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This design-based research has been undertaken within an academic context that actively promotes a speculative approach to urban design projects contextually situated within the contemporary Australian city. From this perspective the concern with the exploration of the view and the image detailed in this document is an academic inheritance of the speculative design work conducted through urban design studios as part of the RMIT architecture master’s research program. Consequently these projects should be approached on the premise that they deliberately favour experimental processes aimed at developing and testing speculative strategies, techniques and tactics that respond to certain trajectories drawn from a context where, as suggested by Carey Lyon (2002), the image functions as the most significant factor in formation of contemporary urban environments. Acknowledging that this opens other ways of approaching urbanism than those offered by traditional monocentric and dense European urban precedents, this master’s research aims to develop appropriate and constructive responses to this condition.

The proliferation of the image in the marketing of the built environment no doubt exploits the propensity of the human mind to organize the world into identifiable figures and forms (Figure 1.1.1). The imagistic strategies and tactics commonly used to sell the built environment typically witness separation between that which is imaged and that which is built. Accordingly this research aimed to develop alternatives to, rather than reinforce, the normative forms arising from such representations of idealized ‘lifestyles’ (Figure 1.2). The resulting design processes actively embrace branding strategies for formal effect as one way to overcome this cynical use of the image. Consequently the approach to the image was more concerned with a notion of figuration focused on the formal potential of the figure of the image rather than any figurative facility of that image. Specifically it will be argued that figural branding, performing an emblematic and iconic ‘job’, effectively prevents the type of semiotic closure expected of portrayal, and by extension contests the use of the image solely as a mechanism to commodify the built environment.

A parallel line of research aimed to develop and examine a range of design processes where the experiential view is as instrumental in the generation of built form as is the plan. Given that the plan continues to dominate urban design the intention of this research was effectively to challenge the plan’s primacy through the agency of the phenomenal ground view. This proposition engages with the curatorial strategy of picturesque scenography, where the experiential view assumes a formally generative role. The projects collectively investigate alternative processes that contest this primacy through an exploration of projective techniques in each design project undertaken.

These research interests culminate in the final major design project for a new technology estate campus in Janefield, on the northern periphery of Melbourne. The project aims to investigate appropriate strategies, techniques and operations to inform the design of an institutional project within a peripheral context. The selection of this project is in part based on an acknowledgment that the drift of the institution into the peripheral ‘zone’ remains as one of the few significant sites for architectural speculation within a context, given that most development in this context is predominantly independent and external to the architectural profession. The project employs the armature of the figure to invert the institutional desire to use three-dimensional architectural form as a mode of imagistic promotion. Consequently the figure as the gifted institutional emblem functions as a brand and the formal generator of a three-dimensional territory. It will be argued that the actual selected figure, as visually and figuratively equivocal, resonates with the ‘formless’ condition of the contemporary Australian periphery.

The research is premised on the testing of this figure and its image as an appropriate strategic response to the institutional desire for identity, the indeterminacy of the master plan and the potential of the image to impact formally and materially on the architectural artefact. In this there is a deliberate intention to instigate a design process that generates form at an urban scale without solely favouring the empirical plan. To achieve this the figure, deployed as a sectional profile, directs the development of form in the vertical dimension. This and other subsequent generative ‘operations’, indebted to a range of formal operations appropriated from the text Formless: A User’s Guide (Bois & Krauss 1997), aim to deliver a figural texturing of the site that opens the project to relationships other than that traditionally offered by the instrumental plan. In this manner the project aims to produce a peripheral ‘institutional campus’ that acts, in plan and section, as a blurred zone of programmatic interaction, offering an alternative to the segregated modernist planning and zoning strategies evident in numerous campus designs.

The documentation for the Janefield Technology Campus will include the production of a range of two and three-dimensional drawings that test the capacity of the figure to deliver an urban form capable of satisfying the empirical determinants of infrastructure and site division through a range of architectural outcomes, including the anchor building and a range of significant open spaces. There will be an emphasis on experiential exterior and interior drawings, as well as diagrams that describe the conversion of the figure into three-dimensional form. Finally the submission will illustrate both the initial staging of the estate and the capacity of this figure to deal with the contingencies of the incremental master plan.
“The disappearance, in our culture, of the frontier plays an important role. Modernity was characterized by the systematic demolition of strongholds and the increasing dysfunctionality of fortresses, city walls and city gates.... The demolition of the wall is not an incident but an integral part of the great accident that has affected the territorial frontier since the Renaissance. From the Renaissance on, the temptations of distance and the journey (trade, contact, communication) have gained the upper hand over the medieval stabilitas loci— the inert fixation to a place” (Nijenhuis 1994, p. 13).

This quote by Wim Nijenhuis from the essay, *City Frontiers and Their Disappearance*, succinctly identifies how the dual forces of mobility and speed have dramatically transformed contemporary urbanism. The development of communication technology, and with it the global economy, has manifested itself in the form of the dispersed, non-hierarchical city. The coincidental shift in location and expression of the frontier within the city has exposed the traditional dense, concentric European urban development as both an inadequate and increasingly unrecoverable model for the making of the contemporary city.

The Australian city, typically identifiable by a central city grid and an extensive peripheral ‘sprawl’, historically developed under colonial and post-colonial conditions that produced an urban form that is atypical to traditional European experience. Until recently the built environment of the suburban periphery unostentatiously aimed to satisfy the cultural ideal of home ownership. The deregulation of the banking sector in the late twentieth century and the associated increase in access to global capital have resulted in commodification of the suburb. Facilitated by increased individual mobility, these new suburban developments are now promoted through images that represent idealized lifestyles (Figure 1.2.1 & 2). The immediate impact is that the house, enlarged and fully accessorized, increasingly becomes a demonstration of personal wealth and prestige (Figures 1.2.3 to 1.2.4).

Yet the most significant change has been in the suburb itself, where the marketable image is designed as the complete idealized package. Such developments, acting both outwards and increasingly back into the existing city fabric, have the potential to generate a seemingly endless formal homogeneity (Figure 1.2.5). The proliferation of this type of city form, predominantly occurring outside the control of the architectural profession, poses new questions of urban design that call for a more strategic engagement with this physical and conceptual context. Issues facing the city can no longer be solved through a wistful retreat back to the boulevards and plazas of the pre-modern city. Any attempt to do so would be to deny the fundamental shift that has occurred in the making of the contemporary city.
Bois (1997, p. 228-230), in discussing Ruscha's work, describes the city as a "mounting tide of non-differentiation (the galloping spread of suburbia proves him right)." He goes on to add that particular examples of Ruscha's work "designate everything that hinders or is useless to the transmission of the message as "noise"; and, by extension, everything that has no informational content, everything that is repeated, predictable, redundant- all that is nothing but dust. In this sense the city itself, as a megalopolis, has become pure noise, pure zone" (Bois 1997, p.229).

This type of urbanism, as a 'zone' of repetition and redundancy, produces indeterminacy that, as Allen and Rem Koolhaas argue, has to be strategically dealt with as a field with loose programmatic and formal boundaries where the architectural object dissolves, resisting any applied conceptual totalization. This 'zone' problematizes the traditional role of architecture, creating a context where it no longer hopes to possess what Taylor (1991) identifies as either the universality of the monocentric modern subject or the polycentric postmodern subject. This indeterminacy in identity instead calls for a type of 'new' urbanism that, as Koolhaas describes:

"will not be based on the twin fantasies of order and omnipotence; it will be the staging of uncertainty; it will no longer be concerned with the arrangement of more or less permanent objects but with the irrigation of territories with potential...that refuse to be crystallized into definitive form..." (Koolhaas 1995, p.969).

One of the most provocative issues facing the architect operating within this attenuated peripheral zone is the effacement of the specific by the dictates of the global. In the suburb one sees an increasing standardization of building stock irrespective of the immediate context or the country. The promotional 'pitch' in selling these homogeneous and generic suburban developments as idealized 'lifestyle' residential environments creates an inversion where what was traditionally seen as the 'ground' of the city is now elevated to the sacred. Viewed in this light Bataille's rallying against architecture's job of presenting "... the ideal being of society, that which orders and prohibits with authority..." (Bataille 1999, p.21) has shifted from state-sponsored architectural monuments to individual and private domestic space. The object that houses this authority has shifted but the objective of any process of idealization aimed at conserving the status quo remains unaltered. The selling of such developments has produced a homogeneity that aims to conserve, through the effacement of difference, a universalized and officially sanctioned image that is asked to reside in built form.

The ideal of urban form as unambiguous, ordered and comprehensible is, perhaps more than ever, an infinitile, utopian expectation. The individual designer's loss of control has now reached the point where the master plan has an increasingly short shelf-life and any utopian desire to maintain its purity is unlikely to be achieved. To quote Koolhaas again:

"A profession persists in its fantasies, its ideology, its pretension, its illusions of involvement and control, and is therefore incapable of conceiving new modesties, partial interventions, strategic realignments, compromised positions that might influence, redirect, succeed in limited terms, regroup, begin from scratch even, but will never re-establish control" (Koolhaas 1995, p.965).

The intent of this research is not to correct a perceived ill but to employ Bataille's operational tactic of using the logic of this "idealized" condition against itself as a way of productively opening other alternative outcomes. In this case the peripheral conditions of repetition and redundancy may be adopted operationally to resist the present suburban outcomes in a way that invests the zone with another potential approach to the question of identity. Accordingly the three design-based research projects all directly engage with the attempt to challenge urban design processes that allow the quantitative plan to be the primary space through which to explore the pragmatic and instrumental distribution of a program across a site.

The first seminar was a late submission for the design of the Good City Form Estate project contested the single elevated exteriorized view in the first project by the derivation of a blurred urban massing developed from the overlaying of the multiple experiential viewpoints (cones of vision) from within the site. The resultant form was then subdivided in a way that subverted the investigated normative housing forms detailed in Lynch's Good City Form by prizes apart the linkage these forms have between density and height so as to disperse housing types throughout the development.

The third preliminary seminar project involved an investigation into the institution within the city periphery. The aim was to investigate the plan, figure and image as a design armature to generate possible other spaces that challenged and resisted the empirical or instrumental determinism of infrastructure and commercial speculation. Through an investigation of the representational potential of the plan figure and image it was hoped to provide "...a critical alternative to the over-determined technical institutionalism of...the "minimalist/formalist position which expresses programs, articulates structure and promotes uniformity" (Alpress 2000, p.41.)

The major project of this research has been drawn from the third and final design studio. The project provided the best vehicle to explore the role of the image without the apparent semiotic closure evident in the first studio. It also builds upon the research of the generative capacity of the phenomenal view and the effects of mobility and speed on the reading of form explored within the second studio project. This final studio project also offered the best opportunity to test the aim of investigating the role of the representation as a generative design tool acting within the experiential realm as non-hierarchical city: the strategic oblique picturesque view from beyond the city edge through the deployment of an appropriated image that served as the emblematic city plan.
a counterpoint to the privileging of the plan in urban design, and to effect an experiential architecture that operationally redeemed qualities of repetition and redundancy to enact an architecture responsive and engaged to those ‘qualities’ of the peripheral zone (Figure 1.2.6).

The research in the final design project aims to explore the institution within the periphery according to three major lines of enquiry, first and foremost as a speculative design-based research with a design outcome tested against its worldly application. The evidence of this investigation will manifest itself in the production of both a master plan and the detailing of a range of formal and spatial outcomes across a number of scales. The project will therefore primarily discuss, through appropriate two and three-dimensional illustrative modes of representation, these outcomes in relation to the incremental master plan as well as the opportunistic architectural potential of the figure. This consequently means that the project aims to address the brief, program and site as a set of ‘worldly’ criteria with which to test the proposition properly.

The second enquiry aims to explore and document a specific design methodology that favours process and innately acknowledges that an account of that design process is itself research that requires documentation. The aim of this exploration can be in some degree isolated from the specific design outcome and can instead focus on the motivations driving this interest, the associated implications of its relevance within the contemporary debate and the questions it raises around the issue of authorship and legitimacy.

The third and final research aim is concerned with an exploration of a theoretical framework and its position within the act of design. It would be a misrepresentation to deny that there have been certain key texts that have provided a very specific context in which certain design decisions have been made. This was particularly evident in the production of both a master plan and the detailing of a range of formal and spatial outcomes across a number of scales. The project will therefore primarily discuss, through appropriate two and three-dimensional illustrative modes of representation, these outcomes in relation to the incremental master plan as well as the opportunistic architectural potential of the figure. This consequently means that the project aims to address the brief, program and site as a set of ‘worldly’ criteria with which to test the proposition properly.

The third and final research aim is concerned with an exploration of a theoretical framework and its position within the act of design. It would be a misrepresentation to deny that there have been certain key texts that have provided a very specific context in which certain design decisions have been made. This was particularly evident in the production of both a master plan and the detailing of a range of formal and spatial outcomes across a number of scales. The project will therefore primarily discuss, through appropriate two and three-dimensional illustrative modes of representation, these outcomes in relation to the incremental master plan as well as the opportunistic architectural potential of the figure. This consequently means that the project aims to address the brief, program and site as a set of ‘worldly’ criteria with which to test the proposition properly.

The second enquiry aims to explore and document a specific design methodology that favours process and innately acknowledges that an account of that design process is itself research that requires documentation. The aim of this exploration can be in some degree isolated from the specific design outcome and can instead focus on the motivations driving this interest, the associated implications of its relevance within the contemporary debate and the questions it raises around the issue of authorship and legitimacy.

The third and final research aim is concerned with an exploration of a theoretical framework and its position within the act of design. It would be a misrepresentation to deny that there have been certain key texts that have provided a very specific context in which certain design decisions have been made. This was particularly evident in the production of both a master plan and the detailing of a range of formal and spatial outcomes across a number of scales. The project will therefore primarily discuss, through appropriate two and three-dimensional illustrative modes of representation, these outcomes in relation to the incremental master plan as well as the opportunistic architectural potential of the figure. This consequently means that the project aims to address the brief, program and site as a set of ‘worldly’ criteria with which to test the proposition properly.

A distinguishing aspect of Bois’s and Krauss’s reading of ‘formless’ is its antagonism to any universalizing constructs that, through semiotic closure, employs representation as a process of idealization. The ‘formless’ is more an operative mode of action concerned with strategic resistance to conceptual frameworks than an intellectual trajectory to establish authenticity through the unambiguous allocation of meaning and signification to objects. Accordingly it is possible to understand ‘formless’ as radically contextual and provisional. This aspect of ‘formless’ is crucial because of the persistence of the figurative within contemporary culture and the attempt to produce a clear semiotic transfer. As such the figurative is understood as being compliant with the making and reinforcement of the conventional. This also means that illustrative or figurative representation has operative potential. In the end the ‘formless’ possesses an ontology based on context across all modes of representation, where its job is to develop strategies and enact tactics to resist and undo any attempt to impart stable readings.

