



## Health Precinct Stage 1

### DESIGN EXCELLENCE REVIEW PANEL

Update to Support State Significant Development Application

July 2017

Campus Infrastructure & Services

<b><u>1.0</u></b>	<b><u>DESIGN EXCELLENCE REVIEW PANEL ENDORSEMENT</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>
<b><u>2.0</u></b>	<b><u>DESIGN EXCELLENCE REVIEW PROCESS</u></b>	<b><u>4</u></b>
<b><u>3.0</u></b>	<b><u>PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT</u></b>	<b><u>4</u></b>
<b><u>4.0</u></b>	<b><u>DESIGN COMPETITION JURY DESIGN EXCELLENCE ISSUES</u></b>	<b><u>5</u></b>
<b><u>5.0</u></b>	<b><u>DERP COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS</u></b>	<b><u>7</u></b>
	<b><u>APPENDIX A: DESIGN COMPETITION JURY REPORT</u></b>	<b><u>9</u></b>

## 1.0 DESIGN EXCELLENCE REVIEW PANEL ENDORSEMENT

DCJ Member

Kim Crestani

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature / /  
Date

DCJ Member

Michael Tawa

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature / /  
Date

DCJ Member

Sean Carter

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature / /  
Date

DCJ Member

Jesse McNicoll

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature / /  
Date

## 2.0 DESIGN EXCELLENCE REVIEW PROCESS

Laing O'Rourke's design team of Billard Leece Partnership and Diller Scofidio and Renfro were the successful proponent in the Design Competition process for the Health Precinct Stage 1 building. Refer to the Design Competition Jury Assessment Report dated 19 April 2017 appended to this report. CIS has retained the design competition jury members to continue their design excellence review role throughout the Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) phase of the project. The ECI phase comprises the following activities:

1. Development of design to address design excellence issues identified by the Design Competition Jury (DCJ) and preparation of an SSDA submission
2. User consultation and design refinement in response to user feedback
3. Design development and submission of a design and lump sum price for delivery of the Health Precinct Stage 1 building and related works.

This report summarises outcomes of the review process at the conclusion of design development to address the DCJ design excellence issues enabling preparation of an SSDA submission as per item 1 above.

The Design Excellence Review Panel (DERP) membership includes the Design Competition Jury members as listed below:

- Jesse McNicoll (JMcN), The City of Sydney Representative
- Shaun Carter (SC), Office of the Government Architect Representative
- Kim Crestani (KC), The University of Sydney Representative
- Michael Tawa (MT), The University of Sydney Representative

The DERP are supported by the following Advisors

- Juliette Churchill, CIS Planning Manager
- Jenny Watt, Health Precinct Design Manager
- Andrej Stevanovic, Precinct 4 Delivery Manager
- Joe Romeo, Project Director

The DERP members have met on three occasions with the design team since completion of the design competition process. At each review they have provided feedback on design excellence progress of developing design.

## 3.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This report outlines the process undertaken by CIS to ensure that the successful design competition scheme was further developed to address the design excellence issues identified by the Design Competition Jury prior to submission of the SSDA application.

## 4.0 DESIGN COMPETITION JURY DESIGN EXCELLENCE ISSUES

The Design Competition Jury Assessment Report identified 11 specific areas of the design that required refinement in order to achieve design excellence. Following the third DERP review session, jury members confirmed that the design had been refined to address these issues and was of a design excellence standard suitable for an SSDA submission. The issues and response are included in the table below:

Ref	DCJ design excellence issue	Design refinement
1	Pedestrian flow studies would be useful to measure pedestrian use in peak periods to test for congestion	Flows were analysed and design modified to increase circulation corridors and stair widths
2	<p>Landscape solution should be reviewed in relation to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider a reductive approach to some of the elements eg water features</li> <li>• Review disposition of building elements below the main entry to enable soil depths that facilitate tree planting. Consider retention or relocation of the existing fig tree</li> <li>• Reconsider overland flow strategy and drainage edges</li> </ul>	<p>Landscape scheme has been significantly refined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water feature has been simplified with areas of water flow replaced with misters</li> <li>• Opportunities for deep soil planting and large trees at the entry have been significantly increased. Arborist advice in relation to the fig has confirmed that general condition including tree roots does not warrant retention.</li> <li>• Overland flow has been satisfactorily addressed with a clear strategy of capture, storage and release that utilises underground zones created by the demolition of the Blackburn building with inlets and outlets integrated with landscape areas.</li> </ul>
3	Improve campus connections to Charles Perkins and RPA	The northern entry to Charles Perkins has been significantly amended including indented and aligned with the cleave over and introduction of a canopy aligning with stair RPA entry has been better integrated with external landscaping, the stair void enlarged and internal planning adjusted to improve connections
4	Explore lowering the Upper Waikil Garden by 1 level to facilitate the	Further analysis of stage 2 and 3 connections and integration with stage

	<p>following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improve connectivity between university and hospital</li> <li>• reduce podium extent</li> <li>• Reduce the length of the stair journey from Western Ave</li> </ul>	<p>1 identified that the garden level was appropriate RPA bridge connection between the Upper Waikil Garden level and hospital entry level was facilitated by the proposed alignment and CIS confirmed that the connection was more likely in Stage 2 of the HP development Further analysis of the podium extent with addition of stages 2 and 3 identified that there was significant opportunity for external connection and light into the expanded floor plate</p>
5	<p>Improve north and west entries and north building elevation to improve relationship to the ground plane</p>	<p>Refer response to 3 above The north elevation has been significantly refined including ground plane interfaces</p>
6	<p>Improve corridor widths in deeper plan areas and explore opportunities for view / light &amp; outlook along the journey through the use of voids, top lighting, windows and activated edges</p>	<p>The podium planning has been modified to improve circulation to be more direct, more generous in dimension and with increased natural light with the introduction of a series of voids and light shafts.</p>
7	<p>Review relative position of teaching spaces to ensure amenity is maximised appropriately</p>	<p>Planning has been adjusted to ensure that teaching spaces have generous student access zones and natural lighting when appropriate.</p>
8	<p>The Upper Wakil Garden should have an easy and open connection to the university &amp; RPA as well as the edges of the building to maximize possible use</p>	<p>Planning has been adjusted to provide activated edges to the garden. Further development of stages 2 and 3 has demonstrated excellent connection to the Upper Wakil Garden</p>
9	<p>Improve the massing, articulation and expression with consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redesign the podium of the Upper Wakil Garden to be a more integrated part of the stage 1 building</li> <li>• Review the north elevation massing to better communicate the dynamism of the overall concept</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The external form and façade treatment has been developed and refined to reinforce the expression of a solid podium, with a lightweight top and a clear transparent layer between. In particular the horizontal sun shade expression of the base contrasts with the glass lighter curtain wall of the building top. The DERP were satisfied that the geometric folded</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconsider the podium façade L0-L2 be more fundamentally different to the upper façade – a more solid expression</li> <li>• Provide a significant horizontal break in the western facade between the podium and the top</li> </ul>	<p>shapes of the upper façade sun shading were rational and much improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The façade treatments on the west and south were developed to provide an appropriate transition from the east and north with a consistent expression of base, middle top.</li> </ul>
10	The screen devices to be refined and rationalised to address the different orientation conditions and access for cleaning and maintenance and bird and insect infestation	The DERP were satisfied that the geometric folded shapes of the upper façade sun shading had been appropriately rationalised and were much improved.
11	Wingara Mura strategies require further development and building integration	A range of building integrated Wingara Mura opportunities identified . The University is in the process of developing a Campus wide Wingara Mura strategy with particular themes in each of the Precincts. The health precinct themes are to be communicated to the design team when available to enable a specific building response to be developed.

## 5.0 DERP COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Further to the above summary, the DERP, at a meeting held on 30 June, confirmed that the design had progressed satisfactorily to enable an SSDA application to be submitted to the Department and the team were commended on their responsive attitude and the quality of the resulting design solution.

Specific comments from that meeting are listed below:

1. The northern entry revised treatment including indent aligned with cleave over and canopy aligning with stair was supported
2. Interstitial glazing treatment was supported with significant discussion around glass selection and glare treatment in work areas to ensure heat load was minimised and workplace was comfortable. Design team confirmed that the JV3 model development now being progressed would dictate glazing types that were expected to be high performance generally. Further detail can be reviewed at a later date

3. Upper level shading device development and rationalisation, including preference for Option B was supported. Resolution at the cleave requires more work
4. South façade treatment generally supported but recommended that detail elements such as slab edge and mullion details be carried through to this face
5. Planning and stair placement rationalisation supported – DERP members considered the latest scheme a significant improvement
6. Landscape scheme update was generally supported with recommendation to soften treatment towards the oval
7. Suggestion to create generous areas of grass for students to sit
8. Slide 64 - consider rationalising pathways towards Western Ave
9. Recommended simplifying landscape in the area of the northern entry
10. Wingara Mura strategy subject to UoS inputs

The above matters will be considered at the next DERP review session to be held in late July. DERP meetings are scheduled monthly until conclusion of the ECI phase.

## APPENDIX A: DESIGN COMPETITION JURY REPORT



## Health Precinct Stage 1

### DESIGN COMPETITION JURY REPORT

Campus Infrastructure & Services

<b>1.0</b>	<b>DESIGN COMPETITION JURY ENDORSEMENT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>COMPETITION PROCESS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>JURY COMMENTS</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>RICHARD CROOKES / IAN MOORE / RICE DAUBNEY HDR</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>LEND LEASE / SNOHETTA/ WOODS BAGOT</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>LAING O’ROURKE / DS&amp;R / BILLARD LEESE</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>AREAS TO BE ADDRESSED TO ACHIEVE DESIGN EXCELLENCE</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>RICHARD CROOKES / IAN MOORE / RICE DAUBNEY HDR</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>LEND LEASE / SNOHETTA / WOODS BAGOT</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>LAING O’ROURKE / BILLARD LEECE PARTNERSHIP + DSR</b>	<b>46</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A: DESIGN COMPETITION BRIEF</b>	<b>48</b>
	<b>APPENDIX B: RESPONSE TO INTERIM PRESENTATION NO 1</b>	<b>49</b>
	<b>APPENDIX C: RESPONSE TO INTERIM PRESENTATION NO 2</b>	<b>50</b>
	<b>APPENDIX D: DESIGN COMPETITION JURY INDIVIDUAL MEMBER RESPONSES</b>	<b>51</b>

### 1.0 DESIGN COMPETITION JURY ENDORSEMENT

DCJ Member

Kim Crestani

*Kim Crestani*

12 / 05 / 2017

DCJ Member

Michael Tawa

*Michael Tawa*

12/05/2017

DCJ Member

Sean Carter

*Sean Carter*

12 / 05 / 2017

DCJ Member

Jesse McNicoll

*Jesse McNicoll*

12 / 05 / 2017

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The jury was equally divided with two members placing the Laing O'Rourke scheme ahead of the Richard Crookes scheme in relation to design excellence and the other two members placing the Richard Crookes scheme ahead of Laing O'Rourke. In both cases the preferred schemes require modifications to achieve design excellence, and it is considered that these changes are achievable within the framework of the respective schemes.

The Lend Lease scheme was unanimously considered the lowest ranked in relation to design excellence and jury members had differing views as to its ability to retain its design integrity given the extent of modification considered necessary to achieve design excellence. The concerns were centred around the master plan proposal's lack of clarity for the stage 1 building and the quality of the façade design.

## 3.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This report has the following primary functions:

- To summarise the design jury feedback from the design competition process iterative workshops and presentations.
- To identify the pathway to design excellence for each design submission considered to have design excellence potential by the Design Competition Jury
- To support, advise and assist the Tender Evaluation Committee.

## 4.0 COMPETITION PROCESS

**Refer to Appendix A for the Design Competition Brief**

The Design Competition Jury (DCJ) voting members included the following:

1. **Jesse McNicoll** (JMcN), The City of Sydney Representative
2. **Shaun Carter** (SC), Office of the Government Architect Representative
3. **Kim Crestani** (KC), The University of Sydney Representative
4. **Michael Tawa** (MT), The University of Sydney Representative

The DCJ were supported by the following Technical Advisors

1. Juliette Churchill, CIS Planning Manager
2. Jenny Watt, Health Precinct Design Manager
3. Andrej Stevanovic, Precinct 4 Delivery Manager
4. Tim Pike, Project Director
5. Kevin Cheslett, Cost Manager

The following three design and construction consortia participated in the Health Precinct Stage 1 design competition:

- Woods Bagot + Snohetta in association with Lend Lease.
- HDR Rice Daubney + Ian Moore Architects in association with Richard Crookes Constructions.
- Billard Leece Partnership + DSR in association with Laing O'Rourke.

The Design Competition Jury process programme is provided below:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Description</b>
15 November 2016	Competition commencement	Request for Tender documentation issued to the three teams inclusive of PPR
14 December 2016	Interim presentation 1	Each of the three groups were given 60 minutes to present their master plan

		<p>approaches and respond to questions – Refer Appendix B for comments issued to proponents</p> <p>As the design jury was not available at that time CIS provided a written response with specific areas of concern to be addressed by each proponent. issued to each group. <b>Refer Appendix B</b></p>
13 February 2017	Interim presentation 2	<p>Each of the three groups were given 60 minutes to present their initial design proposals and respond to questions. Refer Appendix C for comments issued to proponents</p> <p>The design jury provided a written response with specific areas of concern to be addressed by each proponent. issued to each group. <b>Refer Appendix C</b></p>
10 March 2017	Final submission	Each of the three groups submitted their proposal in accordance with RFT requirements
20 March 2017	Final presentations	Each of the three groups were allocated 90 minutes to present their proposals and respond to jury questions.
20 March 2017	Post submission jury assessment meeting No 1	Initial review and discussion
28 March 2017	Post submission jury assessment meeting No 2	Preliminary advice and discussion
3 April 2017	Draft jury report issued	CIS provided a draft document including all juror comments received up to that time.
4 April 2017	Post submission jury assessment meeting No 3	

The competitive design process aligns with the *Department of Planning’s Director General’s Design Excellence Guidelines* including the creation of an independent Design Competition Jury agreed by the University and the Consent Authority to critique and assess the Design Responses.

The three architectural practices were formally invited to participate in a 16-week design competition to develop their responses to the PPR. Invited architects were required to provide responses developed to a standard that could be assessed by the Design Competition Jury to select a preferred scheme.

Evaluation criteria for the Design Responses included the following:

- Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation
- Local and wider campus integration
- Access and circulation internally and externally
- Functional relationships and internal planning
- Internal spatial quality
- Façade design and maintenance regime
- Servicing strategy, operational efficiency
- Building services strategy
- Environmental impacts
- Ecologically Sustainable Design
- Protection of view corridors
- Efficiency
- Flexibility
- Innovation
- Value for money
- Other matters considered relevant by the DCJ

The three submissions are also assessed in relation to the University's over-arching project requirements and internal procurement guidelines. These "non-design" criteria represent critical success factors for the University and are assessed separately from the design responses by the Tender Evaluation Committee (TEC). The non-design components of the Consortia's submission is further split into two components - price and non-price criteria.

The assessment of the Price criteria includes evaluation of:

- Value for money
- Construction price
- Design and construction program
- Risk management

The assessment of the non-price criteria will include evaluation of:

- Efficiency
- Flexibility
- Innovation
- Staging and delivery strategy
- Construction methodology
- Design and construction program
- User consultation and stakeholder management
- Team and relevant experience
- Interfaces and impacts on RPAH and other neighbours
- Risk management

## 5.0 JURY COMMENTS

### 5.1 RICHARD CROOKES / IAN MOORE / RICE DAUBNEY HDR

Refer below table for jury member comments for the Richard Crookes team in relation to terms of reference criteria and other relevant matters raised by the jury during the design review process. **Refer Appendix D** for Design Jury Individual Member Assessments

<b>Richard Crookes/Ian Moore/Rice Daubney HDR</b>		
<b>Terms of Reference Criteria</b>	<b>Positive Attributes</b>	<b>Concerns to be addressed in order to achieve design excellence</b>
<b>1.0 Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation</b>	<p>Proposal is for a very functional rectangular Stage 1 built form with deep floor plates set around an atria space. The Proposal for Stages 2 and 3 are rational and displaced - producing elongated rectangular forms that could be delivered relatively easily.</p> <p>Persuasive as a diagram</p> <p>The team appear to have achieved the brief area requirements.</p>	<p>The building in stage 1 is larger at the upper levels and reduced/smaller at the lower levels. Whilst this may be a result of fitting in with and maximising the CIP envelope it is a rather odd solution because the vertical circulation for students requires use of lifts to access Sim labs on level 5 and the Super labs on Level 6.</p> <p>The University team advised that they don't believe program organization sits at the right levels and will cause traffic flow issues.</p> <p>The DCJ requested at an earlier presentation for the team to address this issue and in particular, the level of service (Fruin) for crush periods. This was not addressed nor submitted at final presentation stage.</p> <p>It is also considered that the displacement of Stages 2 and 3 with a separation distance of some 10 metres may be better as one building.</p>
<b>2.0 Local and wider campus integration</b>	<p>Excellent public domain strategy to the east ground plane. Good linkages in all directions. Good connection to RPA. Look to better resolve bridges, and decide if the north bridge to Charles Perkins is in the stage 1 scheme or not. If not, loose the pedestrian bridge and consider pedestrian flows to entry</p> <p>Volumetrically convincing in terms of scale and articulation;</p>	<p>The proposal relies on a huge under croft space which is simply elevating the building above the ground plane in a rather heroic way. The tree columns are symbolic of the setting however the under croft space is simply dedicated to a loading dock and access.</p> <p>Lower level below entry remains undeveloped and unconvincing</p>

	<p>successfully edging campus development and framing the open space to the north.</p> <p>Views between University &amp; hospital provide a catalyst for stronger connection and integration between institutions. The stage 2 pathway between stages 1 &amp; 2 connect at logical points and pathways.</p> <p>The Eastern entry looks like it will connect well to the university. Keeping some of the existing trees provide for a settled and integrated landscape setting for the new building.</p>	<p>Be careful not to lose the grandstand integration and connection with the building and the university. If rigorously worked through this could be enhanced for a better landscape setting whilst achieving the functionality desired.</p>
<p><b>3.0 Interface with public realm</b></p>	<p>The landscape proposal is well founded and superior in that it retains existing trees and provides a sensitive solution to the site and entrance.</p> <p>Well considered, with a suitable sense of occasion for the arrival sequence from the east.</p> <p>Elegant and refined architectural composition, well scaled to the public domain and well proportioned as a volumetric assembly. Good variation of mass/frame/screen components. Readily responsive to climate.</p> <p>The architecture suggests good public realm connections, which should be developed further to achieve excellent public realm connection.</p> <p>The retention of the existing fig tree allows for a settled public realm landscape setting at the entry</p> <p>Expanded landscape at the entry and to the north is a scheme highlight. Develop all connections to function well to support the excellent landscape setting.</p> <p>Either include or delete the north pedestrian bridge to Charles Perkins and continue reinforce the importance of the north entry</p>	<p>The entrance is detached from the main car drop off on Western avenue and relies on a ramp entrance system that is very formal.</p> <p>The edges of the building not always well programmed to populate and nourish the public domain</p> <p>Bridges and undercroft spaces the main obstacle for design excellence in connection between building and public realm.</p> <p>Locating the building on the old creek bed has significant challenges and while bridges seem like an obvious solution they come with inherent problems. A suggestion could be wider bridges so as to act more like a podium.</p> <p>Some concern as to the suitability of the building's aesthetics and rigorous planning diagram for the disciplines that will populate it and the pedagogies it normally deploys.</p> <p>Develop a master plan strategy to allow Stage 2 building(s) direct ground level connection to the landscaped courtyard</p> <p>Increase the landscape design elements that express the “dry creek bed”</p>

	door.	
<p><b>4.0 Access and Circulation internally and externally</b></p>	<p>The atrium space is rational</p> <p>Entry for east, north and west are a strong point of this design. Work these harder for an excellent design outcome.</p> <p>Long life loose fit plans/ floors should support easy and logical circulation paths for the user.</p> <p>The diagram and resolved architecture has the potential to be the most legible building.</p>	<p>Whilst rational the atrium space offers no joy in its presentation and it would be necessary, should this scheme proceed to ensure a higher quality of atria space is provided. Whilst atria spaces are becoming more the norm in office buildings this proposal suffers from an unfriendly presentation that would require a higher level of design and acoustic and visual considerations if this proposal were to be considered.</p> <p>Entry suffers from ambiguity in the legibility of circulation systems. Concerns as to adequacy of lift provision for vertical circulation to the most populated areas on upper floors; particularly at changeover times on the hour.</p> <p>Paucity of stairs for active circulation by users.</p> <p>North Glazed lifts seem in a poor location. Other central lift location supports a more rational circulation path.</p> <p>North glazed lifts may not pass Section J / heat load comfort levels without significant mechanical or architectural intervention. Compliance would potentially change the appearance and they could lose their diagrammed appearance.</p> <p>Centralising circulation around/ near the transparency of the atrium void supports the logical understanding of the building for the user. Centralised stairs should follow the centralized lifts, however these may have scope to be more playful, as the varying circulation paths on each level suggests.</p> <p>Program organization on levels may need to change to facilitate student movement through the building. This issue is critical in understanding the client and thus achieving design Excellence</p>
<p><b>5.0 Functional relationships and internal</b></p>	<p>The East-West Bar diagram with strong north-south link through the site is a clear strategy to connect to the 3 major entry points to the building [East, North &amp; West] and allows for the significant</p>	<p>The clarity of the circulation diagram, is not as clear or rational as the architectural diagram. The relationship of the lifts and convoluted circulation is considered illogical and way finding is sub optimal. The DCJ</p>

<p><b>planning</b></p>	<p>stormwater flows south to north.</p> <p>Long thin buildings serviced by external façade or atrium provide the best chance for good amenity for the life of the building. The circulation around the atrium varies from level to level providing a variation against an otherwise strong rational planning framework. However, this would be more manageable with centralized lifts &amp; stairs</p> <p>The atrium is the great gift of this design to the building. Make sure it is used, expressed and realized for maximum benefit/ potential – Design Excellence</p>	<p>also requested that consideration be given to the relocation of the vertical transport however consideration of this was dismissed by the team.</p> <p>Modify vertical circulation to ensure that peak student movements can be accommodated (this may require consolidation of lifts as a single core, possibly adjacent to the atrium, or relocating teaching spaces with highest occupancy to lowest levels)</p> <p>Programming and disposition of uses remains problematic. Internal planning too dominated and constrained by the atrium void. Insufficient use is made of potential porosity in the section to counter the rigid, diagrammatic nature of the section, and of the spatial experience by users</p> <p>The traffic circulation and under croft area should be reviewed and changed. This level perhaps should be viewed as more podium level, than a continuation of the bar building elements.</p> <p>Program distribution may not be ideally located on levels. Especially upper levels.</p>
<p><b>6.0 Internal spatial quality</b></p>	<p>The atrium is a good device on large floorplate buildings</p> <p>Successful in the entry sequence and at the circulation lift node on the north.</p> <p>North facing long axis buildings should easily support good internal spatial qualities. Care needs to be taken they don't over heat or cause too much glare at the edges.</p> <p>The atrium: The grand space of this scheme. Care needs to be taken that it doesn't over scale the user, or appear too cold to the user. Carefully consider this space to achieve the qualities you want and that achieve Design Excellence</p>	<p>Pedestrian in the entry space and on the typical layout of upper levels. Preponderance of raw materials results in a somewhat cold and aesthetically unengaging environment.</p> <p>The incursion into this space by the footprint of the super labs diminishes its quality and effectiveness.</p> <p>Abstract and metaphorical assignment of diverse materials to selected areas of the interiors can be a successful strategy architecturally, though it may not reach or be appreciated by the users</p> <p>Review the material selection around the atrium to substantially reduce cold/grey blue material selections with limited embodied craft (grey concrete, steel, glass etc)</p>

