

Design Excellence Guideline
Guidelines for Architectural Design Competitions
Version 1.2

Version	Effective	Resolution	Description	Authorised
1.0	-	19 September 2013	Draft for public exhibition	Council
1.1	-	4 September 2014	Council reviewed guideline	
1.2	-	-	Council adopted guideline	Council

Contents

PART 01 - INTRODUCTION & CONTEXT

1.0 Introduction & Context	5
1.1 Purpose of this Guideline	5
1.2 Land and Development Covered by this Guideline	5
1.3 Objectives of this Guideline	5

PART 02 - ESTABLISHING A COMPETITIVE DESIGN PROCESS

2.0 Establishing an Architectural Design Competition	7
2.1 Initiating an Architectural Design Competition	7
2.2 Types of Competition	7
2.3 The Competitive Brief Process	7
2.4 Community Consultation	8

PART 03 Judging the Competition Entries

3.0 Judging the Competition Entries	10
3.1 Jury Establishment	10
3.2 Heritage-related Applications	10
3.3 Assessment and Decision	10
3.4 Architectural Design Competition Report	11
3.5 Design Integrity Assessment	12
3.6 Procedure where there is an Outstanding Resolution of a Preferred Design	12
3.7 Completion of the Architectural Design Competition Process	13

PART 01 - INTRODUCTION & CONTEXT



1.0 Introduction & Context

1.1 Purpose of this Guideline

The Design Excellence Guideline (the Guideline) establishes the process to initiate and carry out an architectural design competition (ADC). The Guideline should be used by proponents, the relevant consent authority and Tweed Shire Council staff and read in conjunction with the 'Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines', prepared by NSW Department of Planning and Environment.

1.2 Land and Development Covered by this Guideline

This Guideline applies to all land and development subject to an ADC, whether as required by the Design Excellence provisions of the applicable Local Environmental Plan, or pursued by choice by a proponent. Generally, an ADC can be undertaken to inform:

1. Any review or amendment to the Tweed Local Environmental Plan;
2. Any review or amendment to a locality-specific Section of the Tweed DCP; or
3. The preparation and lodgement of a development application.

1.3 Objectives of this Guideline

- Encourage high quality, diverse and innovative design through the use of competitive design processes;
- Facilitate development that individually and collectively contributes to the architectural and overall urban design quality of the Tweed;
- Facilitate greater levels of environmental sustainability;
- To encourage a sense of civic pride; and
- Enable the consent authority to consider granting an additional amount of height or floor space to a development through a rigorous and transparent framework.

PART 02 - ESTABLISHING A COMPETITIVE DESIGN PROCESS

PART 02 ESTABLISHING A COMPETITIVE DESIGN PROCESS



2.0 Establishing an Architectural Design Competition

2.1 Initiating an Architectural Design Competition

To ensure probity, the proponent is to ensure that the documentation of the process is sufficient to enable an audit to be carried out by an independent person or body, such as the Australian Institute of Architects, if required by the consent authority.

The ADC is to be paid for by the proponent. The Consent Authority will convene the competition jury, including the provision of administrative and secretarial services for the recording of the jury proceedings and preparation of the Design Competition Report. A fee of up to \$1,000 may be charged for these services.

2.2 Types of Competition

A proponent can undertake an ADC that is open or invited.

In an 'open' competition, the proponent is to publicly notify of the ADC and call for expressions of interest. All respondents are then supplied with the competition brief and invited to participate.

The call for expressions of interest for an 'open' competition is to state:

1. the form and purpose of the competition;
2. any prizes to be awarded; and
3. the minimum submission requirements.

Within an 'invited' ADC, the proponent invites a minimum of three competitors to participate in the competition and supplies each with the competitive brief.

2.3 The Competitive Brief Process

The competitive brief is to be prepared by the proponent, then reviewed and endorsed by the consent authority prior to its distribution to competition entrants.

