# Public Art Advisory Panel

## (PAAP)

### Confidential Minutes

### From meeting held 3 October 2024

**Time:** 1500 – 1700hrs

**Location:** Ruth Faulkner Library - Meeting Room #1 – Ground Floor Belmont HUB

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Members** | **Role** | **Init.** | **Title** | **Attended Y/N** | **Apology Y/N** |
| Cr Deborah Sessions | CoB | DS | Chair – Elected Member | Y |  |
| Cr Christopher Kulczycki | CoB | CK | Elected Member | Y |  |
| Natasha Griggs | CoB | NG | Manager Library, Culture &Place | N | Y |
| Belinda Dunkley | CoB | BD | A/ Manager Library, Culture & Place | Y |  |
| Harry Deluxe | CoB | HD | Coordinator Arts & Place | Y |  |
| Steven Reeves | CoB | SR | Manager Parks, Leisure & Environment | Y |  |
| Adam Strelein | CoB | AS | Manager Economic & Community Development | Y |  |
| Belinda Cobby | CoB | BC | Arts Officer | N | Y |
| David Attwood | CoB | DA | Arts Officer | Y |  |
| Jamie Wright | CoB | JW | Arts & Place Assistant | N | Y |
| Chantelle Gilbert | CoB | CG | Coordinator Planning Projects | Y |  |
| Benjamin Houweling | CoB | BH | Senior Planning Officer | N | Y |
| **Representatives** | **Role** | **Init.** | **Title** |  |  |
| Bruce Slatter | Com | BS | Community Representative with specialist skills: Discipline Lead of Art in the School of Media, Creative Arts and Social Inquiry at Curtin University, and Practicing Artist. | N | Y |
| Sean Van der Poel | Com | SV | Community Representative with specialist skills: Master of Architecture at UWA, registered architect and practising Public Artist. | Y |  |
| Alison Barrett | AC | AB | Art Consultant (non-voting) | Y |  |
| **Legend:** CoB – City of Belmont; AC – Art Consultant; Com – Community Representative | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Agenda | |
| No | **Item** |
|  | **Acknowledgement of Country – Chair**  DS provided an acknowledgement of Country |
|  | **Welcome and Apologies**  The meeting opened at 3.02pm and DS chaired the meeting. Apologies from NG, BC, BH and BS. |
|  | **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**  Updates to previous minutes by DS noted.  Minutes from last meeting held Thursday 19 September 2024 accepted by HD seconded by SR. |
|  | **Declarations of Interest that may cause a conflict**  DS and AB declared conflicts of interest for information.  DS manages a Facebook page called ‘Upgrade Wilson Park’ which she started before she was an EM.  AB is the contracted consultant for the Wilson Park Public Artwork |
|  | **Developer Applications** |
| 5.1 | Development: 239 Great Eastern Highway Belmont, Bel Air Apartments by Finbar  Public Artwork Coordinator: Mark Geary, Finbar  Artist: Simon Gilby  Artwork Commission Fee: $655,000+GST  3.30pm presentation of new application by Mark Geary and Simon Gilby.  Pre-presentation discussion  Application formally provided and circulated by BC.  Public Artwork Design Approval Assessment form provided for assessment.  The following subjects were raised in the pre-presentation discussion and addressed following the presentation.   1. **Artwork brief**   AB noted difficulty assessing application with no artwork brief provided and no process outlined. DA confirmed that no brief was provided, only a contract. AB suggested that Finbar is informed that there must be a brief next time.   1. **Public Art Contribution (1%)**   AB questioned if the project budget has been reviewed since approval in 2016. CG clarified that 1% of cost was stipulated at the time of approval. SV enquired about whether the 1% public art contribution has been met. MG presented that the ribbon panels are designed to be artwork and that $375,000 was the forecasted cost for the sculpture and ribbons in 2016 and that cost has now grown to $655,000 and will exceed 1%. CG explained that while the planning condition did not specify $375,000, an accompanying report did. CG agreed that $375,000 meets the 1% requirement.   1. **Artist’s Involvement**   SG clarified that they will construct the sculpture and a builder will construct the ribbon panels.  AB raised concern regarding the little detail on the artist’s involvement in the ribbon building process. SV agreed and expressed concern that the artist’s involvement may stop once their design is given over. MG clarified that SG will carry out the detailed design of the ribbon but not the fabrication. SG confirmed that he will be involved in supervising the fabrication process and will see fabrication samples to ensure the design is authentically manifested.  MG clarified SG will do detailed design of the ribbons but not fabrication. SG confirmed that he was involved in design. He will follow process through and see fabrication samples to ensure design is authentically manifested. SG to supervise fabrication process.   1. **Lighting**   AB questioned if there will be uplighting in the sculpture and raised concerns about lights causing discomfort to people looking down from above and the consequences for residents. SG confirmed that there will be uplighting and that he will seek engineering advice regarding internal lighting. MG stated that the internal lighting will be positioned horizontally rather than pointing upwards to eliminate concerns about resident discomfort caused by the lights. SG asserted their desire to configure the lights in a way that emphasises the contrast between the dark black base and the reflective top of the sculpture.  The PAAP unanimously expressed a preference for internal lighting and will seek clarification on what will happen with the lighting prior to granting final approval.   