		<p>Encourage more active use of the atrium by providing stairs within it linking all levels</p>
<p><b>7.0 Façade design and maintenance regime</b></p>	<p>The façade studies and proposal are a great strength of this scheme. The quality of macro to micro considerations of materiality are good as is the use of natural materiality.</p> <p>Generally well conceived, designed and detailed to function practically and aesthetically. There is quite some finesse and elegance in the screening idea, and its variability across the different facades.</p> <p>Façade design needs to consider a materiality that is appropriate to site &amp; place [ ie: to become a Sydney Building ]. Greater consideration of Wingara Mura will help with this.</p> <p>Variation in rhythm and patterning is suggested in the renders. This supports the understanding of different solar orientations of each façade and adds a richness to the architecture. Review other feedback found elsewhere in this report.</p> <p>Think about the underside of the cantilevered entry elements to make sure they support the architectural resolution.</p>	<p>Access for maintenance into some intricate assemblies may prove problematic.</p> <p>Details need to be worked through on all facade elements to demonstrate material longevity &amp; appropriateness, maintenance distances between facade element and glazing is achieved. Bird &amp; other animal nesting/ resting opportunities need to be considered in the design of elements.</p> <p>Provide increased dynamism in the facades (particularly the longer northern facade) for example consider increasing the number of shade blade sizes, more varied spacings etc</p>
<p><b>8.0 Servicing strategy and operational efficiency</b></p>	<p>Generally an efficient &amp; logical building</p>	<p>The scheme proposed the loading and access areas slung under the building below the entrance ramp. In a previous presentation the DJC requested further exploration of this sub optimal area especially as viewed from the entrance ramp. It was requested that the team explore an alternative, however this was not demonstrated in the final presentation. The rationale of elevating the building above this loading area is an expression of the watercourse under the building. It produces a negative building entry experience.</p> <p>Consideration would need to be given to enclosing this entire undercroft space.</p>

<p><b>9.0 Building services strategy</b></p>		<p>Vertical Circulation &amp; program location need improvement.</p> <p>CIS comments                      Electrical                      Alternative light fittings proposed – details required for review                      Substation proposal not clear – options provided but no recommendation                      Diesel generator on roof creates issues                      Substation allowance is \$2million short of requirement</p>
<p><b>10.0 Environmental impacts</b></p>	<p>Persuasive strategy to manage stormwater by conveying surface flows in the central formed gully.</p> <p>The retention of most of the existing tree grove to the east, especially the Fig is a net positive. Will add to the buildings setting.</p> <p>Additional landscape around the grandstand will be a highlight if circulation paths [ car and pedestrian ] work.</p> <p>North facing buildings have the potential to minimize operational energy. Push the ESD &amp; sun shading strategies hard to achieve excellence in these areas.</p>	<p>The location of north/west facing glazed lifts are questioned. This was discussed in an earlier presentation however was challenged by the team.</p> <p>Some concerns as to potential reflection and glare impact of facades on adjoining building occupants.</p> <p>There is always an environmental loss when buildings are demolished. These range from old to 30-40 year old buildings. An enormous amount of embodied energy will be given up. If they are to be replaced, a focus on a long life for the new buildings is fundamental. The goal should be these buildings will last at least 100 years. Design Excellence is the only path that can achieve that</p>
<p><b>11.0 Ecologically Sustainable Design</b></p>	<p>This building has all the necessary ingredients to perform very well against ESD principals. This should be pushed for greatest potential and excellent ESD ratings.</p> <p>Landscape is a strength of this team.</p> <p>Large roof areas should be used for ESD or Habitable purposes. Large scale PV panels or research gardens could be deployed here. So too, so outdoor teaching / social areas.</p>	<p>CIS comments                      Completed index page from UoS sustainability tool not provided                      Confirmation required that car and motorcycle parking are in accordance with CIP                      Renewable energy PV system details lacking                      Fire services test water capture methodology to be provided</p> <p>Large Glazed areas to north, west and east facades have the potential to over heat Sydney buildings. This needs to be carefully considered.</p>

<p><b>12.0 Protection of view corridors</b></p>	<p>Large buildings will block views. RPA's large wall blocks out the west. I'm not sure this is a huge issue on this site.</p> <p>However the right building on this site has the potential to create new view corridors. This should be considered, explored and explained. The current scheme suggests this is inherent in the diagram of the building and shown in the planning and architecture.</p>	
<p><b>13.0 Efficiency</b></p>		<p>The quantum of 25K of GFA with a briefed area of 17K is considered moderate.</p> <p>The vertical circulation doesn't achieve the efficiency the diagram and the architecture suggests. This needs to be significantly improved. Relocating lifts are fundamental to this. See feedback elsewhere in this report.</p> <p>Pedestrian flows &amp; program location an issue.</p> <p>Long thin(ish) north facing buildings with a regular generic grid spacing have the potential for good amenity and long life-loose fit characteristics which promotes the idea of an efficient building</p>
<p><b>14.0 Flexibility</b></p>	<p>The team presented the atrium typology as a "chassis" which offered optimum flexibility. The scheme is regular and orthogonal</p> <p>In principle well considered. Spaces are contiguous and may be readily and differently occupiable. This has not been properly modelled however.</p> <p>Long life loose fit is a good strategy for a building that is likely to have many lives with different users. This building has these qualities</p>	<p>The extensive footprints of the upper floors with smaller footprints at the lower more accessible levels is considered a major issue.</p> <p>Actual adaptability and resilience of the building is not easily gauged without more information on detailing. Structural grid produces narrow building blocks, with some inflexibility due to dimensions and disposition of the structural system.</p>
<p><b>15.0 Innovation</b></p>	<p>Evidence of potential innovation in the detailing and refinement of facade assemblies.</p> <p>Some innovation in the public domain, entry sequence and tree columns supports</p> <p>Gardens, connections, atrium and entries all have the potential to be special moments. All need to be pushed harder to achieve Design Excellence.</p>	<p>The atrium type scheme while rational and reasonable is less innovative as a building typology.</p> <p>Minimal innovation formally.</p> <p>Tree columns supports may be read as cliché</p> <p>The team has the ability to detail a building to achieve Design Excellence. The Consortium should be contracted in a way to allow rigorous design</p>

	The roof terrace has a chance to be special.	<p>resolution from idea through to fine details</p> <p>Off form concrete is beautiful, especially when offset by warm rich native hardwoods. Be careful to not cool the architecture too much with too much concrete not offset by a warmer colour &amp; materials. The light cannons may be reviewed in this regarded.</p>
<b>16.0 Value for money</b>	<p>The best value for money is achieved by design excellence. Design Excellence will give the building the greatest chance of success and longevity and therefore value.</p> <p>A buildings operation energy becomes the biggest cost against the building after 25 years. Operation energy exceeds construction energy usually around the 25-year mark. A life cycle analysis of the building will give a better view on value of money</p>	<p>The proposal is for a quantum of some 23K GFA with approx. 17K deliverable as briefed area. The VFM proposition is not as clear as other schemes.</p> <p>It is difficult to understand / evaluate value for money with a significant variance in areas, efficiency and in this team, a higher initial bid price..</p>
<b>Other Criteria:</b>		
<b>17.0 Wingara Mura</b>		<p>Response to the WMBB strategy and the WMBB design campus principles is generalised and notional. Some evidence of early consideration, but not followed through into the final proposition with a persuasive, clearly declared strategy that encompasses concept, planning, form, socio-spatial conditions, materiality or allegory/metaphor/symbolism</p> <p>Look to Wingara Mura for material guidance. A warm Sydney building would be a great addition to the Universities built environment</p> <p>Wingara Mura will help inform weathering potential. Stones, natural material textures and colours have the best chance to age and patina well</p>
<b>18.0 Clarity of design idea/ diagram</b>	<p>Exceptionally clear and well integrated across the scheme</p> <p>The East-West Bar diagram with strong north-south link through the site is a clear strategy to connect to the 3 major entry points to the building [ East, North &amp; West ] and allows for the significant stormwater flows south to north.</p> <p>Promotes strong connections to the University, RPA and Charles Perkins</p>	<p>The traffic circulation and under croft area should be reviewed and changed. This level perhaps should be viewed as more podium level, than a continuation of the bar building elements.</p> <p>The clarity of the circulation diagram, is not as clear or rational as the architectural diagram. I'd encourage the circulation strategy to be as clear as the architecture.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The North entry appears to receive reasonable student flows. This fails if the bridge link is not delivered as part of stage 1, or the ground link is not encourage to be this doorway. If the bridge is not delivered, I'd drop it, and concentrate on ground movements.</li> <li>- The Stage 2 link between stg1 &amp; stg2 is the obvious natural connection pathway between RPA and the University. A very good strategy.</li> </ul> <p>Long thin buildings serviced by external façade or atrium provide the best chance for good amenity for the life of the building. East- West Bar building diagram best allows for other authors / different design resolution to complete stages 2 &amp; 3 if that dynamic eventuated. The staging diagram for stages 2 &amp; 3 need to match the universities.</p>	
<p><b>19.0 Resolution of Architecture</b></p>	<p>Elegant and refined composition, well scaled to the public domain and well-proportioned as a volumetric assembly. Good variation of mass/frame/screen components. Readily responsive to climate.</p> <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North facing bar building elements are a clear and strong strategy. Light-filled atrium supports light &amp; amenity</li> <li>• The circulation around the atrium varies from level to level. I don't mind this variation against an otherwise strong rational planning framework. However, this is more manageable with centralized lifts &amp; stairs</li> <li>• Strong connections exist in planning thought and resolution between University, Hospital and Charles Perkins. Review north entry point. Either included the bridge in the stage 1 works, or drop it and reinforce the north door.</li> <li>• An activated roof terrace is a logical and lovely planning outcome. Perhaps more opportunity exists to expanded roof &amp; roof terrace uses [ PV's, student uses for out door learning etc ]</li> </ul>	<p>Some concern as to the suitability of the building's aesthetics and rigorous planning diagram for the disciplines that will populate it and the pedagogies it normally deploys</p> <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The circulation paths not as clear as the architecture strategy suggests. Glazed north-facing lifts at odds with strong central atrium axis. Centralised lifts and stairs also support the diagram.</li> <li>• The University experts feel the program is located at wrong levels. Pedestrian flows to be tested. The "loose fit" of the plan may allow that to happen.</li> <li>• Traffic flows and under croft spaces are problematic. These concerns would need to be consider and resolved if Design Excellence is to be achieved. Perhaps viewing the base more as a podium than the pure extrapolation of the bar building scheme to the ground plane. This could still sustain water flow paths in heavy rain / stormwater events.</li> <li>• Rigorous review required of bridges at both east &amp; west doors.</li> </ul> <p>Bar building strategy: Perhaps consider slight/ subtle tonal, material or</p>

	<p><b>Solar Access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long North facing main buildings bar elements with the long face north provides great light &amp; the potential for good amenity. Attenuation is the key here to stop the building over heating. The solutions look to be clear by they need to be tested to get the best results.</li> <li>• The atrium feeding light [ and breeze? ] into the middle of the plan is a sound and proven strategy. The clear glazed ends also help connectivity and act as a catalyst for future connections to be stronger.</li> </ul> <p><b>Composition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bar building strategy with long thin building elements separated by a clear glazed central atrium offers good compositional opportunities.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Key to this is the resolution and patterning of the external sun-screening elements. Every sign exists that the team will develop the natural variation of the facades to solar orientation will drive this compositional strategy.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Proportion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This scheme offers good natural proportions that can be resolved well. I would encourage a continuation of the rigorous resolution of the architecture as you work through feedback to maintain the strong diagram principles. Adopting main issues raised through feedback fundamental to achieving design excellence.</li> </ul> <p><b>Rigour [ resolution of architecture against design idea ]</b>          Rigour is this teams strong point as is the strong clear diagram. Push it harder in the areas identified elsewhere in this report, and be more flexible in others. Again all identified. Don't rest until Design Excellence is achieved in all aspects.</p>	<p>colour variation as well as screen variation pattern to reinforce composition variation in an otherwise well proportioned form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you considered the base level below the bridges at the East entry main front door, will this change how you address the podium composition?</li> </ul> <p><b>What makes a Sydney Building?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wingara Mura as addressed above</li> <li>• Materials, colours &amp; textures as well as Landscape will all play a part.</li> <li>• The ground plane that is identified in the paving material and creek bed direction is a good start. [ check location of creek]</li> </ul> <p><b>What makes a building for nurses? Clinical research?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These ideas can be incorporated with consultation with the faculties with the selected consortium. Design Excellence makes a building ideally suited to clients needs.</li> <li>• I'd look for ideas and richness in this engagement and bring this to the architecture.</li> <li>• Does a softer, warmer architecture support the clients needs. I'd consider these ideas and pathways.</li> </ul>
<b>21.0 Material use</b>	Detailing	Appropriateness

<p><b>/ language</b></p>	<p>The team has the ability to detail a building to achieve Design Excellence. The Consortium should be contracted in a way to allow rigorous design resolution from idea through to fine details.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard to tell at this stage.</li> <li>• Look to Wingara Mura for material guidance. A warm Sydney building would be a great addition to the Universities built environment.</li> <li>• Large Glazed areas to north, west and east facades have the potential to over heat Sydney buildings. This needs to be carefully considered.</li> <li>• Off form concrete is beautiful, especially when offset by warm rich native hardwoods. Be careful to not cool the architecture too much with too much concrete not offset by a warmer colour &amp; materials. The light cannons may be reviewed in this regarded.</li> </ul> <p>Weathering potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again, Wingara Mura will help here. Stones, natural material textures and colours have the best chance to age and patina well.</li> <li>• The sun screening blades needs to last Sydney’s brutal sun and teaming rain and humidity. I’d plan for what will look good in 25 years and you will have your material.</li> </ul> <p>Sydney Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask this question of the design and you will find your materials. From Paving materials to major facade components to interior lining of public areas important here to achieve design excellence</li> </ul>
<p><b>22.0 Overland Flow</b></p>		<p>Stormwater / Over-Land Flow / Flooding: The storm water strategy appears viable, but perhaps will not be easily read in the architecture. Don’t lose the ground plane and other special moments in not dealing with the traffic flow and under croft areas</p>
<p><b>18.7 Achieving design excellence</b></p>	<p>The project can potentially achieve design excellence</p>	<p>Requires considerable replanning and reconsideration of the circulation network to achieve efficiency and amenity for users. The project requires a much more detailed and considered strategy engaging WMBB; as well as a much more detailed and considered public and interior art strategy</p>

## 5.2 LEND LEASE / SNOHETTA/ WOODS BAGOT

Refer below table for jury member comments in relation to terms of reference criteria and other relevant matters raised by the jury during the design review process. **Refer Appendix D** for Design Jury Individual Member Assessments

<b>Lend Lease/ Snohetta/ Woods Bagot</b>		
<b>Terms of Reference Criteria</b>	<b>Positive Attributes</b>	<b>Concerns to be addressed in order to achieve design excellence</b>
<p><b>1.0 Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation</b></p>	<p>The aspirations of this proposal with health and well being, biophilia and the narrative of grafting were inspirational. The understanding of different typologies on the Sydney Uni campus was also well thought through.</p> <p>Persuasive as a three-dimensional diagram and reasonably well extended into the form, spatial organisation and amenity of the proposal.</p> <p>As a single building, and with a more rigorous resolution of idea with plan and elevation this could be a very exciting building. But the brief is for 3 buildings, and all 3 may never be built.</p>	<p>The proposal presented a very risky strategy by the team for a staged building in 3 forms that really represents as one building.</p> <p>It is difficult to correlate how the Stages 2 and 3 could be delivered without the same team and this approach may not be able to manifest. The jury did request submissions on this approach however the separable part of stage 1 is still considered difficult as a stand-alone built form in the final submission.</p> <p>This was an all or nothing strategy that would have been viable and perhaps would have had an opportunity of Design Excellence if it was delivered as a single building. This is ultimately its fatal flaw.</p> <p>The composition of eastern undulations does not work as a stand-alone building.</p>
<p><b>2.0 Local and wider campus integration</b></p>	<p>The overall composition with all 3 stages is seen as more successful in the integration with the wider campus than Stage 1 as a stand-alone proposition.</p> <p>Persuasive throughout. Excellent public domain strategy to the east and north ground planes. Good linkages in all directions;</p>	<p>The project's response to staging is unconvincing, with the Stage 1 component appearing incomplete without Stages 2 and 3; and possessing little capacity to accommodate alternative designs during those stages.</p> <p>The resultant open spaces between the three stages is</p>

	<p>Volumetrically interesting in terms of scale and articulation; successfully edging campus development, framing the open space to the north and drawing it into the upper courtyard.</p> <p>I'm sure the links could be worked through as a single building, but will doubtfully achieve design excellence as a kit of parts that may never be fully put together.</p>	<p>considered sub optimal and ambiguous.</p> <p>Problematic link to RPA.</p> <p>As a single building the links will appear incomplete.</p>
<p><b>3.0 Interface with public realm</b></p>	<p>The proposal explores the relationship of one built form over 3 stages within a landscaped setting.</p> <p>Reasonably well considered</p>	<p>Whilst the aspirations are supported the resolution and end outcome has not achieved the aspirational goal.</p> <p>The proposed landscaping strategy appears significantly overdesigned.</p> <p>The edges of the building are not always well programmed, scaled or materially resolved to populate and nourish the public domain. The extensive areas of glass to the north and east could prove problematic in this respect, particularly in terms of scaling and potential to produce glare.</p> <p>Landscape courtyard must include deep soil to support large trees and spaces for larger groups and movement</p>
<p><b>4.0 Access and Circulation internally and externally</b></p>	<p>The interior public spaces and the large welcoming void are well founded and expansive and whilst a first visitor may find the spatial quality a little overwhelming, regular users would find the circulation within public spaces to be acceptable.</p> <p>Workable strategy. Spaces appear well scaled, well disposed and calibrated to user loads. Good collocation of areas with the most use and user numbers on the lower floors, leading to efficiency and amenity.</p> <p>Many opportunities for active circulation by users throughout the proposal</p>	<p>The dual corridors resulting from the expansive floor plates are considered a little harder to negotiate and navigate.</p> <p>Earlier ideas of micro courtyards and voids could have been more systematically developed and integrated to assist in this, as in clarifying wayfinding for users.</p>
<p><b>5.0 Functional relationships and internal planning</b></p>	<p>The proposal delivers a welcoming building with inviting voids, stairs and amphitheatre style seating.</p>	<p>The indoor/outdoor interface is unresolved. Even with Stages 2 and 3 complete the external space could read as a simple undercroft through site link and not a defined area.</p>

	<p>Appears effective;</p>	<p>The extensive floor plates could become a liability in terms of the amenity of the internal environment, circulation and wayfinding.</p> <p>Provide greater internal spatial definition of public spaces at lower levels</p>
<p><b>6.0 Internal spatial quality</b></p>	<p>The use of timber ceilings is rich and ensures a warmer juxtaposition against the extensive glazed areas.</p> <p>Internal space appears fluid and responsive to user movement</p>	<p>The arrangement of large contiguous floor plates, albeit having greater circulation – is questioned- in particular the amount of double loaded corridors. The wayfinding is ambiguous.</p> <p>Materials and finishes strategies are not yet clear, or clearly related to the volumetric approach.</p>
<p><b>7.0 Façade design and maintenance regime</b></p>		<p>The great concern with this façade design is it never really matched the planning or big idea. The language of the “veil” appears incongruent to the planning and the horizontal banding and eroded language.</p> <p>The building form is a rectangular flat façade with a carved out glazed eroded façade. The juxtaposition of these two elements or ordered against curvaceous requires a more detailed resolution.</p> <p>Generally unconvincing and lacking evidence that the necessary means for scaling and environmental control of the facades have been considered and put in place, even at a schematic level.</p> <p>This glazed area to the north and east have the potential to overheat.</p> <p>The design needs curved glazing to make it sing. But with this not present, and replaced with faceted glazing, it speaks to a direction opposite to Design Excellence.</p> <p>The southern window should be redesigned to be a regular form (the shorter version of the building demonstrates this)</p>

		<p>Address the current aesthetics requirement for very high levels of maintenance/cleaning</p> <p>Eastern facades require substantial shading to allow very clear glazing.</p>
<p><b>8.0 Servicing strategy and operational efficiency</b></p>	<p>Servicing strategy is satisfactory</p>	<p>Operational efficiencies are low despite the large floorplates. The issue appears to be the quantum of circulation required</p>
<p><b>9.0 Building services strategy</b></p>		<p><b>CIS response</b></p> <p><b>Electrical</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary power provisions are not clear</li> <li>• Building diagnostics provisions require review</li> <li>• Centralised precinct substation provisions are not clear</li> <li>• No vertical transport advice provided</li> <li>• Reuse of existing generator to be clarified re capacity and condition</li> </ul>
<p><b>10.0 Environmental impacts</b></p>		<p>The design team was questioned at earlier presentations regarding the application of solar shading to facades and the heroic application of outdoor terraces. Whilst the team did respond to the terraces displacement, they were silent on how the solar shading could work on the project. Notwithstanding that the team is considered highly capable of delivering this it is questioned why it wasn't considered by final bid stage.</p> <p>Potential reflection and glare impact of facades on adjoining building occupants.</p> <p>Potential wind effects on the public domain; particularly in the central courtyard.</p> <p>Substantially reduced solar access in winter to the central courtyard is disappointing.</p> <p>Little evidence that solar load is being managed across the building's multiple orientations with a plausible system. This</p>

		requires substantial modelling.
<b>11.0 Ecologically Sustainable Design</b>		CIS Response Façade compliance to be clarified
<b>12.0 Protection of view corridors</b>	Reasonable and effective.	
<b>13.0 Efficiency</b>		The quantum of GFA is some 25K with a briefed area of some 15K, which appears moderate.
<b>14.0 Flexibility</b>	The flexibility of large floor plates would be acceptable- again provided a staged schema is accepted.	The fluid planning strategy may not be conducive to adaptability and resilience of the building over time. There is some inflexibility due to the disposition of the structural system.
<b>15.0 Innovation</b>	The building typology of large floor plates offers a solution that is recognisable as an office typology and with the student public spaces is reasonably innovative.  There is some inflexibility due to the disposition of the structural system.	Little evidence of potential innovation in the detailing and refinement of facade assemblies; or spatially through cross sectional treatment.
<b>16.0 Value for money</b>		The quantum of GFA at some 25K and resultant brief area requirements of some 15K is also questioned from an efficiency point of view.
<b>Other Criteria</b>		
<b>17.0 Clarity of design idea/ diagram</b>	Exceptionally clear diagram,	For this proposal to be considered it would need to be supported, in the first instance that a cohesive building of some 60K m <sup>2</sup> could be delivered in parts. It is difficult for the jury to endorse a proposal should the University client group be unable to accept such a proposition.  Diagram not persuasively carried through into the architecture and integrated across the scheme.  Substantial stage 2+3 massing and articulation problems must be addressed including a strategy that makes sense of the steps in the future southern facade and very deep future stage buildings