The competitive brief is to:


1. state whether the competitive process is an open or invited competition;
2. describe the role of the proponent;
3. describe the competition objectives and process;
4. require entries include a statement prepared by a suitably qualified person stating the extent of compliance with the applicable Local Environmental Plan;
5. describe the proposed uses, floor area, construction methodology, estimated project budget and construction costs, and any special building requirements for the proposed development;
6. state the assessment criteria;
7. clearly emphasise the importance of excellence in the design;

8. describe the environmental sustainability criteria to be achieved and how they exceed the requirements of the applicable Tweed Development Control Plan and BASIX;
9. state the minimum submission requirements for the competition.
10. indicate the level of documentation required for the submissions. The documentation should be sufficient to explain the design merits of the proposal. The extent of documentation should relate to the scale of the project and should not be excessive, however must include (but not limited to) elevations and plans, heights in RLs, Gross Floor Area tabulations by use, perspectives and photo-montages; and a materials/finishes board;
11. provide a site history and contextual/site information;
12. describe the options available to the proponent following the jury's decision;
13. state the composition of and provide the juror's obligations, including the nomination of the Jury Chair;
14. provide the proponents obligations;
15. advise that the competition process is a public process and that competitors names are to be clearly visible on entries and may be used promotionally;
16. state the fees to be paid to each of the competitors and, as appropriate the awarding of any prizes to the winner and runners up;
17. include a disclaimer stating that the jury's or proponent's decision will not fetter the discretion of the consent authority;
18. allow a minimum period of 28 days (or other specified timeframe required by the consent authority) for the preparation of entries by competitors; and require competition entries to:
 - be of a quality suitable for public exhibition;
 - include an urban design analysis. On large sites with multiple buildings competitors must locate new streets and public domain improvements in context with proposed building form and building massing as appropriate;
19. include, unless determined otherwise by the consent authority, any applicable Heritage Conservation Management Plan, Conservation Management Strategy, or other heritage conservation policy document where the subject site includes any heritage item or is located within a heritage conservation zone;
20. state that competitors are to have due regard to the conservation guidelines set out in any conservation policy referred to (in 19) above.

If the proposed competitive processes brief is not recommended when reviewed by the consent authority, the consent authority is to give its reasons within 14 days of the lodgement of the brief. A competition process void of a brief endorsed by the consent authority will not be considered valid in order to satisfy the provisions of the applicable Local Environmental Plan.

2.4 Community Consultation

At the close of the submission period, the submitted schemes are to be placed on exhibition and community feedback invited. To ensure the jury can meet promptly at the conclusion of the submission period and have the opportunity to view any community feedback obtained, the proponent is to facilitate a display and feedback period of at least 7 days. In light of the potentially concise feedback period, the proponent is encouraged to use both electronic and hard copy methods to display the submitted schemes. The consent authority will assist in facilitating this community feedback process.



PART 03 JUDGING THE COMPETITION ENTRIES

3.0 Judging the Competition Entries

3.1 Jury Establishment

The jury is to comprise a minimum of three (3) members and maximum of six (6) members.

The jury is to comprise of:

1. half the members nominated by the consent authority, who have no pecuniary interests in the development proposal or involvement in approval processes;
2. half the members nominated by the developer, and
3. the Director General of the Department of Planning

Jury members a must not:

1. Have pecuniary interest in the development proposal;
2. Be an owner, shareholder or manager associated with the proponent or proponent's companies'
3. Be a staff member or councillor with an approval role in council's development assessment process.

Members of the jury must have relevant design expertise and experience, and collectively the jury will include the following skills base:

- Architecture,
- Planning,
- Urban Design,
- Heritage,
- Landscape architecture,
- Local and regional issues appreciation

3.2 Heritage-related Applications

If the proposed development includes a building listed in Schedule 5 of the applicable Local Environmental Plan or where a site is located within a conservation area, or in the vicinity of a heritage item, it is required that one member of the jury be an appropriately qualified heritage consultant.

3.3 Assessment and Decision

A minimum of three competitive submissions must be considered.

A copy of the submissions will be distributed to the jury members a week prior to the convened jury meeting, a site inspection will be carried out for them, and the consent authority will provide a summary of planning compliance against the provisions of the applicable Local Environmental Plan.

