chair)		5 March 2020
Olivia Hyde		5 March 2020
Sylvia Corish		5 March 2020
Leone Lorrimer		5 March 2020
Nicole Molloy		5 March 2020
Rachel Neeson		5 March 2020

All information supplied to Urbis in order to conduct this research has been treated in the strictest confidence. It shall only be used in this context and shall not be made available to third parties without client authorisation. Confidential information has been stored securely and data provided by respondents, as well as their identity, has been treated in the strictest confidence and all assurance given to respondents have been and shall be fulfilled.

© Urbis Pty Ltd
50 105 256 228

All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced without prior permission.

You must read the important disclaimer appearing within the body of this report.

urbis.com.au

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Overview	5
1.2	Site Description.....	6
1.3	The Proponent	6
1.4	The Consent Authority	6
1.5	Probity Advisor.....	6
1.6	Evaluation of the Schemes and Winning Design.....	6
2	Architectural Design Competition Process.....	7
2.1	Overview	7
2.2	Jury	7
2.3	Technical/Educational Advisors.....	8
2.4	Consent Authority Observers.....	9
2.5	Key Dates of Architectural Design Competition.....	9
3	Evaluation of Final Submissions.....	10
3.1	Overview	10
3.2	BVN.....	11
3.3	FJMT	13
3.4	TKD	15
3.5	TZG	17
3.6	Wilson Architects & Collins and Turner	19
4	Jury Recommendation	21
5	Conclusion.....	23
6	Disclaimer	24

Appendix A Architectural Design Competition Brief

FIGURES

Figure 1 - Perspectives of the BVN scheme	11
Figure 2 - Perspectives of the fjmt studio scheme	13
Figure 3 - Perspectives of the TKD scheme.....	15
Figure 4 - Perspectives of the TZG scheme.....	17
Figure 5 - Perspectives of the Wilson Architects & Collins and Turner scheme	19

PICTURES

Picture 1 View looking south-west (cnr Joynton Ave and Zetland Ave	11
Picture 2 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)	12
Picture 3 View looking south (Zetland Avenue).....	13
Picture 4 View looking east (Portman Street).....	14
Picture 5 View looking south-west (cnr Joynton Avenue and Zetland Avenue).....	15
Picture 6 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)	16
Picture 7 View looking south-west (cnr Joynton Avenue and Zetland Avenue)	17
Picture 8 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)	18
Picture 9 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)	19
Picture 10 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)	20

TABLES

Table 1 – Competition Jurors 8

Table 2 – Technical Advisors 8

Table 3 – Key Dates of the Architectural Design Competition 9

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The purpose of this Architectural Design Competition Report is to inform the Consent Authority of the process and outcomes of the Architectural Design Competition (Design Competition) for the development of Green Square Integrated Community Facility and School, and the selection of the winning architectural design.

School Infrastructure NSW (SINSW) and the City of Sydney (CoS) (the Proponent) invited five competitors to participate in the Competitive Design Process and prepare design proposals for the site. The five architectural firms that participated in the Competitive Design Process were:

- BVN
- FJMT
- Tanner Kibble Denton (TKD)
- Tonkin Zulaikha Greer (TZG)
- Wilson Architects & Collins and Turner

All five competitors participated in the Design Competition and produced a final submission for consideration and evaluation by the Jury.

The Design Competition was undertaken in accordance with the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (Sydney LEP 2012), the CoS Competitive Design Policy 2013 and the Draft Government Architects Design Excellence Guidelines.

