ART GALLERY NSW

Competition Jury selection report

Sydney Modern Project

Executive summary and recommendation

Background

In March 2013 the Art Gallery of New South Wales (Gallery) announced its strategic vision and master plan under the name Sydney Modern. One of its central components is the Sydney Modern Project, a new building and refurbishment of the existing building that will transform the Gallery into a genuine 21st-century art museum.

The new building will connect with the northern facade of the existing building and be constructed over a land bridge that caps major arterial roads and the disused oil tanks to the northeast of the land bridge. The Gallery aims to realise the Sydney Modern Project by the end of 2021 to coincide with the 150th anniversary of its founding.

The NSW Government allocated $10.8 million in 2014/15 for the initial planning phase of the Sydney Modern Project. This enabled the Gallery to run an invited international design competition to select an architect and concept design. The competition concluded in April 2015 and the winner was announced in May 2015.

SANAA was unanimously selected by the Jury as the architect for the Sydney Modern Project.

The Sydney Modern Strategy Committee (SMS), the sub-committee of the Gallery's Board of Trustees with delegated responsibility for delivery of the Sydney Modern Project, adopted a competition model in June 2014 which was subsequently endorsed by the Australian Institute of Architects (AIA) and the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects (AILA).

The design competition process is outlined below:

Pre design competition

Selection of between 40 and 50 architectural practices nationally and internationally to be considered for invitation to participate in Stage 1 of the competition. Selection made by the Architects Advisory Panel (AAP) primarily through desk top evaluation of each practice's experience and capability against established criteria relative to the Sydney Modern Project vision.

Invitation to architects

Selection of up to 12 architectural practices to be invited to participate in the competition based on the long list prepared by the AAP. Selection made by the Competition Jury. The Jury able to add firms to the list.

Design competition Stage 1

Issue of Stage 1 Competition Design Brief (CDB) to up to 12 invited architectural practices. Concept response assessed by the Competition Jury against Stage 1 CDB and agreed evaluation criteria. Submissions judged anonymously. The Competition Jury recommend up to five finalists to participate in Stage 2 of the competition.

Fee paid to each invited practice.

Design competition Stage 2

Issue of Stage 2 CDB to up to 5 shortlisted architectural practices to develop their design submission. Submissions assessed by the Competition Jury against Stage 2 CDB and agreed evaluation criteria to determine the architectural practice able to deliver the best solutions for the project. Mandatory site visit as well as presentation and interview with the Competition Jury required by each shortlisted practice.

Fee paid to each shortlisted practice.

Competition Jury

Background

The Competition Jury comprised seven members with expertise across a range of issues relevant to the project. Jury members are internationally renowned leaders in the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, cultural institution leadership and curatorship.

The Director of the Gallery was the Chair of the Jury. Jury members could not delegate their responsibilities to others. Representatives of the Gallery attended all Jury meetings and prepared meeting minutes as required by the Chair.

Members of the Jury comprised:

- **Dr Michael Brand (Chair)** Director, Art Gallery of New South Wales
- **Ms Kathryn Gustafson** landscape architect with Gustafson Guthrie Nichol (Seattle) and Gustafson Porter (London)
- **Mr Michael Lynch** CBE AM CEO, West Kowloon Cultural District Authority, Hong Kong
- **Professor Toshiko Mori** Robert P Hubbard Professor in the Practice of Architecture, Harvard University Graduate School of Design
- **Professor Glenn Murcutt** AO Sydney-based architect and recipient of the Pritzker Architecture Prize in 2002
- **Professor Juhani Pallasmaa** Helsinki-based architect, professor emeritus and widely published writer
- **Ms Hetti Perkins** Sydney-based member of the Northern Arrernte and Kalkadoon Aboriginal communities and internationally acclaimed curator, filmmaker and author

Jury roles and responsibilities

The core responsibility of members of the Jury was to undertake a detailed evaluation of the Competitors' submissions and their teams and report on the results of the evaluation throughout the competition selection process.