<p><b>18.0</b> <b>Resolution of Architecture</b></p>	<p>Striking formal composition. The building's organisation, planning and aesthetics appear reasonably well suited to the disciplines that will populate it and the pedagogies it normally deploys.</p>	<p>Striking formal composition. The building's organisation, planning and aesthetics appear reasonably well suited to the disciplines that will populate it and the pedagogies it normally deploys.</p>	<p>MT Much fi reconside variation climate r</p>
<p><b>19.0</b> <b>Joy</b></p>	<p>Clear evidence in the playful, layered facades and the fluid interiors</p>		
<p><b>20.0</b> <b>Material use / language</b></p>		<p>Unclear at this stage and disappointingly undeclared.</p>	
<p><b>21.0</b> <b>Wingara Mura</b></p>		<p>Response to the WMBB strategy and the WMBB design campus principles is extremely generic, if not absent completely. There appears to be no clearly declared approach that encompasses concept, planning, form, socio-spatial conditions, materiality or allegory/metaphor/symbolism.</p> <p>No engagement process has been proposed. There appears to be no public or interior art strategy in place.</p>	
<p><b>22.0</b> <b>Achieving design excellence</b></p>		<p>Much finessing of scale and bulk is needed; as is a reconsideration of scale in relation to the public domain. Little variation in the materiality across the scheme. Responsiveness to climate remains to be modelled and validated</p>	

### 5.3 LAING O’ROURKE / DS&R / BILLARD LEESE

Refer below table for jury member comments in relation to terms of reference criteria and other relevant matters raised by the jury during the design review process. Refer Appendix D for Design Jury Individual Member Assessments

<b>Laing O’Rourke/DS&amp;R /Billard Leese</b>		
<b>Terms of Reference Criteria</b>	<b>Comments – Positive Attributes</b>	<b>Concerns / Issues / Opportunities to be addressed in order to achieve design excellence</b>
<p><b>1.0 Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation</b></p>	<p>Persuasive as a three-dimensional diagram and well extended into the spatial organisation and amenity of the proposal.</p> <p>The scheme is a very joyful proposition which takes advantage of the setting with a landscape healing narrative, turpentine ironbark forest and a good indigenous strategy.</p> <p>The proposal satisfies the briefed area requirements of some 15K M2 and is considered to satisfactorily displace the public areas at the base levels of the building with the learning levels above, followed by the workplace levels in a bifurcated and somewhat intimate plan at the upper levels of the building.</p> <p>This arrangement is superior in that it is a logical and functional arrangement where students and user groups can navigate their way around the required spaces without the need for excessive vertical transport. (Circulation)</p> <p>The arrangement of stairs as a way finding solution both within the interior and the exterior spaces allows a very legible and welcoming reading of the building.</p> <p>The arrangement of numerous uses along the elongated northern boundary overlooking the oval is a fundamental strength of the scheme and optimises the connection with the indoor/outdoor</p>	<p>Pedestrian flow studies would be useful to measure pedestrian use in peak periods to test for congestion.</p>

	<p>quality of the spaces. This is considered the optimum “real estate” for the site both in orientation and preserved views and has been capitalised upon by the design team.</p> <p>The team appear to have achieved the brief area requirements. The client should be engaged with the teams to get the best planning and room arrangement per levels right.</p>	
<p><b>2.0 Local and wider campus integration</b></p>	<p>The Stage 1 proposal supports a “citadel” or podium form with Stage 1 having an elongated built form that proposes a “cleave” between the two forms set around a central core of VT with common areas. Stages 2 and 3 would need to be aligned vertically and horizontally with this Stage 1 submission but could easily be delivered by alternative design teams provided strict criteria is met regarding interfaces in any future briefs.</p> <p>The displacement of the “cleave” and the corresponding upper Wakil garden were originally questioned by the DCJ at earlier presentations- the Jury requested further design development and solar testing of this proposition- which the team has satisfied. Any improvements to the solar access into this space would improve it further.</p> <p>Excellent public domain strategy to the east and north ground planes. Good linkages in all directions other than RPA.</p> <p>Volumetrically convincing in terms of scale and articulation; successfully edging campus development, framing the open space to the north and drawing it into the upper courtyard.</p> <p>The Eastern entry connects well to the university. Deep soil planting for the trees will help here.</p> <p>Removing the storm water grilles and flow from under the building will help north and south facades to connect to better connect to the site.</p> <p>The north face connection the oval has the potential to be good.</p>	<p>The landscape solution, whilst dramatic and espousing “well being” and integration of indoor and outdoor arrangements could consider a reductive approach to some of the elements. For example; Whilst the water features would add to the atmosphere and create calm and a pleasing acoustic presence – the quantum of water bodies could be more judiciously displaced.</p> <p>The north and west connections to Charles Perkins and RPA are poor. These are some of the major links this building needs to achieve and foster. These areas need significant improvement. Reducing the podium by 1 level will significantly help with connectivity.</p> <p>These buildings should act as a catalyst to better improve connection between university and hospital. I don’t see that happening in the design at this moment.</p>

	<p>Work this façade hard to achieve this, as it could be improved.</p> <p>Views: Podium and north facing long façade provide good views over the oval and campus areas.</p>	
<p><b>3.0 Interface with public realm</b></p>	<p>The overall “master plan” with the three forms for Stages 2 and 3 above a podium form could result in a relatively level access from the southeast corner of Cadigal lane and Western Avenue to the Upper Wakil garden at RL 36.4 and this is strength of the scheme.</p> <p>Well considered, with a suitable sense of occasion for the arrival sequence from the east and north. The edges of the building not always well programmed, scaled or materially resolved to populate and nourish the public domain. The extensive areas of glass to the north and east could prove problematic in this respect.</p>	<p>The potential for a bridge connection (if it eventuates) from RPA would necessitate a change in level to the outdoor space. Consideration should be given to reviewing this interface and ensuring that equitable access could be delivered.</p> <p>The main entry space sits above the fire tanks set within the level 0 plan at the eastern edge. Consideration must be given to re looking at the disposition of these services to ensure that adequate soil depths and contiguous planters can be arranged to facilitate tree planting. It would be necessary to re arrange spaces on Level 0 but this is highly recommended. Consideration should also be given to relocation of the fig tree if possible.</p> <p>The drainage edges will be poor urban outcome. This needs to be reconsidered.</p> <p>West and North faces could better related to the pedestrian at the ground plan. Both these entries need to be made more generous, special.</p> <p>A lower podium would encourage more people to walk up to the courtyard garden [ Upper Wakil Garden ].</p> <p>A lower podium will also scale down the 3 storey western wall to RPA, making it more friendly and connectivity better. It will also allow a level access from the hospital bridge to the Upper Wakil garden.</p>
<p><b>4.0 Access and Circulation internally and externally</b></p>	<p>The essential arrangement of arrival at RL 27.20 is considered satisfactory however it could be improved by a more legible open connection to the north aligned with the lifts to assist way finding and orientation. Once at the lift core the sequence and way</p>	<p>Consideration however should be given to the arrangement of common areas at Level 7 with the triangular geometry adjacent lifts.</p>

	<p>finding is considered to be highly legible.</p> <p>The essentially “cruciform” circulation is supported any improvement on light and air ingress to this space should be considered. It is further noted that level 5 north east wing is a little constrained in planning layout and could be improved.</p> <p>Excellent strategy of a perforated volume, enabling multiple vertical connections both visually and physically. Spaces appear well scaled, well disposed and properly calibrated to user loads. Good collocation of areas with the most use and user numbers on the lower floors, leading to efficiency and amenity.</p> <p>Many opportunities for active circulation by users throughout the proposal.</p> <p>East, main university entry is good. Spatially rich. The lift core is some distance from the front door, but with good planning this could be negotiated well, and once found [ its on a direct line of travel ] is very efficient and logical. This should not be an issue if resolved well.</p> <p>One of the great aspects of this design. Clear, logical, efficient and spatially joyful in the upper floating element. It is also used as a device to bring light to the lower levels and for the thermal stack effect. This would only get better if the podium was reduced one level.</p>	<p>Consideration of amending the circulation on Level 0 to the Sim labs is also recommended as it does not open to the external walls and is sub optimal access from the lift core.</p> <p>The North &amp; West entries are perhaps almost as important as the East with student &amp; staff flows from Charles Perkins and RPA. These need significant improvement.</p> <p>Wider corridors in deeper plan areas essential. These should be anchored by east, west or north facing facades to allow for the view &amp; light &amp; prospect along the journey. Voids that plug into these corridors, especially to the north will allow light to penetrate deeper into the plan</p>
<p><b>5.0 Functional relationships and internal planning</b></p>	<p>Appears persuasive.</p> <p>The location and quarantining of enclosed large format Super labs and theatres within the podium is logical and efficient</p> <p>The general organisation of brief function and levels seems appropriate.</p> <p>All levels should be tested with Pedestrian flow studies to guarantee each level, circulation paths work well at peak periods.</p>	<p>The extensive floor plates could become a liability in terms of the amenity of the internal environment, circulation and wayfinding.</p> <p>Amenity of 3 levels of deep plan, whole of site levels is a concern. This is only exacerbated with the additions of stages 2&amp;3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reduction in one level will reduce this concern considerably &amp; help with connectivity to RPA, or,</li> <li>• Deep voids into the middle areas of what ultimately will</li> </ul>

		<p>be a 3 level podium. These should connect to wide corridors to provide light and amenity into deep plan areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connecting deep plan areas with wide corridors anchored by light at the facade is crucial to the success of these lower levels</li> </ul> <p>Reduce the “Folded Ground Plane” by 1 level, thus increasing floating building element. This will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make better connections to RPA with a             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lower podium wall</li> <li>- flat bridge connection from the café area of RPA to the “courtyard area” of the Folded Ground Plane podium, providing the courtyard with greater use &amp; chance of success</li> <li>- reduce the east stair case from the University from 3 flights to 2. This will give the Folded Ground Plane a greater chance of success as people will more likely use these steps to access the courtyard as it is easy to get there, and more able to be seen; drawing people up.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide more amenity to the building overall [less deep plan areas, more surface area ] whilst still providing 2 levels for “black box” uses.</li> <li>• Will give the north external stair case potentially greater meaning as it will arrive at learning studios &amp; resources areas. This could support a café function with seating to the sun.</li> <li>• Will give the north &amp; west glazed areas greater chance to be shaded by tree canopies than 3 levels.</li> </ul> <p>Level 0 could be re-organised to allow deep soil planting for the Eucalypt Forest at the east entry.</p> <p>L1 Flexible Rooms &amp; L2 Learning Studios in the southeast corner</p>
--	--	---

		<p>of the building are likely to be areas of low amenity. Relocating these to the north or west facades on these levels will provide greater amenity. You could consider moving Lecture Theatre 100's on each level to Flexible Rooms &amp; Learning Studio's and look to move these rooms/ studios to external façade areas to the west and North.</p> <p>Large floor plate sections need wider corridors for deeper plans. These corridors should end and be anchored by external glazed façade. The north-south corridors could open onto north glass rather than a seminar rooms on L1&amp;2</p> <p>Deeper plan areas could be better serviced by void areas to the external facade. In particular seminar rooms on Levels 1+2 could be relocated to host a void to the north entry. This would let light deeper into the deep plan &amp; improve the important entry experience on the north façade [ which is probably the main entrance from those coming from Charles Perkins ]</p> <p>I'm not sure the water feature to the north of the main east entry is helping. If you dropped it I feel you would help the design &amp; landscape</p> <p>North external terrace of the folded ground plane arrives at a level that doesn't seem to support the joy of the journey [ why does this to go to the Deans level?]. A level off the podium may assist this. Support it with a lively function, like a café, food outlet/ social area.</p> <p>The courtyard garden should have an easy and open connection to the university &amp; RPA as well as the edges of the building to maximize possible use.</p>
<p><b>6.0</b> <b>Internal spatial quality</b></p>	<p>The internal quality of the public spaces, in particular the cohesive arrangement of the resources collection is very rich and welcoming and mediates between the indoor/outdoor qualities of the spaces. First time visitors would feel welcome into this space.</p>	<p>Materials and finishes strategies are not yet clear, or clearly related to the volumetric approach.</p> <p>Deep plan areas of the podium will struggle for decent amenity,</p>

	<p>Porous and intriguing. Excellent conceptualisation evident in the section. Internal space appears fluid and responsive to user movement.</p> <p>The East Entry, the Cleave-vertical circulation, The Upper Wakil Garden all have the potential to be great spaces. The garden will support the internal spaces next to it. Maintain these qualities and improved if possible.</p> <p>Long north face of the building has the potential for good amenity. Especially with the floating building element. Care needs to be taken so these areas don't over heat or suffer from too much glare</p>	<p>and have the potential to be poor spaces. Everything needs to be done to lift the amenity of these levels/ spaces. Reducing the podium to 2 deep plan areas will significant help with this aim.</p> <p>Wider corridors and possible punching light wells in the deep plan areas of the podium will lift internal spatial qualities</p> <p>Improve the massing, articulation and expression:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the podium of the Upper Wake Garden-this jutting section presents as a temporary condition without good resolution</li> <li>• Review the north elevation – it does not communicate the dynamism of the overall concept in its current form and will always be the principal presentation of the project and precinct</li> <li>• Redesign podium façade L0-L2 be more fundamentally different to the upper façade (options should be explored to create a more solid base to the building not utilising a curtain wall system)</li> <li>• Provide a significant horizontal break in the western facade between the podium and the top</li> </ul>
<p><b>7.0 Façade design and maintenance regime</b></p>	<p>Adequately conceived, designed and detailed to function practically and aesthetically.</p> <p>The upper levels with adequate sun shading propositions are well resolved</p>	<p>The lower podium forms could consider further resolution with regard to “settling” the lower podium/citadel forms into the landscape. For example: Whilst the Sim rooms gain advantage from the northern aspect, consideration of a thicker more articulated ‘brise soleil’ form may assist in grounding the building, whilst providing sun shading and assisting with a reading of the building in its landscape setting.</p> <p>The screen devices require extensive refinement and rationalisation to address the different orientation conditions. Access for cleaning and maintenance into some intricate assemblies, as well as extensive glass surfaces may prove problematic.</p> <p>The Composition strategy is a tripartite form with base [podium],</p>

		<p>middle [shadow-line] and top floating element [screened top]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Typically floating elements are reinforced by a heavy podium – one plays off the other.</li><li>• The podium [ Folded Ground Plane ] is the deep plan section that wants to fully glazed and transparent to allow as much light as possible deep into the plan, which is the opposite to what the diagram wants it to be. A reduced podium [ by 1 level ] &amp; the composition strategy need to be carefully considered, and tested to ensure the 3 elements can be clearly read and identified to allow the elevations to hold together. Maybe the horizontal blades will work, but maybe they won't. I'd start here with composition testing, as the middle compositional devise of clear glazing needs to be offset by more screened "heavier" elements either side.</li><li>• The screening to the glazed floating element is clever. The natural variation that is required on all different facades will help in the reading of the floating element. Keep pushing this as it will be a delight if rigorously worked through.</li><li>• The original diagram had dynamic inclined planes on the façade. As the design has been worked through the various feedback and brief iterations it has become more flat and slab like to the north and west. A design challenge is to bring back some of the original diagram dynamic qualities to these facades. This may help with the façade composition and overall architectural expression.</li></ul> <p>A reduction of the fold ground plane podium will help with proportion. The folded Ground plan will be more podium, than a significant chunk of the building [2 levels of 8 rather than 3]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proportion and Composition will be iterated together in testing for best design.</li></ul> <p>Details need to be worked through on all facade elements to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>demonstrate material longevity &amp; appropriateness, maintenance distances between facade elements and glazing is achieved. Bird &amp; other animal nesting/ resting opportunities need to be considered in the design of elements [both base &amp; floating façade elements could suffer with this].</p> <p>Façade design needs to consider a materiality that is appropriate to site &amp; place [ ie: to become a Sydney Building ]. Greater consideration of Wingara Mura will help with this.</p> <p>What role do the trees play with the north, west and east façade? This needs to be further considered ie: are the trees a green screen for solar attenuation? And if so do you use them as screening for these faces, but if you don't will you lose the façade composition?</p>
<p><b>8.0 Servicing strategy and operational efficiency</b></p>	<p>Stage 1 allocates the car parking within the base of the podium.</p> <p>Its seems efficient. Deep plans are deceptively efficient, but if people don't like the spaces, efficiency looses.</p>	<p>Further consideration would be required when Stages 2 and 3 are proposed of how these interfaces would work.</p>
<p><b>9.0 Building services strategy</b></p>		<p><b>CIS comments</b></p> <p>Umow Lai Sydney experience and presence to be reviewed</p> <p><b>Electrical</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roof mounted PV generation is to comply with the University of Sydney Sustainability Framework</li> <li>• Metering over and above BCA is required in accordance with UoS standards</li> <li>• Roof mount location for standby generator creates acoustic and fire rating issues and bulk fuel tank location</li> <li>• UPS details not provided</li> <li>• Substation area of 77m2 and \$value is 50% of requirement</li> <li>• Supply strategy for Boschs to be reviewed</li> <li>• HV diversions have been excluded from pricing</li> </ul> <p><b>Civil/Hydraulics/Fire</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater drainage and overland flow strategy</li> </ul>

		<p>requires significant rethink with multiple issues to be resolved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct based water and fire infrastructure required</li> <li>• Sewer connection proposal requires rethink as exg sewer line is to be removed</li> <li>• Proposed building footprint impact on existing services to be clarified</li> <li>• Further details required to confirm ability of stage 1 utility connections to service future stages</li> </ul> <p><b>Mechanical</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of Comms rooms &amp; Bio boxes cooling systems to be provided</li> <li>• University preference is for water cooled chillers</li> <li>• Smoke exhaust strategy for building, further details required</li> <li>• Provide further details of the Low temperature VAV zoning for the offices including indicative AHU zoning</li> <li>• Clarify future allowances for shelled spaces outside air provision and plant space</li> </ul> <p><b>BMCS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metering connected to the BMCS, is not PPR compliant. Metering should be connected to the AUMS (the university Utilities metering system)</li> <li>• BMCS proposed to monitor the security systems – not required as there is a dedicated University Security system</li> <li>• The BMCS proposed is listed as being fully compliant with the PPR and the University Standards</li> </ul>
<p><b>10.0 Environmental impacts</b></p>	<p>The proposal has dealt with solar shading of facades in a very practical way (refer façade design notes above)</p>	<p>Potential reflection and glare impact of facades on adjoining building occupants.</p> <p>Potential wind effects on the public domain.</p> <p>Minimal solar access in winter to the central courtyard is disappointing.</p>

		<p>Concern about the effects of over-scaling to the southern facade with the following stages 2 and 3</p> <p>Flooding / Stormwater / overland flow strategy doesn't work. There are better methods to deal with stormwater that could be used. I'd encourage embracing these other strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I don't think the storm water solution is viable, grilles as public edges that will provide for poor aesthetics, pathways for rats and other vermin and could quite possibly be dangerous.</li><li>• The entry and exist points of the water flow will need to be grilled, this will provide a poor interface with the edge of the building and public domain.</li></ul> <p>A better strategy maybe to use the building as a bluff and force the water around the back of the site [west]. This will improve the architecture, safety, public domain responses.</p> <p>The loss of the existing tree grove is a loss, especially the Fig. But not a requirement either</p> <p>North facing main building with the long face north provides great light &amp; the potential for good amenity. Attenuation is the key here to stop the building over heating. The solutions look to be in the design but they need to be tested to get the best results.</p> <p>The solar sculpted cleave for the courtyard garden [Wakil Garden] makes for interesting and potentially joy filled space. The challenge will be to keep this dynamic space whilst maintaining sun to the courtyard.</p> <p>The Cleave is absent of solar screening for the north façade. This</p>
--	--	--

		obviously has benefits, but also the potential for glare and head load. This needs to be considered and these questions answered.
<b>11.0 Ecologically Sustainable Design</b>		<p><b>CIS Comments</b></p> <p>2.17 Process water efficiency should not be targeted in a general building. Sustainability framework index page submitted show mandatory points against process water efficiency, which is incorrect. Mandatory points should be shown against 2.17 Fire Systems. Incorrect version of tool utilised in submission</p> <p>Gold ambition level to be elaborated in relation to points targeted</p>
	<p>Above the podium this building has all the necessary ingredients to perform very well against ESD principals.</p> <p>Large roof areas should be used for ESD or Habitable purposes. Large scale PV panels or research gardens could be deployed here. So too, so outdoor teaching / social areas.</p>	<p>Deep plans are difficult &amp; challenging places and spaces for ESD. ESD is only viable if people are keen to inhabit the building. This is this schemes greatest challenge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large Glazed areas to north, west and east facades have the potential to over heat Sydney buildings. This needs to be carefully considered.</li> </ul> <p>Deep soil planting should be given to east entry trees for a greatest chance of success for these trees.</p>
<b>12.0 Protection of view corridors</b>	<p>Reasonable and effective; particularly in the project's creation of new view corridors. These, however, require proper modelling.</p> <p>Large buildings will block views. RPA's large wall blocks out the west. I'm not sure this is a huge issue on this site.</p> <p>However the right building on this site has the potential to create new view corridors. This should be considered, explored and explained. It may enrichen the project.</p>	
<b>13.0 Efficiency</b>	<p>It is understood that the GFA for this proposal is some 22K. The proposed schedule of accommodation of 16K therefore reflects a very efficient solution.</p> <p>Vertical circulation and long thin north facings buildings always have the greatest potential to do well and be efficient.</p>	<p>Deep plans are efficient in a constructional sense, but poor in many other areas of efficiency. A reduction in the deep plan areas will improve overall big picture efficiency.</p>

<p><b>14.0 Flexibility</b></p>	<p>The current drawings have not explored full engineering and services installations and it is highly recommended that the structure and integration will resolve a number of issues- flexibility of uses within a formalised grid of columns would help sustain the on going flexibility of spaces in this proposal.</p> <p>Long life loose fit is a good strategy for a building that is likely to have many lives with different users.</p> <p>A central vertical circulation core servicing good sized floor areas either side appear to be flexible.</p>	<p>The fluid planning strategy may not be conducive to adaptability and resilience of the building over time.</p> <p>There is some inflexibility due to the disposition of the structural system.</p>
<p><b>15.0 Innovation</b></p>	<p>The proposal is a well-staged master plan concept with two further stages that could be delivered in a cohesive way.</p> <p>Modest innovation formally. Evidence of potential innovation in the detailing and refinement of facade assemblies; as well as in the promising cross section that produces vertical and inclined porosities throughout the building.</p> <p>Some innovation in the public domain landscaping to the north and east.</p> <p>The façade screening device will be a creative and innovative element.</p> <p>Possibly the water skimming pond too</p> <p>Innovation in architecture can be no more than emperor’s new clothes. It’s not a crime to not innovate if design excellence can be achieved by many and varied proven design paths, and resolution. ESD systems tend to be a source of innovation in architecture, and this building has that potential.</p>	<p>What makes a Sydney Building?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wingara Mura will be of great help here. This document coupled with the site and place can inform the architecture to make it a Sydney building.</li> <li>• Materials, colours &amp; textures as well as Landscape [ Upper Wakil gardens will all play a part.</li> <li>• Ask this question of the design and you will find your materials. From paving materials to major facade components to interior lining of public areas important here to achieve design excellence for a Sydney Building.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>What makes a building for nurses? Clinical research?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These ideas can be incorporated with consultation with the faculties with the selected consortium. Design Excellence makes a building ideally suited to clients needs.</li> <li>• I’d look for ideas and richness in this engagement and bring this to the architecture.</li> </ul> <p>Rigour [resolution of architecture against design idea]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All the above will assist with the rigour of the architecture.</li> <li>• The diagram is a challenging one for this program. The reduced podium will deal with some of the amenity challenges, and the edge conditions, especially in a</li> </ul>

