

OPEN
IDEAS

ROYAL
ADELAIDE
HOSPITAL
SITE
DESIGN
COMPETITION

JURY
REPORT

STAGE TWO V1.0

Prepared by Competition Advisor Andrew Mackenzie
Approved by Royal Adelaide Hospital Site Competition Jury

DECEMBER 2013

Additional Information

For queries regarding entry in the Competition please contact:
Andrew Mackenzie
Competition Advisor
RAH@citylab.com.au
Tel. +61 403 774 304

Office for Design and Architecture, SA
Level 2, 26-28 Leigh St
Adelaide SA 5001
RAHsite@sa.gov.au
Tel: +61 8 8402 1884

Introduction

The Jury met for three days in Adelaide, from 18-20 November, to review all six Stage Two submissions. Over the course of two days the Shortlisted Competitors presented their submission and answered the Jury's questions. In most cases team members were present in person, however in some cases team members participated via Skype. In the third and last day the Jury discussed the merits of each submission in turn before commencing a series of votes to decide the winner and place getters.

The process followed was a methodical combination of evaluation and voting, which allowed the Jury to initially remove from consideration those teams that the Jury did not consider worthy of prize. Further consideration allowed the Jury to arrive at a winner and two joint second placed competitors. The Jury considered that both Competitor 011 and 198 were of sufficiently high quality to deserve the 'joint second place'.

This evaluation and voting process involved five rounds of voting, during which the Jury referred extensively to the eight equally weighted evaluation criteria. The Probity Adviser was in attendance throughout, to ensure that the process followed was fair, equitable and transparent, and was consistent with the Competition Conditions and with best practice.

Before commencing the Stage Two Jury session the Jury was reminded of, and discussed at length the Competition's eight Evaluation Criteria, which subsequently informed the Jury's evaluation and voting. These criteria were as follows.

The strength of the Submission to deliver:

A civic and cultural place

Best practice in sustainable design

Enhanced connectivity to the City and its context

Public open space as an extension of the Park Lands

Respect for the Site's cultural and built heritage through adaptive reuse and innovative new uses

An economically viable proposal that supports the East End Precinct, the City of Adelaide and

South Australia

Exploration of the relationship with the adjacent cultural precinct and university campus

Stage Two additional criteria

A considered response to all Stage Two reports as listed in clause 2.5, containing responses to Stage One submissions, from jury, stakeholders and the public.

Overview

The Jury was pleased to note that Stage Two Competitors had largely built on the strength of their Stage One submissions and had responded with care and consideration to the Stage One report provided by the Jury. In addition most teams had demonstrated a considered response to both public and Project Reference Group (PRG) feedback from Stage One. This feedback encompassed a range of views and thoughts from the public and from major stakeholders, which Competitors, though not required to satisfy (given the diversity and at times conflicting ambitions presented for the site), were required to consider.

One aspect of the Stage One report that was of critical importance, related to need to carefully consider the historical and heritage nature of the site. The Jury notes that many of the Competitors reflected on this aspect of the site, and had either exercised a more measured extent of demolition or had presented a reasoned and analytical argument for the balance between the opportunity of new development and the loss of existing buildings. In many this cases this was further supported by a clear and logical proposition for staging development over time.

A number of submissions had invested thought and energy into the economic aspects of their submission, in relation to direct capital costs, but in relation to the economic benefits to the site, to existing economic activities in the city's nearby East End, and more broadly to the city and the state.

Many submissions used Stage Two to refine and improve the ground plans aspects of their proposal, creating increased legibility through

The Jury

the site and enabling greater circulation and legibility. However some had failed to respond sufficiently to the opportunity for greater articulation of the threshold between the site and parkland to the north, and site and city to the south.

The Jury supported those submissions that had responded positively and creatively to the opportunity for greater linkage to and usage by the adjacent universities. In particular, the opportunities to increase intensity of use along Frome Road, by both students and the public was considered to be of vital importance to the overall activation of the site.

The Jury recognised that the Brief contained many challenges that required a thoughtful response to local conditions. Issues such as Adelaide's existing and projected population, existing and projected transport infrastructure, its urban form and planning constraints, the particularities of the local climate as well as both macro and micro-economic forces, are just some of the issues that profoundly impacted on the Competitors' understanding of the site in its context. The submissions that were voted highest by the Jury each demonstrated a keen understanding of these local conditions, though in many cases through radically distinct propositions.

