

# Public Art Advisory Panel (PAAP)

## Confidential Minutes

**From meeting held 07 November 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	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	Y	
David Attwood	CoB	DA	Arts Officer	Y	
Jaimi Wright	CoB	JW	Arts and Place Assistant	N	Y
Chantelle Gilbert	CoB	CG	Coordinator Planning Projects	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,	Y	

			registered architect and practising Public Artist.		
Alison Barrett	AC	AB	Art Consultant (non-voting)	N	Y
<b>Legend:</b> CoB – City of Belmont; AC – Art Consultant; Com – Community Representative					

Agenda	
No	Item
1.	<b>Acknowledgement of Country – Chair</b> DS provided an acknowledgement of Country
2.	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b> The meeting opened at 3.00 pm and DS chaired the meeting. Apologies from BS, AB
3.	<b>Previous Minutes</b> Updates to previous minutes. BC advised that there would be some slight changes in dates for Wilson Park project delivery: The briefing of shortlisted artists will be 13/11 not 14/11 No longer requirement for Council to issue Delegated Authority to CEO to award contract. Minutes from Thursday 3 October and Wednesday 30 October 2024 accepted by SR seconded by DS. Minutes from Wednesday 30 October 2024 accepted by SR seconded by HD.
4.	<b>Declarations of Interest that may cause a conflict</b> No declarations of conflicts of interest for information. Note that the Councillors need to leave the meeting for the Wilson Park Public Artwork commission item. Minutes must reflect the time the Councillors departed and then returned to the meeting. CK & DS departed at 4pm and did not return as the item was listed last on the agenda.
5.	<b>Developer Applications</b>
5.1	<b>New Developments:</b> Development: 199 Great Eastern Highway, KBH Storage Public Artwork Coordinator: Maggie Baxter Artist: Mark Datodi Developer Contribution Requirement: \$120K Artwork Commission Fee: \$100K  Application formally provided and circulated by BC prior to meeting via email.

### **Pre-presentation discussion**

#### **1. Discrepancy in budget**

CG queried if the artist budget was \$100k as this did not meet the requirement of the developer contribution (requiring \$120k). BC stated that full budget is itemised on the last page and includes an additional \$20K attributed to the Art Coordinators fee, Shortlisting Artist Fees, Contingency and Plaques. It was confirmed that the \$120k contribution has been budgeted for within the project proposal.

#### **2. General discussion relating to the visual impact and risks associated with the artwork such as access and vandalism that would be clarified by artists in presentation.**

CG noted concern about 'tower of boxes' as entry statement to the development.

AS aversion to branded public art and longevity if the tenant was to change in the future. SR echoed sentiment and believes that it lacks creativity.

BC/DA commented that the artwork is similar in style, context and visual impact as the Fremantle Sea Containers public artwork and are a model example of how the public artwork reflects the industries where it is placed. DA noted potential unfairness to call proposal too specific due to project brief requiring context of site and surroundings.

AS raised concerns about climb-ability. DA queried whether the artwork will be fenced and not publicly accessible. NG queried whether the work will be obscured if fenced. CG confirmed that there will not be a fence.

AS asked about height of work. To be clarified with applicant.

### **Presentation by Mark Datodi and Maggie Baxter & post-presentation discussion**

#### **1. Lighting**

MD confirmed artwork will have uplighting with the developer provide wiring. BC noted that lighting is not itemised in budget with MD clarifying that the budget will be revised to include this new component and that there should be sufficient funds to accommodate lighting.

#### **2. Fabrication**

MD confirmed there will be sufficient budget for fabrication as he will be fabricating the artwork. The powder coated marine grade aluminium has a 15–20-year lifespan on powder-coat. MD noted that some colours will fade faster than others, e.g. red. Noted hesitation to use colour-red. Boxes can easily be removed for repair if required.

#### **3. Access**

MD confirmed that there is no fence and that the work would be placed as close to the front of property as permissible. Climb-ability & accessibility issues are being considered. The large Gumtree on left of proposed artwork site to remain. Degree to which this tree obscures the artwork is to be explored. AS asked if the tree and its proximity to the sculpture might allow for climbing between the tree and sculpture. MD responded that the tree is difficult to climb and hence should not be a problem, however acknowledged that climb-ability must be addressed.

#### 4. Composition

MD exploring re-arranging boxes so that it consists of two towers, considering an open-framed box at base that can be walked underneath by hollowing out green section. Second option is sliding boxes onto a pole that would provide structural support but not be visible.

#### 5. Tenant-specificity

AS queried the tenant specificity of the artwork. MB responded that Keepsafe is the trading brand of KBH and not merely a tenant but own the property. MD clarified that the building is specifically made for storage so longevity and specificity should not be an issue. The precinct is dominated by freight and logistic companies.