Further to the above, the task of the Jury was to:

- review and endorse the evaluation procedures and assessment guidelines;
- commit sufficient time to carefully read and review all Competitor submissions;
- evaluate the submissions independently in accordance with all relevant assessment criteria;
- identify any clarifications required from the Competitors;
- review responses to clarification questions and technical, architectural and professional competition advisor's analyses;
- summarise the assessment results and recommend the Competitors to be taken forward at each stage of the selection process;
- select up to 12 architects to be invited to participate in Stage 1;
- review the Stage 1 submissions anonymously and shortlist up to 5 architects to be invited to participate in Stage 2;
- produce and sign the Jury selections at the conclusion of each selection stage summarising the assessment and identifying the Competitor the Jury recommends should proceed onto the next stage of the selection process;
- produce and sign the Final Competition Jury Selection Report at the conclusion of Stage 2, summarising the assessment and identifying the successful competitor whom the Jury recommends the SMS Committee should select as the winner of the competition, and make a formal recommendation to the Gallery's SMS Committee.

Sydney Modern Project Secretariat and Technical Advisory Panel

Support to the Jury and AAP was provided by Anne Flanagan, Sally Webster and Penny Sanderson from the Gallery (Sydney Modern Project Secretariat) and Andrew Marsden of O'Connor Marsden (Probity Advisor). Mr Guido Belgiorno-Nettis, President of the Gallery's Board of Trustees, was present as an observer at all Jury meetings.

Professor Richard Johnson acted as Competition Advisor throughout the process.

The Jury also had access to advice from the Technical Advisory Panel comprised of the following disciplines and personnel:

— Chris Arkins
Building Engineer, Steensen Varming

— Sandra Di Bella
Legal, Di Bella Consulting

— Chris Bylett
Quantity Surveyor, Bylett + Associates

— Graeme Dix (Chair)
Architect, Johnson Pilton Walker,

— John Gale
Project Director, Gale Planning Group

— Richard Green
Engineer, Taylor Thomson Whitting

— Michael Harrold
Building Engineer, Steensen Varming

— Clare Swan
Urban Planning, JBA Urban Planning
André Szczepanski
Urban Planning, JBA Urban Planning

— Peter Watts
Heritage, Watts Consulting

Pre design competition

Architects Advisory Panel

The AAP comprised members who in their professional and representative roles could canvas, with appropriate confidentiality, views from a wide range of stakeholder groups.

The Australian Institute of Architects National President acted as Chair of the AAP. Panel members could not delegate their responsibilities to others. Representatives of the Gallery attended all AAP meetings and prepared meeting minutes and action lists as required by the Chair. Others were able to attend AAP meetings at the Chair's discretion.

The Jury could call upon the AAP at any time for advice or comment on the long list, short list or selected submissions. The AAP had no direct interaction with any other parties other than the Competition Jury.

Members of the AAP comprised:

— Paul Berkemeier (Chair) National President AIA (until 28 May 2014 then Immediate Past President)

— Peter Poulet NSW Government Architect

— Graham Jahn Director City Planning, Development and Transport, City of Sydney

— Eleonora Triguboff Trustee Art Gallery of NSW

— Anne Flanagan Deputy Director Art Gallery of NSW

Deliberations of the AAP remained confidential throughout the competition process and following the announcement of the successful architect.

The AAP met on three occasions. Decision-making was by consensus and involved AAP members reviewing works by each architectural practice via the internet that were publicly available to consider.

Stage 1
Invitation to Architects

Jury assessment process

The Jury convened on 8 September 2014 to select up to 12 architectural practices to be invited based on the long list prepared by the AAP to compete
in Stage 1 of the Competition.

Formal Jury meetings were held on 8 and 9 September and September 2014 in the Director's office at the Gallery. Kathryn Gustafson joined the meeting via Skype.

At its meeting on 9 September 2014 the Jury decided on 12 architectural practices to be invited to participate in the Competition.