Clause 3.5 of the CoS *Competitive Design Policy 2013* sets out the requirements for a Architectural Design Competition Report, as follows:

- *Following its determination, the Jury is required to prepare a report (to be referred to as the Architectural Design Competition Report) detailing:*
- *The competition process and incorporating a copy of the competition brief;*
- *The Jury's assessment of the design merits of each of the entries;*
- *The rationale for the choice of preferred design which must clearly demonstrate how it best exhibits design excellence in accordance with the provisions of Clause 6.21(4) of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and the approved Design Excellence Strategy; and*
- *An outline of any further recommended design amendments or proposed conditions of development consent that are relevant to the achievement of design excellence.*
- *The Jury is expected to reach a decision on whether to request a redesign within 14 days and will submit a Jury report (referred to as the architectural design competition report) to the developer and the consent authority, within 14 days of its decision.*
- *Following the Jury's decision, the consent authority may require the developer to hold a public exhibition of the design competition entries.*

This report has been prepared in accordance with this Clause and outlines the Competitive Design Process, the Jury's evaluation of each scheme, and demonstrates the Jury's rationale for selection of the winning scheme. Each Jury member has reviewed and endorsed the content contained within this report.

The Competitive Design Process was undertaken in accordance with the Design Competition Brief (the Brief) prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the CoS, SINSW and the Government Architect NSW (GANSW) on 1 November 2019.

1.2 SITE DESCRIPTION

The Design Competition relates to the site known as 3 Joynton Avenue, Zetland. The subject site is legally described as Lot 2 in DP 1174641 and is located within the City of Sydney Local Government Area (LGA).

1.3 THE PROPONENT

SINSW and the CoS is the Proponent for the Design Competition and invited five Architectural firms to prepare design proposals for the site.

1.4 THE CONSENT AUTHORITY

In accordance with the SRD SEPP, as the proposed development is for a new school (regardless of the capital investment value) it is categorised as State Significant Development (SSD). The Consent Authority will be the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) or the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) unless delegation is sought and given to the CoS.

The Competition Manager liaised with CoS, SINSW and GANSW officers throughout the Competition. CoS officers in addition to a Probity Advisor observed the Competitive Process and the competitor's final presentations to ensure the integrity of the outcomes.

1.5 PROBITY ADVISOR

In accordance with Section 3.7 of the draft GANSW Design Excellence Guidelines a Probity Advisor was engaged to oversee the integrity of the competitive design process and ensure the design competition ran in accordance with the Brief, procedures and protocols.

1.6 EVALUATION OF THE SCHEMES AND WINNING DESIGN

An analysis and evaluation of the designs was undertaken in accordance with the evaluation criteria contained within the Brief. This included the design, planning and commercial objectives of the Brief, compliance with the relevant planning controls (SEPPs, LEPs, DCPs) and importantly, the Royal South Sydney Hospital Masterplan (2013).

The Competitive Design Process has resulted in a winning scheme that was determined by the Jury to demonstrate a high design quality. The Jury resolved that the BVN scheme best demonstrated the ability to achieve design excellence as per Clause 6.21 of the Sydney LEP 2012 and the Brief requirements. The BVN scheme was subsequently awarded the winner of the Design Competition. Detailed within **Section 4** of this report are those features that the Jury considers to be fundamental to the design integrity and those issues that need to be resolved in design development.

Details of the competitor's schemes and Jury deliberations are discussed in the following sections.

2 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION PROCESS

2.1 OVERVIEW

The Proponent invited five competitors to prepare submissions in response to a Design Brief as part of the Design Competition. The Brief was prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the CoS, SINSW and GANSW. The process undertaken is described in more detail as follows:

- Five architectural firms, including one partnership, were invited to participate in the Design Competition, held over a period of 6 weeks.
- The Brief was issued to Competitors and Jury members on 1 November 2019.
- A briefing session was held on 4 November 2019 to provide an overview of the site, outline the planning parameters and the Brief, and provide an opportunity for the competitors to ask questions and seek clarification regarding the Brief and the Competition procedures. This was followed by a site visit.
- An optional meeting with the Quantity Surveyor (QS) was made available to each competitor during the Competition.
- Communication between competitors was managed through SINSW's procurement portal and as such all addendums and clarifications were issued to competitors and remained accessible throughout the duration of the competition. Responses were provided without revealing the source of the question.
- All competitors submitted an A3 Design Report (Final Submission), articulating their proposed architectural scheme for the site.
- Each competitor presented their proposed architectural schemes to the Jury during the Final Presentation dates held on 10 and 11 February 2020. The Jury deliberations were held on 11 February 2020 and a winner of the Design Competition was also determined on this day.