1. **Material considerations**   SV queried whether the sculpture will be made from terrazzo or concrete as the terms are used interchangeably in the proposal but the two materials are not equivalent. SG suggested that artist experimented with different combinations and the intent is to achieve the texture and colour depicted on page 11 of the presentation. SG clarified that the sculpture will be smooth and glossy, not highly textured. SV raised concerns that the dark colour depicted cannot be accomplished with concrete.  SV inquired about the decoration pattern on the ribbon panels to which SG responded that there will be continuous holes and no imagery. Details such as hole size are to be made later and more details are to be provided in the next round. MG confirmed that the panels are purely decorative and not are not designed to be functional.  AB questioned if the holes in the panels will cause whistling. MG responded that they will seek engineering advice.   1. **Uniqueness**   AS questioned the uniqueness and originality of the proposed sculpture and its similarity to the Spiritus Entry Statement artwork in Midland. SG acknowledges that the work is iterative but has a point of difference in its colours and references to the river. DA stated that the proposed artwork meets the criteria as the criteria stipulates that the artist must be unique, not the artwork.   1. **Water**   SR raised concerns about the base of the ribbon panels becoming catchments for water when it rains. MG responded that the size and shape of the ribbons will prevent large surface areas collecting water and causing drips. Concerns about water pooling will be assessed by building as part of the final concept.   1. **Safety**   BD enquired if there are any concerns about safety and people climbing the ribbon artwork. CG clarified that the applicant must acquire a building permit and the building permit will scrutinise the safety of the artwork. No building permit has been obtained as yet. SV stated that safety should not be a concern as the ribbon is on the outside of the one metre balcony balustrades.   1. **Landscaping**   AB enquired if the sculpture is designed for people to congregate around and if the surrounding area will be landscaped. SG responded that this is not the intention and while there is perimeter landscaping in the plans, there will not be landscaping in the area immediately around the artwork. SG expressed that the artwork is designed to stand apart and be a work of disruption, not integration.   1. **Budget**   AB raised concerns regarding the project budget. AB highlighted that the $18,000 allocated for cranage and $10,000 for lighting appear excessive and require justification.   1. **Artwork unity**   AB and DS noted concerns regarding disunity between the ribbon and sculpture artwork and that they do not appear as a suite of works. DA noted that this is not in breach of the assessment criteria and thus this feedback does not need to go back to the artist.  PAAP approved concept design to move forward. PAAP to provide feedback to the artist regarding lighting, safety and water, and request to see some further details of lighting plan. |
| 5.2 | **Seeking Concept Feedback**  Nil. |
| 5.3 | **Seeking Final Approval**  Nil |
| 5.4 | **Completed Projects** |
| 5.4.1 | **31 Rowe Avenue, Rivervale:**  The Springs Public Artwork by Jon Tarry  Maintenance Manual received, plaque installed and Mark Geary has advised that the water feature is running daily from 1 October. |
| 5.4.2 | **Atlas Linen Service, 219 Alexander Road Belmont:** Scintillation Public Artwork by Tom Muller  Notice of Completion  Maintenance Manual received |
|  | **General Business** |
| 6.1 | **Wilson Park Public Artwork Strategy**  Jack Bidwell (JB) provided an update on the Wilson Park Public Artwork Strategy. No material changes have been made other than integrating PAAP feedback from the previous PAAP meeting.  A site visit date has been set and shortlisted artists will have one month following the site visit to prepare their presentations for the final PAAP meeting of 2024. A draft contract will be presented to all applicants as part of the brief. The brief clearly outlines the approval requirements set out by Section 18 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act* and states that all applicant artist teams must contain at least one Whadjuk Noongar artist.    JB sought confirmation of City Project’s proposed timeframes. The following dates were confirmed.   * 5 October, Saturday: EOI Advertisement goes live * 22 October OR 24 October: EOIs to close. JB to consult with David Burton (Coordinator Procurement and Contracts) as to whether EOIs must close on Tuesday as they typically do, or if it can be pushed out to Thursday 24 October. * 30 October, Wednesday 1-3pm: next PAAP meeting (instead of previously proposed 7 November meeting). Meeting for PAAP to review EOIs and reach consensus score based on 1 to 10 scoring system set by procurement.   + 3 shortlisted applicant teams to be provided assessment criteria once they’ve been identified as a shortlisted applicant. PAAP agrees to use regular Public Artwork Design Approval Assessment. * 9 December, close of business: Concept designs presentations due and to be submitted to the PAAP for review * 12 December, Thursday: final PAAP meeting of 2024   JB confirmed the following course of action if the City receives one or zero EOIs   * One EOI: EOI to be assessed against assessment criteria as usual * Zero EOIs: process terminated and City Projects to review why no applications were received and to go out again with a modified process |
|  | **Next meeting dates proposed:**  1.00pm to 3.00pm Wednesday 30 October 2024. |
|  | **Close of meeting**  Meeting closed: 5:00 declared by DS |