Stage 1
Assessment process

Submission receipt and opening

Submissions were received by the Gallery up to 5pm on 22 December 2014. All 12 submissions were received prior to the closing time and were transferred unopened to the offices of the Sydney Modern Project Legal Advisors, Herbert Smith Freehills.

The submissions were opened by the Competition Advisor, Richard Johnson, and the Probity Advisor, Andrew Marsden, and checked for compliance with the Stage 1 submission requirements set out in the Competition Brief. Submissions were anonymous to all present in the Jury meeting apart from the Competition Advisor and Probity Advisor.

Following confirmation that all submissions met the requirements, the submissions had the identifying references masked and were displayed anonymously in the secure assessment room at Herbert Smith Freehills.

Jury assessment process

The Jury convened on 5 January 2015 to commence their viewing and assessment of the 12 Stage 1 submissions.

Formal Jury meetings were held on 5 January 2015, 6 January 2015 and 7 January 2015.

At its meeting on 7 January 2015 the Jury decided on a shortlist of five architects for recommendation to the SMS Committee. Following confirmation of this, the names of the shortlisted Competitors were revealed by the Competition Advisor.

Stage 1
Competition Jury findings

Evaluation Criteria

In determining its conclusions and recommendations, the Competition Jury noted all 12 selected Competitors were capable of completing the design and demonstrated potential with their submissions. The Jury assessed each Stage 1 submission against the following broad evaluation criteria included in the Stage 1 CDB (not listed in order of any priority):

- conceptual architectural response to the Gallery's vision and design brief
- creative response to place, landscape and the cultural significance of the site
- innovative response to all aspects of sustainability
- broad functional and operational considerations of the Gallery's vision
- response to the planning framework and heritage considerations
- cost and 'build-ability'

Jury assessment process

The Jury considered the 5 shortlisted submissions (C/D/E/F/J) best met the above criteria. The Jury noted that the Stage 1 CDB did not require a sufficient level of information to enable assessment of the innovative response to all aspects of sustainability and that this would be required in Stage 2.

The Jury also considered the above shortlisted submissions reflected a diversity of approach all with the potential to meet the Stage 1 CDB purpose and aims.

The Jury considered comments for each submission that could be provided as debrief for both shortlisted and non shortlisted Competitors.

Recommendation

The Competition Jury resolved that the architectural practices listed below be invited to participate in Stage 2 of the Sydney Modern Project competition.

Competitor C Kerry Hill Architects

Competitor D Kengo Kuma and Associates

Competitor E Sean Godsell Architects

Competitor F SANAA

Competitor J RMA Architects

Stage 1
Competition Jury findings

Assessment overview of shortlisted submissions (listed alphabetically)

Kerry Hill Architects (submission C)

The Jury made the following comments:

– A well-articulated response to the Gallery's overall vision that echoes the proportion of the Gallery's Vernon wing

– Design is complementary to the Gallery's existing building with landscape well integrated

– Design integrates the Cultural Plaza into the Gallery's footprint and includes a series of diverse public spaces

– Indigenous art gallery is a key element of the visitor's initial experience of the building as well as diverse exhibition spaces

– Diverse quality of internal spaces creates a clear sequence of gallery experiences that contribute to the functionality of the whole complex

– Response to climate articulated through shading to the west

– Multiple entry points from both Art Gallery Road and Lincoln Crescent

– Woolloomooloo entry well resolved, offering an urban solution with an active façade

Kengo Kuma and Associates (submission D)

The Jury made the following comments:

– A potentially iconic design with a bold 21st century form that links to the metaphor of a wave and the curve of the Harbour Bridge

– Original approach responding to the challenges of the site topography

– High visibility from multiple locations around the city

– Layered entry from Art Gallery Road accessed under the Cultural Plaza

– Articulated internal spatial planning

– Detailed plans with thorough functional layout

– Well considered public access to and from Woolloomooloo

– Articulation of Cultural Plaza, located on two levels, well considered and well-modulated

Sean Godsell Architects (submission E)

The Jury made the following comments:

– Conceptual idea offers potential for a well-developed architectural solution

– Plans deliver a strong statement and reaches out to The Domain and the city

– The plans have been spatially well considered

– Elements of the site are well connected with respect to planning and heritage considerations

– Circulation spaces and gallery relationships are clearly delivered on the plans and offer engaging spaces

– Use of water on the western aspect brings another element to the design and an innovative response to climate considerations

– The design is a logical approach responding to existing elements on the site.