The competitors must present their entry to the jury in person. The presentation

must be no longer than 30 minutes followed by questions from the jury.

Each competitor's submission may be graded (i.e. 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc) by the jury according to the assessment criteria. The jury's decision will be via a majority vote. Unanimous agreement is not required.

The decision of the jury will not fetter the discretion of the consent authority in its determination of any subsequent development application associated with the development site that is the subject of the competition.

In the event that a winner is not selected, the jury may recommend that further refinements be made to up to two (2) of the submissions. For these submissions they will list the design issues for the first and second ranked scheme and request they redesign their entry and represent the entry within 21 days of the initial presentation. Upon completion of the second presentation to the jury, the jury will rank the competition submissions (first and second).

The jury may decline to declare a winner of the architectural design competition if none of the entries exhibit design excellence. If the jury declines to declare a winner, the jury may recommend that none of the entries exhibit design excellence and accordingly end the process.

3.4 Architectural Design Competition Report

Following its determination, the jury is required to prepare a report (to be referred to as the Architectural Design Competition Report) detailing:

1. the competition process and incorporating a copy of the competition brief;
2. the jury's assessment of the design merits of each of the entries;
3. the rationale for the choice of preferred design, how it exhibits design excellence, and the bonus percentage awarded for building height and floor space ratio; and
4. an outline of any further recommended design amendments or propose conditions of development consent that are relevant to the achievement of design excellence.

The jury is expected to reach a decision on whether to request a redesign within 14 days and will submit a jury report (referred to as the architectural design competition report) to the developer, within 14 days of its decision.

Following the jury's decision, the consent authority may require the proponent to hold a public exhibition of the design competition entries.

3.5 Design Integrity Assessment

The purpose of the Design Integrity Assessment (DIA) is to inform the consent authority on whether the proposal (development application or Section 96 modification) is equivalent to, or through design development, an improvement upon the design excellence qualities of the winning competition scheme.

In order to assist retaining design integrity, it is recommended that the architect who designed the winning scheme (as chosen via the ADC) is to be appointed as the Design Architect to:

1. prepare a Development Application for the preferred design;
2. prepare the design drawings for a construction certificate for the preferred design;
3. prepare the design drawings for the contract documentation; and
4. maintain continuity during the construction phases to the completion of the project.

If considered necessary by the Consent Authority, the competition jurors appointed by the Consent Authority or an independent panel established by the Consent Authority may be requested to undertake a DIA to assess design excellence or integrity and/or continuity and scope for improvement.

Where a continuation of design integrity has not occurred, the competition jurors appointed by the consent authority or an independent panel established by the consent authority will make a recommendation as to what further competitive processes or requirements would be necessary to permit an alternative, or revised design to satisfy the design excellence provisions.

The jury shall make such recommendations within 28 days of a request. The cost of such review is to be borne by the consent authority.

3.6 Procedure where there is an Outstanding Resolution of a Preferred Design

In the event that:

- the jury does not reach a decision,
- the developer is not satisfied with the nomination,
- the developer wishes to make a substantive modification,
- the consent authority considers the project submitted for approval (or as subsequently modified) to be substantially different, or
- the Consent Authority indicates it will not grant consent to the design nominated,

either the proponent or the Consent Authority may request that the Jury reconvene and make a recommendation as to what further competitive processes or requirements would be necessary to permit an alternative or revised design to satisfy the design excellence provisions.

The jury shall make such recommendations within 28 days of a request. The cost of such review is to be borne by the proponent.

In the event that the proponent decides not to proceed with the architect of the winning entry. The proponent will -

1. provide the consent authority with written reasons for this decision and,
2. restart the ADC

3.7 Completion of the Architectural Design Competition Process

The Local Environmental Plan requirement that an ADC be held in relation to a proposed development is deemed to be satisfied upon:

1. the issue of a report by the competition jury, or
2. the completion of any further competitive processes recommended by the Jury following a requested review, or
3. should the jury make no further recommendations, 28 days after such a request for review is made, in which case the competition requirement is considered discharged.