		<p>staged process. It will also help with access and use. If the architecture is pushed and rigorously worked through and planned this scheme could achieve design excellence.</p> <p>As with all these buildings, but especially the stage 1 building, opportunities exist in the SIPP envelope for a significant sun drenched and view filled roof terrace. The façade screening could extend to act as balustrading to wrap roof terraces into over all form. These could also be opportunities for outdoor learning.</p>
<p><b>16.0 Value for money</b></p>	<p>Appears high on the evidence of cost vs GFA/UFA, satisfying the briefed requirements, the overall efficiency and the cost plan requirements and is consider good value for money.</p> <p>The best value for money is achieved by design excellence. Design Excellence will give the building the greatest chance of success and longevity and therefore value.</p> <p>A buildings operation energy becomes the biggest cost against the building after 25 years. Operation energy exceeds construction energy usually around the 25-year mark. A life cycle analysis of the building will give a better view on value of money.</p>	<p>The team has the ability to detail a building to achieve Design Excellence. The Consortium need to allow rigorous design resolution from idea through to fine details, and that built</p>
<p><b>Other Criteria</b></p>		
<p><b>17.0 Wingara Mura</b></p>	<p>The engagement process proposed is sound and consultants are experienced and with good track record.</p>	<p>Response to the WMBB strategy and the WMBB design campus principles is reasonable, though currently generic and not properly integrated into the final proposition with a persuasive, clearly declared strategy that encompasses concept, planning, form, sociospatial conditions, materiality or allegory/metaphor/symbolism.</p> <p>What makes a Sydney Building?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wingara Mura will be of great help here. This document coupled with the site and place can inform the architecture to make it a Sydney building.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Materials, colours &amp; textures as well as Landscape [ Upper Wakil gardens will all play a part.</li> </ul> <p>Weathering potential - Wingara Mura will help here. Stone, natural material textures and colours have the best chance to age and patina well.</p>
<p><b>18.0</b> Clarity of design idea/ diagram</p>	<p>Exceptionally clear and well integrated across the scheme</p>	<p>Concern is for the amenity of 3 levels of deep plan, whole of site levels. This is only exacerbated with the additions of stages 2&amp;3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reduction in one level will reduce this concern considerably &amp; help with connectivity to RPA</li> <li>Connecting deep plan areas with wide corridors anchored by light at the facade is crucial to the success of these lower levels</li> </ul> <p>Perhaps a slight variation on the diagram as a unified podium and folded ground plane might be better suited to the program with the 3 or 4 building elements floating above that podium.</p> <p>A unified podium could possibly allow 3 different building elements on top designed by 3 different architects if the stage 1 experience deemed it necessary.</p>
<p><b>19.0</b> Resolution of Architecture</p>	<p>Striking formal composition. Good variation of mass/frame/screen components. Potentially responsive to climate; though this needs further modelling.</p> <p>The building's organisation, planning and aesthetics appear well suited to the disciplines that will populate it and the pedagogies it normally deploys.</p> <p>North facing main building with the long face north provides great light &amp; the potential for good amenity. Attenuation is the key here to stop the building over heating. The solutions look to be in the design but they need to be tested to get the best results.</p> <p>The solar sculpted cleave for the courtyard garden [ Wakil Garden ] makes for interesting and potentially joy filled space. The</p>	<p>Some finessing of scale and bulk is needed; as is a reconsideration of scale in relation to the public domain</p> <p>Reduce the "Folded Ground Plane" by 1 level, thus increasing floating building element - refer detailed comments above</p> <p>The diagram is a challenging one for this program. A reduced podium will deal with some of the amenity challenges, and the edge conditions, especially in a staged process. It will also help with access and use. If the architecture is pushed and rigorously worked through and planned this scheme could achieve design excellence.</p>

	<p>challenge will be to keep this dynamic space whilst maintaining sun to the courtyard. The Cleave is absent of solar screening for the north façade. This obviously has benefits, but also the potential for glare and head load. This needs to be considered and these questions answered.</p> <p>The Composition strategy is a tripartite form with base, middle and top floating element – refer comments above</p> <p>The screening to the glazed floating element is clever. The natural variation that is required on all different facades will help in the reading of the floating element. Keep pushing this as it will be a delight if rigorously worked through.</p> <p>What makes a building for nurses? Clinical research?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These ideas can be incorporated with consultation with the faculties with the selected consortium. Design Excellence makes a building ideally suited to client’s needs.</li> <li>• I’d look for ideas and richness in this engagement and bring this to the architecture.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>20.0</b> <b>Material use / language</b></p>	<p>The team has the ability to detail a building to achieve Design Excellence. The Consortium should be contracted in a way to allow rigorous design resolution from idea through to fine details, and that built.</p>	<p>Unclear at this stage and disappointingly undeclared.</p> <p>Look to Wingara Mura for material guidance – refer comments above</p>
<p><b>21.0</b> <b>Overland Flow</b></p>		<p>Stormwater / Over-Land Flow / Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The storm water solution does not appear viable, grilles as public edges that will provide for poor aesthetics, pathways for rats and other vermin and could quite possibly be dangerous.</li> <li>• The entry and exist points of the water flow will need to be grilled, this will provide a poor interface with the edge of the building and public domain.</li> </ul> <p>A better strategy maybe to use the building as a bluff and force</p>

		<p>the water around the back of the site [west]. This will improve the architecture, safety, public domain responses.</p>
<p>22.0 Achieving design excellence</p>	<p>It is considered that the proposal could achieve design excellence with minor design considerations as noted within the body of this report.</p>	<p>Requires considerable replanning and reallocation of volume to improve solar access to the central courtyard; mitigate negative environmental impacts; reduce the monumentality and overtly ceremonial character of the entry sequences; render the entry point more accessible and deal with the over scaled elements to the south in the full 3-staged version.</p> <p>The project requires a more detailed strategy engaging WMBB; as well as a much more detailed and considered public and interior art strategy.</p>

## 6.0 AREAS TO BE ADDRESSED TO ACHIEVE DESIGN EXCELLENCE

### 6.1 RICHARD CROOKES / IAN MOORE / RICE DAUBNEY HDR

1. Continue and enhance the campus linkages including the grandstand integration and connection with the building
2. Address vertical circulation due to poor clarity relative to the strong rational clarity of the diagram/ architecture.
  - North Glazed lifts are in a poor location – centralizing would improve connections.
  - Centralising circulation around/ near the transparency of the atrium void supports the logical understanding of the building for the user.
  - Centralised stairs should follow the centralized lifts, however these may have scope to be more playful and encourage stair use
3. Undertake pedestrian flow studies for peak periods and relocate program as necessary to test adequacy of vertical circulation due to high student populations on upper levels. It may be necessary to relocate teaching student areas on upper levels to lower ones.
4. Address the spatial quality of the atrium space.
  - Review the material selection to provide a warmer palette
  - Encourage more active use of the atrium by providing stairs within it linking all levels
  - Explore options to increase daylight to the lower levels of the atrium by reducing the superlab intrusion
5. Lower level below entry remains undeveloped and unconvincing.
  - Address the undercroft space to eliminate the negative building entry experience
  - Develop a strategy to remove vehicle access from Western Ave via the ramp (Blackburn Circuit) in the final arrangement to allow Stage 2 direct ground level connection to the landscaped courtyard
  - Consider enclosing this entire undercroft space
6. Further façade development required to address the following:
  - Large Glazed areas to north, west and east facades require further development to address heat load issues

- Provide increased dynamism in the facades (particularly the longer northern facade)

7. Wingara Mura strategies require further development and building integration

## 6.2 LEND LEASE / SNOHETTA / WOODS BAGOT

The DCJ consider the Snohetta/Woods Bagot design considers only a completed 3 stage development. They are unconvinced that the design can be adjusted within the framework of the concept such that Stage 1 can be considered a stand alone building for the following reasons:

1. The composition of eastern undulations does not work as a stand alone building
2. The resultant open spaces between the three stages is considered sub optimal and ambiguous
3. As a single building the links will appear incomplete
4. The relationship with the indoor / outdoor interface is unresolved. Even with Stages 2 and 3 complete the external space could read as a simple under croft through site link and not a defined area
5. There are substantial stage 2+3 massing and articulation problems including a lack of logic to the steps in the future southern facade and very deep future stage buildings

Other matters of concern include:

1. The proposed landscaping strategy appears significantly oversized

2. The edges of the building are not always well programmed, scaled or materially resolved to populate and nourish the public domain
3. Landscape courtyard requires deep soil to support large trees and spaces for larger groups and movement
4. The extensive floor plates could become a liability in terms of the amenity of the internal environment, circulation and wayfinding
5. Materials and finishes strategies are not yet clear, or clearly related to the volumetric approach
6. Lacking evidence that the necessary means for scaling and environmental control of the facades have been considered and put in place, even at a schematic level
7. This glazed areas to the north and east have the potential to overheat
8. The design needs curved glazing to make it sing. But with this not present, and replaced with faceted glazing, it speaks to a direction opposite to Design Excellence
9. Address the current aesthetics' requirement for very high levels of maintenance/cleaning
10. Potential reflection and glare impact of facades on adjoining building occupants
11. Potential wind effects on the public domain; particularly in the central courtyard
12. Substantially reduced solar access in winter to the central courtyard is disappointing.
13. Little evidence that solar load is being managed across the building's multiple orientations with a plausible system. This requires substantial modelling

14. Much finessing of scale and bulk is needed; as is a reconsideration of scale in relation to the public domain. Little variation in the materiality across the scheme. Responsiveness to climate remains to be modelled and validated
15. Response to the WMBB strategy and the WMBB design campus principles is extremely generic, if not absent completely. There appears to be no clearly declared approach that encompasses concept, planning, form, socio-spatial conditions, materiality or allegory/metaphor/symbolism.

### 6.3 LAING O'ROURKE / BILLARD LEECE PARTNERSHIP + DSR

1. Pedestrian flow studies would be useful to measure pedestrian use in peak periods to test for congestion
2. Landscape solution should be reviewed in relation to the following:
  - consider a reductive approach to some of the elements eg water features
  - Review disposition of building elements below the main entry to enable soil depths that facilitate tree planting. Consider retention or relocation of the existing fig tree
  - Reconsider overland flow strategy and drainage edges
3. Improve campus connections to Charles Perkins and RPA
4. Explore lowering the Upper Waikil Garden by 1 level to facilitate the following:
  - improve connectivity between university and hospital
  - reduce podium extent
  - Reduce the length of the stair journey from Western Ave
5. Improve north and west entries and north building elevation to improve relationship to the ground plane

6. Improve corridor widths in deeper plan areas and explore opportunities for view / light & outlook along the journey through the use of voids, top lighting, windows and activated edges
7. Review relative position of teaching spaces to ensure amenity is maximised appropriately
8. The Upper Wakil Garden should have an easy and open connection to the university & RPA as well as the edges of the building to maximize possible use
9. Improve the massing, articulation and expression with consideration of the following:
  - Redesign the podium of the Upper Wakil Garden to be a more integrated part of the stage 1 building
  - Review the north elevation massing to better communicate the dynamism of the overall concept
  - Reconsider the podium façade L0-L2 be more fundamentally different to the upper façade – a more solid expression
  - Provide a significant horizontal break in the western facade between the podium and the top
10. The screen devices to be refined and rationalised to address the different orientation conditions and access for cleaning and maintenance and bird and insect infestation
11. Wingara Mura strategies require further development and building integration

Health Precinct Stage 1

Design Competition Jury Assessment Report

## APPENDIX A: DESIGN COMPETITION BRIEF



# Health Precinct Stage 1

## Design Competition Brief

Campus Infrastructure & Services

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Version 1	02.11.16	As issued
<b>Version 2</b>	<b>10.01.17</b>	<b>Accommodates comments from GA</b>

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Project Mission.....	2
Type of Competition.....	3
Purpose of the Competition.....	3
Role of the University .....	4
Competition Process.....	4
SSD Planning Approval Process .....	7
Relationship to the Campus Improvement Program .....	7
Design and Policy Requirements .....	7
A. State Policy .....	7
B. City of Sydney .....	7
C. Campus Improvement Program .....	7
Heritage Significance.....	8
Proposed Uses .....	8
Capital Investment Value and Construction Budget .....	10
Level of Documentation for Submission.....	10
Submission Deliverables.....	12
Competition Jury .....	13
Terms of Reference for the Competition Jury.....	13
Fees and Compensation.....	13
Program .....	14
<b>Appendix A .....</b>	
<b>Director General’s Design Excellence Guidelines.....</b>	
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	
<b>Capital Investment Value (CIV) Assessment.....</b>	
<b>Appendix C .....</b>	
<b>University of Sydney – Design Excellence Process and Panel .....</b>	

## Introduction

The University of Sydney (the University) proposes to undertake an 'Invited Competitive Design Alternative' process to guide the development of the Health Precinct Stage 1 project. This document serves as a combined Design Competition Brief and Competition Strategy for this project.

The University shares the view of the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) and the City of Sydney in the pursuit of design excellence and we are committed to attaining the highest possible levels of design for our built environment.

The Health Precinct is located on the western end of the University's Camperdown campus and the Stage 1 project seeks to consolidate and accommodate the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery and the Sydney Medical School's Central Clinical School into a single, contemporary teaching and learning facility.

The Health Precinct is identified as a Transformational development precinct under the University's Campus Improvement Program (CIP).

The University has received the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEAR's) from the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE). The SEAR's confirms the project qualifies as a State Significant Development (SSD).

The DPE reference number for the SEAR's is **SSD 7974**.

The Capital Investment Value (CIV) of the development and the overall height of the building, triggers the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan (SLEP) 2012* requirements for a design competition to be undertaken. The University therefore intends to pursue an 'Invited Competitive Design Alternative' process in line with the consent authority requirements.

## Project Mission

The project mission is to create a new, modern facility to accommodate the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery, teaching components of the Sydney Medical School Central Clinical School and the associated support spaces into one facility. The new building shall foster a contemporary approach to pedagogy and create a collaborative, shared and flexible environment for all building users.

The proximity of the site to the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital (RPAH) also lends itself to opportunities for increased connections (professional and physical) between RPAH and the Health Precinct.

## Type of Competition

As the proposed Health Precinct Stage 1 building is anticipated to be over 25 metres in height and with a Capital Investment Value greater than \$100M, the University proposes to follow the competitive design process as described in the Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines and the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (SLEP) Division 4 Design Excellence*.

In accordance with the SLEP, the University will pursue an "Invited Competitive Design Alternative Process" and will seek design responses from three appropriately qualified architectural consultancies to provide a design response to the Principle's Project Requirements (PPR).

As one of Australia's leading tertiary education providers, the University also has a responsibility to both its current and future staff and students to deliver a facility that meets the budget, program, size, efficiency, flexibility and maintenance requirements of the project. Furthermore, the University is bound to comply with its own procurement guidelines that must be integrated with the competitive design process. As such, the architectural consultancies participating in the design competition will also be part of a larger design and construction consortia that will provide a holistic response to the University's wider project requirements.

The three lead architectural practices nominated above are registered architects in accordance with the NSW Architects Act 2003. All three firms have also partnered with either emerging local architects or established international consultancies to support their submissions.

The following three design and construction consortia are proposed to be invited to participate in the Health Precinct Stage 1 design competition:

- **Woods Bagot + Snohetta** in association with Lend Lease.
- **HDR Rice Daubney + Ian Moore Architects** in association with Richard Crookes Constructions.
- **Billard Leece Partnership + DSR** in association with Laing O'Rourke.

In line with the Director General's guidelines, all three design consortia will be made aware that the competition is a public process and all entrants' names must be clearly visible on the documentation.

## Purpose of the Competition

The purpose of the design competition is to provide the University, the Broadway-Camperdown local area and greater Sydney with a high quality built outcome for the site. Furthermore, the design competition will generate a well-considered urban planning response for the campus and provide an integrated landscape and streetscape solution for the local environment.

The University is aware of its' responsibility to be a leader in the built environment and development of public spaces. The competitive design process will ensure the built outcome for the Health Precinct Stage 1 achieves design excellence, engenders a sense of civic pride, and achieves the University's over-arching requirements for the facility.

## Role of the University

The University will facilitate the design competition process with the following requirements:

- Submit a Design Competition Brief (this report) to DPE for comment and endorsement, prior to initiating the competition process.
- Consult with the Consent Authority to develop the Design Competition Jury of appropriate experience, disciplines and resources.
- Provide the design competition guidelines including the Design Competition Brief and the Principal's Project Requirements (PPR) to the invited architects. The latter document includes all available due diligence documentation, the Functional Brief for the building, the Schedule of Accommodation, University guidelines, overarching requirements etc.
- Develop the program for the design competition and the subsequent review and assessment process.
- Follow the University's design excellence process as described in the Design Excellence Process and Panel document attached in Appendix C to achieve an appropriate outcome.
- Require the Design Competition Jury to respond to all queries, clarifications and requests for additional information by the invited architects during the design competition.
- Following completion of the competition, drive the assessment process in line with the process guidelines and program.

## Competition Process

The competitive design process will align with the *Department of Planning's Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines* which are attached to this Brief in Appendix A. This will include the creation of an independent Design Competition Jury agreed by the University and the Consent Authority to critique and assess the Design Responses.

Furthermore, the three submissions must also satisfy both the University's over-arching project requirements as well as the internal procurement guidelines. These "non-design" criteria also represent critical success factors for the University and will be assessed separately from the design responses. Therefore, two concurrent evaluation processes are proposed:

1. The Invited Competitive Design Alternative evaluated by the Design Competition Jury, and
2. The Commercial Offer evaluated by the Tender Evaluation Committee

In further detail;

1. The three architectural practices will be formally invited to participate in a 14-week design competition to develop their responses to the PPR. Invited architects will be required to provide responses developed to a standard that can be assessed by the Design Competition Jury to select a preferred scheme.

Minimum requirements for the final submission are detailed in Section 13 of this document.

Evaluation criteria for the Design Responses is captured in Attachment 5 “CIS Design Excellence Criteria” in the attached “Design Excellence Panel and Process” document and will include:

- Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation
  - Local and wider campus integration
  - Access and circulation internally and externally
  - Functional relationships and internal planning
  - Internal spatial quality
  - Façade design and maintenance regime
  - Servicing strategy, operational efficiency
  - Building services strategy
  - Environmental impacts
  - Ecologically Sustainable Design
  - Protection of view corridors
  - Efficiency
  - Flexibility
  - Innovation
  - Value for money
2. Concurrently the University’s Tender Evaluation Committee will assess the non-design components of the Consortia’s submission. This “Commercial Offer” will be further split into two components - price and non-price criteria.

The assessment of the Price criteria will include evaluation of:

- Value for money
- Construction price
- Design and construction program
- Risk management

The assessment of the non-price criteria will include evaluation of:

- Efficiency
- Flexibility
- Innovation
- Staging and delivery strategy
- Construction methodology
- Design and construction program
- User consultation and stakeholder management
- Team and relevant experience
- Interfaces and impacts on RPAH and other neighbours
- Risk management

Whilst the University recognises that the evaluation of the design competition and the commercial offer needs to be separate, there also needs to be dialogue between the two assessment committees. This connection will ensure continuity between the two groups during discussions and deliberations.

It is therefore proposed that during the assessment phase and prior to nominating the preferred scheme, the Design Competition Jury will consider the Tender Evaluation Committee’s assessment and commentary on the non-design criteria.

During the period of the design competition, the invited architects will each be required to individually present their interim submissions to the Design Competition Jury. The Jury will offer constructive feedback to the designers to assist in their interpretation of the PPR. This process is intended to ensure the invited architects' understanding of the competition guidelines and complex brief requirements align with the University's expectations.

All design presentations will be individual, mandatory and confidential and will be undertaken at Weeks 4,10 and 12 during the design competition. An optional additional session will be made available if the Design Competition Jury feels the design consortia is not progressing adequately. Similarly, should the design consortia request additional time with the Design Competition Jury, the University will consider additional sessions on a merit basis. Should an additional session be granted to one consortia, the other two invited teams will be offered the same opportunity. Section 18 of this Brief outlines the program of the competition and the subsequent assessment period in further detail.

All invited consortia will be compensated for their submissions through a fixed lump payment at the conclusion of the process – refer to Section 17 of this Brief for further details.

In line with the competitive design process, the following steps will be undertaken:

1. The University will propose a Design Competition Jury of appropriately qualified persons to critically assess and review the submissions. The proposed panel of jury members will be issued to the Consent Authority for their endorsement. The jury will include appropriate representative(s) nominated by the Consent Authority, as well as University representatives selected from the pre-qualified panel attached in Appendix C.

The Jury will be supported by a qualified team of Technical Advisors (including project managers, cost planners, engineers, sustainability representatives, facilities management etc) who will be on call should the Design Competition Jury require validation of any component of the submissions.

All meetings conducted by the Design Competition Jury will be minuted and agreed actions recorded. Copies of these minutes will be included in the subsequent State Significant Development Application.

2. A minimum of two interim and one final presentation will be made to the Design Competition Jury. Copies of the final submissions will also be made available to the Consent Authority for review.
3. The Design Competition Jury will prepare a Design Competition Report detailing the design review and assessment process and nominating the preferred scheme. This report will be issued to the Consent Authority and will also describe the Jury's understanding of each submission as well as provide commentary in relation to the merits and the limitations of the design responses. Furthermore, the Jury may also make recommendations for design amendments or conditions in the attainment of design excellence.

A copy of the Design Competition Report will be issued to the University once complete.

4. The Design Competition Report will be assessed by the Consent Authority to consider whether the University's competitive design process has demonstrated the attainment of design excellence and created an appropriate design outcome for the site.

## SSD Planning Approval Process

On October 13<sup>th</sup>, the University received DPE's SEAR's (SSD 7974) confirming the Health Precinct Stage 1 project as being State Significant Development. The SEAR's will be included as part of the competition briefing documents with a requirement that they are considered in the Architects design responses.

## Relationship to the Campus Improvement Program

### SSD 13\_6123

The University has adopted the Campus Improvement Program (CIP) for the implementation of development and infrastructure to the Camperdown-Darlington campus. The CIP has previously been determined as State Significant Development (SSD 13\_6123) and was approved by the Minister for Planning on 16 February 2015.

The CIP provides a total of six campus precincts with pre-approved building envelopes, generic University land uses, transport and access arrangements, landscape concepts, heritage and design principles for the University's campus.

The Health Precinct is one of the six campus precincts approved as part of SSD 13\_6123. The CIP information will be included within the competition briefing documents.

## Design and Policy Requirements

The three invited architects will be made aware that their responses will be required to consider the following policies, plans and documentation.

### A. State Policy

- State Environmental Planning Policy (State & Regional Development) 2011 (the SRD SEPP) - clause 15 & Schedule 1.
- State Environmental Planning Policy No 33 (Hazardous and Offensive Development) 2011
- State Environmental Planning Policy No 55 (Remediation of Land)
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007
- Draft policy 'Better Placed' (Government Architect, NSW) 2016

### B. City of Sydney

- City of Sydney LEP 2012; and
- City of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012

### C. SSD 13\_6123 – Campus Improvement Program (CIP)

- relevant conditions of the Minister's consent for the Concept Campus Improvement program SSD 13\_6123; and
- S83D(2) Status of staged development applications and consents of the Environmental Planning Assessment Act 1979

## Heritage Significance

The Blackburn Building is located within the Health Precinct CIP envelope as well as the Stage 1 development site. The building is classified as having a minor local heritage value on the University of Sydney's Section 170 Register, but is not listed as a local heritage item under Sydney LEP 2012 or as a State Heritage item. Under the CIP, the demolition of the Blackburn Building has been endorsed, but still requires a formal stage 2 planning approval for actual demolition process and associated conditions.