#### 6. Uniqueness

NG raised concern of potential for KBH to do similar works. MB stated this is the first public artwork done by this developer and that it does not have plans at this stage to do any public artwork in their other areas (which are outside Belmont).

#### 7. Scope & Scale

AS asked about change in scope and scale. MD responded that the presentation image is merely a concept but would like to think that the freestanding artwork will be least 5.5-6 metres high and the boxes on the side of the building will be of significant scale also.

### **MD and MG were thanked for their presentation and left the meeting**

#### Post presentation discussion

##### 1. Proximity to road

SR asked if they are pushed closer to the road, will there be cause for concern. CG noted that there are no traffic lights in the area. Main Roads to be consulted as work is abutting Great Eastern Highway.

##### 2. Climb-ability

The PAAP to communicate to applicant formally that climb-ability must be addressed.

	<p>3. AB's comments were shared with summary that the artwork is contemporary and a strong focal point, created by an experienced artist and that her comments were generally supportive of the project proposal.</p> <p>4. Maintenance</p> <p>AS queried the durability and maintenance requirements for the artwork and expressed concerns about potential vandalism on lower elements and ask that a maintenance plan be added to the budget (and that it includes consideration on how to repair scratches), however SV questioned if scratch-ability is really a major a concern for an artwork of this scale.</p> <p>SR suggested that anti-graffiti paint could be applied to powder coated metal.</p> <p>The PAAP provided their individual proposals, with the following outcome.</p> <p>The PAAP support concept design in principle, however, would like the following details to be addressed and a response provided to the PAAP before the project proceeds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Budget update to include lighting costs and reflect breakdown costs for the two variations.</li> <li>2. Final design for the wall &amp; free-standing sculptures to be provided to the PAAP with indication of scale, size and placement.</li> <li>3. Climb-ability concerns are addressed in the final design to minimise any potential safety risks</li> <li>4. Proximity to road to be considered by Main Roads with any comment provided back to the PAAP, and</li> <li>5. The maintenance plan will consider upkeep of potential vandalism and paint repairs.</li> </ol>
<b>5.2</b>	<p><b>Seeking Concept Feedback</b></p> <p>Nil</p>
<b>5.3</b>	<p><b>Seeking Final Approval</b></p> <p>Nil</p>
<b>5.4</b>	<p><b>Completed Projects</b></p> <p>Nil</p>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>General Business</b></p>
<b>6.1</b>	<p>Wilson Park Public Artwork update</p> <p>Jack Bidwell and Jannette Davies from City projects entered the meeting at 4pm to present an update on the Wilson Park Public Art commission tender process and documents.</p> <p>PAAP supported the content of the document.</p>

	<p>Tender doc to be sent to two shortlisted artists on 8.11.2024 through tender portal.</p> <p>Mandatory briefing with City Projects Team Weds 13.11.24, 4PM.</p> <p>Tender response open until 21 Jan 2025.</p> <p>Compiled by procurement team to then present to PAAP on 30.01.2025.</p> <p>Tender requirements for assessment</p> <p>Panel Members (4)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 assessing member from procurement: David Burton</li> <li>2 assessing member from projects: Jack Bidwell, Janette Davies</li> <li>1 PAAP representative (not an Elected Members)</li> </ol> <p>Score to be derived from each Panel Member's evaluations and the AAG and landscaping reps to be included.</p> <p>Assessment panel recommendation to be taken to Council in February 2025.</p> <p>BC has sent minor revisions of the document with track changes to wording of the Qualitative Criteria to reflect the PAAP's assessment criteria for public artworks and suggested that additional requirement for Detailed Design Documentation stage to be presented to the PAAP during the project.</p> <p>JB acknowledged this, however, does not need to be formally included in tender process document. This can be done but a date would need to be nominated. Will include in tender that the artist make allowance for a (x) number of presentations to PAAP seeking feedback.</p> <p>BC asked for a completion report including professional photographs, artist statements and artist biographies. JD agreed that this can be added. SV requested that the City covers the cost for documentation and requests the artist's consent to use photos provided by artists and put in the public art inventory.</p> <p>SV suggests that dates for delivery of artwork items be separated to accommodate need for early requirement of canopy design to meet construction deadlines. JB - Panels on canopy are mounted and can be constructed, then fixed later in the event of delay.</p> <p>Invitation to PAAP for tender evaluation meeting on 30.01.2025 to be sent.</p>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Next meeting dates proposed:</b></p> <p>5 December 2024</p> <p>30 January 2025 (Wilson Park Concept Design Assessment meeting)</p> <p>Note: this is the latest possible date for City Project deadlines. Currently called special PAAP meeting, can be renamed evaluation meeting if required.</p> <p>13 March 2025</p>
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Close of meeting</b></p> <p>Meeting closed 4:16 declared by NG.</p> <p>Next meeting 5 December 2024.</p>