In this framework not only does the contingency of the ‘real’ establish a context as a valid departure point but it also acknowledges both the existence and value of temporality and relativity. By resisting the perennial or fundamental ‘formless’ locates the discussion, sets the parameters and provides an immediate space to work within. The contingency of context, which is inherently reliant on the contingency of the social, functions as an agreed medium where ideas and messages are exchanged and contested. Context destabilizes theory because, as Bataille argued, theory prefers “the universe would have to take shape” (Bataille 1999, p31) against the formlessness to the ‘real’. So, the contingent marks the space where motivation and argumentation are instrumental to design practice and acts as a guide and tool of assessment. It also restricts space required for ideology to ‘form’ so as to serve rather than direct design.
The specific aim of this design research program is to speculate on possible new architectural design strategies and techniques responsive to the Australian contemporary city periphery across a variety of scales. These studies have been structured around three preliminary design seminars culminating in a final exemplary project. These preliminary projects focused on the investigation of process-driven design research and therefore concentrated more on technique than articulation of final design outcomes. The implications of these projects will be reviewed in the discussion of the major research project so what follows is a brief description of the brief, intent and process of each seminar project.

2.1
STUDIO ONE:
A LATE ENTRY FOR THE DESIGN OF CANBERRA

This project, a late entry for the original competition for the city of Canberra, acted as an introductory vehicle that explored a concern with a speculative use of the image as a device to design a contemporary city, identified as being programmatically complex, formally ‘thin’ and organizationally non-hierarchical. In this case the image acted as both an emblematic figure and as a formal generator of appropriate spatial and formal relationships. The subsequent strategies and tactics explored the possibility of the view acting as an armature by which to direct form-making where the image and its viewing deliberately instigated a process that resisted the plan’s primacy in the urban design process and suspended the normative pragmatism of the planner.

John Macarthur makes the distinction that the history of the city plan is that of the sovereign’s view rather than that of the phenomenal ground view of the crowd (Figure 2.1.1). Building on the work of Louis Marin in *Utopias: A Spatial Play*, Macarthur argues that the drawn city plan commissioned by the sovereign represented and revealed the city space as being only completely accessible to the monarch. Macarthur argues that the elevated view from a publicly accessible strategic vantage point subverts this situation so as to democratize the view of the city. By extension one could argue that the capacity to retain an emblematic image within the memory allows a greater degree of accessibility of that city plan. To quote: “[I]f we turn to Louis Marin’s work on the ‘utopic’ of the city map then we can recall that maps like Nolli’s do not merely describe cities produced by absolutist power but themselves represent and refer to the sight of the sovereign. Before aerial photography such views were an imagined experience of the abstract by an extra-human figure of the King, who commissioned such maps and who constituted the single point at which such a mass of data could be significant. Aerial photographs are thus not merely a new means to see the city; they are the first palatable view of what had been an abstraction, human society. They may not be greatly significant in what they can tell us about the city but the aerial photographs completely revolutionise the semantics of the sovereignty of sight.” (Macarthur, J, 2000, p.114)

The contemporary ‘thin’ city inverts the typical dissolution of the view within the tall and/or dispersed city plan. This flatness witnesses a condition where the plan and the view collapse into each other, opening the possibility that the city, as a consistent readable surface, can be exploited to impart the ‘city view’ with emblematic legibility. After a series of tests it was decided to develop the city ‘plan’ from a translation of Jackson Pollock’s *Blue Poles* (Figure 2.1.2). This selection was made on the basis that it possessed rich spatial potential when formally translated and also for its representational significance. This latter point acknowledges, somewhat ironically, the image’s present iconic cultural status and its historical significance as an imported cultural artefact whose purchase could be seen to exemplify the country’s ‘cultural cringe’.

The intention was to view the city image from a privileged but democratized position outside the city boundary, in this case a viewing platform located within a proposed telecommunications tower to the city’s south. Procedurally the image of *Blue Poles* was appropriated, re-scaled, stretched and laid, like fabric, within the identified competition boundary (Figure 2.1.3). The decision to stretch the initial image aimed to partially correct the foreshortening occurring in the oblique, elevated gaze from which the city emblem was to be viewed. The spatial outcome is consequently based on the viewing of the image. This criterion privileges the oblique view that operationally requires the plan to be stretched, making the plan a distortion occurring within the space of the computer. This ensured that the city plan was more than a rescaled version of the original.
Figure 2.1.4
Mapping of existing fault lines.

Figure 2.1.5
Fold and cuts geometries.

Figure 2.1.6
Template of fold and cuts to be applied to compressed image of Blue Poles.

Figure 2.1.7
Template of fold and cuts applied to image of Blue Poles.
Figure 2.1.8 Outline of initial folds to image.

Figure 2.1.9 Template in middle of folding process.

Figure 2.1.10 Final Outline of Template after folding

Figure 2.1.11 Physical model of folded image
Rosalind Krauss’s (1997) interpretation of Pollock’s work as an index of the force of gravity provided an opportunity to read city form and program through a reinterpretation of the quality of the line, while further future expansion outside the competition boundary was, like the detritus caused by the random spills on Pollock’s studio floor, understood to develop in a less planned and more dispersed form (Figure 2.1.15). This image was then meticulously cut and folded to the site’s topographic and geological information, inscribing the site on and through its surface (Figures 2.1.4 to 14). Ground and image modify each other in an attempt to resist the tendency to use the image in a way that reduces the site to a tabula rasa condition.

The outcome of this process is a slippage that reveals the gap between the plan as an experiential trace or a mental map of the image. This slippage doubles the effect of the complexity of the source image to produce a labyrinthine city space, a space that is “not an object, not a referent. It does not have a transcendence that would permit one to explore it” (Hollier, D, 1993, p.58).
The second seminar design was a response to those moments when the peripheral condition folds back into voids within the existing inner city fabric. Consequently the project aimed to explore the outcome when potential spatial qualities of the city periphery were allowed to configure a disused inner city ‘zone’ located vicariously adjacent to City Link Freeway. In this case the primary concern was an attempt to understand how the ‘formless’ and loose plan geometries and the highly figured elevational realm of the periphery could be deployed in this zone.

The project, sited in the inner city Melbourne suburb of Burnley, was the redevelopment of a disused precinct adjacent to a major new piece of civil infrastructure, Melbourne’s City Link Freeway (Figure 2.2.1). The program called for a high-density residential and commercial development located at City Link Burnley Interchange site. The conceit of the brief, extracted from The Office of Metropolitan Architecture’s Bijlmermeer redevelopment, was to employ Rem Koolhaas’s rhetorical text S,M,L,XL as a filter to reinterpret the normative residential typological survey found in Kevin Lynch’s Good City Form (Figure 2.2.2).
As with the first seminar the project was operationally derived from an interaction of the phenomenal or experiential view and the appropriation of an emblematic image. As in the Canberra project the selection of the image was based both on its representational capacity for ironic signification and an opportunistic potential to satisfy the programmatic requirements. In this case, however, the deportment of the image was instrumental in the generation of form because its irregular deportment ensured that the prime entry points to the development were located so as to prevent the generation of symmetrical form (Figure 2.2.3). The reading of the image’s ‘ribs’ as bridges linking a new shopping mall at the northern boundary to the new residential component was vital in generating a less identifiable form. Subsequently the decision to give these bridges the same sectional curvature meant that the plan position of the primary viewing points could be determined by setting a single height datum corresponding to the ridge of the shortest bridge. The cones of vision from these eleven visual entry points were then mapped, with their direction in plan aligned tangentially to the curve of each bridge (Figure 2.2.4). At this point all intersections between the cones of vision were identified and allocated a numerical weighting corresponding to the number of overlapping cones of vision occurring in that zone. This developed a contour map that was then incrementally quantified to give elevational height (Figure 2.2.5). The final act was to strategically modify this mass, first, as a response to pragmatic issues concerned with programmatic amenity and existing context issues, and secondly, to explore a research interest in the experiential perception of form, in this case modifying urban form to cater for its perception both at the speed of the driver or...
passenger and the pedestrian.

This concentration of the tallest massing along the freeway opportunistically suggests a distribution of office program along this edge (Figure 2.2.8). This mass then bleeds down and out into a one to two-storey edge linking into the existing urban fabric. In the process Lynch’s residential typologies blur together, creating a slippage between form and type that resists any reductive separation between categories within this programmatic type (Figures 2.2.6 & 7).

It became evident that this process developed a type of urban massing that “exceeds every form and escapes all formation” (Taylor, M, 1992, p.30). As Taylor quotes Kant,

“[T]he beautiful in nature is a question of the form of the object, and this consists in limitation, whereas the sublime is to be found in an object even devoid of form, so far as it immediately involves, or else by its presence provokes, a representation of unlimitlessness, and yet its totality is also be present to thought.” (Kant, I, as cited in Taylor, M, 1992, p.30).

The importance of this formless massing is, therefore, an attempt to exceed notions of beauty imparted by a clear...
The third design study investigated the nature of the architectural object at the periphery through an investigation of the links between the plan figure and its reading in phenomenal view, and the role of the two-dimensional image applied to the character of the built form. Programmatically the project was a university campus located on Melbourne’s periphery at Janefield, Bundoora (Figures 2.3.1 & 2). The project attempted to explore the degree of comprehension, and subsequent nature of the relationship, of the plan figure in the phenomenal view, and the ability of the two-dimensional image to modify and elaborate the design’s architectural character. The role of the plan form and plan image of the figure was therefore twofold. First it was to be the generator of the plan figure and act as a form of an emblem.
The second expectation for the figure was to provide a more performative role in the spatial outcome in the experiential or phenomenal realm (Figures 2.3.7 to 10). To enact this the text Formless: A User’s Guide (Bois & Krauss 1997) and associated interpretative readings of George Bataille’s notion of the Informe (Bataille 1999, p.31) were employed as theoretical filters and operational references.

The first three studios focused primarily on the development of a range of techniques, rather than on the articulation of an explicit built proposal. The scope of the Janefield project did, however, implicate a number of previous lines of enquiry and for this reason this project was selected as the final exemplary project of this master’s research. As such this project will be subjected to detailed discussion and it will be examined as the main body of research.
"It is often said that Australians are a highly urbanised population, but the vast majority ‘live’ amidst suburban sprawl. Architects play a decreasing role in this context, where economies of scale still favour the easily marketed generic output of developers and commercial builders. The medium-scale institutional building is, however, one remaining market niche in the suburbs where the design skills of the architect are still valued” (Allpress, 2000, p.41).

Previous design seminars have addressed urban design strategies and outcomes on varying scales and levels of detail. The Janefield project provides an opportunity to apply this research directly and develop strategies and operations with the aim of testing the ensuing urban condition across a range of architectural scales. The primary objectives of the project can be summarized as follows:

1. Engage with the issue of the image as a generative armature to address the institutional compulsion to identify and represent itself;

2. Engage operationally with the qualities of the peripheral zone to produce architecture responsive to these conditions;

3. Employ the experiential ground view as a way of challenging the instrumental and empirical determinism of the plan;

4. Explore the capacity of a figure to generate an incremental master plan and to test the implications of this deployment on a range of architectural scales.

The outcome of this research project will detail the first stage of development and the strategic development of the staged master plan, which will also identify the location of the privately developed recreational and residential components. The following consideration of the Janefield project will begin with a review of the brief and a discussion of the selection criteria of the figure. This will be followed by a description of the methodological underpinnings of the project and the paper will then conclude with a discussion and review of the design proposition. This section therefore aims to provide a qualitative overview of the university’s aim and approach to the estate.

3.1 THE JANEFIELD BRIEF

The Janefield Site, located on the northern periphery of Melbourne and adjacent to RMIT’s Bundoora Campus, is the proposed home of a new technology park (Figures 3.1.1 to 3). An initiative of RMIT, the development envisaged for this site is a joint industry - university venture. The university’s financial outlay associated with the development is to be mainly funded through the sale of surplus land for private residential and recreational development. The original RMIT brief assumes all campus development would be complete within a five-year period. The following is a summary of the modified brief found in Appendix 1.

It is important to note that the mix of industry and residential components differs from the original RMIT brief because the initial specification was for four Industry Service Centres (or I.S.C.). The number of I.S.C.s was actually increased to twelve in total, and a further allocation was made to include smaller incubator units. The rationale for this increase is specifically linked to the research agenda where the relatively short time frame for the completion of the campus in the original brief was deemed an insufficient parameter by which to test the logic of the design process against the temporal instability of the incremental master plan. Consequently the increase in the size of the campus component re-established the issue of temporal indeterminacy of the master plan as a research objective. The absence of any long-term expansion plans seemed short-sighted. The obvious benefit of the increase in the number and type of I.S.C.s is an improvement in the diversity and quantum of the estate’s research and development outcomes and the inclusion of incubator-style units also allows the university selectively to employ a more speculative mode of engagement with high-risk, start-up industry partners. The reduction in university revenue that resulted from the reduction in the land allocation for the low-density residential component was to be partially offset by an increase in higher density residential development. Consequently phase one of the master plan will see full development of the incubator units as well as four of the twelve I.S.C. units, one of which will house the project’s anchor tenant.
All I.S.C. units are effectively shared facilities that house both the industrial partner and the university’s required teaching facilities. To quote from the now defunct RMIT Janefield website these facilities have “A flexible approach to the overall design, which has the ability to incorporate major structural change without compromising the overall design in terms of its reflection of RMIT’s objectives for the project. Development envelopes shown on the plan are indicative, and may grow or shrink according to the requirements of particular tenants. A substantial proportion of the available land (particularly in the north west corner of the site) is reserved for future development by RMIT” (Lyall, 1999, Development Regime: Flexible Design Options section).

All I.S.C.s are briefed as loose fit accommodation to cater strategically for changes in tenancies and usage and offer the potential to exploit every space as a site for the full integration of practice-oriented teaching and research activities. Each unit, ranging in size from 6700 to 10000m², accommodates both the industry partner’s administrative section and the university’s teaching spaces. The incubator units, varying in size up to a maximum of 1000m², are grouped together into two development sites. These will have access to shared teaching facilities, the amount of which will be in accordance with a pro rata allocation to that of the main I.S.C.s.