– Design conceptually links to the existing building

Stage 1
Competition Jury findings

Assessment overview of shortlisted submissions (listed alphabetically)

SANAA
(submission F)

The Jury made the following comments:

– Concept with multiple floating pavilions and green roofs that contrasts with the existing building with the potential to deliver an original solution for the whole complex

– Design relocates exhibition spaces from the existing building to linking pavilions in the new building

– Pavilions offer different orientations within the site and views and permeability through the site

– Articulated response to sustainability principles

– Considered response to planning considerations with minimal overshadowing

– Potential diversity of exterior landscape spaces

– Potential for green roofs to balance loss of green space

– Attention paid to connectivity to the Royal Botanic Gardens

RMA Architects
(submission J)

The Jury made the following comments:

– Design that respects the existing building and enhances its status as the Gallery's primary building

– Heritage considerations are respected and there is no confusion between the new building and existing building

– Design creates a minimal architecture/ built footprint

– The planning framework has been considered and the design creates minimal overshadowing

– The design is of a quiet scale but still successfully communicates the purpose of the building as an art museum

– There is a creative response to place and landscape as the design drills into the earth, touching the ground to create a strong, enclosed 'sense of place'

– The profile of the site is well maintained

– A strongly defined new link to Woolloomooloo is created

Stage 2
Assessment process

Mandatory site visit

A tour of the competition site and Gallery as well as presentations by Gallery staff and associated consultants was given to all Competitors as one group.

Submission receipt and opening

Submissions were received by the Gallery up to 2pm on 30 March 2015. All 5 submissions were received prior to the closing time.

The submissions were opened by the Competition Advisor, Richard Johnson, and the Probity Advisor, Andrew Marsden, and checked for compliance with the Stage 2 submission requirements set out in the Competition Brief.

Following confirmation that all submissions met the requirements the submissions were displayed in the secure assessment room on the ground floor of the Gallery.

Jury assessment process

The submissions were circulated electronically to the Jury on Monday 30 March 2015.

The Jury convened on 7 April 2015 to commence their viewing and assessment of the 5 Stage 2 submissions. As per clause 5.8 of the Competition Conditions the Jury formed a preliminary decision by evaluating Envelope 1 of each Stage 2 submission without reference to Envelope 2 which related to fees.

Formal Jury meetings were held on 7 April 2015, 8 April and 9 April 2015.

On 8 April 2015 each of the 5 shortlisted architects made a formal presentation to the Jury outlining their design concept and methodology followed by questions and answers. Each session was 1.5 hours.

At its meeting on 9 April 2015 the Jury unanimously agreed on a preferred architect. The Jury then requested Envelope 2 of the preferred architect be opened. The fee submitted by the preferred architect was within the price benchmarks established by the Gallery based on independent advice. The Jury then agreed the preferred architect be recommended to the SMS Committee.

Stage 2
Competition Jury findings

Evaluation Criteria

In determining its conclusions and recommendations, the Jury noted all 5 shortlisted Competitors demonstrated innovative responses to the complex site. The Jury noted the quantum of work each shortlisted Competitor undertook in the development of the design concept and the high quality of the formal presentations. The Jury agreed that all 5 design concepts demonstrated good potential and displayed innovative thinking across a range of areas including relationship to the existing building and connection to the city, Sydney Harbour and urban precinct and all displayed potential to meet the CDB's purpose and aims.

