MEETING NOTES

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MEETING # 5

CHAU CHAK WING MUSEUM

Date: Monday 11 September 2017
Time: 10.30am – 12.55pm
Location: Meeting Room 3, G12 Services Building, 22 Codrington Street, Darlington

Attendees	Initials	Position / Role
Panel Members		
Di Leeson	DL	Chair
Juliette Churchill	JC	Campus Planning Manager, CIS
Kim Crestani	KC	Independent Architect, Order Architects
Angelo Candalepas	AC	Independent Architect, Candalepas Associates (from 11.45am onwards)
Professor Michael Tawa	MT	Professor of Architecture, University of Sydney
Panel Advisors		
Paul Donnelly	PD	Associate Director, Museum Content, CCW Museum
Scott Biggs	SB	Precinct 3 Delivery Manager
Kate Bimson	KB	Project Director, CCW Museum
Ian Kelly	IK	CIS Heritage Consultant
David Watt	DW	Design Manager, CCW Museum
JPW Team		
Graeme Dix	GD	Director, JPW Architects
Kiong Lee	KL	Director, JPW Architects
Apologies		
David Ellis	DE	Director, Museums

MEETING NOTES

1.		**Welcome & Introduction** DL noted apologies from DE. DL outlined the purpose of Design Review Panel (DRP) Meeting #5 was to review and endorse the progress of the CCW Museum design development since the previous DRP Meeting in January 2017, and to agree on the project team's responses to the SSDA submissions and key issues to be addressed as issued by the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE), in particular those raised by the NSW Heritage Council (HC). SB noted that the design & construct tender will be issued to contractors by the end of September 2017, with JPW and most other consultant disciplines novated to the successful contractor.	Note
		NOTE: DRP commentary during the meeting is inserted as a shaded paragraph. DRP resolutions made are provided at the end of these meeting notes.	

2.		**<u>Design Presentation Update</u>** GD presented the current design as it has developed since the concept proposal previously endorsed by the DRP in January 2017. <u>High level commentary:</u> - Concept has survived relatively intact from January 2017, with the response to the site and the building sitting comfortably within the landscape - Building mass is large; but sits well within the existing tree canopies, its base stepping down the site - Materiality has now been resolved, with an off-white/light grey concrete upper form atop a sandstone-coloured undercroft. <u>Design evolution:</u> - Design development has occurred heavily in consultation with the University's Project User Groups, Design User Groups through several presentations and workshops - Design team coordination meetings have been held weekly - Cost planning has been running in parallel to design development, and is currently around 6% above the construction budget of $50M - It is intended to complete documentation to 70% design development for a design & construct tender issue at the end of September 2017. <u>Design challenges and known issues:</u> - Service access to the basement levels and collection storage - Landscape character of the area and its heritage value - Site constraints with existing significant tree roots – investigative studies are now complete - Contextual relationship of museum to Fisher Library – context and height <u>SSDA imagery (CGIs):</u> - Materiality of upper concrete floating structure (off-white/light grey) contrasting with the sandstone-coloured base – reference to site geology - Stepped planes and terraces assist to articulate and step the building down the site - Interplay of compressed and larger volume space create a dynamic user experience - Ivy ground cover and the softening of terrace edges - Site is 'wrapped' by lawns – preservation of the existing landscape and cultural memory.	Note
		GD presented each level, key points noted as follows: <u>Basement 1</u> - Loading dock entry via ramp from University Place - Collections storage (CERC) with part mezzanine areas - High bay storage - Vertical transportation for exhibits (oversized), passengers, and café are clustered on a single core <u>Level 1</u> - Lowest level of public exhibition - Courtyard off gallery space - Circulation around galleries brings the visitor back to the central stair	