The University requires a central administrative building and a resource facility. There is also allocation for commercial development, a hotel conference centre and student housing. There is no explicit direction as to the specific location of any of these facilities. In addition it was decided to consolidate new and existing university recreational facilities with new facilities that would commonly occur as part of the residential and recreational zones. The fact that the university directly oversees the development of all but the privately developed residential zones and the golf course strategically allows it to exercise significant control of the architectural quality of the overall estate in the first phase of development.

Institutionally RMIT University places a great deal of emphasis on practice-oriented learning that addresses real world issues. The following vision and mission statement, directly extracted from the current website, clearly articulates this attitude.

“RMIT’s vision is to be:
- Global in outlook and action, offering our students and staff a global passport to learning and work.
- Urban in orientation and creativity, reflecting and shaping the city of the 21st century.
- The first choice provider of work-relevant learning in Australia, preparing students for professions and vocations of the future.
- One of Australia’s top research universities, internationally known for our applied focus and for excellence in research and research education in our chosen fields.

Mission
RMIT is a global university of technology with its heart in the city of Melbourne. We create and disseminate knowledge to meet the needs of industry and community and foster in students the skills and passion to contribute to and engage with the world” (Romer, 2007, Vision & Mission section).

This is further reflected in the Institution’s self-description.

“RMIT University is one of Australia’s leading educational institutions, producing some of Australia’s most employable graduates.

RMIT is an innovative, global university, with its heart in the city of Melbourne. It has an international reputation for excellence in work-relevant education and high quality research which is engaged with the needs of industry and community.

More than 63,000 students study at RMIT campuses in Melbourne, in Vietnam, online, by distance education, and at 100 partner institutions throughout the world. A vibrant alumni community now stretches across more than 100 countries.

More than 950 higher education and vocational education programs are offered across a broad range of fields. Many specialist programs are regarded as among the best of their type in Australia.

RMIT University began as the Working Men’s College in La Trobe Street, Melbourne in 1887. The University has grown to become one of the largest in the country and has built a worldwide reputation for excellence in professional and vocational education and research” (Moretti, 2007, Welcome to RMIT section).
This vision of RMIT as an institution leading ‘real world’ practice-oriented research outcomes underpinned the vision for the Janefield campus. To quote again from the RMIT Janefield website:

“Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT University) proposes to create a unique environment in which the university, the local community and participants in the RMIT Technology Estate form an inter-related and interacting community that generates substantial long term economic and lifestyle benefits for the region as a whole.

The RMIT Technology Estate will integrate high technology industry, residential areas, commercial, retail, services, hotel and motel accommodation, and recreation facilities. Industry participants will be users and developers of leading edge technologies who recognise and value the synergies and benefits that emerge through close interaction with similar industries and proximity to a university focused on R&D, education and training, and applications of emerging technology.

The RMIT Technology Estate will become an environment that is internationally significant for enhancing innovation and meeting the expertise demands of technology-intensive companies in Advanced Manufacturing, Applied Biomedical and Health Sciences, Environmental Management and Technology, and Information Technology. The impacts on regional employment, exports, international linkages, innovation and business growth, and the overall economic development of the region will be substantial” (Lyall 1999, The RMIT Vision section).

The website goes on to state that

“The RMIT Technology Estate will be free of substantial air, noise, water and land pollution, where industry will benefit through links to RMIT’s expertise in research, development and innovation and education and training.

This environment will appeal to companies involved in:

- Research, development and innovation in advanced manufacturing, applied biotechnology, information technology, environmental science and technology.
- Advanced product and process design with an emphasis on ecological friendliness.
- Information processing and analysis technologies.
- Computer software and hardware development and testing, etc.
- Product development, prototyping and testing, and provision of support services.
- Application of clean manufacturing technologies and industrial ecology, etc.
- Common infrastructure, including access, utilities and broadband communications, will be available to all participants. Additional or abnormal infrastructure necessary for particular requirements can be accommodated with ease.
- Participants in the RMIT Technology Estate and the surrounding community will enjoy access to the commercial, recreational and community activities and other facilities in the Estate. Facilities proposed include:
  - Neighbourhood shopping centre for everyday needs
  - Restaurants
  - RMIT’s Industry Service Centre - a shop front to RMIT
  - High quality hotel and motel accommodation
  - Local Government and regional agencies
  - Child Care Centre
  - 18 hole championship golf course and club house
  - Reception and Conference Centre
  - Library
  - Bike paths and access to the Plenty Gorge Park
  - High quality housing
  - Quality residential areas
  - Schools and Kindergartens

University amenities” (Lyall 1999, An Environment for Growth section).
3.2

CRITERIA FOR THE FIGURE'S PERFORMANCE

3.2.1

THE FIGURE: THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE FIGURAL AND THE FIGURATIVE

The desire actively to contest representation, as an issue of signification, remains as one of a number of criteria by which we can assess the performance of the selected figure. These other criteria, issues of site, program, typology, commercial and institutional desire, and the indeterminacy of the incremental master plan, act as tests by which to assess the figure’s capacity to generate an architectural and urban response. The following section therefore aims to discuss the performance of the selected figure against these criteria, paying particular attention to the requirements as outlined in the brief. The discussion will begin with the figure and its image.

Architecture’s relationship to function and scale accentuates the representational slippage in the transformative movement of design by opening representation as an instrumental and productive activity. Unlike many other design practices where the materiality and techniques are embedded within the actual artefact, such as sculpture and painting, architectural outcomes tend to be negotiated through a scalar relationship to the projected real (Evans, 1997). Both the nature of this material and the instrumentality of this representational space vary dramatically in adopted design practices of any architectural act. In this scenario the architect has two options, to accept the potentiality of the mediation and translation offered by these modes, tools and materials of representation, or to focus on their mimetic role and thus erase their effect on design. The former option can be seen to employ a notion of design practice where form emerges as it registers the effects of indexed information on virtual or physical systems. The latter option can be said to rely more on modes of practice where precedent and typological effectively acts as re-drawing or re-presentation of a previously conceived model (Benjamin 2000).

The other important consequence of the scalar relationship between the design process and the projected ‘real’ is that the pre-eminence and appropriation of form intrinsically cast design practice as working within the realm of analogy. The mode of representation in architecture always acts in place of the projected real, which in turn establishes a movement in the design process where the means of projecting that real, as representations, can only ever be analogous to the real even when the ‘drawing’ is conceptually understood as a neutral space. At the same time design requires an initial form on which to act. Consequently any mediation of an artefact through scalar representation, conceptually and in practice, works analogously such that the design act operates only in a comparative relationship to the intended final artefact (Perin, 2007).

Leaving aside any arguments on the relative merits of the instrumentality of architectural representation it is evident that both approaches to architectural representation are not unproductive. As argued by Andrew Benjamin (2000), the architectural act is an act of repetition and this act of repetition is constantly generating alterity or variability. So the architectural artefact can never, or for that matter can never expect, to be the same as its representational precedent simply because it is at best premised on similarity rather than duplication. What can be said is that for the architect either option implicitly requires an act of making that is reliant on an initial assignation of form and mode of representation, irrespective of the specific architectural job it is asked to perform.

The following definitions of figure are:

- to represent by a pictorial or sculptured figure, a diagram, or the like; picture or depict; trace (an outline, silhouette, etc.).
- to mark or adorn with a design or pattern.
- a textural pattern, as in cloth or wood: draperies with an embossed silk figure.
- an emblem, type, or symbol
- form or shape, as determined by outlines or exterior surfaces

(Macquarie Dictionary, 1998, p.785)
The presence of form is relevant in as much that to be recognizable as a form its shape must possess a discernible outline or surface and so can be said to possess a figure (Figure 3.2.1.1). Be it an abstract entity, like the grid, or a representational entity, like an image, the connection between form and its associated figure ensures a figural underpinning to any architectural proposition. This is not, of course, to say that all figures are inherently legitimate: their architectural application still requires some account of both the criteria by which a figure is selected and the intellectual context in which it exists. To claim that the design process undertaken in the Janefield project is experimental and speculative does not imply that an account of its selection and an assessment of its performance are undesirable, unnecessary or intellectually redundant.

Before presenting an account of the criteria behind the selection of the figure in the Janefield project it is important to articulate the two primary modes in which it is employed. The first is its use as a two-dimensional image. This develops a line of research into representation previously initiated in my earlier project for the 'late' competition entry for the city of Canberra. In this project the appropriation of Jackson Pollock's Blue Poles as both a plan and a city emblem aimed to work at two distinctive levels. The first was an imagistic engagement with the narrative associated with its cultural context. The second was as a generative armature that provided a slippage from which opportunistically to suggest and test an alternative urban condition. Yet it is this desire for that image to endow the city with an emblematic figure that tends to limit the impact of this appropriation. The engagement with the figure of an existing artefact permanently situates the formal outcome within the debate around the painting. The semiotic 'job' asked of the painting tends to obscure any of its formal urban potential. The figure of the painting tends to speak unequivocally and therefore manifests its operative potential to an issue of opinion that either reinforces or rejects its suitability. It therefore tends to frame the project around issues of representation as signification that has the result of reducing architecture to symbolic parody, which according to Linda Hutcheon (1985) can only ever achieve either valorization or irony, which are not in themselves particularly instrumental or productive.

The selection of the Janefield figure differs from the Canberra project because it performs differently in two significant ways: the first asks how the figure might perform within a specific design process as 'material' to generate a three-dimensional architectural project, while the second asks how the figure performs within the context of the two-dimensional image as a brand, emblem or logo for the estate. These are not to be seen as two distinct and separate ambitions, as there is

Figure 3.2.1.1. Studies on the relationship between the delineation of a figure through boundary discontinuities and variation of interiority.
the intention to assess their anticipated performance both in respect to the brief and the associated pragmatics of program and site, and their temporal contingencies in the development of the master plan.

The first ambition for the figure’s performance is effectively procedural in that there is a desire to deploy the figure and its image as something more than material or an active source for design. The figure is instead generative not only of the plan but also the elevation and by extension the experiential realm. The use of the figure’s deployment in the experiential realm extends the use of the generative cones of vision applied in the project for the earlier Vicarious Urbanism Studio. In Janefield the figure explicitly becomes ‘material’ within a design process that can be seen to act experientially in a ‘ground plane’. This usage is unlike the purely plan-based derivation of an image, as in the Canberra project where the conversion to the third dimension was left to another process. The Canberra project remained as a two-dimensional vehicle: nothing within the process immediately generated thickness or directly affected the experience of being within the urban space. The ambition for the figure in Janefield was to test and assess its capacity to generate a three-dimensional form through the vertical. This was not simply to make the figure present experientially to establish a repetition or redundancy that contested the authenticity of the plan. It also aimed to suggest a formal and material response suitable to the building types typically found in such industrial estates. The fact that the estate is a proportioning system, but there is no imagistic fidelity between them. The imagistic derivation of the Janefield figure is released from any narrative trajectory if “…the figure becomes an Image, an Icon… (it must)… stick to the fact” (Deleuze 2004, p.6). As I have discussed in a previous conference paper, Deleuze demonstrates this in reference to Bacon’s Tryptics (Figure 3.2.1.3) where

*“the lack of any temporal cinematic linearity releases the work from the ‘job’ of signification, and the figure becomes performative because it frustrates the development of uncomplicated meaning, allowing the object’s material presence to exercise affect. This is very different from the normative understanding of ‘affect’ as some type

Figure 3.2.1.2
Same figure extrusion of a regular rectangular figure

Figure 3.2.1.3
Francis Bacon, Tryptic May - June, 1973

The selection of the figure can therefore be linked to the requirement to evidence its presence both in the aerial view and the experiential realm. This suggests a process that generates a three-dimensional form through a derivation of the plan figure in the elevation. This impacted on the selection of the figure by excluding strong platonic shapes on the basis that the uniformity of the resultant three-dimensional form would be less accommodating to the varying spatial requirements of the program and, to a lesser extent, the topography of the site (figure 3.2.1.2).

Colin Rowe (1996) presents a convincing account of the divergent approach to the relationship between the plan and elevation in modernist and classical traditions, but he all too quickly assumes that the use of geometry is not figurative. On one level this is a fair assumption, certainly pure geometric platonic form does not exist ‘in the world’ but is instead a projective logic mediated through the act of drawing. Yet there are enough moments within architectural discourse that effectively assign geometry the role of being evidence of the transcendental. This indicates that conceptually, at least, geometry consigned a symbolic or figurative import in that it was asked to ‘stand in for’ the transcendental.

The decision to deploy the figure in plan and elevation superficially appears to accept and engage with Rowe’s observation that one important difference between the classical and the modern resides in the latter’s extension of the geometric ‘figure’ of the plan into the elevation or experiential realm. The important difference between this modernist tactic and the Janefield project is that in the latter the role of the non-geometric figure exerts a discipline on the design processes that requires a literal fidelity to be established between the elevation and plan. The geometric ‘figure’ is only ever an abstract spatial device that therefore alleviates any need for exact duplication. Consequently the plan and the elevation might share the same spatial logic, a proportioning system, but there is no imagistic fidelity between them. The imagistic derivation of the Janefield figure creates a procedural logic where the elevation is literally the same as the plan. The resulting consistency between plan and elevation inverts the role of the figural content so that it effectively privileges the sampled non-geometric figure over any projective idealized geometry.

The second aim behind the selection for the figure was to engage with representation in such a way that the figure or its image could resist the semiotic closure of a figurative reading. The risk of the appropriation of any image lies in that its figurative specificity enables a reading of that image as absolute, fixed or inflexible. This lack of the figurative specificity is a counter to the direct formal conversion based on images of the type detailed by Carey Lyon (2002) in the essay Unreal Estate. The aim of the figure is to exceed form making based purely on strict formal adaptation of the types of environments imaged in the promotion of new urban and suburban developments.