In relation to this last point the Jury was pleased to note that a healthy collaborative spirit was demonstrated by many of the Competitors and their local participating team member/s. In establishing local participation in Stage Two (through clause 2.4 of the Conditions) the State was keen to ensure that some immediate economic benefit came to those architects and landscape architects working in South Australia. However this clause also acknowledged the valuable input that South Australian team members might bring to a submission. The Jury notes that where creative cooperation was evident it had invariably benefitted the Stage Two scheme.

Shelley Penn (Chair)

Architect and adviser to government and the private sector.

Bob Nation

Sydney based architect with over 40 years experience in practice.

Dr Catherin Bull

Emeritus Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of Melbourne.

Timothy Hill

Award winning London based Australia architect who was Director at Donovan Hill for twenty years.

Tim Horton

Architect who has worked across public and private sector in Australia and internationally.

Marcus Spiller

Principal, partner and director of SGS Economics & Planning.

Catherine Slessor

Editor of The Architectural Review (UK).

The Jury was joined by:

Andrew Mackenzie

Competition Adviser and Director of CityLab

Anne Dalton

Probity Adviser and Director Anne Dalton Associates

SLASH + Phillips Pilkington Architects

Victoria (Aus)

Overall Competition Winner

This submission expands the repertoire of civic spaces within Adelaide with a creative re-animation of the site's historic fabric. While the existing city might be characterised as highly ordered and zoned, this scheme for a 'miniature city within the city' creatively and productively challenges this logic, within the extant framework. The reuse of existing buildings and the insertion of new elements represent an appropriate response that invites useability, delivers diversity and creates a new identity with sensitivity to the past. The design proposition is well considered, graphically clear and draws on a rigorous and emphatic examination of the site and its context.

The jury was impressed by the depth of research into the social and physical history and condition of the RAH site. This research was evidenced and brought to life at all scales by the design proposal; from the architecture to heritage, engineering and landscape. The design solves the essential challenges of the site with minimal impact, and celebrates a continuing presence for the hospital buildings with subtlety, humour and respect. It presents a strong and innovative attitude to heritage, that preserves existing fabric and historic value, while integrating a new aesthetic. In doing so, it offers a new identity for the site that extends rather than replaces its history.

The submission provides a convincing strategy to improve legibility and connectivity through and beyond the site, with the diagonal 'slash' stretching from the corner of North Terrace and Frome Road. This gesture is both a dramatic formal expression and a convincing mechanism that invites pedestrians into the heart of the scheme, providing visual and physical permeability to the heart of the site and the Botanic Gardens beyond.

The open space throughout is clearly defined, with appropriate activation and a strong mix of uses throughout. The diverse building program, distributed across inter-linked buildings, suggests a site of constantly evolving relationships, opportunities and collaboration to

support and expand the existing functions west of Frome Rd. In this sense, the scheme offers a vision for an evolving, dynamic civic place. The proposed functions extend the existing range of uses and programs offered by key stakeholders within an accessible, inclusive environment that is characterised by an innovative and engaging interplay of past, present and future.

This mix of uses was strongly supported by the jury, including the proposition for an urban high school, a boutique hotel and the new RaRa museum. The submission presents a high degree of sustainability through a sophisticated and layered approach centred on minimising embodied energy and waste, and combining both passive and active measures for both built form and landscape.

Finally the Jury considered this submission to offer a high degree of economic viability, with a range of inter-related functions that would suit university participation and would likely provide a reliable engine for activation on the site, supporting economic activity locally, and in particular the city's East End. The proposal envisages a diversified and flexible approach to land use mix, which can respond to market conditions as they evolve. This makes for a robust and buildable vision, addressing all the criteria set out in the competition brief. The submission represents a convincing, pragmatic and exciting response to a large site that is likely to require staging.

Bonhag & De Rosa with TCL

Germany

Joint Second Place

This submission was premised on the retention of a considerable amount of the existing building stock, and proposed the selective removal of certain elements to liberate the centre of the site and the ground plane to create enhanced permeability, circulation and accessibility. The resulting contrast between retained existing buildings and increased transparency in new structures, along with improved visual connectivity on the ground plane was a compelling concept. However, the Jury considered that the scheme required more detail and articulation to demonstrate a convincing vision of the spatial experience for pedestrians moving through the site, in terms of both architecture and landscape. This included uncertainty regarding important practical considerations such as vehicle access for site servicing.

The mix of functions proposed for the site was considered by the Jury to support public life and activation within the site as a 'civic' exchange. The mix included outdoor events, a focus on food production, science, sustainability and learning in the public realm. This cross-disciplinary site program centred on a 'sustainability showcase' to promote a shared purpose.