		- External finishes continue internally and wrap into display showcases and gallery walls - Plant is arranged to allow vertical stacking throughout building <u>Level 2</u> - Café located in north-east corner - Galleries is the predominant function with the central display wall/showcase an important feature - Three Study Rooms located to the west of the floor plate - Northern core wall (lifts, amenities, services rooms) to be clad in timber	
		MT asked if the café terrace can open up to the south-east to be more inviting to the public. GD & SB responded that the café is an intended integral part of the museum and not a destination in itself. Security dictates that a single point of entry to the museum (from the west) rules out any other secondary entry points. The current walkway to the south-east is primarily for egress and invited entry only. MT queried whether there might be opportunities for bringing more natural light into the galleries. PD stressed that it is important to protect museum content from direct and uncontrolled natural light, whilst maximising display wall area. MT pointed out that the activation of southern side of the building (at Level 2) is still a problem – can soffit and walls be activated? GD explained that yes, there are opportunities to further explore, and JC noted that external art or cultural content light projection may be possible.	
		<u>Level 3 (Main Entry Floor)</u> - Lead-in flanking walls to the entry courtyard are sandstone-coloured precast walls planks, with 500mm high horizontal bands - Visitor journey starts with the generous airlock, concierge and shop - Multi-Purpose Room is entered directly off the north-western corner of the arrival gallery space - Schools Education Room is located in the north-eastern corner of the floor - Large exhibition space is arranged to the south of the central void, with a connecting bridge overlooking the easterly aspect with views to Victoria Park - Spatial compression is highly effective, utilising the 3m high ceilings to create gravity and tension with the landscape.	
		<u>Level 4</u> - Large temporary exhibition gallery positioned at the east end of the floor, with a high ceiling (6.5m) - Staff areas are placed at the western end of the floor, with the boardroom centrally located, directly looking back to the Quadrangle. - Conservation/photography and Reference Resource Room complete the Level 4 arrangement - Four-sided circulation around the central void.	
		<u>Level 5</u> - Contains plant rooms, arranged as efficiently as possible around the central skylight, with PV cells above.	

3.		**SSDA Status** Noted that the design team is currently preparing a Response to Submissions (RtS) for the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE). The RtS directly responds to the three key assessment issues identified by DPE as requiring addressing: - Urban design - Heritage - Construction traffic <u>Urban Design</u> Southern elevation: - Because of the raking nature of the ground to the southern elevation, direct activation is difficult midway along the flanking wall; however, there is the ability to have future activation programmes along these surfaces to fill this space. - The east and west ends of the southern elevation provide interactivity by being able to see into the gallery through a slot window (east) and the physical connection to the entry courtyard (west). Northern elevation: - The north of the building is not intended to be as active as the south because of the noisier environment of Parramatta Road traffic. - The activation is therefore deemed to not be required, and is a secondary "low key" pathway. Materiality: - The choice of materials has been relatively consistent since concept design - The upper white element is an off-white concrete, which will weather over time, and project an honest appearance - The lower plinth will be a subtle sandstone coloured precast concrete <u>Heritage</u> - Members of the project team met with the NSW Heritage Council (HC) on 6 September 2017 to further consult on the items raised in its submission to DPE. No feedback has yet been obtained. - The material presented at the HC meeting illustrated an improved and softened portal treatment, with terraced walls and landscaped edges. - The driveway is located as close as possible to the Parramatta Road gates to minimise the impact to the site curtilage. - The geometry of the driveway entry ramp is working very hard, minimizing ramp height difference and its visual impact within the landscape. - The DRP agreed that the response to HC for the loading dock area was appropriate and having the least impact on the precinct.	Note
		MT asked if the loading dock area can be expanded into a larger public space with sliding screens and steps, even opening up in future to a public transport node. SB confirmed that this would be not be possible within the current budget; but could be considered as a future project. No inground services are to be constructed within this south-eastern curtilage area of the site.	