The Design Competition was undertaken in an open and transparent manner in consultation and disclosure with CoS, SINSW and GANSW officers and the Probity Advisor in attendance as observers. In accordance with the City's Competitive Design Policy 2013 and the draft Government Architect's Design Excellence Competition Guidelines (2018), the CoS, SINSW, GANSW and a Probity Advisor was involved in the Design Competition Process as follows:

- CoS and GANSW – Reviewed, provided comment and endorsed the Brief.
- CoS – Provided clarification on Competitive Design Process procedures.
- Probity Advisor – copied into all correspondence between the competitors and the Competition Process Manager regarding questions or requests for additional information.
- Probity Advisor – attended the briefing session, was invited to attend the optional meetings with the QS and the final presentation dates, and was present for Jury deliberations.

2.2 JURY

The composition of the Jury was in accordance with the draft Government Architects Design Excellence Competition Guidelines. The Jury comprised a total of five (5) members in the following composition:

- Two (2) representatives with architectural/design experience nominated by the CoS;
- Two (2) members nominated by the NSW Department of Education (education specialist);
- One (1) member nominated by SINSW having architectural/design experience; and
- One (1) member nominated by the GANSW.

The Jury consisted of the below individuals:

Table 1 – Competition Jurors

Juror	Position	Qualification
Richard Johnson (Jury Chair)	Registered Architect and Director JPW	Registered Architect nominated by CoS
Olivia Hyde	Director of Design Excellence, GANSW	Registered Architect/Urban Designer nominated by GANSW
Sylvia Corish	Executive Director, School Performance	Functional Educational Specialist
Leone Lorrimer	Registered Architect and Strategic Consultant	Registered Architect nominated by DoE
Nicole Molloy	Principal Woollahra Public School	Functional Educational Specialist
Rachel Neeson	Owner and Director, Neeson Murcutt Architects	Registered Architect/Urban Designer nominated by CoS

All members of the Jury have extensive experience across architecture, urban design and education.

2.3 TECHNICAL/EDUCATIONAL ADVISORS

Technical/educational advice was provided to competitors throughout the Design Competition and an assessment of schemes was undertaken on the final submissions. The technical/educational advisors involved in the Competitive Design Process were those outlined in Table 2.

Table 2 – Technical Advisors

Name	Company	Consultant
Simon Gunasekara	Urbis	Competition Manager / Planner
Sarah Horsfield	Urbis	Competition Manager / Planner
Cormac Ryan	Altus Group	Quantity Surveyor
Nic Accaria	Department of Education	Education Specialist
Alison Cox	SINSW	Education Facilities Specialist
Jasna Stajic	SINSW	Education Facilities Specialist
Stephanie Noble	Northrop	Civil
Ian Van Eerden	Northrop	Sustainability
Joseph Bonica	Northrop	Structural
Greg Harris	Northrop	Mechanical
Scott Murray	Northrop	Hydraulic
Brandon Shutlar	Northrop	Electrical
Charles Slack-Smith	Group DLA	BCA Consultant

2.4 CONSENT AUTHORITY OBSERVERS

The Competition and assessment were overseen by several observers, some of whom attended the Final Presentation dates. The following observers from the GANSW and CoS were present at various stages of the Competition:

- Andrew Rees – Area Planning Manager – CoS
- David Zabell – Specialist Planner – CoS
- Anita Morandini – Design Excellence Manager – CoS
- Marie Ierufi – Design Excellence Coordinator – CoS
- Rod Stanton – Project Director – SINSW
- Fiona Pollack – Director – Infrastructure Delivery - SINSW