In the Janefield project the use of the figure is to furnish an institutional emblem that performs outside an understanding of representation purely as an issue of narrative signification. The desired objective for the figure is focused on the way in which the performative potential of the image negotiates the difference between the figurative and figural. Deleuze’s (2004, p.6) account of Francis Bacon’s paintings distinguishes the figurative being representational is illustrative of an object “ but also implies a relationship of an image to other images in a composite whole that assigns a specific object to each of them “. Importantly for Deleuze the figure is released from any narrative trajectory if “…the figure becomes an Image, an Icon… (it must)… stick to the fact” (Deleuze 2004, p.6). As I have discussed in a previous conference paper, Deleuze demonstrates this in reference to Bacon’s Tryptics (Figure 3.2.1.3) where

“the lack of any temporal cinematic linearity releases the work from the ‘job’ of signification, and the figure becomes performative because it frustrates the development of uncomplicated meaning, allowing the object’s material presence to exercise affect. This is very different from the normative understanding of ‘affect’ as some type
of extenuated temporal delay allowing the presence of
the ‘thing’ to enforce itself on one’s consciousness even
after the object assumes intelligible meaning. Deleuze
challenges this temporal conception by arguing that it is
Bacon’s visual strategies that short-circuit, to permanently
‘put off’ the possibility of the figurative forming meaning.
This is important because the figural is an operative
undoing that resists a conception of affect as a codified
set of forms deployed to solicit specific experiential
outcomes.” (Perin 2006, p.137)

The selection of figure in the Janefield project in relation to
the issue of signification is explained by the aim of promoting
the figural as a way of resisting the semiotic function of
the figurative. The lack of figurative content provides the
institution with a brand that imparts identity without a
valorizing meaning or narrative. Undoubtedly the import
of the non-representational figure lies in its instrumental or
operative capacity but the maintenance of its iconography
can also impose a formal determinant that acts against the
immediate and long-term programmatic contingencies
in the development of the master plan. For this reason the
selection criteria of the figure must be guided by its ability to
fulfil the specifics of site and program. The selection of a non-
geometric figure was therefore made in anticipation that it
could satisfy the requirement stated in the brief to provide
pragmatically loose and mutable built form while still being
representationally non-specific. The ensuing literal presence
of the figure is premised on the intent to exist beyond a
semiotic function and invests it with an expectation of a
formally generative capacity. The search for an appropriate
figure that could act in this way indicated that the ‘found’
image of a wall defect had potential to operate as both
an institutional emblem and a profile that could generate
an appropriate three-dimensional form to satisfy issues
of site and program. The progressive acts of deterioration
and ‘making good’ evident in the formation of this wall
defect yielded a contour that was, because of its lack of
signification, figural rather than figuratively representational
(Figure 3.2.1.4). Consequently it existed outside the closure
of meaning found commonly in the narrative structures of
the figurative. Instead it delivers an enigmatic emblem that
stands for the body of the institution as well as providing
a generative figure for the project. As the final drawings
and images show this lack of representational specificity
is particularly useful pragmatically because the absence of
an actual referent by which it can be compared provides
an autonomy necessary for variations that refers back to
that source. Therefore used either in plan or elevation each
reappearance allows looseness to the application of the
figure to modify itself to any pragmatic contingencies of
the brief or site. The appearance of each figural variation is
thus as ‘authentic’ as the last. The figure tenuously grasps
onto a form as an act of ekphrasis (Mitchell, 1994), where its
avoidance from a literal figurative reading allows it to ‘stand
in’ for the idealized singular image of the university. The
figure’s lack of representational specificity acknowledges
the impossibility of providing a singular account for an
institution, given they are, on the one hand, conceptually
abstract and, on the other, structurally complex and
contradictory entities. The use of a figure without semiotic
closure renders an attempt to acknowledge this condition.
Instead this semiotic indeterminacy aims to “figure the
unfigurable” through a performative incapacity to provide a
definitive meaning or identity (Taylor, M, 1994, p.10),
As I have written elsewhere this desire for a figurative reading of architecture within the wider community ensures its contemporay relevance. As the following quote from journalist Miranda Devine makes clear the type of figurative readings contained within the National Museum of Australia (NMA) by Melbourne firm Ashton Raggatt McDougal (ARM) is never called into question. Her comments are underscored by an expectation for buildings to possess a narrative. (Perin 2006, p.134) To quote:

“...the national identity portrayed by the museum was designed to make visitors hang their heads in shame. As one museum council member said, it made "people leave the museum hating other Australians". Little can be done about other attempts by the architects to falsely equate Aboriginal history with the Jewish Holocaust in Europe. The imagery is embedded in the design, copied in part from Daniel Libeskind's Jewish Museum in Berlin, which combines a broken Star of David with an SS symbol. But, under Morton, what he calls the "black T-shirt" view of Australian culture is being replaced by something more complex and accurate.

"I want people to come out feeling good about Australia," he said... " (Devine, 2006). As the above quote indicates Devine's issue with the NMA is not whether architecture can or should possess narrative facility but more about what it should say. To refer back to a previous paper "Architects may dismiss this as being unsophisticated but the context in which this expectation exists has a tendency to reassert itself irrespective of whether or not it is acknowledged in the conception, production or promotion of the artefact. Ultimately the failure to recognize this social expectation can only create a rupture between the profession and the community." (Perin 2006, 134) To quote:

“...strategies will need to take account of the qualities of these new ephemera with speculative methods and processes, which might create new types, new models and new readings of our cities” (Lyon 2002). The use of the image is therefore inherently conceived for an ability to instigate a new
range of urban and architectural solutions resulting from the forces shaping the contemporary context more than a preoccupation with conveying specific codified ‘messages’.

As I have written elsewhere:

“Yve-Alain Bois (1997) offers an insight into the way in which this performative framing of representation, as an issue of signification, could be approached. Of particular relevance is Bois’s discussion, in Formless: A User’s Guide, of Bataille’s reading of Manet’s Olympia (Figure 3.2.2.4). He argues that both the painting’s form and content create an “…uprooting, which he [Bataille] also calls a slippage, that… [reveals] Manet’s “secret”: the true goal of his art is to “disappoint” expectation” (Bois 1997, p.15). The vital shift in the understanding of performance of representation occurs in the realization that the social conventionalizing of the image’s form and content also makes it implicitly susceptible to deliberate subversive slippages. The rejection of the image’s role of ‘naming’ becomes operative because it is effectively an undoing of its conventional reading. As “neither a theme, nor a substance, nor a concept” (Bois p.15) Bataille’s ‘Informe’ is antithetical to the attempt to create or stabilize meaning so that the instrumentality of ‘formless’ resides in the capacity operatively to unsettle any ideological formations sublimated within the desire for the artefact to express figurative ‘content’.” (Perin 2006, p.136)

The capacity of the figure and its image to act operationally is potent if it can open an interpretative open space that resists semiotic closure. The operational potential of the image is reliant on the prevention of the simple insertion of another, although contradictory, stable interpretation or reading. The figurative or the semiotic expectation for an image to say something, for it to say the proverbial ‘thousand words’, raises the danger of the outcome being limited to the literal interpretation that acts as a mode of representational closure. At best this closure reduces the project to a ‘one-liner’ and at worst enslaves the project to an imagistic fidelity whose formal specificity for figural uniformity ensures that the resultant project is unresponsive to any other requirements of the brief or context.

In the context of this discussion any ability of the Institution to represent itself as the stable, substantial, ordered body through the architectural unity of the campus aesthetic, such as I.I.T. (Figures 3.2.2.5 & 6), is progressively seen as not only impossible but also undesirable. The idealized collective architectural object within the Australian context has even greater difficulty sustaining itself, given the commercial and financial constraint of campus development whereby the first stage of the master plan represents a fraction of the final projected campus. Coming between the master plan and its development economic expediency often results in the indeterminacy of the imaged master plan. The reality is that the desire of the Institution to represent itself and to hold onto an idealized image of itself manifest in the implied order of a gestalt is becoming increasingly problematic.

The appropriated image of Pollock’s Blue Poles in the Canberra Design Studio as a city emblem was one specific method by which to engage with the institutional client’s desire to order and represent itself in an increasingly visual and commercial culture. The emblematic image becomes a form of currency that can be redeployed as a promotional brand. For the ‘Institution’ the abdication of government’s fiscal responsibility towards tertiary education has resulted in a commercial imperative to generate funding streams from the private sector through the recognition of the potential prestige in the brand. Increasingly the prestige generated by the dissemination of an institution’s built image necessitates that these buildings act iconographically to advertize the university.
The dissemination of the institutional image is of course not a new strategy. Manifest in forms as diverse as the postage stamp it has, however, increasingly taken on a new level of importance (Figures 3.2.2.7 & 8). Today these forms, such as the aerial view from the web site, represent the institution’s physical ‘body’, act as a vital strategy in the generation of an identifiable image (Figures 3.2.2.9 & 10). It is here that the master plan acting as an idealized speculative image and the aerial view of the campus act as a potent branding image of the ‘institution’ that it can distribute and disseminate. To RMIT, which has strategically employed its buildings as a way of raising its public profile within the community, this is a strategic imperative. My project revisits the issue of the emblematic as a way to satisfy this desire. Within the project the privileged position of the sovereign’s plan and aerial view acts as an iconic gift of identity to the institution. The uniqueness of the Janefield figure is that while its imagistic translation provides a recognizable identity for the institution, it does so without resorting to strong platonic form.

In this sense the artefact avoids the danger of merely representing or illustrating a theory and circumvents any tendency to be assessed against the theory’s own a priori logic. The recent theoretical interest in technique evidenced in the texts of John Rajchman (1998), Elizabeth Grosz (2001) and Andrew Benjamin (2000) are important because they reposition theory’s operative capacity beyond the text’s semantics. Provoked by the emergence of the virtual space of the computer this rethinking of representation from illustrative to generative tool significantly repositions the role of theory in design practice so that it is no longer concerned with meaning but is ethically ‘open’ to a design process that privilege the tools of practice and the production of the artefact. As Grosz points out; “Instead of the eternal status of truth, or the more provisional status of knowledge, texts have highly provisional or short term effects, though they may continue to be read for generations.” (Grosz, 2001, p.58).

At one extreme John Rajchman promotes an instrumentality without explicit concern with judgement outside the method of production. In his text Constructions there is a sense in which the design process is autonomous, creating a circumstance where theory is disconnected from any contingencies of the real: Elizabeth Grosz (2001), while also approaching the virtual through a Deleuzian argument, steps away from this level of autonomy. Grosz acknowledges a relevance beyond production and implicates a sense of criticality. To quote:

text could... scatter thoughts and images into different linkages or new alignments without necessarily destroying them. Ideally they should produce unexpected intensities, peculiar sites of indifference, new connections with other objects, and thus generate affective and conceptual transformations that problematize, challenge, and move beyond existing intellectual and pragmatic framework.” (Grosz, 2001, p.58).

The vital aspect of both these positions is that design-based practice can only be considered research when sited outside the normative. When predicated on the establishment of authenticity and the reliance on precedent, either in artefact or theory, design practice becomes a functionary to re-presentation and subsequently fails to yield any new knowledge. Design processes that promote architectural precedent are problematic because they can lead to the reinforcement of architectural conventions. Design becomes research only when an ethic of tolerance and openness is constructed around the commitment to the engagement and exploration of other potentialities.

Andrew Benjamin (2000) offers cogent parameters by which to assess the value of architecture’s artefacts. In a counter to Rajchman’s radical instrumentality he draws on Bataille’s definition of the ‘Informe’ to extract a notion of alterity, or “the possibility of otherness” (Benjamin, 2000, p.11). Departing from the question of time in architecture, Benjamin argues that the temporal shifts and interplay between time and function manifest themselves in a condition of repetition where the alterity of form is constantly present. This is not a duplication of form but a context that opens the possibility of other outcomes in each repetition. The notion of repetition in itself can only be present in relationship to an existing context. As Benjamin writes:
“It is not a question of whether there is a relation between these elements, but of the nature of already existing relations. The already present – the inscription of the given – is the operation of repetition” (Benjamin 2000, p.7).

Any potentiality of the new tools of representation therefore becomes provisional and assessable by their relationship to a context.

This concern with judgement goes beyond a mere academic preoccupation. The artefact exercises a value within a social context. This is not to confuse its action: any linkages to social semiotic codes are premised on an attitude of contestation rather than reinforcement. The question of assessment also instigates a second component in the ethical trajectory of this argument. To permit an openness of exploration entails a suspension of any theoretical pre-determinism where this argument. To permit an openness of exploration entails a suspension of any theoretical pre-determinism where.

The 'formless' is therefore conceived as a mode of critique concerned with the contingencies of a context rather than transcendental. Formless: A User’s Guide offers a way of acting operatively and critically around context. The distinguishing feature of Bois's and Krauss’s reading of 'formless' is then its antagonism to any singular and monolithic construct that, through semiotic closure, employs representation as a process of idealization. This is crucial because of the persistence of the figurative within contemporary culture. The figurative, in its attempt to reduce itself to a clear semiotic transfer, is compliant with the making of the conventional. This also means that illustrative or figurative representation has operative potential. In the end the 'formless' possesses an ontology based on context across all modes of representation. It is this that allows it to maintain relevance.

An inevitable expectation of any research into the architectural value of the figure is for that figure to be made present within a visual domain of some scale and form(at). The intent to have the Janefield figure present in aerial and phenomenal ground view inherently obligations a mode of assessment of its success to be based on the project's architectonic capacity to establish a legible figural boundary. Returning to Rowe (1976), we see clearly that the extension of the plan's logic into the elevation, with the expressed aim of achieving a modernist transparency of a gestalt, is an essential tool at the scale of the urban if branding is to be comprehensible. The fidelity of the phenomenal ground view as a 'witness' to the plan not only reduces any slippage between the two; it also promises an experiential comprehension of its order. As such the provision of a mental view or gestalt of this conceptual ordering would be a conceptual requirement for success.

One of the research objectives for this project is a formal and spatial engagement with the urban periphery that possesses a qualitative empathy in this context. The application of Rowe's discussion of the plan - elevation relationship is instructive in that it attempts to provide a framework in which to analyze the 'formless' experiential affect. The plan of the contemporary suburb, while having an obvious systemic logic, does not possess strong identifiable form often evident in iconic building form. Instead the elevational realm of the suburb is highly figured, inasmuch as each individual dwelling tends to be referential either formally or as a branded product (Figure 3.2.3.1). In the Janefield scheme the appearance of the generative figure in plan and elevation can be said to perform experientially in a similar way to the formalism of the suburb. The plan may be irregular and without strong form but the elevation is highly figural. The important difference is that this affect of the figure emerges from a procedural fidelity to a modernist alignment of plan and elevation, the import being that through this generative process the figure operatively undid this modernist expectation through a direct application of its own procedural logic. The value of the irregular figure comes to the fore when translated into three dimensions: the resulting form inherently produces a constant misalignment between plan and elevation. The use value of an irregular plan figure resists the providence of a strong plan form to yield to a comprehensible gestalt.