The University intends to pursue a planning pathway for the proposed demolition of the Blackburn Building and Dangerous Goods Store buildings as a separate early works package under the provisions of Clause 29 Development Permitted Without Consent of the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007* (the iSEPP), and not as part of the formal SSD application for this site.

The Heritage Impact Statement accompanying the CIP SSD application concluded the buildings' gross inefficiency and unsuitability for contemporary teaching, learning and research methodologies, as well as its' ageing infrastructure deemed as being beyond economic repair.

As such, there are no significant heritage requirements to be considered as part of this design competition. However, it has been determined that any future developments on the existing Blackburn Building site shall include a heritage interpretation plan in accordance with NSW Heritage Branch guidelines.

The University will provide the invited architects with a list of existing items of heritage significance from the Blackburn Building. The design consortia will be required to incorporate these items into the design of the new Health Precinct Stage 1 building.

## Proposed Uses

The 13,000m<sup>2</sup> Health Precinct site (shown dashed on the plan below) is located on an under utilised part of the Camperdown campus located on the corner of Western Avenue and Cadigal Lane. The site is adjacent to the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital (RPAH) to the west and close to the University's Oval number 1 to the north. The site is essentially unseen from any major public road or public domain areas.

The Health Precinct Stage 1 development is proposed to be located in the north western corner of the greater site (shown in red below). It incorporates the development of a new contemporary, flexible and collaborative facility that aligns with the University's strategic vision. The proposed building will make better and more effective use of an under utilised section of the campus that contains an ageing asset deemed to be beyond economic repair.

The new building will accommodate:

- Faculty of Health Sciences (currently located at the Cumberland campus)
- Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery (currently located at the Mallett Street campus)
- Sydney Medical School Central Clinical School administrative and teaching functions (currently located within the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital and the Blackburn Building), and
- Library functions and informal study spaces (currently located at Cumberland, Mallett St and the Bosch 1B building)
- Car parking for 30 cars
- Support spaces and back of house areas,



*The potential building footprint for the Health Precinct Stage 1 site is outlined in red in the diagram above.*

It is anticipated the new building will house approximately 25,000m<sup>2</sup> of Gross Floor Area and accommodate the following spaces:

- Entry foyer and reception facilities
- General Teaching Spaces
- Specialist Teaching Spaces
- A Clinical and Research Hub
- Offices and workstations for academic and professional services
- Breakout spaces and meeting rooms
- Support and Back of House spaces
- Optional cold shell spaces suitable for future wet laboratory fit out
- Significant landscaped areas

The high level Schedule of Accommodation is provided on the following page:

## Summary Schedule of Accommodation

Component	Useable Floor Area	Component Total
Workplace and Entry	4,936 sqm	6,159 sqm
Teaching and Learning – General	3,606 sqm	3,952 sqm
Teaching and Learning – Specialist	3,571 sqm	3,571 sqm
Clinic and Research	1,651 sqm	2,146 sqm
Back of House	852 sqm	852 sqm
<b>Total UFA</b>	<b>14,625 sqm</b>	<b>16,679 sqm</b>
Grossing Factor	45%	
<b>Gross Floor Area (GFA) without car parking</b>		<b>21,207 sqm</b>
UFA to GFA		69%
<b>Car parking spaces</b>	<b>30</b>	
Grossing Factor	10%	
<b>GFA car parking</b>		<b>990 sqm</b>
<b>Total GFA including car parking</b>		<b>22,197 sqm</b>
UFA to GFA		66%

As part of the PPR, the design consortia will be issued the endorsed Project Brief v7. This includes the full details of the briefed spaces summarised above, areas and the intended functions for the Health Precinct Stage 1 building.

## Capital Investment Value and Construction Budget

The Cost Manager's report prepared by Aquentia concludes the Capital Investment Value of the Health Precinct Stage 1 project is \$149,899,000 excluding GST.

The total construction budget for the project is \$115M excluding GST.

The Capital Investment Value assessment has been attached to this paper in Appendix B.

## Level of Documentation for Submission

The University requires that all design responses will be of sufficient quality to be adequately critiqued and assessed by the Competition Jury. The below tables highlight the final and interim submission requirements.

Furthermore, it is anticipated the successful submission will form the basis of a subsequent SSDA with DPE.

In order to allow a full and thorough assessment of the design responses and to allow the earliest possible lodgment of the subsequent SSDA, it is expected that the design consortia will prepare and submit the following documents with their submission.

## **PLANNING, ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN DESIGN**

### **A. Analysis of the Brief**

- I. Appraisal of sensitive elements in the brief
- II. Lessons learnt from previous projects

### **B. Health Precinct Master Plan**

- I. Health Precinct master plan
- II. Health Precinct staging strategy
- III. Campus linkages including pedestrian, vehicle and service access for stage 1 and future stages
- IV. Construction methodology including site access and construction operation

### **C. Stage 1 Design**

- I. Architectural concept Design
- II. Stage 1 planning
- III. Schedule of accommodation by level detailing functional and gross floor areas and briefed areas
- IV. Façade design
- V. Structural system principles and design
- VI. Sustainability strategy
- VII. University of Sydney Sustainability Framework compliance
- VIII. Building users access and circulation diagrams
- IX. Visitor access and circulation
- X. Goods handling and access diagrams
- XI. Security strategy
- XII. Operational waste management strategy
- XIII. BCA compliance and proposed fire engineering strategy with key alternate solutions required and approval risk assessment
- XIV. Schedule of primary internal finishes and finishes board
- XV. Schedule of primary external finishes and finishes board
- XVI. Three dimensional visualisations demonstrating architectural quality and “campus fit”

## **MECHANICAL DESIGN**

- I. Functional Description of each system type.
- II. Zoning plans showing what system serves each space.
- III. Block plans showing plant room and riser locations demonstrating that major equipment can be accommodated including required clearances and egress paths
- IV. Single line schematics for all major systems.
- V. Input into Sustainability Framework
- VI. High level calculations noting primary system capacities.
- VII. Returnable Schedule 3.3 completed identifying and dispensation required for variations from University of Sydney standards

## **MEDICAL GASES**

- I. Functional Description of gas storage and distribution strategy
- II. High level calculations noting primary system volumes and capacities.
- III. Returnable Schedule 3.3 completed identifying and dispensation required for variations from University of Sydney standards

## **ELECTRICAL**

- I. Functional Description of each system type.
- II. Block plans showing plant room and riser locations and demonstrating that major equipment can be accommodated including required clearances and egress paths.
- III. Single line schematics for all major systems.
- IV. Infrastructure Report including all interfaces with the campus (e.g. power,

- communications, security etc.)
- V. Design calculations for maximum demand in accordance with AS 3000
- VI. Inputs into sustainability framework
- VII. Returnable Schedule 3.3 completed identifying and dispensation required for variations from University of Sydney standards

#### HYDRAULIC AND FIRE SERVICES

- I. Functional Description of each system type.
- II. Block plans showing plant room and riser locations and demonstrating that all required equipment can be accommodated including required clearances and egress paths.
- III. Single line schematics for all major systems.
- IV. Infrastructure Report including all interfaces with the campus (e.g. storm water, cold water, sewer etc.)
- V. Inputs into sustainability framework
- VI. Returnable Schedule 3.3 completed identifying and dispensation required for variations from University of Sydney standards

## Submission Deliverables

The University is proposing a minimum of two interim presentations to the Competition Jury as part of the competitive design process. These are being convened to ensure the design consortia fully understand the University's design criteria and expectations. The jury will provide robust and open feedback to the teams as their designs progress. The following deliverables for the each presentation (week 4 and week 6) are proposed:

Deliverables	Milestone Date
	<b>15 November 2016</b> Issue of RFT documentation
<b>Interim Presentation 1 Master Planning Workshop</b>	<b>9 December 2016</b>
1. Master planning assessment and options including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Health precinct masterplan options</li> <li>b. Preferred option principles and campus linkages</li> <li>c. Compliance or deviations with CIP</li> <li>d. Staging strategy</li> <li>e. Stage 1 location and envelope</li> <li>f. Preliminary assessment of masterplan and Stage 1 potential GFA</li> </ul>	Response to include relevant construction strategies and risks associated with preferred option  <b>Electronic plus 3 x bound and 1 x loose hard copies to be provided</b>
2. Brief analysis and general arrangement in relation to proposed stage 1	
<b>Interim Presentation 2</b>	<b>3 February 2017</b>
1. Introduction to and demonstration of the roles of the key members of the proposed team (including the key subcontractors and consultants)	<b>Electronic plus 3 x bound and 1 x loose hard copies to be provided</b>
2. Project brief analysis of key components and relationships	
3. Confirm campus integration and linkages	
4. Planning principles and relationships: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Workplace and entry</li> <li>b. Teaching and learning - general</li> <li>c. Teaching and learning - specialist</li> <li>d. Clinic and research hub</li> </ul>	

e. Back of house	
5. Internal circulation principles	
6. Preliminary schedule of accommodation	
7. Services system principles	
8. Structural system principles	
9. Concept façade design and finishes	
10. Indicative Programme & Milestones	
<b>Interim Presentation 3</b>	<b>14 February 2017</b>
<b>Final Tender Submission</b>	<b>24 February 2017</b>
1. Final submission	<b>Electronic plus 6 x bound and 1 x loose hard copies</b>

## Competition Jury

The University acknowledges that to achieve the best design outcome, a committed and professionally diverse assessment team is required. Therefore, the Design Competition Jury for the assessment of the Health Precinct Stage 1 design responses is proposed to be made up of the following three members:

- Di Leeson (non voting Chair),
- **Jesse McNicoll** The City of Sydney
- **Shaun Carter** The Government Architect (representative),
- **Kim Crestani** The University of Sydney (representative), and
- **Michael Tawa** The University of Sydney.

The final selection of the Design Competition Jury will be completed in consultation with the Consent Authority.

## Terms of Reference for the Competition Jury

The Terms of Reference for the Competition Jury has been included as part of the Design Excellence Process and Panel document attached to this paper in Appendix C.

## Fees and Compensation

It is proposed that upon successful completion of the design competition, all three design consortia will be compensated for their submissions.

Subject to the Design Competition Jury's determination that the design responses have met the competitive design criteria, the participants will each be paid a fixed lump sum amount of:

Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$400,000) excluding GST.

It is noted that there is no capacity for progress payments or part payments during the design competition process. The lump sum amount will be paid to the nominated lead consultant in the design consortia and the University has no input or control as to how this amount is distributed (or otherwise) within the design consortia.

## Program

Subject to endorsement from DPE, the University intends to manage the competitive design process and the subsequent assessment period in line with the below dates.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>
RFT and design competition opens	15.11.16	
Interim Submission 1 Presentation	09.12.16 14.12.16	Week 4
Interim Submission 2 Presentation	31.01.17 02.02.17	Week 10
Interim Workshop 3	14.02.17	Workshop
RFT and design competition closes	24.02.17	
Preliminary Assessments	27.02.17 - 03.03.17	5 days duration
Final Presentations	07.03.17	
Design Assessments and discussions Clarifications	08.03.17 – 15.03.17	5 days duration As required
Architectural Design Competition Report	16.03.17	
DPE endorsement	17.03.17 – 23.03.17	5 days
Design Integrity Panel dates	April - May	To Be Confirmed
Target SSDA lodgement	25.05.17	To Be Confirmed

## Appendix A

### Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines

## **Appendix B**

### Capital Investment Value (CIV) Assessment











## Appendix C

University of Sydney – Design Excellence Process and Panel

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

COMMITTEE	HEALTH PRECINCT STAGE 1, DESIGN COMPETITION JURY (DCJ)
PURPOSE	<p>To provide commentary on the designs as they develop for the Health Precinct Stage 1, to ensure the Consent Authority's design excellence requirements are balanced with the University's broader objectives;</p> <p>To provide feedback during the design competition process through iterative workshops and commentary.</p> <p>To support, advise and assist the Tender Evaluation Committee.</p>
TERMS OF REFERENCE	<p><b>DCJ responsibilities:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Participate as a member of the assessment panel (DCJ) and work collaboratively with your fellow members to agree outcomes.</li> <li>b. Participate in all interim workshops, presentations and other design forums.</li> <li>c. Critique all design proposals and provide feedback and commentary on the alignment with the Principals' Project Requirements (PPR) including (but not limited to):             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation</li> <li>- Local and wider campus integration</li> <li>- Interface with public realm</li> <li>- Access and Circulation internally and externally</li> <li>- Functional relationships and internal planning</li> <li>- Internal spatial quality</li> <li>- Façade design and maintenance regime</li> <li>- Servicing strategy and operational efficiency</li> <li>- Building services strategy</li> <li>- Environmental impacts</li> <li>- Ecologically Sustainable Design</li> <li>- Protection of view corridors</li> <li>- Efficiency</li> <li>- Flexibility</li> <li>- Innovation and</li> <li>- Value for money</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. Evaluate the submissions in accordance with the assessment criteria,</li> <li>e. Recommend refinements to one or more submissions and the review process to be followed to achieve design excellence</li> <li>f. The jury's decision will be via a majority vote.</li> </ol>
CHAIR	<b>Di Leeson</b> (non-voting)
MEMBERSHIP	<p>Voting Members</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Jesse McNicoll</b>, The City of Sydney Representative</li> <li>2. <b>Shaun Carter</b>, Office of the Government Architect Representative</li> <li>3. <b>Kim Crestani</b>, The University of Sydney Representative</li> <li>4. <b>Michael Tawa</b>, The University of Sydney Representative</li> </ol>

<b>PROBITY ADVISOR</b>	Representative of O'Connor Marsden & Associates (probity advisor) will be present in all meetings with the proponents and as required otherwise.
<b>SUPPORT</b>	<p>Technical Advisors (as required)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Juliette Churchill, CIS Planning Manager</li> <li>2. Jenny Watt, Design Manager</li> <li>3. Andrej Stevanovic, Precinct 4 Delivery Manager</li> <li>4. Tim Pike, Project Director</li> <li>5. Kevin Cheslett, Cost Manager</li> </ol> <p>others as required</p>
<b>QUORUM</b>	Three (3)
<b>SECRETARIAT</b>	To be provided by CIS
<b>MEETINGS</b>	<p>Project Briefing: January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017  Presentation 1: January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017  Presentation 2: February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2017  Final Presentation: March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017</p> <p>Frequency of the assessment and evaluation meetings to be determined by the DCJ.</p>
<b>MINUTES</b>	<p>All meetings to be accurately minuted and actions agreed and recorded.</p> <p>Action list with schedule of active items, responsibilities and deadlines to be maintained.</p> <p>Minutes to be retained and kept on file for inclusion as part of the subsequent State Significant Development Application.</p>
<b>DELIVERABLE</b>	<p>At the conclusion of the evaluation period for the design responses, the DCJ shall author a Design Competition Report. The Chair will be required to incorporate the commentary of the DCJ and the Report shall be endorsed by all members.</p> <p>The Report will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Summarise the competition process,</li> <li>- Outline the assessment of the design merits of each scheme,</li> <li>- Present the Jury's preferred scheme, including the rationale for the choice of a nominated design and how this exhibits design excellence, and</li> <li>- Outline any recommended design amendments that are relevant to the achievement of design excellence for all submitted schemes.</li> </ul> <p>The DCJ Report will be submitted to the DoPE and the TEP.</p> <p>The TEP will consider the Jury's report in determining the outcome of the selection process.</p>

## APPENDIX B: RESPONSE TO INTERIM PRESENTATION NO 1

## Health Precinct Stage 1 - Master Planning Workshop

### Laing O'Rourke (LOR) Consortia

- Option 1 (Street) and 3 (Terrace) contain very strong planning principles, particularly around the spaces created between the buildings
  - Option 1 may better align with the University's objectives in relation to maximising development potential within the project budget
  - Option 3 – Consortia's preferred option – elements of Option 3 are very exciting however the demolition and integration of the Grandstand building may be difficult within the project budget. Suggest consortia also pursues a compliant scheme that retains the Grandstand in its current form
  - Some concern regarding the cost to build these schemes, particularly Option 3 (Terrace)
  - Potential for repurposing of Stage 1 carpark (with additional floor to floor height) with the future integration of Stage 2 and 3 carparks provides positive long term flexibility
  - Initial concepts for massing and stacking were conventional – exploration of the less conventional approach (such as Columbia Medical School) could be considered
  - Further consideration of overland flow and on site detention is necessary
  - Further consideration to be given regarding permeability through colleges and view impacts from Western Avenue
  - Vehicular loop around RPAH noted as an important element to engage the west of the site however all stages must not rely on any RPAH land or access over it
  - LOR enquired about the retention of the existing Plane Trees in Blackburn Circuit. Can these be removed and replaced with other trees? Noted there are some health issues associated with the existing trees. Project Team to respond separately.
- 
- Stage 1 is to be a stand-alone facility with ability to be integrated with future stages. Consortia to consider how this will look prior to completion of subsequent stages.
  - Stage 1 development has to consider servicing strategy for the adjacent Bosch buildings as well as the existing Grandstand during and post construction.
  - Greater integration with the RPAH is desirable and provisions that enable it are welcome however the proposed scheme has to be viable without relying on any RPAH land or access over it.
  - Maximising the GFA opportunities across the site is an important consideration
  - If the proposed scheme is outside the CIP envelope, the proponent needs to obtain independent planning advice and factor the relevant planning and program risks into their response
  - Ongoing consideration of the Wingara Mura strategy required
  - Consortia is reminded of the \$115M design and construction budget

## Health Precinct Stage 1 - Master Planning Workshop

### Lend Lease (LL) Consortia

- Landscape was identified as a key element in the scheme but a whole of site approach was not addressed.
  - In particular, the interfaces the western interface with RPAH must provide a “front door” approach between the two sites
  - Interfaces with the Colleges must not diminish college amenity and should positively contribute to college outlooks
  - South, east and west site boundary interfaces not addressed in the concept scheme to a level of granularity that will be essential
  - The concept of “bringing the landscape through” needs to be successful without Gloucester House piece or any other reliance on RPAH interface. GFA to be maximised within the site constraints
  - Landscape strategy needs to be stand alone and not rely on RPAH as their inevitable expansion may utilise all of their available land
  - Connections could be strengthened with confirmation of RPAH levels
  - Careful consideration required as to how Oval No. 1 may engage with the Health Precinct green space
  - Consortia suggested that overland flow was to be “celebrated” – how this manifested in the scheme was not immediately apparent
  - On Site Detention strategies must be included in the project budget (even if Hockey Square is part of the solution).
- 
- Stage 1 is to be a stand-alone facility with ability to be integrated with future stages. Consortia to consider how this will look prior to completion of subsequent stages.
  - Stage 1 development has to consider servicing strategy for the adjacent Bosch buildings as well as the existing Grandstand during and post construction.
  - Greater integration with the RPAH is desirable and provisions that enable it are welcome however the proposed scheme has to be viable without relying on any RPAH land or access over it.
  - Maximising the GFA opportunities across the site is an important consideration
  - If the proposed scheme is outside the CIP envelope, the proponent needs to obtain independent planning advice and factor the relevant planning and program risks into their response
  - Ongoing consideration of the Wingara Mura strategy required
  - Consortia is reminded of the \$115M design and construction budget

## Health Precinct Stage 1 - Master Planning Workshop

### Richard Crookes Constructions (RCC) Consortia

- Detailed site analysis undertaken however the master plan concept had not been fully developed
- Richard Crookes concerns regarding budget adequacy had resulted in masterplan options that do not meet the requirement and briefed areas of the Functional Brief.
- Site development does not appear to be maximised with under 50,000m<sup>2</sup> achieved. Stage 1 development site should ensure future stages can maximise the GFA opportunities on the site
- Further consideration of linkages, integration and overlooking between RPAH and the Health Precinct is required. The Health Precinct should look to engage with RPAH architecturally professionally and academically
- Stage 1 solutions cannot rely on RPAH land or access across their land. Access via John Hopkins Drive should be limited to ambulance and emergency vehicles
- Landscape solution between RPAH and western site boundary needs further consideration
- Consideration of the amenity of adjacent building occupants is important
- Access and servicing strategy for the Grandstand during and post construction will require careful consideration
- Bosch 1B is built on the University boundary, therefore service access to Stage 1 cannot be to the west of this building. Richard Crookes to reconsider the access strategy for Stage 1
- Further consideration to be given to view lines from RPAH onto the University grounds
- Further consideration into the stormwater management strategy and on site detention is required. Flow paths need to be considered
- Ongoing consideration of the Wingara Mura strategy required
- All options focused on a Stage 1 central atrium solution – the advantages of this concept were not fully described in the presentation
- Interfaces between stages was not clear – what is the nature of the zones between the buildings and in what stage is it built?
- Stage 1 is to be a stand-alone facility with ability to be integrated with future stages. Consortia to consider how this will look prior to completion of subsequent stages.
- Stage 1 development has to consider servicing strategy for the adjacent Bosch buildings as well as the existing Grandstand during and post construction.
- Greater integration with the RPAH is desirable and provisions that enable it are welcome however the proposed scheme has to be viable without relying on any RPAH land or access over it.
- Maximising the GFA opportunities across the site is an important consideration
- If the proposed scheme is outside the CIP envelope, the proponent needs to obtain independent planning advice and factor the relevant planning and program risks into their response
- Ongoing consideration of the Wingara Mura strategy required
- Consortia is reminded of the \$115M design and construction budget

## APPENDIX C: RESPONSE TO INTERIM PRESENTATION NO 2

**Health Precinct Stage 1  
PCI Presentation No 2 – 30 January 2017**

**Design Competition Jury Comments**

**Laing O'Rourke  
Diller Scofidio + Renfro (DS+R)  
Billard Leece Partnership  
Arcadia Landscape**

Demonstrate how the scheme can be modified to respond to the following key issues:

1. Compliance within the CIP envelope
2. The level of the central "green" appears a level too high to connect with RPA with the optimum connection required to the southern RPA entry level adjacent to the café
3. How can pedestrian connectivity to RPA work without a bridge
4. Improve solar access to central "green"
5. Address wind mitigation to central "green"
6. Improve the permeability and activation of the ground plane
7. Simplify and rationalise extent of terraces and upper level landscaping
8. Healthy building response to include "calm" as well as active space
9. Mixed mode ventilation solutions are not preferred due to complexity of operational façade components
10. High volume student zones require more generous and clearer circulation connections to building entry points

Provide clarification in relation to the following:

11. Building façade and floor level interface with the ground plane, in particular for Stage 1
12. How do the facades respond to the particular context of the location
13. How does the "L" shaped circulation integrate with the greater master plan/public domain
14. Internal building circulation appears to rely on links/connections to future stages – demonstrate how stage 1 is stand alone
15. Provide the way finding strategy
16. How does the water circulate under the building
17. Compliance with the UFA (Usable Floor Area) as specified in the PPR and the GFA (Gross Floor Area) of the proposed design. Please provide diagrams of UFA and GFA measurements.

These comments are provided for your team's consideration and action. The CIS team is happy to offer the tenderers the opportunity for CIS to provide clarification of the comments and to discuss your preliminary responses at a workshop on Friday, 3 February 2017.