The submission offered a strengthening of civic presence along North Terrace, however it was less successful in mediating the relationship of the site to Botanic Gardens. Despite the evident potential of the scheme's central concept, the proposal did not articulate a convincing transition or connection from the site's urban south to its parkland north.

The vertical garden was a compelling idea with the potential to act as a major new experience that both educates and delights. The Jury would have preferred to see a more explicit landscape strategy within the submission to describe the experience of the public realm and to flesh out the implicit landscape approach, which was seen as critically important.

The reuse and adaptation of existing buildings through the demarcation of new work and other strategies, offered a chance to build on and

enrich the site's history. However, the presentation graphics did not adequately communicate or explore the heritage potential, which was more evident in the supporting text. The Jury supported the proposition of new buildings scaled in proportion to existing buildings.

Staging has been carefully elaborated to allow potential partnerships to mature through use of the site and its activation. However greater clarity surrounding the staging of demolition and its logic would have been valuable. The range of potential uses, partners and sectors suggests a layered model and potential for the site's resilience and evolution, which was considered likely to complement and support existing activities within the East End.

In summary, the Jury supported the overarching concept and much of the mix of uses, however there was insufficient elaboration of vision for the public realm and a lack of clarity regarding the character and functional relationships of the ground level.

Nice Architects with Mulloway Studio

Slovakia

Joint Second Place

This submission's central proposition is for a 'naturalistic' hill constructed from recycled materials salvaged from the RAH site as well as salvaged material from other nearby demolitions. It is a powerful, provocative and unique proposition for a new civic space that literally builds on its former use. The Jury considered the hill to be an audacious civic gesture that extends Adelaide's parkland character and identity, offering an engaging landmark, and providing a range of formal and informal possibilities for both locals and visitors to experience.

The Jury notes that this central proposition is not only about visual and physical activation, but proposes an exciting hybrid of natural systems and sophisticated environmental technologies to generate heating and cooling for public areas on the site, to process site waste and to communicate this interdependency through a generous civic gesture. The public dimension of thermal performance conveyed in the scheme is both poetic and innovative. The submission also introduces sport and recreation, in many forms, as a specific and new civic function.

Both the proposed hill and the tower have the potential to add legibility to the city, with their large scale acting as key landmarks. The connection between city and site is fostered not only through the hill's visibility from afar, but also from the vantage point of the hill's viewing area, with dramatic views back across the city and beyond. Clearly such a proposition would drive considerable tourism to the area. As such, the hill could form a positive, powerful addition to the city's identity. The Jury noted, however, that the height of the tower and its formal expression would need careful consideration.

The single mixed-use tower proposes a possible means for generating some of the funding and activation for this new public space, while occupying a modest footprint on the site, which in turn frees up land on the site for open public space. However the reliance on a single element of this scale and with this mix of uses requires careful thought, with the Jury regarding the tower as currently proposed in need of re-evaluation.

In addition to the grand gesture of the hill, the submission also offers a network of plausible

smaller open public spaces. Proposed uses for remaining historic buildings are astute, however some may need to be reconsidered.

While the Jury was uncertain as to the reliability of the proposed preliminary costing, it was appreciated that some research had been undertaken, which was commendable, given some submissions had largely avoided cost evaluation.

Oculus + FKA + DASH

New South Wales and Victoria (Aus)

This submission proposes a series of varied landscape spaces that provide a range of experiences, suggesting an expanded role for the parklands as a place of water treatment, recreation and incidental exercise. The landscape is posed as a setting for a major new gallery and related cultural uses. However some of the clarity and strength of the Stage One submission and the power of its landscape proposition has been diminished with the Stage Two submission.

Given the extent of demolition, and the need for this to be undertaken at the outset to allow redevelopment, the Jury would like to have seen evidence of the research and analysis that would create a compelling case for the removal of much of the existing fabric, or the benefit provided by the new built fabric and its proposed institutional functions. Overall the scheme proposes a heavy reliance on public funding (that may not be sustainable in the long term), and to this end must offer a compelling value in return for cost. While the Stage Two submission has retained more of the existing built fabric than proposed in Stage One (in response to the Stage One Jury Report), the Jury was not convinced by the proposed design integration of some existing elements, such as the Bice Building's integration into the large museum/gallery building, which appeared awkward and lacking in sensitivity, despite the potential for contemporary interventions that animate both new and existing parts.

The proposed new integrated cultural facility offers a number of benefits in terms of co-location, collaboration and shared services, however the impact of this new facility on the existing gallery, museum and other functions to the west of the site was unclear. A high level strategic response was not clearly evident.