2.5 KEY DATES OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION

The key dates for the Design Competition were as follows:

Table 3 – Key Dates of the Architectural Design Competition

Date	Milestone
1 November 2019	Commencement Date
4 November 2019	Briefing Session and Site Visit
26 November 2019	Progress Sessions
16 December 2019	Jury Briefing and Site Visit
20 December 2019	Final Submissions Lodgement Date
6 - 17 January 2020	Technical Assessment by Proponent’s Technical Advisors
20 – 24 January 2020	Post Submission Clarifications Period
5 February 2020	Presentation Date Material Submission
10 February 2020 and 11 February 2020	Presentation Date
5 March 2020	Architectural Design Competition Report

3 EVALUATION OF FINAL SUBMISSIONS

3.1 OVERVIEW

Following the submission of the final competitive design schemes, a technical/educational assessment and compliance review of the competitor's submissions was undertaken by the technical/educational advisors. This review was provided to the Jury seven (7) days before the Final Presentation dates.

The technical/educational advisors conducted a briefing to the Jury members, including an opportunity for questions in regard to the site and Brief requirements.

Each competitor presented their scheme to the Jury explaining their approach to the site, design concept, compliance with planning controls and the design, planning and commercial objectives of the Brief, as well as the benefits of their respective schemes.

In accordance with the evaluation criteria within the Brief, the design schemes presented by the five (5) competitors were analysed and evaluated by the Jury with a focus on design quality, compliance and the design and commercial objectives of the Brief. Based on this method of evaluation, a winning scheme was recommended by the Jury. The key evaluation areas are identified below:

1. Compliance with the design requirements of the Brief
2. Compliance with the planning requirements of the Brief
3. Compliance with the commercial requirements of the Brief
4. Compliance with the buildability requirements of the Brief

An evaluation of the design merits and areas for further development were also identified and discussed during the deliberation process. The Jury noted that the majority of schemes demonstrated a clear understanding of the Brief, site context and demonstrated a high level of compliance with the relevant planning controls. All schemes were accepted as generally fulfilling the submission requirements.

All schemes recognised the strategic importance of the site and its context, and the need to respond to both the educational requirements of the Brief and the building's response to the public realm as well as conforming to the project budget. Some schemes were assessed by the quantity surveyor as exceeding the project budget. Most schemes were generally compliant with the building envelope while some schemes proposed some non-compliances with respect to some aspects of the planning envelope or brief requirements.

Following the deliberations, the Jury determined that there was a winning scheme which was the scheme most capable of achieving design excellence. It is intended that feedback will be provided to competitors with respect to the Jury's review of their scheme.

The following section outlines each of the five design schemes in more detail.

3.2 BVN

The BVN scheme responds to the surrounding context through scale, form, materiality and design. The building is designed as a perimeter block with strong, simple lines and varying parapet heights. The Jury commended this formal and clear presentation and acknowledged that the horizontal nature responds well to the architecture of the Gunyama Park Aquatic and Recreation Centre, Zetland Avenue and the adjoining heritage precinct.

The scheme proposes a multi-purpose court on the corner of Zetland Avenue and Portman Street to enhance visual and physical linkages through the site. The permeable nature of the court creates multiple linkages through the site, while the double height space invites daylight access through the centre of the site. The Jury highly commended this design move as a key merit of the scheme, and noted it created an open and inviting ground plane.

The Jury commended the fresh and distinctive character of the cladding.

The approach to education is simple, with learning hubs provided on Levels 1 and 2 and play spaces provided on Ground Level and Level 3. The Jury appreciated the clear separation of the two school uses from a functional perspective.

The Jury highly commended the consideration of environmental sustainability in the scheme. The proposed mixed-mode strategy includes passive solar design principles, sun screening, harvesting of rainwater and use of Z-transition ducts to reduce heat load and encourage natural airflow.