		MT also suggested that another option could be to adopt an innovative "James Bond" style loading dock entry camouflaged gate that opens and closes as required. The DRP members discussed this option; however, SB also confirmed that this option would not be possible within the current budget.	
		KC noted (and it was generally agreed by all DRP members) that the loading dock entry should not really be "*celebrated*" and that the current design provides the best visually recessive outcome as a minimal impact solution.	
		<u>Construction traffic</u> - Arup will be providing a technical response to this item.	
4.		**<u>Discussion Items</u>** <u>Materiality</u> GD outlined the intent for the materiality of the upper concrete element: - Smooth off-form finish – similar to the National Portrait Gallery, Canberra) – with tie bolt holes not prominent, and joints will not be a feature - Boral Envisio concrete mix gives high performance and crack control, with an off-white/light grey colour - JPW is investigating using a Kiem's finish to conceal any patch marks. The lower concrete element will be sandstone-coloured precast walls planks, with 500mm high horizontal bands.	
		MT queried why precast is not being used (better quality control). KL confirmed that structurally this would not be possible to stitch this together whilst retaining the cantilever (Arup advice). MT suggested that the breakup and proportion of the in-situ panel joints could take cues from the rest of the Campus. GD noted that the CGI renderings don't accurately depict how the concrete will look in context. MT noted that the window treatment and detailing is important to ensure maximum impact of the "slots". AC requested why the internal gallery walls could not be concrete? PD & KL confirmed that the gallery walls needed to be plasterboard on a ply backing for fixing off museum content and flexibility generally.	
		<u>Level 4 Slab & Soffit</u> GD explained that the floor to floor height is very tight and compressed, leaving little space for building services. All services are therefore cast into the concrete slab, with void balustrades "turned up". The Multi-Purpose Room and Schools Education Room will have suspended plasterboard ceilings.	
		SB & PD expressed concerns regarding future flexibility with not having a lightweight suspended ceiling. Since this only affects one gallery space, the DRP agreed to maintain the current design approach, and if there is an issue when construction documentation is further advanced, then the matter would be referred back to the DRP for resolution.	

		<u>Skylight</u> GD presented the current skylight design: - a proprietary system – with an insulated thermal IGU – that will produce filtered sunlight with very subtle variations in light quality throughout the day. GD further explained that humans respond to subtle changes in differing daylight conditions. - The 'V' baffles are clad in painted plasterboard - Void above is a heat reservoir, vented to the outside - There will be no direct light entering gallery spaces - Supplementary artificial light is provided above the baffles for night conditions General discussion held regarding the impacts if the skylight was to be replaced with an artificial lantern.	
		MT asked that JPW investigate whether the skylight element should be treated differently from the remainder of the museum internal finishes – different visual 'weight'. PD confirmed that whilst controlled light is critical to protect gallery content, the principle of natural light is good, provided that control is achieved. AC believed that natural light conditions make an average museum a memorable and seductive experience. The DRP recommended that more work be undertaken on the skylight design to make this element an important and special feature of the building, satisfying both Museums (glare and lux level control) and JPW (subtle responses to external daylight conditions).	
		<u>Wingara Mura</u> Noted that the narrative has been agreed to in principle; however still requires further development. Current elements proposed to be incorporated are: - Gathering ceremony space in the northern area of the entry courtyard - The basecourse of the building representing the hewn rockface geology of the sandstone ridge Agreed that it was important for the Wingara Mura response to "talk" to the building.	
		MT suggested that the aim should be to present indigenous elements as something contemporary. Agreed that it was important that Museums ensure that the curation programme prior to occupation is mindful of Wingara Mura principles.	
		<u>Public Artwork</u> JC noted that Barbara Flynn has been engaged by CIS to provide public art curation services across Campus; however due to the nature of the CCW Museum her services would not be required. PD outlined the current thinking for the placement of external sculptures around the building curtilage: - "Tree knot" in grassed area to the east - Hinde sculpture in the east sunken courtyard - Tom Bass "The Student" to main entry courtyard.	

		Agreed that the museum should be a living building and the UoS is to commit to an ongoing narrative that embeds indigenous talent and artwork into its exhibitions (Daniel Boyd exhibition, Macarata poles, etc).	
		General Design Comments MT noted that the current developed design is "beautifully detailed". AC noted that this building will be an important cultural artefact and University asset.	
5.		**Resolutions & Endorsements** 1. The DRP endorsed the current design progression since the earlier concept phase in January 2017. 2. The DRP endorsed the design response to the Heritage Council for the loading dock area as being appropriate and having the least impact on the precinct, and that a future design competition could be initiated for future development to the southern fringe of the site. 3. The DRP endorsed the materiality of the proposed building finishes. 4. The DRP endorsed the current approach of cast-in services to the Level 4 slab only, and if there is an issue when construction documentation is further advanced, then the matter would be referred back to the DRP for resolution. 5. The DRP recommended that more work be undertaken on the skylight design to make this element an important and special feature of the building, satisfying both Museums (glare and lux level control) and JPW (subtle responses to external daylight conditions).	
6.		**Meeting Close**	
		The meeting closed at 12.55pm	