The Jury assessed each Stage 2 submission against the following evaluation criteria included in the Stage 2 CDB (not listed in order of any priority):

- conceptual architectural response to the Gallery's vision and design brief
- creative response to place, landscape and the cultural significance of the site
- innovative response to all aspects of sustainability
- broad functional and operational considerations of the Gallery's vision
- response to the planning framework and heritage considerations
- cost and 'build-ability'
- engagement with the Gallery to develop and deliver the project
- resourcing the project
- proposed personnel and expertise
- understanding of the design brief and required deliverables for the Initial Engagement and subsequent project phases
- program and delivery time frame
- fee budget that appropriately reflects the project scope, budget and complexity

The Jury considered SANAA best met the above criteria.

The Jury considered comments for each design concept. At the conclusion of the competition process and utilising the Jury's commentary the Sydney Modern Secretariat compiled a draft citation for each of the shortlisted schemes. The Jury Chair circulated the citations to each Jury member for comment. Following feedback the citations were finalised.

Stage 2
Competition Jury findings

Assessment overview of shortlisted submissions (listed alphabetically)

Kengo Kuma and Associates

The scheme opens up the competition site by presenting a small built footprint and minimal physical contact between the new and existing buildings. The location of the internal interface between the buildings is innovative and results in clear circulation paths both vertically and horizontally.

The concept provides landscape continuity and view permeability while maximising floor space by elevating exhibition galleries above the Cultural Plaza.

The large space between the new and existing buildings offers expanded opportunities for outdoor activities. The bold elevated northern façade would provide extraordinary views over Sydney Harbour.

The integration of landscape shows sensitivity and an understanding of local native Sydney sandstone and flora. This includes a link between architecture and nature through the materiality of the building facade inspired by the texture of the paperbark tree.

The new entrance to the Gallery is clearly defined within the Cultural Plaza and creates a place of welcome for visitors. The scheme offers well considered internal spaces with a diverse range of art display spaces that are spatially interesting and inviting to the visitor. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander galleries are well located at the commencement of the visitor's journey through the museum with the space defined by a vaulted ceiling in a continuum from the Cultural Plaza.

> We aim at blending of architecture and 'locus' where you find a rich and firm link between the building and the 'place' it stands. To achieve this goal, we use natural materials that are locally available in each 'place', such as stone or wood, and try to retrieve warmth and tenderness to the architecture.
>
> — Kengo Kuma and Associates

Stage 2
Competition Jury findings

Assessment overview of shortlisted submissions (listed alphabetically)

Kerry Hill Architects

The scheme creates a 'new terrain' which engages with its urban and landscape context on all sides. The link with the Woolloomooloo Gate entrance to the Royal Botanic Gardens is strong, as is the location of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander galleries at this point.

The scheme delivers a well-rounded response to the brief and the complexities of the site and creates a single integrated art museum. The response is inspired by what the architects describe as the 'layered geometrics' found in the strata of the site. The scheme has a generous range of outdoor spaces that accommodate a variety of uses and are well integrated with indoor spaces.

The use of water, landscaped spaces and opportunities for engagement with multiple art forms and major events creates a welcoming arrival point. The visitor journey through the urban link from Woolloomooloo to the city provides opportunities for engagement with art with exciting views into the building.

The material palette the architects express for the new building explores the use of new building materials and indicates an innovative response that would help achieve a reduction in the Gallery's carbon footprint. The planting of Angophora Costata trees by the Art Gallery Road façade adds a strong sense of local landscape to the scheme.

> The concept for Sydney Modern is motivated by the idea of engagement – a building that engages in multiple ways with its physical and cultural context to create a stage for diverse encounters with art.
>
> — Kerry Hill Architects

Stage 2
Competition Jury findings

Assessment overview of shortlisted submissions (listed alphabetically)

Rahul Mehrotra Architects

The scheme is conceived to take advantage of the natural landform of the site by embedding the new building in the landscape. This formal modesty allows the design concept to articulate a striking relationship between the exisitng and new buildings with most of the new spaces placed underground.