While the scheme met the design requirements of the Brief, the Jury noted further revision of internal spatial planning was required to improve functional operation. The location of toilets, canteen, lift spaces and library require further consideration.

Figure 1 - Perspectives of the BVN scheme



Picture 1 View looking south-west (cnr Joynton Ave and Zetland Ave)

Source: BVN



Picture 2 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)

Source: BVN

3.3 FJMT

The FJMT scheme incorporates a series of pavilion forms to create definition to a shared central courtyard whilst also addressing the surrounding street network. The orientation of the communal hall and library to align with Geddes Avenue was commended by the Jury.

A continuous ground floor civic colonnade is provided along Zetland Avenue, with similar openings provided along the Portman Avenue elevation. While this design move provided an improved fine grain context from the surrounding streetscape, the Jury acknowledged that within the site this strategy created poor amenity due to the depth of the undercroft which restricts solar access.

While the scheme provides a positive address to the northern and eastern elevations, the Jury acknowledged the lack of resolution of the southern and western elevations. This presented a number of challenges such as internal circulation, access and thermal requirements, and in the opinion of the Jury would require revision of site planning.

The Jury commended the use of warm materiality such as timber and copper that creates a light-weight materiality and contributes to the overall positive aesthetic of the scheme. The integration of public art into the scheme was also well considered.

The design of the learning hubs was commended by the Jury for its clear focus and understanding of pedagogical and educational requirements, while also allowing for internal adaption based on needs. Despite this, the Jury noted further consideration was required of the school amenities as specified in the Brief including toilets, OSHC and administration area.

Figure 2 - Perspectives of the fjmt studio scheme



Picture 3 View looking south (Zetland Avenue)

Source: *fjmt*



Picture 4 View looking east (Portman Street)

Source: *fjmt*

3.4 TKD

The TKD scheme expresses the functional components of the scheme as two separate yet interlinked identities. The ground floor plane is envisaged as a permeable community connection, with educational spaces provided at the upper levels for security and space management.

The Jury commended the functionality of the scheme which sensitively resolved the complexities of planning spaces for children. The scheme presents a well-resolved response to the design objectives of the Brief, particularly the administration spaces, library, learning pods and COLA. Similarly, the rooftop play area demonstrated a good use of space and was a positive element of the scheme. The jury noted the need to resolve the negative impact of the column grid on the functionality of the learning pods.

The Jury commended the scheme's consideration of environmentally sustainable initiatives, including the use of recycled materials, PV cells and tangible and visible rainwater harvesting and use.

Physical and visual permeability through the site was raised as a key issue by the Jury. While the scheme had positive façade elements particularly through the use of terracotta, overall it was perceived as inward-looking and uninviting.

The primary entry was seen by the Jury as unwelcoming. The intersection of the two functional components is unresolved and disrupts clear visual sightlines through the site. The entrance stairs were noted as further disrupting the open space, particularly when located adjacent to the entry ramp.

In regard to the site's relationship with the broader Green Square precinct, the Jury questioned the massing of the built form which appeared to fall away to the east in opposition of the higher-density form along Botany Road and the future developments within the Green Square town centre. This was seen as a negative element that disrupts the building's relationship with the civic context.

While the Jury acknowledged the scheme presented interesting architectural concepts, further refinement and resolution of urban design issues is required.

Figure 3 - Perspectives of the TKD scheme



Picture 5 View looking south-west (cnr Joynton Avenue and Zetland Avenue)

Source: TKD



Picture 6 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)

Source: TKD

3.5 TZG

The TZG scheme was informed by a detailed master planning process to determine the height and scale of the building and its relationship with the surrounding context. This beneficial exercise has resulted in a positive response to Zetland Avenue and a permeable ground plane achieved through generous floor to floor heights.

While the scheme created a strong presentation to the surrounding context through use of materiality, form and scale, the Jury also noted the scheme appeared heavy and visually dominant.