The submission generates a very specific and complete character rather than an open-ended armature for development, which the Jury was concerned would not withstand the robust

review and master-planning that will inevitably follow for a site of this nature.

While the landscape approach to the site was developed in some detail and offered many delightful spaces to enhance the urban experience of those living and working in the city, it did not clearly communicate the site's relationship to the botanic garden along its important north eastern boundary. In addition, its dominance in the Stage One submission was diminished by the Stage Two architectural footprint and layout.

Ysalazam

Colombia

In Stage One this submission offered a compelling opportunity to explore a distinct and dramatic approach that prioritised landscape and extended the parkland into the site in the form of a dense urban forest. In Stage Two, this proposal remained highly seductive and the Jury recognised that considerable thought had been applied to site conditions, climate and species selection in the forest proposal, despite some inconsistencies. However the scheme overall appeared undeveloped and ambiguous, lacking clarity, resolution and conviction.

The proposal for built civic spaces demonstrated a lack of understanding of Adelaide's summertime conditions, and the likely scale of activity expected for the site within the medium term. In particular, the extensive scale of the relatively unmitigated paved surfaces did not demonstrate a convincing strategy to ensure an adequate level of activity within the site. In addition, the extent of underground program, for a city as sparsely populated as Adelaide, was considered by the Jury to be inappropriate. Key functions located on North Terrace failed to optimise their potential to bring life and activity to this important frontage, and to draw people into the site on a daily basis.

Strategies to integrate historical or existing fabric were lacking and missed the opportunity to enrich the development of the built civic spaces. In addition the submission's significant structural interventions required compelling justification. Other interventions in heritage fabric appeared somewhat flippant or unrealistic. The Jury was not convinced by the proposed large theatre, which represented a significant public investment yet failed to demonstrate any needs analysis or research.

While the Jury remained intrigued and impressed by the overall concept of a powerful indigenous urban forest as an insertion into the site, the lack of research and resolution meant the scheme failed to convince overall.

Zuzana & Nicholas

Queensland (Aus)

The Jury was impressed by many aspects of this submission, which sought to cluster multiple cultural functions within a cellular arrangement of spaces, which could accommodate other uses, and evolve in response to demand over time. An underpinning strength of the proposal was its modularity – with potential for staged growth based on a flexible 'kit of parts'. There is also a demonstrated understanding of the value of existing site infrastructure, and of the scope for a contemporary intervention to provide new identity for the site. The Jury had some concerns however that undermined the strengths of the proposal.

While the submission's dispersed campus-style arrangement with its armature of defined streets, open spaces and development envelopes was an intelligent and calculated proposition, the overall layout poses challenges for wayfinding and activation of the site. In addition, the elegant identity suggested to 'tie' this armature together relies on a refined architectural aesthetic, which is also noted as but one 'option'. There is an inconsistency in this argument that weakened the proposal. The Jury thought that without the strength of the proposed architecture, the low-key nature of the scheme might diminish its success as a civic space, and that this would be inconsistent with the importance of the site to both the city and the state.

Mapping existing activity within the city helped to provide a more developed program in the proposal. However the opportunities for site functions and occupants such as Carclew appeared notional in the development of public space, its function and potential. In places the public space appears to be somewhat residual, with the Jury noting the extensive amount of curtilage around the buildings and little evidence of how this would be occupied and used.

The selection of materials, particularly for new building envelopes were understood as informed by local historic building fabric, however the extent of demolition represented a significant loss of existing built form, which compromised this aspect of the submission's heritage response. The suggested reuse of underground spaces such as the catacombs,

and the scope to reveal them from the ground plane hinted at an enriched public realm experience, and a more varied ground plane experience across the site, yet the scheme lacked the requisite detail to convince.

The submission offered a framework for development and encouraged an enhanced relationship with the university, which the Jury considered a key strength of the submission. However a large part of the proposal was dependent on publicly funded tenants and organisations, which did not represent a sufficient diversity of public and private sector economic contribution to the site. Beyond this dependence there was no clear model for economic development or growth to encourage sustainable funding sources.

The Jury recognised that the submission had demonstrated a thorough analysis of cultural needs in the city, bringing together many diverse interests and potential user groups, but in the process of trying to accommodate too many uses the submission risked a degree of homogeneity in its program. The inclusion of a development formula as well as a design response was commended, though further careful analysis was required.



**OFFICE FOR
DESIGN +
ARCHITECTURE SA**