The scheme is porous and facilitates movement from the Royal Botanic Gardens and The Domain through the Gallery with a strong series of stepped terraces and ramps that reach down the site into Woolloomooloo.

The central concept of a 'void' connecting to both sky and earth is a powerful idea and the suggested creative programming would offer interesting ways of interpreting an art museum and its collection. Spaces created through the setting of a circular void in a rectilinear plan would provide unique spaces for curatorial creativity within the art museum context. The galleries for both contemporary art and temporary exhibitions are beautifully articulated spaces.

Through its deep commitment to the site and its potential for innovative programming the rigorously argued scheme presents a number of interesting ideas that address the concept of a 21st-century art museum.

> The building is an armature for Art.
>
> A Gallery should not be a singular image and overpower the artefacts; rather the site allows a plural dispensation of architectural strategies and form (or non-form, or earth-building).
>
> — Rahul Mehrotra Architects

Stage 2
Competition Jury findings

Assessment overview of shortlisted submissions (listed alphabetically)

SANAA

The scheme responds to the beauty of the competition site through a series of pavilions that reach out to The Domain and the Royal Botanic Gardens as they cascade down to Sydney Harbour and Woolloomooloo. The low profile of the pavilions complements and preserves both the integrity and importance of the existing Gallery building and creates spaces to bring people together and foster a sense of community, imagination and openness.

Its lightness of form speaks to the new century while respecting the architecture of the previous centuries to create a harmonious and inspiring new public space for Sydney. The scheme is futurist in its thinking about art museums and the visitor experience, and will be transformative for the Gallery. The scheme elegantly places Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander art at its heart.

This is a 21st century concept that has the full potential when developed to be an environmentally sensitive art museum. The scheme starts to deconstruct the classical art museum and offers opportunity for further development of new types of spaces for the display of a variety of art forms, both existing and new.

The design offers what the architects describe as ‘a clean palette’ for displaying art and staging cultural events. The scheme will invite artists to experiment and provide a curatorial challenge for the Gallery which would be profoundly invigorating for an institution transforming itself into a 21st century art museum.

> The concept for the site is transition. The transition from man-made Botanic Gardens and Domain to the wild and natural sandstone escarpment of Woolloomooloo Bay.... The new wing of the Gallery sits lightly on the land to preserve the landscape and special atmosphere of the existing place. The new building is a low calm building that steps and shifts gently along the natural contours to form a plaza between the existing and new galleries.
>
> — SANAA

Stage 2
Competition Jury findings

Assessment overview of shortlisted submissions (listed alphabetically)

Sean Godsell Architects

The scheme presents a boldly geometric concept that demonstrates potential to deliver an exciting new building for Sydney that aspires to the notion of a participatory museum.

The incorporation of water in the Cultural Plaza is well conceived and allows the existing entrance to be transformed to a bridged entrance for special occasions or to be blocked off in an intriguing manner. The design concept is innovative and includes a two-storey glass and steel building set atop the land bridge along with a number of other pavilions under a huge rectangular 'bio skin.' A further four levels of new space—both front and back of house—are located on the north side of the expressway and connect to Woolloomooloo. The design footprint of the new building occupies a significant proportion of the site but does include shaded outdoor spaces under the 'bio skin'.

A key part the concept, the 'bio skin' would utilise sun and rain to maximise the building's environmental performance. Further information on the technical detail of this element would be required as to the possibility of the intended outcomes being achievable. The scheme creates additional spaces to those included in the design brief. The vertical 'needle' as an orienting component of the design is an exciting one that would increase the visibility of the institution within the city of Sydney.