The selection of an irregular figure to generate the project was also based on an expectation that this generative figure could withstand the typical temporal changes that occur in the long-term master plan better than those developments with strong plan forms. The rhetoric of the project required a figure, as the institutional logo, to possess a capacity to retain an identifiable form when developed in the experiential view. This capacity is strategically useful, particularly in the aerial view, because the figure could tolerate variation and retain its comprehensibility as the campus develops. This figural tolerance imparted a capacity for the generative figure to respond to the contingencies at work by ensuring that it could accept a certain 'reconfiguring' without losing its identifiable strength.
Consequently the effect of the slippage between plan and elevation, when coupled with the client’s requirement for a loose and mutable formal strategy, suggested that a strong alignment of elevation and plan figures was not essential. The selection of the Janefield figure was premised on the intention to undo the expectation to establish fidelity of the experiential phenomenal view to the plan. Obviously such an achievement, while still meeting the expectation for the visual formation of the figure, required a degree of slippage between the information in the plan to that of the elevation. Introducing an irregular figure that is anamorphically converted into the elevational profile develops, for the project, a connection to the plan figure without a ‘modernist’ fidelity between plan and elevation.

This is not to say that the irregular figure as a plan automatically guarantees that this strategy will not impart a strong experiential edge as people move between, through and around the scheme. To accomplish this blurred edge a further strategy at the level of materiality must be employed to disrupt the strong definition of boundary. Elements like road infrastructure contribute experientially to the establishment of the strong plan forms of campuses like IIT. The capacity of these elements to define boundary can be seen to reside in their material homogeneity, which is often then accompanied by clear programmatic and typological discontinuities. In Janefield the materiality of the boundary is deliberately heterogeneous, with its material definition constituted from a range of new and existing elements.

The campus boundary is marked instead on a series of interruptions or discontinuities as it blends into that part of the site that remains unaffected (Figure 3.2.3.2). In doing so this campus edge deploys a range of hard infrastructure, roads and masonry walls, as well as soft landscape elements, landscaped berms, reconfigured topography and differing ground treatments and so on, to create a figural discontinuity in the experiential realm.

The figure profiles were deliberately aligned and extruded against the topography so as to incorporate and reconfigure the site within the generative logic of the process. On one level this aims to develop a formal response that imparts a horizontal emphasis to the campus. This is a tactical response to the inherent proportions of the main I.S.C.s, the nature of the landscape, and the ‘formless’ way in which this might subvert in the expectation that buildings will be formally distinguishable from the topography. To achieve this aim the site is reconfigured in such a way that there is continuity between hard and soft form creating a reading of the campus as a figure / to / figure relationship establishing ambiguity between landscape and built form. The result of this interaction between the existing topography and the new surface generates a third topography, sitting within the existing landscape, that neither completely erases nor duplicates its exact ‘geometry’. Consequently the ramped incline evident within the site is maintained experientially as a component part of this new topography.

The modification of the site is conceived as a process where the campus is ‘contoured’ into the site by earthworks that, as they scrape away the existing site contour, develop new undulating surfaces. The value of the figure’s topography is that it maintains a certain analogous relationship to a level shift in the site. Unlike a tabula rasa approach the scraping of the site with this new extrusion of the figure refuses to flatten the slope of the site, but instead replaces the existing slope with a new topography that the new buildings must negotiate. In an attempt to ‘make good’ this act of site degradation a process of cutting is accompanied by a redistribution of soil to fill and grade the site to ready it for the first phase and influence future development. Opportunistically these
earthworks contribute to the formation of the figure in both plan and elevation. This alleviates the buildings from the responsibility of such figural development and ensures the landscape is integral to the building work within the first phase of development. The site is effectively ‘fitted’ for the three-dimensional form incorporating a sense of the existing incline, as it slopes away from Plenty Road in the west to the Plenty River in the east (Figure 3.2.4.1). The value of this approach also has an impact on the user experience in that it helps to achieve the desired ambiguity between the building and the site. The irregular, blurred campus edge establishes a less defined boundary that effectively bleeds into the rest of the site. The irregularity of the figure, together with the shifting material delineation and earthworks, creates a perceptual complexity that imparts a ‘formless’ affect as one skirts around the perimeter of the campus.

The third and final criterion that led to the selection of the figure is linked to an anticipated capacity to satisfy the varying programmatic requirements of the brief. The brief identifies a number of programs that possess very different spatial configurations. The selected figure for Janefield was considered useful in that its irregular profile when extruded produced a three-dimensional form that imparted a variegated distribution of its mass across the site. This irregular profile had potential to provide numerous and non-uniform variations in the building mass. Against the figure of a regular platonic form such a shape would provide a level of variation when extruded through its plan and so resist a uniform three-dimensional form that would tend to limit the placement of the program along more conventional precedent strategies outside the logic of that figure. Whereas a simple form, such as a cube, provides very little information within the actual interior, the benefit of the generative Janefield figure is that its internal variation offers a cue for reading the final massing. This correlation is critical because the variation and zones within the actual figure offer a richer interpretative mass from which to satisfy the spatial requirements of the various programs as well as providing a formal response to the exterior. The selected figure is interpretative because the experiential responses while emerging from attitudes to conventional building form are not limited by conformities of a regular shape. The intention for the figure is to provide a massing that could approximate specific programs, from workshops to dwellings, without the final building mass being formally or typologically specific. This ambiguity is vital to the project’s capacity to avoid typological determinism.

This issue of figural detail does not of course exclude other detailed figures. Conceivably, for example, something like the institution’s coat of arms satisfies this criterion (Figures 3.2.5.1). If we ignore the more theoretical desire or interest for the figure to suspend any clear semiotic reading, the coat of arms would still fail to deliver as much as the irregular figure given their, often, strong geometric figures and their tendency to exist as simple figure - ground images, which in turn would possess a degree of interpretative difficulty when being converted to building form.
The value of the figure’s detail in its extruded form applies equally to its use as the campus plan. Initially stimulated by a reading of Formless: A User’s Guide, this strategy approaches the question of identity by deliberately making it ambiguous through the dissolution of the boundary between the subject, in this case the institutional body or campus, and its immediate exterior. The value of an irregular plan figure over strong geometric figures, such as that of IIT, is that when ‘applied’ to the site, it creates indeterminacy between the institutional and the privately developed zones. This visual slippage, reminiscent of early picturesque visual strategies, allows the institution to partition views of the neighbouring development to visually extend the campus beyond that point where any claim to real estate legally exists. This is of course a reciprocal relationship given that the private development benefits by being affiliated to an institution.

The strategic blurring of the boundaries of the irregular plan works at two scales of programmatic differentiation. The first occurs at a meta-level where the clear programmatic separation between the ‘publicly’ owned campus zones and the privately occupied zones outside the campus program are actually contained within the plan figure. As Carey Lyon (2002) identifies in the essay Unreal Estate many contemporary peripheral developments provide facilities that act as physical evidence of the images of idealized living environments promoted in the marketing campaigns. The provision in the Janefield brief of a privately owned championship golf course is therefore strategically located between the private residential development and the campus so that both can visually appropriate this facility as open green space.

The second scale of the strategic blurring occurs within those components of program that can exist immediately adjacent to the main areas and spaces detailed in the campus brief. This strategy responds to the competing battle for prominence that the various partners in the development display. The irregular edge of the plan figure and its extruded three-dimensional form were seen as one strategy by which the dissolution of any sense of a clearly-delineated campus edge operationally created a blurring and intermingling of the visual presence of both the private and public end users (Figure 3.2.5.2), so the modernist zoning strategies still evident in many campus developments are subverted by the introduction of these counter moves. Adjacent programs within the main body of the campus commingle to the advantage of each other’s program. Opportunistically the figure, and the paths that cut through it, creates areas suitable for other types of program, infusing the campus with additional capacity for new activities. The major spatial components and functions bleed into each other, providing adjacencies to yield a range of spaces for various undetermined events.

Figure 3.2.5.2
Plan of Campus.
1. SPORTS CENTRE
2. MAIN ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDINGS
3. MAIN I.S.C.
4. CONVENTION, RESIDENTIAL AND RETAIL PRECINCT
5. I.S.C.
6. RESIDENTIAL
7. INCUBATOR UNITS
“As Walter Benjamin noted in his famous passage— one that, unfortunately for architecture, has been too little taken to heart— architecture is perceived unconsciously and in passing, “distractedly and through the collective” (Raith, 2000, p. 9).

**Formless / The Informe.**

The inherent complication to any incremental development of a master plan occurs in its (in)capacity to maintain the integrity of the institution’s image over time. In the essay *Form and Materials: Some Notes on Birrell’s Aesthetic* (Macarthur, J & Murray, S, 1997) the authors discuss four possible formal modes of delivery of the image of the plan figure in the work of James Birrell. The loose figure generated by the specifics of site and budget result in an architecture reminiscent of Corbusier’s promenade where the building acts as some sort of cinematic ‘treat’. The need for an overall recognizable gestalt is foregone for the experiential qualities of the spaces generated in the interplay of building and site. In the Agriculture and Entomology Building (Figures 3.2.6.1 & 3) and Union College Building (Figures 3.2.6.2 & 3) the plan figure begins to take on qualities of the loose figure similar to those of Richard Serra’s work (Figures 3.2.6.4 to 6). As discussed by Bois (1988) in the essay *A Picturesque Stroll Around Clara Clara*, Serra creates a formal misalignment between the abstract plan and its spatial reality so that the actual spatial experience defies the gestalt of the plan figure that one carries when within that space. Articulated in this tension are the permanent separation of the expectation of the experience of the plan and the actuality of this as impossible. The gap existing in the plan as an index of a corresponding experiential outcome begins to suggest that the traditional belief that the plan is the generator of a tangible, ‘real’ and clearly articulated form is a flawed assertion.

A slippage between plan and elevation is to an extent a permanent issue within the scale of urban design. In the Janefield project, however, the sheer scale confronts the viewer not only at the scale of the master plan but also at the scale of each individual building. Accordingly the figure, as a sort of institutional logo, acts as much in the experiential realm as in the abstracted realm of the plan’s image. Engaged in a continual movement between the plan and
its intimation in the experiential realm, the operation of
the user’s passage through the scheme to some extent recalls
Bois’s review of Richard Serra’s work as an example of the
sublime picturesque. The inability to have a gestalt view is, in
this case, not just a matter of size, but significantly one where
the apparent gestalt is subverted by the unexpected shifts
in comprehension of built form experienced as one moves
through the plan figure. It is in this way that the sectional
use of the image’s figure implicates and yet subverts the
gestalt of that same image. The plan and section can never
be replicas of the figure of the wall defect (or in fact its
image) because both are translations. Even though there is
a constant repetition of the section throughout the campus,
the recurrence experienced temporally in a user’s movement
through it only ever serves to express the section’s inability
to be the plan. The gestalt of the plan only ever remains
alluded to and so any continuity between the plan view and
the spatial experience expresses when “the fact that this
continuity was produced by means of a discontinuity” (Bois
1988, p.360-1).

This sense of discontinuity assumes an alternative form
as an almost inevitable by-product of the dominance of
the shed typology, where the scale of this large building
type exacerbates the incomprehensibility occurring at the
campus scale. In the essay Bigness, Koolhaas summarizes the
cause of this discontinuity. To quote:

“3. In Bigness, the distance between the core and the
envelope increases to the point where the façade can
no longer reveal what happens inside. The humanist
expectation of “honesty” is doomed: interior and exterior
architectures become separate projects, one dealing
with the instability of programmatic and iconographic
needs, the other—agent of disinformation—offering the
city the apparent stability of an object” (Koolhaas, p.
500-501).

Against these conditions of discontinuity, Janefield’s Industrial
and Technology Estate program is itself antagonistic to the
preferred ideal of the Green Campus (Figures 3.2.6.7 & 8).
Typically this collection of generic sheds, laid in a grid and
surrounded by asphalt, is hostile to the generation of external
spatial variation and a susceptible to the architectural
banality of the generic shed. Therefore one important
aim for the Janefield figure in the phenomenological view
was to strategically open experiential qualities within the
ground view to counter the potential banality of the typical
technology estate. The accessibility of the figure in this view
strategically also relieves the plan of the sole responsibility
for revealing the university’s gifted figure.

An associated reading of the text Formless: A User’s Guide
was used to extract what were perceived to be performative
operations of repetition, redundancy and horizontality.
Employed to resist the primacy of the plan figure the
institution’s ideal master plan is constructed to yield a range
of buildings that witness the constant return of the figure
at ground level. Produced by a sectional extrusion of the
figure’s anamorph as it threads through the plan boundary,
the figure returns in the experiential realm at regular intervals
according to strategic vantage points as determined from a
reading of the underlying brick coursing in the original wall
defect.

The strategic materialization of the figure in the ground plane
recalls the picturesque strategy of scenographic distribution
of figures in the landscape where the development of the
horizontal and figural in the project imparts the gift of the
literal figure to the user within the phenomenal realm. The
return of the literal figure in this plane supplants the claim
that the plan or section has the authenticity of origin because
both are imperfect translations of the generative figure.
Counter to the Canberra design project, where the oblique experiential view is set from one privileged position, the generative logic behind the Janefield project delivers a number of strategic viewpoints from the surrounding development immediately outside the campus plan. This repositioning and multiplying of the figure within these viewpoints in the experiential or phenomenal ground view strategically projects the institutional form into the surrounding context, extending the figure of the university beyond its notional physical boundary.

The anamorph is also conceived and appropriated from marketing strategies similar to the projection of commercial logos onto the playing fields (Figure 3.2.6.9). The anamorphic projection differs in that it reconfigures as an oblique and perspective view. This has the effect of disrupting the reading of the perspective view because it neither creates the visual disruption of flat anamorphic projection nor the seamlessness of the ‘real’ view. This false perspectival view strategically projects the institutional form into the phenomenal plane, extending the figure of the university beyond its notional physical boundary.

The decision to construct the anamorphs as a projection in the initial phase of development can be in the middle two-fifths of the extruded three-dimensional form. Second, the ‘figural’ density of the information opens up the possibility of containing the most important figural information within the zone of one building unit. This means that the later developments can be added without the need to retain the formal restraints of the figure, allowing the slippage between the figure in the phenomenal view and the plan to become less stable.

The geometry of the anamorph figure establishes visual criteria to locate built form. This means the plan is no longer the sole arbiter of architectural form. Furthermore, as one moves along the ‘elevational figure’ there are differing levels of ‘figural’ and therefore formal complexity. This suggests zones of highly articulated or standard building form though it is also worth noting that any part of the profile can be further simplified without any significant impact of the legibility of the anamorphed figure (Figure 3.2.6.10). All these factors offer the ability to construct and retain the integrity of the anamorph within the first stage of the master plan.