An additional workshop will be held on Monday 13 February with the Design Competition Jury. The session will be informal and interactive and we encourage you to come along with options, sketches and the like rather than developing a formal presentation format.

The Design Competition Jury consider that successfully addressing these issues is critical to achieving design excellence. To ensure adequate time is given to address this feedback, it is proposed to extend the final submission date by two weeks – from 24 February 2017 to 10 March 2017.

**Health Precinct Stage 1  
PCI Presentation No 2 – 30 January 2017**

**Design Competition Jury Comments**

**Lend Lease  
Woods Bagot  
Snohetta  
Aspect Studio**

Demonstrate how the scheme can be modified to respond to the following key issues:

1. Improve solar shading to the north east landscape zone
2. Simplify and rationalise extent of terraces and upper level landscaping
3. Improve access and quality of natural light on workspace floors (i.e. 60m deep floor plates)
4. Interface between the 2 x facade systems (terraced internal and vertical external) requires greater refinement
5. Improve the permeability and activation of the ground plane
6. How does pedestrian connectivity to RPA work without a bridge

Provide clarification in relation to the following:

7. Interface between Stages 1, 2 and 3 appears seamless. Demonstrate how construction staging can be achieved without impact on completed stage operation
8. How do the facades respond to the particular context of the location
9. How do the facades interact with the ground plane
10. Demonstrate stage 1 massing is stand alone.
11. Compliance with the UFA (Usable Floor Area) as specified in the PPR and the GFA (Gross Floor Area) of the proposed design. Please provide diagrams of UFA and GFA measurements.

These comments are provided for your team's consideration and action. The CIS team is happy to offer the tenderers the opportunity for CIS to provide clarification of the comments and to discuss your preliminary responses at a workshop on Friday, 3 February 2017.

An additional workshop will be held on Monday 13 February with the Design Competition Jury. The session will be informal and interactive and we encourage you to come along with options, sketches and the like rather than developing a formal presentation format.

The Design Competition Panel consider that successfully addressing these issues is critical to achieving design excellence. To ensure adequate time is given to address this feedback, it is proposed to extend the final submission date by two weeks – from 24 February 2017 to 10 March 2017.

**Health Precinct Stage 1  
PCI Presentation No 2 – 30 January 2017**

**Design Competition Jury Comments**

**Richard Crookes  
HDR Rice Daubney  
Ian Moore Architects  
JMD Design Landscape**

Demonstrate how the scheme can be modified to respond to the following key issues:

1. Maintaining loading and servicing access to both Bosch buildings until Stages 2 and/or 3
2. Reassess proposed Stage 1 loading dock access to minimize impact on public domain
3. Improve the permeability and activation of the ground plane and streetscape
4. Create various scales of use to provide intimacy
5. Improve vertical and horizontal circulation strategy
6. Building drop off/entry should be located at Western Avenue for all user arrivals
7. How does pedestrian connectivity to RPA work without a bridge

Provide clarification in relation to the following:

1. GFA diagrams showing distribution of the 30,000m<sup>2</sup> of floor space
2. While the scheme provides a very clear diagram please provide an understanding of how the users will experience the building
3. Demonstrate how the building will provide a comfortable environment for the broad range of building users
4. How do the facades respond to the particular context of the location
5. How does the building interface with the adjacent landscape around its perimeter
6. Demonstrate legibility of the narrative for the whole community around the waterway strategy
7. Compliance with the UFA (Usable Floor Area) as specified in the PPR and the GFA (Gross Floor Area) of the proposed design. Please provide diagrams of UFA and GFA measurements.

These comments are provided for your team's consideration and action. The CIS team is happy to offer the tenderers the opportunity for CIS to provide clarification of the comments and to discuss your preliminary responses at a workshop on Friday, 3 February 2017.

An additional workshop will be held on Monday 13 February with the Design Competition Jury. The session will be informal and interactive and we encourage you to come along with options, sketches and the like rather than developing a formal presentation format.

The Design Competition Panel consider that successfully addressing these issues is critical to achieving design excellence. To ensure adequate time is given to address this feedback, it is

proposed to extend the final submission date by two weeks – from 24 February 2017 to 10 March 2017.

Health Precinct  
PCI Interim Presentation 2

UoS comments to all tenderers

- To ensure there is no ambiguity, the University confirms that the service zone off Cadigal Lane between Bosch 1A and 1B is included in the Stage 1 site area and may be considered for service access to Stage 1
- Ensure there is a “front door” to RPAH
- Demonstrate how the vertical circulation accommodates the building population as it is distributed in the design at peak periods i.e. incoming and outgoing students during a 10-minute timetable turnaround
- Provide a diagram showing the façade treatment and solar attenuation for north, south, east and west facades
- Explain how the building responds to the particular disciplines of nursing, midwifery and health sciences AND describe the experiential quality of the exterior, arrival and interior spaces – i.e. “joy”
- The final presentation is to provide a holistic response to the design solution ie “storytelling”

In responding to the above, please note that the Dean of Nursing and Midwifery and the Dean of Health Sciences have been invited to the final presentation and both sit on the Tender Evaluation Committee together with a representative from the Faculty of Medicine

## APPENDIX D: DESIGN COMPETITION JURY INDIVIDUAL MEMBER RESPONSES

# CONSORTIA NAME: LL

Date	Juror Name
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	Kim Crestani FIRST DRAFT COMMENTS

Terms of Reference Criteria	Comments
Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation	<p>The aspirations of this proposal with health and well being, biophilia and the narrative of grafting were inspirational. The understanding of different typologies on the Sydney Uni campus was also well thought through.</p> <p>It is however considered that notwithstanding these approaches, the proposal presented a very risky strategy by the team for a staged building in 3 forms that really represents as one building.</p> <p>It is difficult to correlate how the Stages 2 and 3 could be delivered without the same team and this approach may not be able to manifest. The jury did request submissions on this approach however the separable part of stage 1 is still considered difficult as a stand-alone built form in the final submission.</p>
Local and wider campus integration	The overall composition with all 3 stages is seen as more successful in the integration with the wider campus than Stage 1 as a stand-alone proposition. Notwithstanding this- the resultant open spaces between the three stages is considered sub optimal and ambiguous.
Interface with public realm	The proposal explores the relationship of one built form over 3 stages within a landscaped setting,. Whilst the aspirations are supported the resolution and end outcome has not achieved this goal.
Access and Circulation internally and externally	The interior public spaces and the large welcoming void are well founded and expansive and whilst a first visitor may find the spatial quality a little overwhelming, regular users would find the circulation within public spaces to be acceptable. Notwithstanding this the dual corridors- as a result of expansive floor plates are considered a little harder to negotiate and navigate.
Functional relationships and internal planning	The proposal delivers a welcoming building with inviting voids, stairs and amphitheatre style seating, however the relationship with the indoor outdoor interface is unresolved. Even with Stages 2 and 3 complete the external space could read as a simple under croft through site link and not a defined area.
Internal spatial quality	The arrangement of large contiguous floor plates, albeit having greater circulation – is questioned- in particular the

	<p>amount of double loaded corridors. The wayfining is ambiguous.</p> <p>The use of timber ceilings is rich and ensures a warmer juxtaposition against the extensive glazed areas.</p>
Façade design and maintenance regime	The building form is a rectangular flat façade with a craved out glazed eroded façade. The juxtaposition of these two elements or ordered against curvaceous would require more detailed resolution.
Servicing strategy and operational efficiency	NA
Building services strategy	NA
Environmental impacts	<p>The design team was questioned at earlier presentations regarding the application of solar shading to facades and the heroic application of outdoor terraces. Whilst the team did respond to the terraces displacement, they were silent on how the solar shading could work on the project.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that the team is considered highly capable of delivering this it is questioned why it wasn't considered by final bid stage.</p>
Ecologically Sustainable Design	NA
Protection of view corridors	NA
Efficiency	The quantum of GFA is some 25K with a briefed area of some 15K, which appears moderate.
Flexibility	The flexibility of large floor plates would be acceptable- again provided a staged schema is accepted.
Innovation	The building typology of large floor plates offers a solution that is recognisable as an office typology and with the student public spaces is reasonably innovative.
Value for money	The quantum of GFA at some 25K and resultant brief area requirements of some 15K is also questioned from an efficiency point of view.
<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Design Excellence	<p>For this proposal to be considered it would need to be supported, in the first instance that a cohesive building of some 60K m<sup>2</sup> could be delivered in parts.</p> <p>It is difficult for the jury to endorse a proposal should the University client group be unable to accept such a proposition.</p>

# CONSORTIA NAME: LOR

Date	Juror Name
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	Kim Crestani FIRST DRAFT COMMENTS

Terms of Reference Criteria	Comments
Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation	<p>This proposal is a very joyful proposition which takes advantage of the setting with a landscape healing narrative, turpentine ironbark forest and a good indigenous strategy.</p> <p>The proposal satisfies the briefed area requirements of some 15K M2 and is considered to satisfactorily displace the public areas at the base levels of the building with the learning levels above, followed by the workplace levels in a bifurcated and somewhat intimate plan at the upper levels of the building.</p> <p>This arrangement is superior in that it is a logical and functional arrangement where students and user groups can navigate their way around the required spaces without the need for excessive vertical transport. (Circulation)</p> <p>The arrangement of stairs as a way finding solution both within the interior and the exterior spaces allows a very legible and welcoming reading of the building.</p> <p>The arrangement of numerous uses along the elongated northern boundary overlooking the oval is a fundamental strength of the scheme and optimises the connection with the indoor/outdoor quality of the spaces. This is considered the optimum “real estate” for the site both in orientation and preserved views and has been capitalised upon by the design team.</p>
Local and wider campus integration	<p>The Stage 1 proposal supports a “citadel” or podium form with Stage 1 having an elongated built form that proposes a “cleave” between the two forms set around a central core of VT with common areas. Stages 2 and 3 would need to be aligned vertically and horizontally with this Stage 1 submission but could easily be delivered by alternative design teams provided strict criteria is met regarding interfaces in any future briefs.</p> <p>The landscape solution, whilst dramatic and espousing “well being” and integration of indoor and outdoor arrangements could consider a reductive approach to some of the elements.</p>

	<p>For example; Whilst the water features would add to the atmosphere and create calm and a pleasing acoustic presence – the quantum of water bodies could be more judiciously displaced.</p> <p>The displacement of the “cleave” and the corresponding upper Wakil garden were originally questioned by the DCJ at earlier presentations- the Jury requested further design development and solar testing of this proposition- which the team has satisfied. Any improvements to the solar access into this space would improve it further.</p>
Interface with public realm	<p>The overall “master plan” with the three forms for Stages 2 and 3 above a podium form could result in a relatively level access from the southeast corner of Cadigal lane and Western Avenue to the Upper Wakil garden at RL 36.4 and this is strength of the scheme.</p> <p>However the potential for a bridge connection (if it eventuates) from RPA would necessitate a change in level to the outdoor space. Consideration should be given to reviewing this interface and ensuring that equitable access could be delivered.</p> <p>The main entry space sits above the fire tanks set within the level 0 plan at the eastern edge. Consideration must be given to re looking at the disposition of these services to ensure that adequate soil depths and contiguous planters can be arranged to facilitate tree planting. It would be necessary to re arrange spaces on Level 0 but this is highly recommended. Consideration should also be given to relocation of the Fig Tree if possible.</p>
Access and Circulation internally and externally	<p>The essential arrangement of arrival at RL 27.20 is considered satisfy however it could be improved by a more legible open connection to the north aligned with the lifts to assist way finding and orientation. Once at the lift core the sequence and way finding is considered to be highly legible.</p> <p>The essentially “cruciform” circulation is supported any improvement on light and air ingress to this space should be considered. It is further noted that level 5 north east wing is a little constrained in planning layout and could be improved.</p> <p>Consideration however should be given to the arrangement of common areas at Level 7 with the triangular geometry adjacent lifts.</p> <p>Consideration of amending the circulation on Level 0 to the Sim labs is also recommended as it does not open to the external walls and is sub optimal access from the lift core.</p>
Functional relationships and internal planning	<p>The location and quarantining of enclosed large format Super labs and theatres within the podium is logical and efficient</p>

	however consideration should be given to the ancillary circulation spaces could be enhanced by the provision of vertical skylight elements that could align with the outdoor Wakil garden and allow for top lighting to those spaces.
Internal spatial quality	The internal quality of the public spaces, in particular the cohesive arrangement of the resources collection is very rich and welcoming and mediates between the indoor/outdoor qualities of the spaces. First time visitors would feel welcome into this space.
Façade design and maintenance regime	The upper levels with adequate sun shading propositions are well resolved however the lower podium forms could consider further resolution with regard to “settling” the lower podium/citadel forms into the landscape. For example: Whilst the Sim rooms gain advantage from the northern aspect, consideration of a thicker more articulated ‘brise soleil’ form may assist in grounding the building, whilst providing sun shading and assisting with a reading of the building in its landscape setting.
Servicing strategy and operational efficiency	Stage 1 allocates the car parking within the base of the podium. Further consideration would be required when Stages 2 and 3 are proposed of how these interfaces would work.
Building services strategy	NA
Environmental impacts	NA
Ecologically Sustainable Design	The proposal has dealt with solar shading of facades in a very practical way (note_ façade design notes above)
Protection of view corridors	NA
Efficiency	It is understood that the GFA for this proposal is some 22K. The proposed schedule of accommodation of 16K therefore reflects a very efficient solution.
Flexibility	The current drawings have not explored full engineering and services installations and it is highly recommended that the structure and integration will resolve a number of issues- flexibility of uses within a formalised grid of columns would help sustain the on going flexibility of spaces in this proposal.
Innovation	The proposal is a well-staged master plan concept with two further stages that could be delivered in a cohesive way.
Value for money	The proposal appears to be satisfying the briefed requirements, the overall efficiency and the cost plan requirements and is consider good value for money.
<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Design Excellence	It is considered that the proposal could achieve design excellence with minor design considerations as noted within the body of this report.

**Health Precinct Stage 1**  
**Design Competition Responses**

# CONSORTIA NAME: RC

Date	Juror Name
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	Kim Crestani FIRST DRAFT COMMENTS

Terms of Reference Criteria	Comments
Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation	<p>The proposal is for a very functional rectangular Stage 1 built form with deep floor plates set around an atria space. The Proposal for Stages 2 and 3 are rational and displaced - producing elongated rectangular forms that could be delivered relatively easily.</p> <p>However the proposition is for a building in stage 1 that is larger at the upper levels and reduced/smaller at the lower levels. Whilst this may be a result of fitting in with and maximising the CIP envelope it is a rather odd solution for the following reasons. The circulation of students requires use of lifts to access the Super labs, which are located on Level 6.</p> <p>This is considered difficult to support and the DCJ did request at an earlier presentation for the team to address this issue and in particular level of service (Fruin) for crush periods. Unfortunate this information was not addressed nor submitted at final presentation stage.</p> <p>It is also considered that the displacement of Stages 2 and 3 with a separation distance of some 10 metres may be better as one building.</p>
Local and wider campus integration	<p>The proposition of a large rectangular built form in an orthogonal geometry is reasonable, however the proposal relies on a huge undercroft space which is simply elevating the building above the ground plane in a rather heroic way. The tree columns are symbolic of the setting however the undercroft space is simple dedicated to a loading dock and access. [See also servicing]</p>
Interface with public realm	<p>The landscape proposal is well founded and superior in that it retains existing trees and provides a sensitive solution to the site and entrance. The entrance however is detached from the main car drop off on Western avenue and relies on a ramp entrance system that is very formal.</p>
Access and Circulation internally and externally	<p>The atrium space whilst rational offers no joy in its presentation and it would be necessary, should this scheme proceed to ensure a higher quality of atria space is provided. Whilst atria spaces are becoming more the norm in office</p>

	buildings this proposal suffers from an unfriendly presentation that would require a higher level of design and acoustic and visual considerations if this proposal were to be considered.
Functional relationships and internal planning	The relationship of the lifts and convoluted circulation is considered illogical and way finding is sub optimal. The DCJ also requested that consideration be given to the relocation of the vertical transport however consideration of this was dismissed by the team.
Internal spatial quality	The atrium is a good device on large floorplate buildings however the incursion into this space by the footprint of the super labs diminishes its quality and effectiveness.
Façade design and maintenance regime	The façade studies and proposal are considered to be a great strength of this scheme. The quality of macro to micro considerations of materiality are good as is the use of natural materiality.
Servicing strategy and operational efficiency	The scheme proposed the loading and access areas slung under the building below the entrance ramp. In a previous presentation the DJC requested further exploration of this sub optimal area especially as viewed from the entrance ramp. It was requested that the team explore an alternative, however this was not demonstrated in the final presentation. The rationale of elevating the building above this loading area is an expression of the watercourse under the building. It produces a negative building entry experience.  Consideration would need to be given to enclosing this entire undercroft space.
Building services strategy	NA
Environmental impacts	The location of north/west facing glazed lifts are questioned. This was discussed in an earlier presentation however was challenged by the team.
Ecologically Sustainable Design	NA
Protection of view corridors	Addressed above.
Efficiency	The quantum of 25K of GFA with a briefed area of 17K is considered moderate.
Flexibility	The team presented the atrium typology as a “chassis” which offered optimum flexibility. Whilst this is agreed, as the scheme is regular and orthogonal- it is still a major issue regarding the extensive footprints of the upper floors with smaller footprints at the lower more accessible levels.
Innovation	It is considered that an atrium type scheme is rational and reasonable but in terms of innovation it is considered that it is less innovative as a building typology.
Value for money	The proposal is for a quantum of some 23K GFA with approx. 17K deliverable as briefed area. The VFM proposition is not as clear as other schemes.

Other Criteria	Comments
Design Excellence	<p data-bbox="627 210 1362 315">It is considered that this proposal would need a great deal of re planning to satisfy the above concerns. In fairness, the other schemes would not require such extensive re design.</p> <p data-bbox="627 353 1273 387">As such design excellence may be difficult to achieve.</p> <p data-bbox="627 425 1278 564">Alternatively consideration could be given to ensuring validation by independent third party reviewers to demonstrate that circulation of students would reach satisfactory levels of service.</p>

**LL/SNOHETTA**

Date	Juror Name
Friday 31 March 2017	Michael Tawa

Terms of Reference Criteria	Comments
Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation	Persuasive as a three-dimensional diagram and reasonably well extended into the form, spatial organisation and amenity of the proposal.
Local and wider campus integration	Persuasive throughout. Excellent public domain strategy to the east and north ground planes. Good linkages in all directions; however problematic link to RPA. Volumetrically interesting in terms of scale and articulation; successfully edging campus development, framing the open space to the north and drawing it into the upper courtyard. The project's response to staging is unconvincing, with the Stage 1 component appearing incomplete without Stages 2 and 3; and possessing little capacity to accommodate alternative designs during those stages.
Interface with public realm	Reasonably well considered; though the proposed landscaping strategy appears significantly oversized. The edges of the building are not always well programmed, scaled or materially resolved to populate and nourish the public domain. The extensive areas of glass to the north and east could prove problematic in this respect, particularly in terms of scaling and potential to produce glare.
Access and Circulation internally and externally	Workable strategy. Spaces appear well scaled, well disposed and calibrated to user loads. Good collocation of areas with the most use and user numbers on the lower floors, leading to efficiency and amenity. Many opportunities for active circulation by users throughout the proposal. Earlier ideas of micro courtyards and voids could have been more systematically developed and integrated to assist in this, as in clarifying wayfinding for users.
Functional relationships and internal planning	Appears effective; though the extensive floor plates could become a liability in terms of the amenity of the internal environment, circulation and wayfinding
Internal spatial quality	Internal space appears fluid and responsive to user movement. Materials and finishes strategies are not yet clear, or clearly related to the volumetric approach.
Façade design and maintenance regime	Generally unconvincing and lacking evidence that the necessary means for scaling and environmental control of the facades have been considered and put in place, even at a schematic level.

Servicing strategy and operational efficiency	
<b>Building services strategy</b>	
Environmental impacts	<p>Potential reflection and glare impact of facades on adjoining building occupants.</p> <p>Potential wind effects on the public domain; particularly in the central courtyard.</p> <p>Substantially reduced solar access in winter to the central courtyard is disappointing.</p> <p>Little evidence that solar load is being managed across the building's multiple orientations with a plausible system. This requires substantial modelling.</p>
<b>Ecologically Sustainable Design</b>	
Protection of view corridors	Reasonable and effective.
Efficiency	Appears low on the UFA/GFA numbers.
Flexibility	<p>The fluid planning strategy may not be conducive to adaptability and resilience of the building over time.</p> <p>There is some inflexibility due to the disposition of the structural system.</p>
<b>Innovation</b>	<p>Some formal innovation in the articulated mass of the building. Little evidence of potential innovation in the detailing and refinement of facade assemblies; or spatially through cross sectional treatment.</p> <p>Some innovation in the public domain landscaping to the north and east.</p>
Value for money	Appears moderate on the evidence of cost vs GFA/UFA.
<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Pathway to Design Excellence</b>	
Clarity of design idea/ diagram	Exceptionally clear diagram, though not persuasively carried through into the architecture and integrated across the scheme.
Resolution of Architecture	<p>Striking formal composition. Much finessing of scale and bulk is needed; as is a reconsideration of scale in relation to the public domain. Little variation in the materiality across the scheme. Responsiveness to climate remains to be modelled and validated.</p> <p>The building's organisation, planning and aesthetics appear reasonably well suited to the disciplines that will populate it and the pedagogies it normally deploys.</p>

Joy	Clear evidence in the playful, layered facades and the fluid interiors.
Material use / language	Unclear at this stage and disappointingly undeclared.
Wingara Mura	Response to the WMBB strategy and the WMBB design campus principles is extremely generic, if not absent completely. There appears to be no clearly declared approach that encompasses concept, planning, form, socio-spatial conditions, materiality or allegory/metaphor/symbolism. No engagement process has been proposed. There appears to be no public or interior art strategy in place.
Achieving design excellence	The project is unlikely to achieve design excellence due to the extensive range of problematic issues, ranging from its response to staging, to the alignment of formal propositions and climate control, and its undeveloped WMBB strategy.