The rationalisation of lifts and stairs into a single form and elevation of the necessary circulation into a sculptural element was commended by the Jury.

The scheme incorporates soft and hard landscaping to reflect the site's original water ecology and the movement patterns throughout the building. The metaphor of flowing water and its representation through fluid lines and pool-shaped passive spaces was commended by the Jury. The Jury commended the positive impact of opening the façade with landscaped play space at all levels.

The Jury commended the covered multi-purpose court achieved through the L-shaped form of the building. However, the design requirements of the school component required further resolution, particularly the administration area, deep learning pods, OSHC and width of student circulation walkways. The Jury similarly raised concerns with the location of the primary entry on Portman Street, which is inconsistent with the Brief.

Figure 4 - Perspectives of the TZG scheme



Picture 7 View looking south-west (cnr Joynton Avenue and Zetland Avenue)

Source: TZG



Picture 8 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)

Source: TZG

3.6 WILSON ARCHITECTS & COLLINS AND TURNER

The Wilson Architects & Collins and Turner scheme exhibits a playful approach to architecture and urban design, conceived in response to the rigidity of the surrounding urban fabric.

The Jury commended the landscaping strategy which created a range of multi-purpose learning spaces across tiered balconies. The integration of landscaping throughout the scheme created positive vistas within the site, particularly when viewed from the internal courtyard which was described by the Jury as a 'seductive' viewpoint.

The playful nature of the scheme was continued throughout the ground floor plane with the curved ground floor arches. While these arches create broad and welcoming entries with clear circulation, most of the Portman Street frontage was occupied by service and storage spaces with no activation to the street.

While the scheme was well integrated within the site, the contextual response to the immediate local context and broader Green Square precinct was questioned by the Jury. The Jury raised issues with the internal spatial planning which sited services, utilities and storage along the perimeter of the primary ground floor interfaces with Portman Street and Zetland Avenue. This compromised the civic response of the scheme and created a disconnect with the immediate site context.

The Jury acknowledged there was no preparation of design principles for the vision of the school, which was reflected in the poor execution of the educational requirements of the Brief. The Jury noted the replication of architecture at each level created a sameness to the overall design, and a lack of progression as students moved up through the school.

Figure 5 - Perspectives of the Wilson Architects & Collins and Turner scheme



Picture 9 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)

Source: Wilson Architects & Collins and Turner



Picture 10 View looking south-east (cnr Zetland Ave and Portman Street)

Source: *Wilson Architects & Collins and Turner*

4 JURY RECOMMENDATION

The Jury evaluated the design schemes of the Design Competition for the development of the Green Square Integrated Community Facility and School. Of the five design schemes presented, the BVN scheme was determined to be the most convincing response to the design, planning, and other objectives of the Brief. In the opinion of the Jury, this scheme is the most capable of achieving design excellence.

The Jury selected the BVN scheme as the preferred scheme to progress to the Development Application (DA) phase. Understanding that the scheme will evolve as it is developed, the Jury made the following recommendations:

Recommendation to proceed with the BVN scheme, subject to design development.

1. Design elements strongly supported in the scheme that should be retained in order to achieve Design Excellence:

- The games court was deemed as an integral component of the design and must be maintained in the location proposed.
- The public artwork that is integrated with the games court must be maintained, including on the eastern wall and soffit.
- The relationship between the communal hall and games court is to be retained, especially the benefit of a large, whole of school/community congregational space.
- The scheme is to maintain the high level of activation to all street frontages.
- The transparency and openness of the ground floor. The clear line of sight provided with respect to the east-west through site connection is to be maintained as it contributes to a very permeable ground floor.
- Maintain the visual connections throughout the building – particularly outward views.
- The generosity and clarity of the open space is to be retained alongside the coherent landscape strategy.
- Open circulation and connectivity across and between all floors is critical to the design excellence of the scheme.
- The Jury provide strong support for the fresh and distinctive character of the cladding, including its colour and natural materiality, and request this is retained and further developed with open and closed panels subject to detail material and system selection and sourcing.
- The high degree of flexibility, pattern of light and shade, privacy and thermal benefits of the screen should be maintained.
- Retention of a north, south, east and west connection.
- The Jury strongly support the benefits of the timber structure, particularly the aesthetic, sustainability, health and education benefits.
- The flexibility of the learning areas is supported and is to be retained.
- The location of Multi-purpose Space 2 on the corner of the shared driveway facing the public space is a strong gesture and is to be retained.
- Principles of sustainability to be maintained in achieving the aspirations of the proponent.