> Our concept for Sydney Modern at the AGNSW is to make a timeless environment for contemporary art that creates a uniquely Australian sense of place in a landscape that supports all forms of art and that encourages the easy congregation and flow of visitors – one museum that can speak to the world with a discernibly Australian accent as it addresses the issues of 21st century museum design.
>
> — Sean Godsell Architects

Competition Jury recommendation

Recommendation

The Competition Jury resolved unanimously that SANAA be recommended to the SMS Committee as the preferred architect for the Sydney Modern Project competition.

Competition Jury Design Integrity Assessment

Addendum to Competition Jury Selection Report

Introduction

This Design Integrity Assessment (DIA) has been prepared as an addendum to the Competition Jury Selection Report for the Art Gallery of NSW Expansion – Sydney Modern Project. The DIA is required in response to the need to amend the design of the Sydney Modern Project due to confirmation of the funding commitment for the project from the NSW Government and stakeholder feedback. The objective of this DIA is to demonstrate the proposed design is substantially the same and retains the design excellence exhibited in the design selected as the winning scheme in the international design competition.

A two-stage international design competition was held for the Sydney Modern Project from September 2014 to April 2015. The Competition was overseen by a 7-member Jury comprising internationally renowned architects, landscape architects and art administrators. The Chair of the Jury was Dr Michael Brand Director Art Gallery of NSW.

A Competition Jury Selection Report was prepared noting the process and decision of the Jury on the design competition.

International architects from Japan, SANAA, were nominated as the preferred Design Architect, supported by Architectus as Executive Architect. SANAA and Architectus were appointed as Architects for the Project in July 2015.

The competition winning design was developed by SANAA during 2015/16 aligned to the project budget (A$450M Dec 2014 $) stated in the Competition Brief to a detail required for a development application.

This development application was not submitted to government.

In June 2017, the NSW Government announced funding of $244M for the Project. As a consequence of the reduced funding envelope, and based on feedback the Gallery received during stakeholder consultation the architectural scheme was revised. A revised design brief, closely aligned to the competition brief, was developed to reflect the reduced scope.

Proposed changes to architectural scheme

Through evolution of the competition winning design, the new building designed by SANAA, is now a stand-alone structure. The connection between the new and existing building is now realised through an art garden over the land bridge. The distribution of building volumes (pavilions) following the topography of the site as articulated in the competition scheme is retained. As with the competition scheme the new building remains no higher than the cornice of the Vernon façade of the existing building.

A desire for greater retention of public open space was raised during consultation and through the design process the footprint of the pavilions has reduced resulting in a substantial reduction in built form on the land bridge and a greater amount of public open space retained. This area remains publicly accessible 24/7.

The new building retains a ratio of 40% gallery space consistent with the competition scheme and the amount of gallery space in the existing building.

Following public consultation and budgetary constraints the evolved design no longer includes dedicated function areas. Commercial activity in the new building is now provision of food and beverage services and retail.

Purpose

Given the evolution of the design following confirmation of the Project budget and public consultation, the Competition Jury was required to be consulted and a DIA prepared under the requirements of the Department of Planning and Environment's '*Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines*' and the City of Sydney's '*Competitive Design Policy*'. The DIA is to certify that the design is substantially the same and retains the design excellence exhibited in the design competition submission, and remains aligned to the Competition Jury findings as stated in the Competition Jury Selection Report.

Process

The requirement for reconvening the Jury and approach for preparing the DIA for the Project was discussed with the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) in early 2017.

Jury members, roles and responsibilities are detailed in the Competition Jury Selection Report and these apply to the DIA. The additional process requirements for the DIA are set out below.

For the purposes of the DIA, Jury members were approached by email by the Chair of the Jury Dr Michael Brand on 28 August 2017 to inform them of the DIA process and request their Jury services.

Following the email the Chair then individually briefed in person 5 of the 7 Jury members on the evolved design. The Chair had individually updated the other 2 Jury members on how the design was evolving prior to the 28 August 2017.