**LOR/ DILLER SCOFIDIO**

Date	Juror Name
Friday 31 March 2017	Michael Tawa

Terms of Reference Criteria	Comments
Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation	Persuasive as a three-dimensional diagram and well extended into the spatial organisation and amenity of the proposal.
Local and wider campus integration	Persuasive throughout. Excellent public domain strategy to the east and north ground planes. Good linkages in all directions; however poor link to RPA. Volumetrically convincing in terms of scale and articulation; successfully edging campus development, framing the open space to the north and drawing it into the upper courtyard.
Interface with public realm	Well considered, with a suitable sense of occasion for the arrival sequence from the east and north. The edges of the building not always well programmed, scaled or materially resolved to populate and nourish the public domain. The extensive areas of glass to the north and east could prove problematic in this respect.
Access and Circulation internally and externally	Excellent strategy of a perforated volume, enabling multiple vertical connections both visually and physically. Spaces appear well scaled, well disposed and properly calibrated to user loads. Good collocation of areas with the most use and user numbers on the lower floors, leading to efficiency and amenity. Many opportunities for active circulation by users throughout the proposal.
Functional relationships and internal planning	Appears persuasive; though the extensive floor plates could become a liability in terms of the amenity of the internal environment, circulation and wayfinding
Internal spatial quality	Porous and intriguing. Excellent conceptualisation evident in the section. Internal space appears fluid and responsive to user movement. Materials and finishes strategies are not yet clear, or clearly related to the volumetric approach.
Façade design and maintenance regime	Adequately conceived, designed and detailed to function practically and aesthetically. The screen devices require extensive refinement and rationalisation to address the different orientation conditions. Access for cleaning and maintenance into some intricate assemblies, as well as extensive glass surfaces may prove problematic.
Servicing strategy and operational efficiency	

Building services strategy	
Environmental impacts	<p>Potential reflection and glare impact of facades on adjoining building occupants.</p> <p>Potential wind effects on the public domain.</p> <p>Minimal solar access in winter to the central courtyard is disappointing.</p> <p>Concern about the effects of overscaling to the southern facade with the following staged components.</p>
Ecologically Sustainable Design	
Protection of view corridors	Reasonable and effective; particularly in the project's creation of new view corridors. These, however, require proper modelling.
Efficiency	Appears moderate on the UFA/GFA numbers.
Flexibility	<p>The fluid planning strategy may not be conducive to adaptability and resilience of the building over time.</p> <p>There is some inflexibility due to the disposition of the structural system.</p>
Innovation	<p>Modest innovation formally. Evidence of potential innovation in the detailing and refinement of facade assemblies; as well as in the promising cross section that produces vertical and inclined porosities throughout the building.</p> <p>Some innovation in the public domain landscaping to the north and east.</p>
Value for money	Appears high on the evidence of cost vs GFA/UFA.
<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Pathway to Design Excellence</b>	
Clarity of design idea/ diagram	Exceptionally clear and well integrated across the scheme
Resolution of Architecture	<p>Striking formal composition. Some finessing of scale and bulk is needed; as is a reconsideration of scale in relation to the public domain. Good variation of mass/frame/screen components. Potentially responsive to climate; though this needs further modelling.</p> <p>The building's organisation, planning and aesthetics appear well suited to the disciplines that will populate it and the pedagogies it normally deploys.</p>
Joy	Some evidence in the playful facades and porous, fluid interiors with marked dramatic vertical moments in places.
Material use / language	Unclear at this stage and disappointingly undeclared.

<p>Wingara Mura</p>	<p>Response to the WMBB strategy and the WMBB design campus principles is reasonable, though currently generic and not properly integrated into the final proposition with a persuasive, clearly declared strategy that encompasses concept, planning, form, sociospatial conditions, materiality or allegory/metaphor/symbolism.</p> <p>The engagement process proposed is sound and consultants are experienced and with good track record.</p>
<p>Achieving design excellence</p>	<p>The project can potentially achieve design excellence; however this would necessitate considerable replanning and reallocation of volume to improve solar access to the central courtyard; mitigate negative environmental impacts; reduce the monumentality and overtly ceremonial character of the entry sequences; render the entry point more accessible and deal with the overscaled elements to the south in the full 3-staged version.</p> <p>The project requires a more detailed strategy engaging WMBB; as well as a much more detailed and considered public and interior art strategy.</p>

**RCC/IAN MOORE**

Date	Juror Name
Friday 31 March 2017	Michael Tawa

Terms of Reference Criteria	Comments
Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation	Persuasive as a diagram; however, inflexible and rigid in terms of amenity. Disposition of areas with the most use and user numbers on the upper floors not conducive to efficiency or amenity.
Local and wider campus integration	Persuasive throughout. Excellent public domain strategy to the east ground plane. Good linkages in all directions. Good connection to RPA. Lower level below entry remains undeveloped and unconvincing. Volumetrically convincing in terms of scale and articulation; successfully edging campus development and framing the open space to the north.
Interface with public realm	Well considered, with a suitable sense of occasion for the arrival sequence from the east. The edges of the building not always well programmed to populate and nourish the public domain.
Access and Circulation internally and externally	Entry suffers from ambiguity in the legibility of circulation systems. Concerns as to adequacy of lift provision for vertical circulation to the most populated areas on upper floors; particularly at changeover times on the hour. Paucity of stairs for active circulation by users.
Functional relationships and internal planning	Programming and disposition of uses remains problematic. See above. Internal planning too dominated and constrained by the atrium void. Insufficient use is made of potential porosity in the section to counter the rigid, diagrammatic nature of the section, and of the spatial experience by users.
Internal spatial quality	Successful in the entry sequence and at the circulation lift node on the north. Pedestrian in the entry space and on the typical layout of upper levels. Preponderance of raw materials results in a somewhat cold and aesthetically unengaging environment. Abstract and metaphorical assignment of diverse materials to selected areas of the interiors can be a successful strategy architecturally, though it may not reach or be appreciated by the users.
Façade design and maintenance regime	Generally well conceived, designed and detailed to function practically and aesthetically. There is quite some finesse and elegance in the screening idea, and its variability across the different facades. Access for maintenance into some intricate assemblies may prove problematic.

Servicing strategy and operational efficiency	
Building services strategy	
Environmental impacts	Persuasive strategy to manage stormwater by conveying surface flows in the central formed gully. Some concerns as to potential reflection and glare impact of facades on adjoining building occupants.
Ecologically Sustainable Design	
Protection of view corridors	
Efficiency	Appears high on the UFA/GFA numbers.
Flexibility	In principle well considered, though the actual adaptability and resilience of the building is not easily gauged without more information on detailing. Structural grid produces narrow building blocks, with some inflexibility due to dimensions and disposition of the structural system. However spaces are contiguous and may be readily and differently occupiable. This has not been properly modelled however.
Innovation	Minimal innovation formally. Evidence of potential innovation in the detailing and refinement of facade assemblies. Some innovation in the public domain, entry sequence and tree columns supports; though these last may be read as cliché.
Value for money	Appears questionable on the evidence of cost vs GFA/UFA.
<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Pathway to Design Excellence</b>	
Clarity of design idea/ diagram	Exceptionally clear and well integrated across the scheme
Resolution of Architecture	Elegant and refined composition, well scaled to the public domain and well proportioned as a volumetric assembly. Good variation of mass/frame/screen components. Readily responsive to climate. Some concern as to the suitability of the building's aesthetics and rigorous planning diagram for the disciplines that will populate it and the pedagogies it normally deploys.
Joy	Very little. Dour and efficient.
Material use / language	See above.

<p>Wingara Mura</p>	<p>Response to the WMBB strategy and the WMBB design campus principles is generalised and notional. Some evidence of early consideration, but not followed through into the final proposition with a persuasive, clearly declared strategy that encompasses concept, planning, form, socio-spatial conditions, materiality or allegory/metaphor/symbolism.</p>
<p>Achieving design excellence</p>	<p>The project can potentially achieve design excellence; however this would necessitate considerable replanning and reconsideration of the circulation network to achieve efficiency and amenity for users. The project requires a much more detailed and considered strategy engaging WMBB; as well as a much more detailed and considered public and interior art strategy.</p>

**Health Precinct Stage 1**

**Design Competition Responses / Pathway to Design Excellence**

**CONSORTIA NAME :** Laing O'Rourke, BL + DS+R, Landscape Architects [ name??? ]

Friday 31 March 2017	Laing O'Rourke, BL + DS+R, Landscape Architects [ name??? ]
----------------------	---

Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team appear to have achieved the brief area requirements.</li> <li>• Pedestrian flow studies would be useful to measure pedestrian use in peak periods to test for congestion.</li> <li>• I'll take advice from the experts and the client as to how the rooms and level layouts work as designed. The client should be engaged with the teams to get the best planning and room arrangement per levels right.</li> </ul>
Local and wider campus integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The north and west connections to Charles Perkins and RPA are poor. These are some of the major links this building needs to achieve and foster. These areas need significant improvement.</li> <li>• Reducing the podium by 1 level will significantly help with connectivity.</li> <li>• These buildings should act as a catalyst to better improve connection between university and hospital. I don't see that happening in the design at this moment.</li> <li>• The Eastern entry connects well to the university. Deep soil planting for the trees will help here.</li> <li>• Removing the storm water grilles and flow from under the building will help north and south facades to connect to better connect to the site.</li> <li>• The north face connection the oval has the potential to be good. Work this façade hard to achieve this, as it could be improved.</li> </ul>
Interface with public realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drainage edges will be poor urban outcome. This needs to be reconsidered.</li> <li>• West and North faces could better related to the pedestrian at the ground plan. Both these entries need to be made more generous, special.</li> <li>• The avenue/ grove of Gum trees to the main university entrance need deep soil planting for success.</li> <li>• A lower podium would encourage more people to walk up to the courtyard garden [ Upper Wakil Garden ].</li> <li>• A lower podium will also scale down the 3 storey western wall to RPA, making it more friendly and connectivity better. It will also allow a level access from the hospital bridge to the Upper Wakil garden.</li> </ul>
Access and Circulation internally and externally	<p>Entry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East, main university entry is good. Spatially rich. The lift core is some distance from the front door, but with good planning this could be negotiated well, and once found [ its on a direct line of travel ] is very efficient and logical. This should not be an issue if resolved well.</li> <li>• The North &amp; West entries are perhaps almost as important as the East with student &amp; staff flows from Charles Perkins and RPA. These need significant improvement.</li> </ul>

	<p>Vertical circulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the great aspects of this design. Clear, logical, efficient and spatially joyful in the upper floating element. It is also used as a device to bring light to the lower levels and for the thermal stack effect. This would only get better if the podium was reduced one level.</li> </ul> <p>Circulation to Room</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wider corridors in deeper plan areas essential. These should be anchored by east, west or north facing facades to allow for the view &amp; light &amp; prospect along the journey. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Voids that plug into these corridors, especially to the north will allow light to penetrate deeper into the plan</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Legibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Careful way finding at the east entry for a longish journey to the central circulation will be necessary....this should be easily managed I would have thought. It is after all straight ahead from entry.</li> </ul>
<p>Functional relationships and internal planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The general organisation of brief function and levels seems appropriate.</li> <li>• All levels should be tested with Pedestrian flow studies to guarantee each level, circulation paths work well at peak periods.</li> <li>• North external terrace of the folded ground plane arrives at a level that doesn't seem to support the joy of the journey [ why does this to go to the Deans level? ]. A level off the podium may assist this. Support it with a lively function, like a café, food outlet/ social area.</li> <li>• The courtyard garden should have an easy and open connection to the university &amp; RPA as well as the edges of the building to maximize possible use.</li> </ul>
<p>Internal spatial quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The East Entry, the Cleave-vertical circulation, The Upper Wakil Garden all have the potential to be great spaces. The garden will support the internal spaces next to it. These need to maintain these qualities and improved if possible.</li> <li>• Long north face of the building has the potential for good amenity. Especially with the floating building element. Care needs to be taken so these areas don't over heat or suffer from too much glare.</li> <li>• Deep plan areas of the podium will struggle for decent amenity, and have the potential to be poor spaces. Everything needs to be done to lift the amenity of these levels/ spaces. Reducing the podium to 2 deep plan areas will significant help with this aim.</li> </ul>
<p>Façade design and maintenance regime</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details need to be worked through on all facade elements to demonstrate material longevity &amp; appropriateness, maintenance distances between facade elements and glazing is achieved. Bird &amp; other animal nesting/ resting opportunities need to be considered in the design of elements [ both base &amp; floating façade elements could suffer with this ].</li> <li>• Façade design needs to consider a materiality that is appropriate to site &amp; place [ ie: to become a Sydney Building ]. Greater consideration of Wingara Mura will help with this.</li> <li>• The podium base needs work. The tripartite design wants</li> </ul>

	<p>this to be a heavy solid podium, but the plan and program want it to be completely glazed and transparent. You will need to prove this can work to achieve Design Excellence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What role do the trees play with the north, west and east façade? This needs to be further considered [ ie: are the trees a green screen for solar attenuation? And if so do you use them as screening for these faces, but if you don't will you loose the façade composition? ]</li> </ul>
Servicing strategy and operational efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Its seems efficient. Deep plans are deceptively efficient, but if people don't like the spaces, efficiency looses.</li> <li>• Will take advise on this.</li> </ul>
Building services strategy	
Environmental impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flooding / Stormwater / overland flow strategy doesn't work. There are better methods to deal with stormwater that could be used. I'd encourage embracing these other strategies.</li> <li>• The loss of the existing tree grove is a loss, especially the Fig. But not a requirement either</li> <li>• There is always an environmental loss when buildings are demolished. These range from old to 30-40 year old buildings. An enormous amount of embodied energy will be given up. If these buildings are to be replaced, a focus on a long life for the new buildings is fundamental. The goal should be these buildings will last at least 100 years. Design Excellence is the only path that can achieve that.</li> </ul>
Ecologically Sustainable Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above the podium this building has all the necessary ingredients to perform very well against ESD principals.</li> <li>• Deep plans are difficult &amp; challenging places and spaces for ESD. ESD is only viable if people are keen to inhabit the building. This is this schemes greatest challenge.</li> <li>• Deep soil planting should be given to east entry trees for a greatest chance of success for these trees.</li> <li>• Large roof areas should be used for ESD or Habitable purposes. Large scale PV panels or research gardens could be deployed here. So too, so outdoor teaching / social areas.</li> </ul>
Protection of view corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large buildings will block views. RPA's large wall blocks out the west. I'm not sure this is a huge issue on this site.</li> <li>• However the right building on this site has the potential to create new view corridors. This should be considered, explored and explained. It may enrichen the project.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vertical circulation and long thin north facings buildings always have the greatest potential to do well and be efficient.</li> <li>• Deep plans are efficient in a constructional sense, but poor in many other areas of efficiency. A reduction in the deep plan areas will improve overall big picture efficiency.</li> </ul>
Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long life loose fit is a good strategy for a building that is likely to have many lives with different users.</li> <li>• A central vertical circulation core servicing good sized floor areas either side appear to be flexible.</li> <li>• Bespoke deep plan areas are less flexible.</li> </ul>
Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The façade screening device will be a creative and innovative element.</li> <li>• Possible the water skimming pond too [ that or it will not</li> </ul>

	<p>work and not last the design phase ].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am always wary of innovation in architecture being more emperor’s new clothes than innovative. It’s not a crime to not innovate if design excellence can be achieved by many and varied proven design paths, and resolution. We tend to find ESD systems to be a source of innovation in architecture, and this building has that potential.</li> </ul>
Value for money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The best value for money is achieved by design excellence. Design Excellence will give the building the greatest chance of success and longevity and therefore value.</li> <li>• A buildings operation energy becomes the biggest cost against the building after 25 years. Operation energy exceeds construction energy usually around the 25 year mark. A life cycle analysis of the building will give a better view on value of money.</li> </ul>
<b>Pathway to Design Excellence</b>	
Clarity of design idea/ diagram	<p>The Parti / the big idea Appropriateness of the design idea/ diagram</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question for me is, is this the right diagram? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ My concern is for the amenity of 3 levels of deep plan, whole of site levels. This is only exacerbated with the additions of stages 2&amp;3.</li> <li>○ A reduction in one level will reduce this concern considerably &amp; help with connectivity to RPA</li> <li>○ Connecting deep plan areas with wide corridors anchored by light at the facade is crucial to the success of these lower levels</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Perhaps a slight variation on the diagram as a unified podium [ and folded ground plane ] might be better suited to the program with the 3 or 4 building elements floating above that podium.</li> <li>• A unified podium could possibly allow 3 different building elements on top designed by 3 different architects if the stage 1 experience deemed it necessary.</li> </ul>
Resolution of Architecture	<p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the “Folded Ground Plane” by 1 level, thus increasing floating building element. This will <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Make better connections to RPA with a <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ lower podium wall</li> <li>▪ flat bridge connection from the café area of RPA to the “courtyard area” of the Folded Ground Plane podium, providing the courtyard with greater use &amp; chance of success</li> <li>▪ reduce the east stair case from the University from 3 flights to 2. This will give the Folded Ground Plane a greater chance of success as people will more likely use these steps to access the courtyard as it is easy to get there, and more able to be seen; drawing people up.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Provide more amenity to the building overall [ less</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>deep plan areas, more surface area ] whilst still providing 2 levels for “black box” uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will give the north external stair case potentially greater meaning as it will arrive at learning studios &amp; resources areas. This could support a café function with seating to the sun.</li> <li>○ Will give the north &amp; west glazed areas greater chance to be shaded by tree canopies than 3 levels.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 0 could be re-organised to allow deep soil planting for the Eucalypt Forest at the east entry. These will be bonzi’ed and stunted if in planters.</li> <li>• L1 Flexible Rooms &amp; L2 Learning Studios in the south east corner of the building are likely to be areas of low amenity. Relocating these to the north or west facades on these levels will provide greater amenity. You could consider moving Lecture Theatre 100’s on each level to Flexible Rooms &amp; Learning Studio’s and look to move these rooms/ studios to external façade areas to the west and North.</li> <li>• Large floor plate sections need wider corridors for deeper plans. These corridors should end and be anchored by external glazed façade. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The north-south corridors could open onto north glass rather than a seminar rooms on L1&amp;2</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Deeper plan areas could be better serviced by void areas to the external facade. In particular seminar rooms on Levels 1+2 could be relocated to host a void to the north entry. This would let light deeper into the deep plan &amp; improve the important entry experience on the north façade [ which is probably the main entrance from those coming from Charles Perkins ]</li> <li>• Any area lost due to reduced podium level, may be able to be found in upper elements, or traded into other stages.</li> <li>• I’m not sure the water feature to the north of the main east entry is helping. If you dropped it I feel you would help the design &amp; landscape</li> </ul> <p>Solar Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North facing main building with the long face north provides great light &amp; the potential for good amenity. Attenuation is the key here to stop the building over heating. The solutions look to be in the design but they need to be tested to get the best results.</li> <li>• The solar sculpted cleave for the courtyard garden [ Wakil Garden ] makes for interesting and potentially joy filled space. The challenge will be to keep this dynamic space whilst maintaining sun to the courtyard.</li> <li>• The Cleave is absent of solar screening for the north façade. This obviously has benefits, but also the potential for glare and head load. This needs to be considered and these questions answered.</li> </ul> <p>Composition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Composition strategy is a tripartite form with base [ podium ], middle [ shadow-line ] and top floating element [ screened top ] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Typically floating elements are reinforced by a heavy podium – one plays off the other.</li> <li>○ The podium [ Folded Ground Plane ] is the deep plan section that wants to fully glazed and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>transparent to allow as much light as possible deep into the plan, which is the opposite to what the diagram wants it to be.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A reduced podium [ by 1 level ] &amp; the composition strategy need to be carefully considered, and tested to ensure the 3 elements can be clearly read and identified to allow the elevations to hold together. Maybe the horizontal blades will work, but maybe they won't. I'd start here with composition testing, as the middle compositional devise of clear glazing needs to be offset by more screened "heavier" elements either side.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The screening to the glazed floating element is clever. The natural variation that is required on all different facades will help in the reading of the floating element. Keep pushing this as it will be a delight if rigourously worked through.</li> <li>• The original diagram had dynamic inclined planes on the façade. As the design has been worked through the various feedback and brief iterations it has become more flat and slab like to the north and west. A design challenge is to bring back some of the original diagram dynamic qualities to these facades. This may help with the façade composition and overall architectural expression.</li> </ul> <p>Proportion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My view is the reduction of the fold ground plane podium will help with proportion. The folded Ground plan will be more podium, than a significant chunk of the building [ 2 levels of 8 rather than 3 ] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proportion and Composition will be iterated together in testing for best design.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>What makes a Sydney Building?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wingara Mura will be of great help here. This document coupled with the site and place can inform the architecture to make it a Sydney building.</li> <li>• Materials, colours &amp; textures as well as Landscape [ Upper Wakil gardens will all play a part.</li> </ul> <p>What makes a building for nurses? Clinical research?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These ideas can be incorporated with consultation with the faculties with the selected consortium. Design Excellence makes a building ideally suited to clients needs.</li> <li>• I'd look for ideas and richness in this engagement and bring this to the architecture.</li> </ul> <p>Rigour [ resolution of architecture against design idea ]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All the above will assist with the rigour of the architecture.</li> <li>• The diagram is a challenging one for this program. The reduced podium will deal with some of the amenity challenges, and the edge conditions, especially in a staged process. It will also help with access and use. If the architecture is pushed and rigourously worked through and planned this scheme could achieve design excellence.</li> </ul>
--	--

Joy	<p>Views</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Podium and north facing long façade provide good views over the over and campus areas. The key is to keep these qualities.</li> <li>As with all these buildings, but especially the stage 1 building, opportunities exist in the SIPP envelope for a significant sun drenched and view filled roof terrace. The façade screening could extend to act as balustrading to wrap roof terraces into over all form. These could also be opportunities for outdoor learning.</li> </ul> <p>Spatial complexity / simplicity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Main east entry &amp; and Cleave offer the best opportunity for spatial, light filled joy. The courtyard garden too. These need to be maintained and rigourously worked through.</li> <li>Deep plan areas will only get deeper with stages 2&amp;3 plugging into the podium. These have the potential to be poor spaces for people. Wide corridors opening onto brightly light external facades feed by voids will significantly improve these experiences.</li> <li>West &amp; North entries seem like poor spatial experiences, but there is enormous scope to lift both these entries spatially.</li> </ul> <p>Generosity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The courtyard [ Upper Wakil Garden ], the grand stair up to the garden [ north &amp; south ], the Grove of Gums to the east entry, the East Entry and the Cleave are all generous spaces. These need to be kept.</li> <li>Greater generosity to West and North entries is needed to improve these entry experiences and connections.</li> <li>Roof terraces could be easily achieved and add to the experience, and to outdoor learning.</li> </ul> <p>Voids</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comments above</li> <li>The North entry could be reinforced &amp; joy lifted with voids to the north façade above the entry, Light will also be allowed deeper into the plan.</li> </ul> <p>Gardens/ well being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The great challenge will be realize the garden ideas. Especially on the building. There was little engagement with the landscape architect through the presentation process. I'd encourage a more integrated landscape architect role within the design team.</li> </ul> <p>Special Moments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above</li> <li>The water skimming pond and stream on the Upper Wakil Garden has the potential to be something special, or a not work at all [ perhaps one idea too many ]. I'd push this through testing and iteration to see if this can be realized.</li> <li>The roof terrace has a chance to be special.</li> </ul>
Material use / language	<p>Appropriateness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hard to tell at this stage.</li> <li>Look to Wingara Mura for material guidance.</li> <li>Large Glazed areas to north, west and east facades have the potential to over heat Sydney buildings. This needs to be carefully considered.</li> </ul>

	<p>Weathering potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again, Wingara Mura will help here. Stone, natural material textures and colours have the best chance to age and patina well.</li> <li>• The clever suncreening device needs to last Sydney's brutal sun, teaming rain and humidity. I'd plan for what will look good in 25 years and you will have your material.</li> </ul> <p>Sydney Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask this question of the design and you will find your materials. From paving materials to major facade components to interior lining of public areas important here to achieve design excellence for a Sydney Building.</li> </ul> <p>Detailing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team has the ability to detail a building to achieve Design Excellence. The Consortium should be contracted in a way to allow rigourous design resolution from idea through to fine details, and that built.</li> </ul>
Wingara Mura	<p>Wingara Mura considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This could be done in a deeper more considered way</li> <li>• Refer to comments above.</li> </ul> <p>Wingara Mura principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This could be done in a deeper more considered way</li> <li>• Refer to comments above.</li> </ul>
Other [ list ]	<p>Stormwater / Over-Land Flow / Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I don't think the storm water solution is viable, grilles as public edges that will provide for poor aesthetics, pathways for rats and other vermin and could quite possibly be dangerous.</li> <li>• The entry and exist points of the water flow will need to be grilled, this will provide a poor interface with the edge of the building and public domain.</li> <li>• A better strategy maybe to use the building as a bluff and force the water around the back of the site [ west ]. This will improve the architecture, safety, public domain responses.</li> </ul>