2. Satisfactory resolution of the following:

- Levels and security lines, universal access at ground level to be resolved
- Resolution of OSHC and north-south access between 4:30PM and 6:00PM with consideration given to child protection matters.
- Review and resolve the address and entry of multi-purposes space 1A and multi-purposes space 1B – levels and ancillary spaces

- Provision of direct access to amenities for multi-purposes space 1A and multi-purposes Space 1B.
- Further refinement of the Zetland Avenue access to provide visually more direct north-south connections.
- The ground floor administration area is to be replanned to ensure all required functions are co-located.
- Canteen location to be revisited as necessary to support re-planning of the administration area
- Further development and detail with regard to maintenance access between the façade screen and internal glass line wall to be reviewed and resolved to ensure adequate space is provided.
- Exploration of options with regard to the location of the library to the satisfaction of education requirements.
- Resolve issues with respect to columns within multi-purposes spaces and games court to ensure unobstructed spaces are provided.
- Resolution of access to substation.
- Look for opportunities to increase the generosity of vertical circulation.
- Refinements to maximise outdoor play space – It is acknowledged that with the planning constraints on this site that being slightly under the recommended level may be acceptable.
- Toilet numbers and locations are to be reviewed
- Equitable light distribution to all classrooms access throughout school which may involve the relocation of some amenities.
- Resolution of carparking and loading to ensure all functions operate effectively and do not block north south public access
- Effective management of acoustic impacts of the games court for internal school functions.

5 CONCLUSION

This Report provides a summary of the outcomes of the Design Competition for the development of Green Square Integrated Community Facility and School, located at 3 Joynton Avenue, Zetland.

The Competitive Design Process was undertaken in accordance with the Design Competition Brief prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the CoS, SINSW and GANSW on 1 November 2019.

This Architectural Design Competition Report outlines the Competitive Design Process and summaries the Jury's comments and recommendations for the preferred scheme, as follows:

- A Design Competition was undertaken for the redevelopment of 3 Joynton Avenue, Zetland. The relevant provisions of the Sydney LEP 2012, the CoS Competitive Design Policy 2013 and the Draft Government Architects Design Excellence Guidelines have been considered throughout this competition.
- The Competition was undertaken in accordance with clause 6.21 of the Sydney LEP 2012. The submission of this report to the CoS and GANSW satisfies the reporting requirements of Clause 3.5 of the CoS *Competitive Design Policy 2012* and the requirements of the draft GANSW Design Excellence Guidelines.
- The BVN scheme was recommend by the Jury as the winning scheme of this Competitive Design Process. This scheme is to progress to the preparation of a detailed SSD DA for lodgement to the DPIE unless otherwise delegated to the CoS. The scheme was determined to be the most convincing response to the design, planning, and commercial objectives of the Brief.
- Subject to further refinement as outlined in **Section 4**, the winning scheme by BVN is considered capable of achieving design excellence.

The Jury confirms that this report is an accurate record of the Competitive Design Process and endorses the evaluation and recommendations.

6 DISCLAIMER

This report is dated 5 March 2020 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd (**Urbis**) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of SINSW and City of Sydney (**Instructing Party**) for the purpose of Design Competition Report (**Purpose**) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose, and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report, and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.

APPENDIX A

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION BRIEF