The oblique view of the figure in the elevational dimension in the Janefield project is sympathetic to Bataille’s opposition to the extrovert role of architecture. As Hollier remarks “Bataille’s prison derives from an ostentatious, spectacular architecture, an architecture to be seen… Bataille’s architecture- convex, frontal, extrovert-an architecture that is externally imposing, shares practically no element with that of Foucault, with its insinuating concavity that surrounds, frames, contains and confines for therapeutic or disciplinary ends. Both are equally effective, but one works because it draws attention to itself and the other because it does not. One represses (imposes silence); the other expresses (makes one talk)…Bataille thinks in terms of authoritarian representations (Hollier, 1993, pX [10]).

Here the anterior relationship traditional institutional architecture establishes to the viewer is deferred to the oblique. Implicating both the architecture and the landscape the viewer is presented with a figural form legible only as a pervasive staining. As in the Canberra Studio, the interior of the precinct is to a degree formless but in this case the presence of the figure within the experiential realm means that this effect is repeated across different scales and viewpoints. Moreover, when this figure is viewed from inside the campus it appears as part or fragment of that figure that has enough definition for it to operate as a trace of an order that refutes to form a gestalt. This staining allows the figure to provide the sort of ordering and identity that one sees in a patterning. Didi-Hubermans’ discussion of the Shroud of Turin offers a way of understanding the performance of the figure (Figure 3.2.6.11).

“…one element [is] sent mutating into the next” (Bois & Krauss, 1997, p.155). In this way the anamorphic distortion of the figure in the phenomenal plane plays a tenuous game with the question of identity: while it seems to attempt to provide the impossibility of a gestalt to do so it reveals the vanity of this idealization. The elevation application of the figure works to open a gap of perceptual recognition between the effect of the projected figure, which can never rendered over, never made completely good. What it does provide, however, is a potential for opportunistic insertion, eruption and filling of program meeting a dimensional criteria of these amorphous zones.
One of the main lines of research identified in the introduction was an exploration of a process-driven design methodology. This intent is clear in all preliminary projects where the formal outcomes demonstrate a reliance on relatively obtuse and autonomous design processes that suspend any direct authorship of architectural form. This intention is premised on the expectation that all design processes used could offer alternative formal and spatial arrangements to those delivered by typologically determined projects. The privileging of formally generative processes is premised on the notion that they yield ‘other’ potential formal arrangements with enough inherent complexity to sustain the type of inter-relationships required of an urban scheme.

This section is dedicated to a detailed description of the process used in the Janefield project. The decision to focus on the Janefield design methodology is based on the understanding that the preliminary experiments in technique occurring in the preliminary projects have been adequately presented and manifest themselves most comprehensively in this final scheme. What follows is a presentation of the Janefield figure’s transformation from a two-dimensional image into a three-dimensional form. As an independent area of research into process it is capable of being reviewed independently of those addressing the issues arising from a final architectural proposition. This discussion on method inevitably requires an account of the motivations underpinning the actual design process as well as a discussion on the relationship between process and the value of the suspension of authorship. A detailed account of the process itself is included as an integral component of the overall research.

The objective to test the formal and spatial implications of the selected figure was predicated on a mode of deployment that maintains the figural integrity of the figure or logo without being reduced architecturally to a façade treatment. The ambition of the project was to use the figure at various levels of figural depth and resolution to generate a range of internal and external formal and spatial outcomes across a range of scales. This implied an exploitation of the materialization of the figure’s formal and spatial potential throughout the incremental development of the master plan from both the aerial and ground views.

Any design process that departs from the deployment of a figure is inherently predicated on the privileging of the generation of form over those concerned with contingencies such as program, typology and site. The Janefield objective was to select a figure that could withstand the complexity of a particular design process and had the potential to satisfy questions of program and site without concession to the formal pre-determinants common to a typological investigation. The resulting exploration of this process allows a projective approach to program and site without the exact nature of its formal and organizational specificity being known in advance. There is instead an attempt to anticipate the brief’s approximate requirements, so that any assessment of the actual performance of the generated three-dimensional form against the specific requirements of the brief remains to be tested. As will be evident in the following discussion the three-dimensional formal development of the figure cannot be completely removed from a concern with program because, as with the site, it is understood to be a fundamental attribute by which to assess an architectural proposition. The figure’s looseness, however, allows an equally loose engagement with program and site that enables a resistance to form being...
typologically prescribed. This looseness is vital if the project is to satisfy the need to form the institutional figure and also cater for the formal variations prompted by the different programs. The desire for a design process that effectively removes any pre-determined linkage of program to form opens a space for a retrospective mode of programmatic inhabitation. In this way the figure instigates a delay or stutter within the act of design where its performance can be seen to be a projective act requiring retrospective assessment.

The strategic selection of the figure effectively intercedes and halts any tendency to reduce the specified program to its containment within the standard and the generic. While there is no expectation that typological issues will be erased from the scheme it is important to emphasise that the predominant building type within the campus is the factory. The opportunity afforded by the figure is that it resists the dominance of the minimum typological standards found in the regulatory building codes and standard construction methods (Figure 3.3.1.3). The benefit of the figure is that it can be applied as a thin façade or as a template for generating more complex formal and spatial outcomes. The degree of figural articulation can then be co-opted by the institution as a type of control on building quality. This level of control is necessary, given that much of the institutional prestige is asked to reside within the architecture. The figure potentially offers the institution leverage by which to assert a higher build quality throughout all the phases of development of the master plan than present within more speculative developments.

The proposed design for Janefield can be said to be formalist inasmuch as it privileges an autonomous form making process that works independently of contextual and programmatic contingencies. Its form cannot be considered an emergent generative process that responds to contingent information, nor can it be seen as an explicit typological response to the brief. Unlike other formalist approaches, however, this process cannot be understood as a purely mannered response because the final formal articulation remains outside pre-determined form. Nor can it be said completely to ignore site and brief, given that these actualities help establish criteria for selecting the generative figure. Instead the formal outcome acts more as a complex spatial diagram possessing an irregular, or at least non-standard, form which, through a wide range of potential interpretative techniques, is open to formal built translation.

Another important divergent strain from a formalist tradition is that the generative process, while self-contained and autonomous, remains underpinned by the imperative for its figure to act within a representational response to contemporary issues of branding and identity. Hence, unlike the type of non-representational diagram deploying abstract entities, such as the grid in the Rebstock Project (Figure 3.3.1.3) by Eisenman Architects (Benjamin 2000, p.49), the Janefield figure, as a logo, can be said to be contextual in as much as it is a response to a cultural context. Unlike the abstract grid, the imagistic uniqueness ensures that it functions not only as a spatial system underpinning form-making but also attempts to acknowledge and act within a wider cultural sphere.

The strategic selection of the figure effectively intercedes and halts any tendency to reduce the specified program to its containment within the standard and the generic. While there is no expectation that typological issues will be erased from the scheme it is important to emphasize that the predominant building type within the campus is the factory. The opportunity afforded by the figure is that it resists the dominance of the minimum typological standards found in the regulatory building codes and standard construction methods (Figure 3.3.1.3). The benefit of the figure is that it can be applied as a thin façade or as a template for generating more complex formal and spatial outcomes. The degree of figural articulation can then be co-opted by the institution as a type of control on building quality. This level of control is necessary, given that much of the institutional prestige is asked to reside within the architecture. The figure potentially offers the institution leverage by which to assert a higher build quality throughout all the phases of development of the master plan than present within more speculative developments.

The proposed design for Janefield can be said to be formalist inasmuch as it privileges an autonomous form making process that works independently of contextual and programmatic contingencies. Its form cannot be considered an emergent generative process that responds to contingent information, nor can it be seen as an explicit typological response to the brief. Unlike other formalist approaches, however, this process cannot be understood as a purely mannered response because the final formal articulation remains outside pre-determined form. Nor can it be said completely to ignore site and brief, given that these actualities help establish criteria for selecting the generative figure. Instead the formal outcome acts more as a complex spatial diagram possessing an irregular, or at least non-standard, form which, through a wide range of potential interpretative techniques, is open to formal built translation.

Another important divergent strain from a formalist tradition is that the generative process, while self-contained and autonomous, remains underpinned by the imperative for its figure to act within a representational response to contemporary issues of branding and identity. Hence, unlike the type of non-representational diagram deploying abstract entities, such as the grid in the Rebstock Project (Figure 3.3.1.3)
Step Two: Conversion of vector copy of the traced figure image to an elevational view.

The conversion of the vector tracing into a suitable elevational profile required an assessment of its ability to generate a three-dimensional form that first revealed the figure in both plan and elevation and could be roughly aligned to programmatic requirements. This required a profile with a large dimensional bias towards the length, which meant that the original figure was too ‘tall’. The only way to create a long low profile while still retaining the visual ‘shape’ of the figure was to compress its vertical dimension or use anamorphic projection. Both techniques meant that any viewpoint of the figure profile was located both at a very acute angle to that profile and beyond the campus boundary. The process of determining the elevational profile began with the initial criteria that it imparted a satisfactory rendition of the figure from this ground view position and opportunistically satisfied the pragmatics of the brief and site. The following three criteria were therefore crucial to this selection process:

1. That the conversion process provided an elevation that, when viewed from oblique positions outside the campus boundary, imparted a recognizable visual fidelity to the original figure. This tests how well it redistributed the detail of the figure across the elevational profile.

2. That the elevation, and ensuing three-dimensional form, offered an alignment to the different programs. It was decided that height is crucial for the ISC program and should therefore be in the order of twelve (12) metres.

3. That the final elevational profile did not yield areas where the figural ‘information’ was both too complex and condensed or too dispersed. This was important to ensure that the figural legibility did not reside in too small a section of this elevational length, making architectonic conversion formally too complex, or too dispersed, which would mean that the institutional desire to retain the figure in future development of the elevation would require the imposition of a regulatory framework based on the figure profile.

The ensuing trial and error experimentation resulted in three options (Figure 3.3.2.3). The first simply compressed the figure’s vertical axis. This proportional flattening of the figure allowed an even distribution of figural detail and a high degree of control over height and therefore control over the modification of form to program. It failed, however, to retain visual fidelity to the original figure from the oblique viewpoint because the flattening created a distortion that was excessively extenuated. The degree of figural slippage between the plan and the phenomenal view resulted in the rejection of this method.

The second option applied a straight anamorphic projection of the original figure. The anamorphic projection is, in this case, conceptually appropriated from marketing strategies similar to the projection of commercial logos onto the playing field. While this is a more complicated process there is still enough capacity to manipulate the profile to accommodate the required programmatic heights by modification of projection angles. This technique provides a high level of fidelity between the plan figure and the phenomenal view, but, as is typical of this process, the flatness is visually abrupt within the experiential realm. The major problem, however, with this method of projection is that the detail of the figure is condensed into a small zone located at the end closer to the viewpoint from which it was projected. The ensuing wedge-shaped profile condenses figural intensity into zones of extreme formal complexity and simplicity, which in turn limits any capacity to productively explore programmatic distribution. Significantly the actual dimensions of the areas of figural intensity were unable to satisfy the height requirements of the I.S.C. units. Therefore, while one could argue that this effectively avoided any dependence on the industry partners for the forming of the institutional figure, this dimensional limitation meant that the figural zones could only be materialized as decorative façade treatments. Accordingly this anamorphic profile was rejected.
The third option produced anamorphic projections of oblique views of the original figure (Figures 3.3.2.4 to 8). The selection of an oblique perspective resulted from a range of tests that aimed to offer a more even distribution of the figural image while still retaining a strong legibility to that original figure. Through a process of trial and error, the oblique viewpoint selected existed outside the human cone of vision. When converted into an elevational profile, the image of the figure no longer possesses the usual visual abruptness of the flat anamorph and also, as an experientially impossible view, fails to align with any experiential view of the image of the figure. The effect, first observed in the Canberra Project when a proportional distortion of an original image is viewed in the oblique, is visually subtler because it confounds and destabilizes any intuitive application of perspectival logic. In the case of the Janefield project this optical effect was exploited precisely because the misaligned perspective made it difficult to reconcile the experiential view to a two-dimensional mental image. Consequently the manipulation of spatial depth disrupts the normal experiential understanding of the visual field that does not conform to either the flat view of anamorphic projection or the mimetic seamlessness of the re-presentation of the figure in the ‘real’ view. Programmatically the anamorphic projection of an oblique ‘view’ also provides a profile that retains a strong linkage to the original figure, reduces the figural compression and offers an even redistribution of the height across the full length of this profile. Since this profile satisfied both the general programmatic and specific visual performance criteria the technique was selected for further development.
At this stage there was a decision to generate two oblique views to acknowledge the two possible directions from which the elevational figure can be viewed (Figure 3.3.2.9). Not to do so would be to locate all external anamorphic viewpoints on one side of the campus plan. The generation of these two oblique projections allowed the production of elevational profiles that aligned with the orientation of the plan figure to establish directional consistency between the figure in both the plan and the experiential view. These profiles were thus distributed to provide an equal number of viewpoints from both northern and southern sides of the campus. The alternate placement of profiles was determined by aligning their viewpoints to the significant entry points of the campus.

One further anamorphic projection, generated from the Tower Building on the Main Bundoora Campus, was also produced in an attempt to produce a mirror reflection of the oblique view of the Janefield Campus plan from this viewpoint. Accordingly this profile was located directly on Plenty Road edge (Figure 3.3.2.10).
Step Three: Location of the Anamorphic Projections in Relation to the Plan Figure and Site.

The next step was to rescale the profiles proportionally to the actual width of the plan figure at their selected positions along the variegated edge (Figure 3.3.2.11). The exact location of these profiles aligned approximately with the brick courses evident in the original wall stain, which at the scale of the site located them at 120-metre intervals. These modified profiles were next repositioned in the vertical axis to provide the best fit of each profile to the site so that final generated form registered the existing topography of the site (Figure 3.3.2.12).
Step Four: Generation of the ‘Gordon Surface’

Once the elevations had been rescaled and aligned with the site the next step in the process was to extrude a solid surface along the paths linking these elevational profiles (Figures 3.3.17 to 3.3.2.13). The final three-dimensional form is constructed by connecting the same points in each figural zone of the profile. The figure is effectively composed of six different zones corresponding to the six zones within the original figure. The resultant geometric entity, a Gordon Surface, is made of a network of three-dimensional latitudinal curves, the elevational profiles, along a set of paths corresponding to longitudinal plan curves linking these profiles. The longitudinal curves are determined by joining of those points within the profile that are located at the common points shared by the zones within the figure overlap. Some zones within the profile overlap with two other zones, requiring six longitudinal curves, while others overlap with one other zone and therefore require only two longitudinal curves. Once all zones are generated they are assembled into an overall three-dimensional form.
At this stage the three-dimensional form aligns with the plan figure at nine equidistant points. The desire to produce a form with greater fidelity to the irregular boundary of the plan figure means that a series of new locations of secondary profiles is identified. Once identified, the three-dimensional form is cut and welded back together, proportionally rescaled to the corresponding width of the plan figure and then aligned with the actual plan figure edge (Figures 3.3.2.14 to 24).