**Health Precinct Stage 1**

**Design Competition Responses / Pathway to Design Excellence**

**CONSORTIA NAME :** Richard Crookes, IM + HSR Rice Daubney, JMD Design

Friday 31 March 2017	Richard Crookes, IM + HSR Rice Daubney, JMD Design
----------------------	--

Response to Functional Brief and Schedule of Accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team appear to have achieved the brief area requirements.</li> <li>• Pedestrian flow studies would be necessary to measure pedestrian use in peak periods to test for congestion. The University team doesn't believe program organization sits at the right levels and will cause traffic flow issues. Look at relocating students to a lower levels.</li> <li>• I'll take advice from the experts and the client as to how the rooms and level layouts work as designed. The client should be engaged with the teams to get the best planning and room arrangement and levels right.</li> </ul>
Local and wider campus integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The connections between hospital, Charles Perkins and University all have the potential to be strong. Though they are not at Design Excellence just yet. Look to better resolve bridges, and decide if the north bridge to Charles Perkins is in the stage 1 scheme or not. If not, loose the pedestrian bridge and consider pedestrian flows to entry.</li> <li>• Views between University &amp; hospital provide a catalyst for stronger connection and integration between institutions. The stage 2 pathway between stages 1 &amp; 2 connect at logical points and pathways.</li> <li>• The Eastern entry looks like it will connect well to the university. Keeping some of the existing trees provide for a settled and integrated landscape setting for the new building.</li> <li>• Undercroft spaces are concerning. The university has noted this in their feedback. This must be addressed to achieve Design Excellence.</li> <li>• Be careful not to loose the grandstand integration and connection with the building and the university. If rigourously worked through this could be enhanced for a better landscape setting whilst achieving the functionality desired.</li> </ul>
Interface with public realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridges and undercroft spaces the main obstacle for design excellence in connection between building and public realm. Locating a building on a old creek bed has significant challenges and bridges seem like an obvious solution....but they come with draw backs. A suggestion could be wider bridges so as to act more like a podium with channels under, may help.</li> <li>• The architecture suggests good public realm connections. Push these harder to achieve excellent public realm connection.</li> <li>• The retention of the existing fig tree allows for a settled public realm landscape setting at the entry</li> <li>• Expanded landscape at the entry and to the north a highlight. Check all connections function well which will support the excellent landscape setting.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add in or delete north pedestrian bridge to Charles Perkins and continue reinforce the importance of the north entry door.</li> </ul>
Access and Circulation internally and externally	<p>Entry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entry for east, north and west are a strong point of this design. Work these harder for an excellent design outcome. See feedback elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p>Vertical circulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perhaps the weakest part of this scheme. The vertical circulation has poor clarity to the strong rational clarity of the diagram/ architecture.</li> <li>• North Glazed lifts seem in a poor location. I would revise by centralizing. Your other lift location is better located and supports a more rational circulation path.</li> <li>• North glazed lifts may not pass Section J / heat load comfort levels without significant mechanical or architectural intervention. They would in all likelihood change and perhaps lose their diagrammed appearance. This is solved by relocating the lifts.</li> <li>• Centralising circulation around/ near the transparency of the atrium void supports the logical understanding of the building for the user.</li> <li>• Centralised stairs should follow the centralized lifts, however these may have scope to be more playful, as the varying circulation paths on each level suggests.</li> </ul> <p>Circulation to Room</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long life loose fit plans/ floors should support easy and logical circulation paths for the user.</li> <li>• Program organization on levels may need to change. Do pedestrian flow studies for peak periods and relocate program if necessary. It may be necessary to relocate teaching student areas on upper levels to lower ones. This is critical in understanding the client and thus achieving design Excellence.</li> </ul> <p>Legibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This diagram and resolved architecture has the potential to be the most legible building. It's not there yet but perhaps not far away. Keep on pushing the architecture, especially through the feedback to achieve design Excellence.</li> <li>• See feedback elsewhere in this report</li> </ul>
Functional relationships and internal planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program distribution may not be ideally located on levels. Especially upper levels. See feedback elsewhere in this report.</li> <li>• Improving the clarity of the vertical circulation will significantly help the functional and internal planning relationships. This needs to be fixed to achieve Design Excellence.</li> <li>• The atrium is the great gift of this design to the building. Make sure it is used, expressed and realized for maximum benefit/ potential – Design Excellence.</li> </ul>
Internal spatial quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North facing long axis buildings should easily support good internal spatial qualities. Care needs to be taken they don't over heat or cause too much glare at the edges.</li> <li>• The atrium: The grand space of this scheme. Care needs to be taken that it doesn't over scale the user, or appear too cold to the user. Carefully consider this space to achieve the qualities you want and that achieve Design Excellence</li> <li>• See feedback elsewhere in this report.</li> </ul>

Façade design and maintenance regime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details need to be worked through on all facade elements to demonstrate material longevity &amp; appropriateness, maintenance distances between facade element and glazing is achieved. Bird &amp; other animal nesting/ resting opportunities need to be considered in the design of elements [ both base &amp; floating façade elements could suffer with this ].</li> <li>• Façade design needs to consider a materiality that is appropriate to site &amp; place [ ie: to become a Sydney Building ]. Greater consideration of Wingara Mura will help with this.</li> <li>• Variation in rhythm and patterning is suggested in the renders. This supports the understanding of different solar orientations of each façade and adds a richness to the architecture. Review other feedback found elsewhere in this report.</li> <li>• Think about the underside of the cantilevered entry elements to make sure they support the architectural resolution.</li> </ul>
Servicing strategy and operational efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's seems an efficient &amp; logical building.</li> <li>• Vertical Circulation &amp; program location need improvement.</li> <li>• Will take advise on this.</li> </ul>
Building services strategy	
Environmental impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The retention of most of the existing tree grove to the east, especially the Fig is a net positive. Will add to the buildings setting.</li> <li>• Additional landscape around the grandstand will be a highlight if circulation paths [ car and pedestrian ] work.</li> <li>• North facing buildings have the potential to minimize operational energy. Push the ESD &amp; sun shading strategies hard to achieve excellence in these areas.</li> <li>• There is always an environmental loss when buildings are demolished. These range from old to 30-40 year old buildings. An enormous amount of embodied energy will be given up. If they are to be replaced, a focus on a long life for the new buildings is fundamental. The goal should be these buildings will last at least 100 years. Design Excellence is the only path that can achieve that.</li> </ul>
Ecologically Sustainable Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This building has all the necessary ingredients to perform very well against ESD principals. This should be pushed for greatest potential and excellent ESD ratings.</li> <li>• Landscape, as mentioned elsewhere in this report is a strength of this team.</li> <li>• Large roof areas should be used for ESD or Habitable purposes. Large scale PV panels or research gardens could be deployed here. So too, so outdoor teaching / social areas.</li> </ul>
Protection of view corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large buildings will block views. RPA's large wall blocks out the west. I'm not sure this is a huge issue on this site.</li> <li>• However the right building on this site has the potential to create new view corridors. This should be considered, explored and explained. The current scheme suggests this is inherent in the diagram of the building and shown in the planning and architecture.</li> </ul>

Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The vertical circulation doesn't achieve the efficiency the diagram and the architecture suggests. This needs to be significantly improved. Relocating lifts are fundamental to this. See feedback elsewhere in this report.</li> <li>Pedestrian flows &amp; program location an issue. See feedback.</li> <li>Long thin(ish) north facing buildings with a regular generic grid spacing have the potential for good amenity and long life-loose fit characteristics which promotes the idea of an efficient building.</li> </ul>
Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long life loose fit is a good strategy for a building that is likely to have many lives with different users. This building has these qualities.</li> <li>Simple plan areas can easily handle program relocation and new programs.</li> </ul>
Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am always wary of innovation in architecture being more emperor's new clothes than innovative. It's not a crime to not innovate if design excellence can be achieved by many and varied proved design paths, and design resolution. We tend to find ESD systems to be a source of innovation in architecture, and this building has that potential.</li> </ul>
Value for money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The best value for money is achieved by design excellence. Design Excellence will give the building the greatest chance of success and longevity and therefore value.</li> <li>A buildings operation energy becomes the biggest cost against the building after 25 years. Operation energy exceeds construction energy usually around the 25 year mark. A life cycle analysis of the building will give a better view on value of money.</li> <li>It is difficult to understand / evaluate value for money with a significant variance in areas, efficiency and in this team, a higher initial bid price. My experience is initial costings are nothing like the final price.</li> </ul>
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Pathway to Design Excellence</b>	
Clarity of design idea/ diagram	<p>The Parti / the big idea Appropriateness of the design idea/ diagram</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The East-West Bar diagram with strong north-south link through the site is a clear strategy to connect to the 3 major entry points to the building [ East, North &amp; West ] and allows for the significant stormwater flows south to north.</li> <li>Promotes strong connections to the University, RPA and Charles Perkins <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The North entry will appear to receive reasonable student flows. This fails if the bridge link is not delivered as part of stage 1, or the ground link is not encourage to be this doorway. If the bridge is not delivered, I'd drop it, and concentrate on ground movements.</li> <li>The Stage 2 link between stg1 &amp; stg2 is the obvious natural connection pathway between RPA and the University. A very good strategy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Long thin buildings serviced by external façade or atrium</li> </ul>

	<p>provide the best chance for good amenity for the life of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The traffic circulation and undercroft area should be reviewed and changed. This level perhaps should be viewed as more podium level, than a continuation of the bar building elements.</li> <li>• The clarity of the circulation diagram, is not as clear or rational as the architectural diagram. I'd encourage the circulation strategy to be as clear as the architecture.</li> <li>• East- West Bar building diagram best allows for other authors / different design resolution to complete stages 2 &amp; 3 if that dynamic eventuated. The staging diagram for stages 2 &amp; 3 need to match the universities.</li> </ul>
<p>Resolution of Architecture</p>	<p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North facing bar building elements are a clear and strong strategy. Light-filled atrium supports light &amp; amenity</li> <li>• The circulation paths not as clear as the architecture strategy suggests. Glazed north-facing lifts at odds with strong central atrium axis. I would consider relocation main lifts to support the central axis. Perhaps where the single passenger lift and hidden good lift are. This keeps the transparency of the atrium which is good for light &amp; visual connection between Institutions. Centralised lifts and stairs also support the diagram.</li> <li>• The circulation around the atrium varies from level to level. I don't mind this variation against an otherwise strong rational planning framework. However, this is more manageable with centralized lifts &amp; stairs</li> <li>• The University experts feel the program is located at wrong levels. A request was made to test pedestrian flows. This needs to be done, and program relocated if it doesn't work. I believe the "loose fit" of the plan will allow that to happen.</li> <li>• Concern has been raised in feedback about traffic flows and undercroft spaces. These concerns would need to be consider and resolved if Design Excellence is to be achieved. Perhaps viewing the base more as a podium than the pure extrapolation of the bar building scheme to the ground plane. This could still sustain water flow paths in heavy rain / stormwater events.</li> <li>• Strong connections exist in planning thought and resolution between University, Hospital and Charles Perkins. Review north entry point. Either included the bridge in the stage 1 works, or drop it and reinforce the north door.</li> <li>• Rigorous review bridges at both east &amp; west doors. Undercroft spaces can be difficult spaces to resolve well. Rigour has been a strong point for this team, continue down this path towards a design excellence solution/ resolution.</li> <li>• An activated roof terrace is a logical and lovely planning outcome. Perhaps more opportunity exists to expanded roof &amp; roof terrace uses [ PV's, student uses for out door learning etc ]</li> </ul> <p>Solar Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long North facing main buildings bar elements with the long face north provides great light &amp; the potential for good amenity. Attenuation is the key here to stop the building</li> </ul>

	<p>over heating. The solutions look to be clear by they need to be tested to get the best results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The atrium feeding light [ and breeze? ] into the middle of the plan is a sound and proven strategy. The clear glazed ends also help connectivity and act as a catalyst for future connections to be stronger.</li> </ul> <p>Composition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bar building strategy with long thin building elements separated by a clear glazed central atrium offers good compositional opportunities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Key to this is the resolution and patterning of the external sun-screening elements. Every sign exists that the team will develop the natural variation of the facades to solar orientation will drive this compositional strategy.</li> <li>○ Perhaps consider slight/ subtle tonal, material or colour variation as well as screen variation pattern to reinforce composition variation in an otherwise well proportioned form.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If you considered the base level below the bridges at the East entry main front door, will this change how you address the podium composition?</li> </ul> <p>Proportion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This scheme offers good natural proportions that can be resolved well. I would encourage a continuation of the rigorous resolution of the architecture as you work through feedback to maintain the strong diagram principles. Adopting main issues raised through feedback fundamental to achieving design excellence.</li> </ul> <p>What makes a Sydney Building?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wingara Mura will be of great help here. This document coupled with the site and place can inform the architecture to make it a Sydney building.</li> <li>• Materials, colours &amp; textures as well as Landscape will all play a part.</li> <li>• The ground plane that is identified in the paving material and creek bed direction is a good start. [ check location of creek, I have seen many creek locations and they are all different ].</li> </ul> <p>What makes a building for nurses? Clinical research?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These ideas can be incorporated with consultation with the faculties with the selected consortium. Design Excellence makes a building ideally suited to clients needs.</li> <li>• I'd look for ideas and richness in this engagement and bring this to the architecture.</li> <li>• Does a softer, warmer architecture support the clients needs. I'd consider these ideas and pathways.</li> </ul> <p>Rigour [ resolution of architecture against design idea ]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rigour is this teams strong point as is the strong clear diagram. I'd push it harder in the areas identified elsewhere in this report, and be more flexible in others. Again all identified. Don't rest until Design Excellence is achieved in all aspects.</li> </ul>
--	---

Joy

#### Views

- North facing long façades provide good views over and towards campus areas. The key is to keep these qualities.
- As with all these buildings, but especially the stage 1 building, opportunities exist in the SIPP envelope for a significant sun drenched and view filled roof terrace. These could also be opportunities for outdoor learning.
- The transparency of the east west atrium ends excellent for promoting a visual connection between Hospital & university. Make sure this is retained.
- The natural connection line between that is identified between stage 1 and stage 2 from university & hospital has the potential to reinforce a strong visual link between both institutions. Especially with the prospect of landscape at either end of this line of sight.

#### Spatial complexity / simplicity

- Clearly the main atrium void is the special spatial moment. These can be soaring successes or a bit frightening. Care must be taken so as to not overscale the user. Warm textures and natural materials suggest a pathway to achieving this. Continue down this path.
- The entry cave-like overhang idea of the cantilevered north and south bar elements supported by tree columns another big spatial moment that supports the negative space of the transparent entry. All good. Think about the soffits of these overhangs and the undercroft spaces created by the bridges. The undercroft spaces have the potential to pollute these special spatial moments. Moving to a move podium like enclosed base with enclosed traffic circulation will reinforce the cave-overhang diagram. Good detailing will allow stormwater to flow as it wants. I'm not sure the dry creek bed will be read with deep wide bridges.

#### Generosity

- The connections to RPA, Charles Perkins and the University are a strong point of this design. They have the potential to act as a catalyst for stronger future connections between institutions. Push these to realize maximum potential. Take on board north entry feedback.
- The atrium and entry both generous spaces. These spaces want to sing. Make sure they do.
- Expanded Roof terraces could be easily achieved and add to the experience, and to outdoor learning.
- Extended gardens a gift to the site if all connections work properly.

#### Voids

- See comments above and elsewhere in this report about the atrium and entry over-hang.

#### Landscape - Gardens/ well being

- [The Landscape design is a strong point for this design.](#)
- The increase in north facing gardens with the removal of the service roadway to the grand stand a lovely setting for the building and the oval.
- The retention of the fig tree and some/ most of the existing trees to the east a strong point.
- Connectivity to the popular and well used and much loved grandstand fundamentally important to the University. Make sure nothing is lost in designing the extended

	<p>gardens.</p> <p>Special Moments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See above &amp; elsewhere.</li> <li>• Gardens, connections, atrium and entries all have the potential to be special moments. All need to be pushed harder to achieve Design Excellence.</li> <li>• The roof terrace has a chance to be special.</li> </ul>
Material use / language	<p>Appropriateness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard to tell at this stage.</li> <li>• Look to Wingara Mura for material guidance. A warm Sydney building would be a great addition to the Universities built environment.</li> <li>• Large Glazed areas to north, west and east facades have the potential to over heat Sydney buildings. This needs to be carefully considered.</li> <li>• Off form concrete is beautiful, especially when offset by warm rich native hardwoods. Be careful to not cool the architecture too much with too much concrete not offset by a warmer colour &amp; materials. The light cannons may be reviewed in this regarded.</li> </ul> <p>Weathering potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again, Wingara Mura will help here. Stones, natural material textures and colours have the best chance to age and patina well.</li> <li>• The sunscreening blades needs to last Sydney's brutal sun and teaming rain and humidity. I'd plan for what will look good in 25 years and you will have your material.</li> </ul> <p>Sydney Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask this question of the design and you will find your materials. From Paving materials to major facade components to interior lining of public areas important here to achieve design excellence for a Sydney Building.</li> </ul> <p>Detailing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team has the ability to detail a building to achieve Design Excellence. The Consortium should be contracted in a way to allow rigorous design resolution from idea through to fine details.</li> </ul>
Wingara Mura	<p>Wingara Mura considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This could be done in a deeper more considered way</li> <li>• Refer to comments above.</li> </ul> <p>Wingara Mura principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This could be done in a deeper more considered way</li> <li>• Refer to comments above.</li> </ul>
Other [ list ]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater / Over-Land Flow / Flooding: I think the storm water is viable, but perhaps will not be easily read in the architecture. Don't loose the ground plane and other special moments in not dealing with the traffic flow and under croft areas.</li> <li>• Be careful not to design out warmth and joy. The interiors need to be enjoyable warm spaces to be in.</li> </ul>

# **Jesse McNicoll**

## **Comments provided by email 26 March 2017**

I do not believe that any of the schemes currently achieve design excellence but that RCC with reasonable modification is capable of achieving design excellence. This is in large part because of this schemes relatively more flexible masterplan concept. Both LOR and LL could be modified to achieve design excellence but the degree of change required, I believe, is very great.

### **RCC (Machine)**

- Modify vertical circulation to ensure that peak student movements can be accommodated (this may require consolidation of lifts as a single core, possibly adjacent to the atrium, or relocating teaching spaces with highest occupancy to lowest levels)
- Ensure that there will not be peak over-crowding on L2 – if crowding is potentially problematic explore strategies for spreading the larger spaces, as an example lowering the 350 theatre 1 level
- Develop a strategy to remove vehicle access from Western Ave via the ramp (Blackburn Circuit) in the final arrangement to allow S2 building(s) direct ground level connection to the landscaped courtyard (this could involve relocating access to Cadigal Lane and relocate the loading to west side of the building accessed from Lambie Dew Dr in stages 2+3)
- Reduce the number of vehicle movements within the dry creek bed space to allow it to be used as a seating area. To accomplish this change parking access so that it is a straight ahead movement as vehicles come down the ramp from Western Ave (this should be possible as the number of movements and loading will be low/infrequent)
- Reduce the proportion of the dry creek bed that is covered to address safety concerns (limited surveillance and extent of concealed spaces). This could be achieved by narrowing the dry creek to 6m wide (west of the tree columns) and either building in the undercroft or pulling back the deck and providing more seating in the creek bed area. Increasing surveillance could also be improved by locating a student commons area adjacent to the creek bed on Level 1.
- Increase the landscape design elements that express the “dry creek bed”
- Review the material selection around the atrium to substantially reduce cold/grey blue material selections with limited embodied craft (grey concrete, steel, glass etc). For example this could be achieved by providing all balustrades, soffits and walls around atrium in profiled timber
- Encourage more active use of the atrium by providing stairs within it linking all levels
- Explore options to increase daylight to the lower levels of the atrium by reducing the superlab overhang into it
- Provide increased dynamism in the facades (particularly the longer northern facade) for example consider increasing the number of shade blade sizes, more varied spacings etc
- Provide clinics with a terrace near the waiting area (if the rehab courtyard is not accessible)

### **LOR (Temple)**

While the stair connections to the upper garden are a strong formal concept it seems likely that they will not be highly utilised.

- Improve the massing, articulation and expression:
  - Redesign the podium of the Upper Wake Garden and sacrificial walls to be a more integrated part of the stage 1 building – this jutting section presents as a temporary condition without good resolution

- Redesign the north elevation to be less long and flat – it does not communicate the dynamism of the overall concept in its current form and will always be the principal presentation of the project and precinct
- Redesign podium façade L0-L2 be more fundamentally different to the upper façade (options should be explored to create a more solid base to the building not utilising a curtain wall system)
- Provide a significant horizontal break in the western facade between the podium and the top
- Increase the quality of the public areas within the podium particularly views out and daylight access:
  - Provide lightwells and voids to provide significantly more daylight to common areas on L0, 1 and 2 for both Stages 1 and Stages 2-3
  - Provide large external windows to provide daylight to the Sim Labs and associated common corridor
  - Improve entry sequence to the Sim Labs from L1 and the access corridor from the entries at L0
  - Increase axial views out to external space from Public Spaces and corridors on L1 and 2
  - Ensure internal public stair along northern façade terminates in an appropriately public place
  - Redesign the western entry (to RPAH) to be more clearly defined in the façade, it must include barrier free access.
- Improve the landscape design
  - Retain at least 4 of the existing plane trees near Western Ave within the site
  - Provide deep soil for new forecourt trees near Western Ave
  - Delete the cascade water feature and replan for generous seating steps (note do not block daylight to the Sim Labs)
  - The elevated courtyard must be designed with sufficient soil depth to support at least 3 large mature trees.
  - Design overland flow discharge outlets to be no more than 0.5m high and show how landscaping will mask them
- Move one of the main theatres off L2 to reduce crowding (possibly to L0)
- Coordinate structure with spatial arrangement - it must not be haphazard as per current design
- Design workspace arrangements to ensure that no desks are exposed to main circulation routes.
- Revise the L7 lift lobby (clearances)

### **LL (Iceberg)**

It is very difficult to imagine how the below can be addressed while maintaining any semblance of the current concept - with that in mind I am not sure that I can recommend that this scheme can achieve design excellence even with modification. I will be satisfied with the unanimous decision of the other jurors on this point.

- Redesign the composition of eastern undulations to work as a stand alone building
- The southern window should be redesigned to be a regular form (the shorter version of the building demonstrates this)
- Landscape courtyard must include deep soil to support large trees and spaces for larger groups and movement
- Fix theatres (including columns)
- Provide greater internal spatial definition of public spaces at lower levels
- Substantial stage 2+3 massing and articulation problems must be addressed including a strategy that makes sense of the steps in the future southern facade and very deep future stage buildings

- Address the current aesthetic's requirement for very high levels of maintenance/cleaning
- Include substantial vertical shading on eastern facade to allow very clear glazing
- Include curved glazing
- Increase width of northern atrium to 8m and extend it clear top to bottom

Generally on all schemes ensure stairs are suitable for public and external areas (not too steep and at least 2m clear width)

## **Teams**

RCC need to develop a better working relationship between the two architectural practices. Additionally the team must demonstrate that they are willing and able to work through issues that will require design modification with the client and other parties and not respond to design review by re-explaining why design decisions have been made.

LOR require a more senior managing designer to take carriage of the project to ensure that the high level concept is expressed through all levels of the design resolution.

LL require the team to bridge the apparent divide between functional planning and architectural expression.