On 6 October 2017 Jury members were sent via drop box:

- SANAA's competition entry (extract April 2015)
- Competition Jury Selection Report (April 2015)
- Revised Design Brief (December 2016)
- Current design prepared for submission of development application (October 2017)

The Competition Jury Design Integrity Assessment Addendum to the Competition Jury Selection Report (for comment/signature) was also circulated.

The proposed architectural drawings sent to the Competition Jury were prepared to a detail ready for Development Application lodgement.

The Competition Jury members were asked to respond by 13 October 2017 by return email in relation to the following matters:

- verify the proposed plans are substantially the same and exhibit design excellence of the design competition scheme; AND

Competition Jury Design Integrity Assessment

Addendum to Competition Jury Selection Report

— confirm the Competition Jury's citation of the SANAA scheme in the Competition Jury Report applies to the new scheme, or to advise of changes to the citation; OR

— if it is found the proposed design is not substantially the same and does not exhibit design excellence of the design competition scheme, the Competition Jury is to advise of any changes to the proposed architectural scheme to ensure it better exhibits design excellence of the design competition scheme or to generally improve the design that would not be inconsistent with the design competition scheme.

The Technical Advisory Panel and the Architects Advisory Panel were not reconvened for the Sydney Modern DIA.

Findings

The Competition Jury found the proposed design to be substantially the same and retains the design excellence exhibited in the design competition scheme, for the following key reasons outlined below, in response to the Jury citation of SANAA's submission in the Competition Jury Selection Report:

1. 'The scheme responds to the beauty of the competition site through a series of pavilions that reach out to The Domain and the Royal Botanic Gardens as they cascade down to Sydney Harbour and Woolloomooloo.'

Response: The new scheme maintains a series of pavilions that follow the topography from the Botanic Garden and Domain to the harbour and Woolloomooloo.

2. 'The low profile of the pavilions complements and preserves both the integrity and importance of the existing Gallery building and creates spaces to bring people together and foster a sense of community, imagination and openness.'

Response: The new scheme maintains low pavilions that relate well to and uphold the importance of the existing Gallery building. New internal and external spaces will be created that foster a sense of community, imagination and openness, for example, the Entry Plaza, and the art garden.

3. 'Its lightness of form speaks to the new century while respecting the architecture of the previous centuries to create a harmonious and inspiring new public space for Sydney.'

Response: The lightness of building form is maintained, acting as an effective counterpoint to the existing Gallery building.

4. 'The scheme is futurist in its thinking about art museums and the visitor experience, and will be transformative for the Gallery.'

Response: The new scheme allows for multitude of indoor and outdoor spaces with flexibility to accommodate a wide range of existing and emerging art forms and visitor experiences.

5. 'The scheme elegantly places Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander art at its heart.'

Response: The scheme features the gallery for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander art prominently at its centre.

6. 'This is a 21st century concept that has the full potential when developed to be an environmentally sensitive art museum.'

Response: The environmental credentials of the new scheme will be maintained.

7. 'The scheme starts to deconstruct the classical art museum and offers opportunity for further development of new types of spaces for the display of a variety of art forms, both existing and new.'

Response: Refer to response to item 4 above.

8. 'The design offers what the architects describe as 'a clean palette' for displaying art and staging cultural events.'

Response: The new scheme provides a clean palette for displaying art and staging cultural events through large and flexible indoor and outdoor spaces and a restrained, elegant and considered architectural style that will not take away from the art and cultural performances.

9. 'The scheme will invite artists to experiment and provide a curatorial challenge for the Gallery which would be profoundly invigorating for an institution transforming itself into a 21st century art museum.'

Response: The new scheme provides for spaces for artist experimentation and positive curatorial challenges.

The Competition Jury made no recommendations for changes to the design or for future design integrity processes.

Determination

The Competition Jury convened for the Sydney Modern Project certified the proposed design is substantially the same and retains the design excellence exhibited in the design competition scheme.

The Competition Jury also certified the citation on SANAA's submission in the Competition Jury Selection Report applies to the proposed new design.

The Competition Jury resolved unanimously of this determination.