The resulting form possesses a diagonal patterning that distributes the high points across a greater plan area. This offers a greater potential to disperse program types and fortuitously generates a top surface located within the 30° east / 15° west solar arc. Another advantage in this generative technique is that every cut to this form between these primary profiles produces a variation, rather than a scaled version, of the profile, which added to the catalogue of figural variations, resists any sense of figural authenticity.
Figure 3.3.2.18
Extra locations of profiles identifies to allow greater fidelity to plan figure.

Figure 3.3.2.19
Initial figure form with new profile locations.

Figure 3.3.2.20
Demonstration of process in reference to bottom section of the initial figure form. Initial form cut along new profile location.

Figure 3.3.2.21
Form cut.

Figure 3.3.2.22
Vertical plan identifies length of new profile.

Figure 3.3.2.23
Final modified form.

Figure 3.3.2.24
Form rescaled to match new profile length.
Step Five: Differentiation of Subtractive Techniques between Main Zones within the Plan.

A subtractive process develops the formal outcome of the project where the nature of the final three-dimensional form ensures that every cut reveals a variation of the elevational profiles. This immediately establishes the viewpoints outside the boundary of the plan figure from which the anamorphic views are formed (Figure 3.3.25).

The next step was to separate the three-dimensional form along the initial nine locations for each elevational section. At this stage the overall mass has been converted to a series of strips, running in the north-south direction (Figure 3.3.2.26). This is then cut, in plan, according to the six zones within the plan figure, by vertical extrusion of each zone boundary into a cutting plane and, via a process of Boolean subtraction, extraction of the zone's massing from the overall three-dimensional form (Figure 3.3.2.27).

Step Six: Re-projection of Profiles Along View Corridors.

The above processes produce a range of figural gaps across all the eastern and western elevational profiles of these strips. To close these gaps the absent figural profiles are re-projected onto the modified built form (Figures 3.3.32 to 3.3.35). The importance of retaining this visual integrity also results in the deployment of the same re-projective technique in those areas where the amount of landscape and building works in the first phase of the campus development is not dense enough to form the profile across the plan width of the campus. In this case the profile is condensed and projected onto a much smaller section of that area of the development (Figures 3.3.2.28 to 36). This point, discussed in more detail in the section addressing the incremental development of the scheme, has the advantage of retaining the campus’s visual logo irrespective of the architectural expression used in subsequent developmental phases of the master plan.
Figure 3.3.2.28
Section of form cut with an inclined 30 deg plane.

Figure 3.3.2.29
New profile of elevational figure in red.

Figure 3.3.2.30
This profile is cut according to plan figure zone boundary. Light red areas are retained, middle section is part of figure that is absent.

Figure 3.3.2.31
Middle 'gap' section in profile when seen from viewpoint (A). This gap is closed by projecting its outline back onto plane (B) behind.

Figure 3.3.2.32
Close up detail of projected figure viewing 'cone' (C passing through plane.

Figure 3.3.2.33
Outline of 'gap' profile when projected back onto plane.
Figure 3.3.2.34
Architectonic translation of missing middle section.

Figure 3.3.2.35
Example of final formal translation based on various anamorphic projective techniques (Main ISC and Administrative Buildings)
3.4
ASSessing the figure’s Performance

3.4.1
Figure as University Logo

The scheme engages with the institutional desire to represent itself. The commercial imperative to generate funding streams, coupled with the desire to attract students, places an onus on the ‘institution’ to distinguish itself. The image, as a form of currency, imparts such prestige to its buildings, which through their iconicographic strength ‘advertise’ the institution. To RMIT, which has strategically employed the ‘trophy building’ as a form of promotion, this manoeuvre becomes a strategic imperative. The image of the figure aims to impart this distinction in a context where restricted budgets compromise the ability of the university to deliver the ‘trophy building’. In doing so it takes the place of more traditional demonstrations of distinctiveness achieved through the use of geometry, materiality and detail. The appearance of the figure within the experiential or phenomenal view is therefore understood as only one of many possible views to acknowledge the strategic value of the iconic or emblematic view of the campus (Figure 3.4.1.1). In the first instance this would manifest itself in the form of the architect’s speculative ‘vision’ of the completed master plan. As this image is subsumed by the built reality other vehicles are appropriated to ensure a public presence. This recognizes both traditional modes and more contemporary virtual ‘venues’ ranging from the architectural publication and the postage stamp to new virtual ‘sites’ such as Google Earth. For this reason the image ‘in’ the plan is as vital as those within the site.

The previous discussion in this document attempted to consider the potential of the figure as a design armature working at the urban scale. The issues of the incremental master plan, program and site are asked to act as ‘weak’ influences or criteria that affect the selection of the figure and the way in which it was conceived as operational ‘stuff’ or ‘material’ to convert into three-dimensions. The Janefeld scheme can be seen to oscillate between the autonomy of the image and its translation into three-dimensional form and that of the pragmatic concerns of the project as specified in the actual brief. These competing issues offer a mutual resistance preventing one concern from dominating the other but the real import of this interaction is how the figure’s amplification or the affect at the return to the figural reappearance at each cut can be assessed through its capacity to address a number of pragmatic concerns across a range of scales throughout the scheme. The rest of the document will therefore aim to discuss the performance of the figure against the issues of signification and the pragmatics of the master plan, site, program and their material translation.

Importantly the conversion of the Gordon surface was premised on testing figure’s capacity to yield a buildings ranging from the structurally and constructionally complex through to the simple and banal. This consequently had a significant effect on the way this surface was translated into a final ‘built’ proposition, so the material translation of the figure was based on relatively convention structural, constructional and material systems, rather than an exploration of new systems.

Figure 3.4.1.1
View of elevational figure from one of the major viewpoints.

3.4.2
THE MASTER PLAN

One of the significant investigative aims for the Janefeld project was to exploit the figure’s potential to see not only how it might impart or brand the institution but to generate a form that presented the identifiable institutional figure within both the plan and ground view. The problem of the master plan then is its inflexibility regarding contingency and change, and clearly one of its great challenges must be premised on its ability to retain this figural integrity in the face of these contingencies of the incremental development of that ‘plan’. Typically the desire to retain the original ‘image’ of that master plan has been problematic because of the difficulty in initially establishing that image against the logic of the infrastructural and empirical determinants of the project and then sustaining this projective image against temporal degradation. In such cases the tendency to assert a consistent three-dimensional architectural language ensures that the problem of the master plan is framed and made an architectural one, ensuring that retention of its projective image is often compromised by the impossibility of maintaining this architectural language.

The formal conversion of the master plan’s projective image does not significantly impact figural retention in the plan view. In some ways the use of a figure in the plan is reasonably unproblematic given that campus plan figures underpinning IIT and La Trobe University demonstrate a certain resilience
of the figure in the aerial view (Figure 3.4.2.1). The Janefield scheme departs from a determination to test the capacity to retain figural consistency in both the aerial and ground views. This research aim establishes a criterion that immediately reduces a certain degree of openness found within planning structures that use such geometric entities.

The imposition of strong geometric entities has two significant impediments on their use value to the development of the master plan. First is the physical difficulty in creating such forms, which is a result of both the temporal dissolution of the master plan’s authority and the predominance of irregular forms in the landscape, which blurs the clarity of such figures. The second impediment is that the institutional use of such entities as a way to signify their stability, order and structure, is of less promotional value in a contemporary context where brand identity is of more importance. Geometric entities, as universalized shared figures and forms, deny the possibility of individual ownership and fail to impart brand uniqueness.

Clearly there are two immediate issues surrounding the deployment of the image as the formal generator of a master plan. There is an obvious potential for the figure to replace this empirical determinism with an imagistic one. The nature of the image is that its legibility is dependent on the completion of its figure. The notion of the completed master plan ‘image’ or vision is certainly more likely to be accomplished in contexts like the Middle East and Asia where rapid urbanism witnesses the development and completion of significantly-sized cities in a short enough time for the master plan vision to be built. Given the way in which the role of the figure acts as a significant cultural determinant, which often witnesses the appearance of it in an emblematic mode, suggests that the use of the figure in the Janefield scheme may be usefully applied to urban development in these contexts (Figures 3.4.2.2 and 3).

The extension of the logic of the grid in Mies’s IIT campus plan into the elevation or experiential ground view indicates that this figural determinism is not a particularly unusual proposition. For example, it is clear in the aerial perspective of Mies’s master plan that it was conceived as a three-dimensional template to guide future development (Figure 3.4.2.4). Yet the grid’s capacity to assume numerous modes of formal articulation and its capacity to be folded into conventional structural and constructional systems ensured that it possessed enough flexibility to retain either an accidental or explicit guiding principle. The grid as such can be seen to serve as the pre-eminent device for the master plan, in that it is compliant with the economic determinants of capitalism. This is, however, problematic for the institution when the use of the grid, in establishing stability within the plan, willingly concedes the experiential ‘elevational’ space for the architect to reshape and re-image the institution with each new addition (Figure 3.4.2.5). This acts only to promote the urban with a traditional figure ground paradigm that acts to constantly dissipate the institution’s self image because that figure is only ever experienced from above. In such cases even the earlier Dubai projects witness significant figural slippage between the plan figure and the figurative facades in the elevational zone.

Within a discussion of the generative capacity of the image the figure allows the formal development of the project to exist outside the underlying geometries found within those projects conceived primarily within the space of the software. The project stands outside this displaced geometric order and is neither completely of the grid or the irregular loose curvilinear geometries present within the contemporary suburbs of the periphery. Borrowing from both, neither is privileged. In a ‘formless’ act it becomes the third term sitting between both.

The uniqueness of the figure underpinning the Janefield scheme immediately makes this problematic because it doesn’t immediately appear to possess the same figural interpretative flexibility or structural and constructional fidelity to conventional building systems. The problems with this figure are how one strategically deals with such a level of formal determinism and its potential for essentially excluding difference and failing to deal strategically with the contingencies inherent in the incremental master plan. The tendency is for such an approach to repeat the failures of the modernist urban planning strategy and the desire of the architects to impose their vision over the whole project.

The potential solution to this lies in the reframing of the expectation of the level of figural appearance. As previously discussed, this allows a certain degree of visual slippage because the figure does not refer to anything else. This lack of a referent, in turn, allows a chance for the figure to modify itself without any usage of that figure being able to establish primacy. This figural variation is equally useful in the plan and phenomenal ground view where the work is conducted in the first phase of the master plan. Certainly the amount of construction work in this initial phase means that it is relatively easy to accomplish its figural outline to the point where the
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Figure 3.4.2.2

Figure 3.4.2.3

Figure 3.4.2.4
Mies van Der Rohe, IIT Campus (aerial perspective), 1938

Figure 3.4.2.5
Google Earth, IIT Campus, viewed 17 August, 2007
Figure 3.4.2.6
An Aerial View of the Janefield Campus
figure's looseness offers a high degree of tolerance, allowing further changes to this edge without any significant loss in the figure's visual integrity. In fact the greatest weakness in establishing the figure in the aerial view over the incremental development of the master plan occurs in zone 2, where most of the main I.S.C. units are located. As seen in the roof plan (page 69) this can be resolved by applying a similar landscape patterning to that in the I.S.C. roof planes. Here it is the notion of pattern that is deployed to camouflage the inconsistency between building and landscape until the completion of this zone of the master plan.

The same amount of figural variation can be equally as useful in the phenomenal ground view. Like the plan the integration of the figure in this realm equally co-opts the first phase of construction works, but there is enough of neither building nor earth works in this phase to sustain the making of the figure in this realm. It is here where it becomes important to recalibrate and reject the expectation for the figure to be universally present throughout the scheme to accord to the originally generated three-dimensional form. Consequently the impossibility of manufacturing the figure throughout the scheme in this realm is best answered by rejecting the need to ‘build’ this ‘pure’ form.

This step in the process effectively allows the figure to be made present in the first phase of development in three ways. First, as a condensed version projected onto shorter elevational sections strategically opens the potential for any future developments to exist within the ‘shadow’ of the figure established in the first phase of development (Figures 3.4.2.7-9 & 13). The second strategy takes advantage of those areas of figural simplicity to form the figure during the phase one earthworks. This is taken to an extreme with two sites on the north boundary where the conversion to an I.S.C. unit merely requires the addition of a roof and low cost walling (Figures 3.4.2.10 & 11). Finally there is an acceptance of the impossibility of maintaining the figure throughout the whole campus, so that at moments it remains as fragment waiting to be subsumed by further development (Figure 3.4.2.12). The translation into built form thus accepts three modes in which the figure is made manifest: as the ideal ‘extruded Gordon surface, a sort of applied façade image and finally as an obscure figural fragment. Again the notion of privileging a singular understanding of the forming of the figure adds a depth to its architectural application, which in turn acknowledges and happily resists the impossibility of achieving this ‘pure’ and ideal form. Importantly the effect of these tactics creates moments of formal complexity and simplicity within the elevational profile, allowing the development in the first phase to establish enough figural presence in the phenomenal view to satisfy the institution’s expectations. Conceptually there is enough freedom to allow any additions to exist within and outside the formal dictates of this figure without any need to enforce an automatic compliance. At the same time it strategically provides enough options for the structural and constructional requirements of the building works to be delivered at the appropriate budget.

The reality of the temporal uncertainties of the Master Plan restricts this total figural vision. The generic will enforce itself leaving this project’s formal outcomes as a series of gestures and desired developmental restrictions toward buildings, landscape and the plan. Importantly both the nature of the anamorphic projection to condense the figural ‘information’ to an end of each profile and the scale at which these elevational profiles exist allow a reasonable figural flexibility without interfering with the overall legibility of the figure. The conversion of this imagistic information into generic and conventional construction systems consequently increases the formal and spatial repertoire available in the realization of the project. This strategically allows every building outcome from the highly articulated and complex to the simple generic shed.

In this way the university has the capacity to insist that its emblem or logo is present without enslaving future development of the master plan to the making of this figure. In a counter to this the replacement of the empirical determinants by the figure makes it possible for the master plan to retain integrity within or outside the logic of this generative figure without jeopardizing its integrity. The development of buildings existing outside the dictates of the figure further destabilizes the idea of a clear precinct boundary, as this inconsistency in the phenomenological view creates a disjunction between the gestalt of the boundary established between plan and elevation. The initial plan offers this opportunity of similarity or difference because it strategically establishes the figure both in plan and elevation within the first phase of the project.
In keeping with the primary motivations of the Janefield project, the siting of the figure occurs as an issue of both the plan and the phenomenal view. Accordingly the landscape is an integral component in the development of the project and operates across a range of issues including the incremental development of the master plan through to the material expression of the project. In much the same way as the geometric figure of the grid informs both the building and landscape components in Eisenman’s Restock Project, Janefield attempts to use the formal potential of the original ‘stain’ figure to understand all constructional work as part of a singular exploration of material variation. This aims to rescue the urban from the traditional notion of the figured ‘building’ placed on the ground of the landscape. The figure developed from the ‘wall stain’ was expected to function conceptually as a thick surface. This deliberate tactical manoeuvre altered the conception of building as the figure to the landscape’s ground to a position where both building and landscape equally possess a figure. This essentially alters this relationship from a figure – ground to a figure – figure relationship. The following section will cover both the ‘siting’ of the figure in plan and the interaction between the ‘idealized’ three-dimensional form and the existing topography in the phenomenal ground view.

The positioning of the plan figure was determined by the decision to locate it strategically within the middle of the north-south axis of the site and as close as possible to the Plenty Road boundary. The former decision was based on the notion that surrounding the campus by the other first phase privately owned programs, a suburban subdivision and the Championship Golf Course, would establish a perceptual hierarchy revolving around the ‘void’ of the campus. This decision was, in part, a response to John Baldessari’s Crowds with Shape of Reason Missing (1986, p.36), where the vacancy of the photo’s subject draws attention to those in the background of the image (Figure 3.4.3.1). The effect of this was to suggest a relationship where notionally the campus acted as an occupational void around which the various other components were wrapped. Experientially this means that any movement within these adjacent programs tends towards being centrifugal, creating a subtle and non-specific sense of hierarchy in the overall master plan. Equally the location of the plan figure along Plenty Road was a deliberate attempt to locate the institution, via the phenomenal presence of the figure as a reinterpretation of ‘estate gate’, in a prominent and public zone (Figure 3.4.3.2). This siting also visually linked the three different Bundoora campuses, identifying that stretch of road as an RMIT University precinct.

The siting was also adjusted to align the two main view corridors of the three-dimensional form with those of the existing roads. The decision to retain much of the existing road system was a simple recognition that the capacity of the existing road network to deal with the topography provided a useful framework around which to develop the vehicular circulation system and that the outline of the roads shared an uncanny resemblance to the institutional figure. The location of these entry points was critical inasmuch as they dictated the location of the most fully developed elevational anamorphic projections. Tactically this decision aimed, for the briefest of moments, to enforce the presence of the institutional figure as all Janefield residents and clients passed through the estate.
The reshaping of the site topography provided an opportunity to favour pedestrian circulation over the vehicular system (Figures 3.4.3.3 & 4). Correspondingly the roads, where possible, were either bridged or sunk below the pedestrian network. Where they met the road was made one-way. The resultant circulation systems never completely privileged one over the other: at certain moments one is more articulated than another. This interaction was therefore more than a response to pedestrian safety or to enforce the notion of the pedestrian green campus, as its configuration also aimed deliberately to present moments throughout the campus that drew on and referred to the spatial qualities, construction techniques and the materiality found around suburban infrastructure. Again, as regards the notion of ‘formless’, the schism between the two systems was never intended to be fully resolved.

As previously discussed, the capacity to achieve the figure in the plan is relatively easy given the range of earth works and programmatic variation. However, the temporal determinism of the master plan pushes the utopian vision into a strategic withdrawal when it comes to the phenomenal ground view. Primarily the ‘lack’ of enough building envelope prevents the figure from assuming the same unrelenting formal unity as the plan. The incapacity of this type of figural formation in the phenomenal realm required a series of tactics that strategically and directly led to a clear procedural criterion based on the desire to establish the institutional figure in this realm. Consequently the formation of the figure directed and informed decisions both on the siting of the building works and on the reformation of the landscape in the initial phase of development.
The alignment of the elevational profiles strategically sits within the existing topography to ensure that any subsequent modification of the site is premised on the desire to provide the best fit between the figure profile and existing topography (Figure 3.4.3.5). The logic determining the location of each profile was based on matching the directionality of each profile to the directionality of the existing and the new entry points to the campus. The site is conceptually reconfigured by scraping or cutting away of the existing topography according to the bottom contour of the final extruded Gordon surface (Figures 3.4.3.6 & 7). In practice the translation into a final built proposition ensures that parts of the original topography are retained while others are excavated earth and redistributed to create berms that provide material differentiation so as to realize parts of the elevational figure and to stitch this new ground plane into the existing unmodified site contour. At certain moments the berms are configured both to form walls for I.S.C.s in the next phase of development and satisfy the requirement for figural fidelity. In this moment numerous non-program specific open public spaces, ranging across many scales from intimate to open, are thrown out of the process as some unintended by-product. The outcome of all these approaches allows both the existing contour and the excavations to be co-opted to form both a landscaped base for buildings and actual built fabric. The logic behind this terracing and realignment of the profiles can therefore be said to minimize the production of waste from excavation.

The final significant effect of the attempt to develop the figure in the phenomenal realm is in the location of the viewpoints from which the anamorphic projection is visually reassembled (Figure 3.4.3.8). In a strategy reminiscent of the picturesque these vantage points act as the privileged viewpoint, which reappears at specific intervals within the movement around the estate. The location of these viewpoints within the estate but outside the campus effectively projects the presence of the campus figure back into this surrounding context. The notion that the campus itself acts as some sort of desirable feature ensures that this is not a completely unidirectional exchange benefiting the institution only. Any sense that the presence of the campus adds prestige to the whole Janefield development implies that the democratization of the view of the figure in this phenomenal ground view can act only to provide a mutually beneficial exchange.
 Determining the distribution of program was a product of a combination of factors. First there was a proportional matching of the programmatic floor area to figure area. There was also a figural legibility criterion based on the visual difference between types of programs possessed, particularly in relation to differences in roof treatments, built densities and plan depth. The third, least important criterion saw a ‘dumb’ allocation of program to a reading of the figure. As figure 3.4.4.3 shows the ‘head’ zone (zone 5), was programmed to house the main ceremonial university spaces while the main industry partner I.S.C. unit was placed in the figure’s chest zone (zone 6). Once these criteria were determined other more flexible typologies, such as residential components, were distributed across all zones of the campus figure.

The largest zones in the figure, zone one, two three, possess the greatest potential for development. To distinguish these zones in the plan view it was decided that each area should possess a different program and that this differentiation would ensure a material difference. The following distribution of program was therefore decided upon:

Zone 1: Golf Course Zone.

The location of zone one, in both plan and elevation, mediates the imposition of built form to the site and is understood primarily as a landscape intervention. This zone within the plan figure fronts onto the more sensitive landscape section to the east of the site and so it was decided to locate the last nine holes of the golf course in this area. The existing topography is reformed to conform to the bottom edge of the zone one elevational profile, while the shared plan boundary between zone one and two becomes a retaining wall whose shape conforms to the outline produced when zone one is cut along this boundary. This allowed for the topography to be reconfigured as a buffer zone to capture and process runoff from the campus before it enters the Plenty River. It also guarantees the retention of the view corridor to the east over subsequent phases of the master plan’s development. Consequently any desire to retain the full elevational profile is abandoned in this zone and any trace of the full profile is more akin to exposed geological strata (Figure 3.4.4.4).

Zone 2: I.S.C. Zone.

This zone was identified to house the I.S.C. units because it possesses the largest figural area. The material and formal consistency of factory typology ensured a certain degree of consistency as the master plan developed. The individual I.S.C.s are developed via a process of Boolean subtraction where a cutting plane, produced through vertically extruding each unit’s footprint, extracts form from the zone’s three-dimensional massing.

The original Janefield figure was selected partially on the basis that its image was constituted of numerous zones (Figure 3.4.4.1). One of the selection criteria was based on whether a figure, constituted of a range of different zones, would in the conversion into a Gordon’s surface deliver a complex set of programmatic relationships both in plan and section. This was a particularly important test for the sectional programmatic inter-relations, given the deliberate motivation to use of the figure in the vertical plane. Obviously the potential for the form to deliver any valuable programmatic outcome was reliant on the capacity for the form to house the program adequately while still maintaining figural integrity and that the decisions taken in the architectonic translation of the diagrammatic form could support a productive juxtaposition and distribution of program. The significant problem arising from the dictates of diagrammatic purity of the Gordon surface occurred because of the intention to align program to the different figural zones, as they appear both plan and section. Such an idealized conceptual framework unsurprisingly resulted in a disjunction that required an alternative approach to aligning program and figural information. Accordingly a strategic differentiation was made between the way in which the figural information in the plan and section was used to determine programmatic outcomes.

This differentiation was possible when it was observed that generally the alignment to program was less successful in the section owing to the scale and dimensional variation within the Gordon surface, which limited a capacity to retain figural fidelity of each zone against the dictates of program. A number of these figural zones were therefore dimensionally unsuitable to the containment of any program so tactically the figural linkage to program could be conceptually reframed as a simple material differentiation, ranging from solid to transparent (Figure 3.4.2.2). This meant that the determination of program in the vertical became a qualitative response linking programmatic amenity to the potential material reading of the figural zones. This allowed the differentiation of the main programmatic components of the brief to be left to the figural zones within the plan. On this basis it was decided that primarily in the plan each zone would be explicitly linked to program type and that in elevation each zone would have a programmatic relation mediated through material. Consequently the plan figure acts as an armature to determine the location of the campus programs. The essential criteria in determining the distribution of program was a product of a

### Figure 3.4.4.1
Identification of the figural zones

### Figure 3.4.4.2
Alignment of figure profile and program - Residential / Library Building

#### Zone 1
Golf Course Zone.

#### Zone 2
I.S.C. Zone.
Zone 3: Mixed Program Area A.

This plan zone contains three main programs; a new sports facility shared between the campus and the private development zones, the incubator I.S.C.s and the Convention Centre. It was felt that the smaller incubator units would foster a greater range of possible industry partners that may grow and eventually transfer to larger units. The new sports centre satisfies an absent program and is envisaged as a shared facility satisfying the needs of students, staff and local residents. The primary aim of this addition was its capacity to provide a meeting space for all players in the Janefield estate and surrounding area.

Both programs are modifications to the studio brief and this effectively replaces four of the full scale I.S.C.s. These programs are distinguished because of their smaller footprint and unit depth, which create a material and visual discontinuity in the aerial view. This visual discontinuity is further enhanced by the Boolean subtraction from the zone’s massing by a thirty (30) degree inclined plane down each elevation along each side of the view corridor. The effect of this cut also works to reveal more of the elevational figure in the plan view.

Zone 4: Open Space / Circulation Zone.

This area is the central public space of the campus. The western end of this zone modifies the original topography so as to mediate the difference in height between this new ground line and the forecourt of the central institution building in zone 5.

Zone 5: Zone Public Interface.

The size and location of this zone suggested a single structure to house significant campus events. Acting as the main ceremonial interface between the institution and public the building was designed with two auditoriums and a large foyer - exhibition space (Figure 3.4.4.5).
Zone 6: Zone I.S.C. Facility.

It was decided that this zone would house the main industry partner's I.S.C. facility given its size and its location close to the geographic centre of the campus.

A second challenge to the intention of establishing and maintaining a productive figural and programmatic relationship occurred in the process of translating the diagrammatic form of the Gordon surface into a final built proposition. The final procedural step inevitably eroded this form to a point where it endangered the figural alignment to program. Undoubtedly this was a result of the decision to apply the discipline of buildability to the project but this constraint again yielded both a framework to think and test the project and invited further unanticipated interpreted opportunities (Figures 3.4.4.3 to 7). As a result those moments in the scheme where the dictates of the plan opened gaps in the elevational realm resulted in a further set of techniques by which to close these visual gaps. Consequently a secondary projective technique was used whereby the figural fragments contained within these gaps were projected onto background building mass. This 'figural' information opportunistically suggested an approach to programmatic delineation.

3.4.5 Programmatic Orders of Scale

The project's procedural and tectonic development stems from the intention to test the capacity of the Gordon surface to distribute program in plan and section so as to infuse all program types throughout the entirety of this mass. With this in mind the brief for the Janefield development can be separated into academic and non-academic program types. The following discussion will address issues around the non-academic program types before addressing those of the academic programs.

Non-Academic Program Types

The non-academic program types can be distinguished quantitatively through their footprint. This differentiation obviously operates as an order of scale rather than program type, though of course there is an implicit relationship between the two. These program types are distinguished in two ways: those that retain a spatial integrity, referred to as 'bundled' programs, and those that spill into the campus zone, referred to as 'integrated' programs. The bundled programs are privately owned and so can be considered to exist outside the academic operation of the campus. They tend to be either a special feature to increase the marketability of the estate and help finance the building of the institutional components, or provide associated amenities to be shared between all users of the Janefield development. The integrated programs individually command a much smaller footprint and range from privately owned commercial spaces to private enterprises running from within university-owned facilities. They can therefore be said to provide amenity to the site both within and external to the campus.

Bundled Non-Academic Program

The size of the bundled non-academic programs, consisting mainly of the golf course and residential development, possesses a significant footprint. This ensures that they have a significance presence in the aerial plan view. The decision was to tactically co-opt significant parts of these programs to visually define the campus figure boundary. For this reason the large sections of the golf course and suburban development physically wrap around the external side of the campus figure. This siting also means that the majority of
anamorphic viewpoints are located within these areas, so that the elevational figure views invasively project back into these zones, thus blurring any sense of a strong boundary in this experiential space.

The formal ‘built’ consequences of this approach occur in the layout of the golf course, where a visual differentiation defines the southern boundary of the campus and the eastern zone of the campus plan figure. This differentiation is achieved by dividing the course into a tree-lined fairway section that mediates the space between the campus and future suburban development and another section with a more open and low scale landscape. Finally the driving range, clubhouse and pro shop are within the sports facility located in the western end of the campus figure (Figure 3.4.5.1).

The residential components distributed within and outside the campus plan figure. Those areas outside the campus figure are typical suburban developments. The eventual conversion of a landscape dominated by a tree canopy is deliberately used to enforce a distinctive differentiation between it and the campus. The residential component within the campus adopts a different residential typology and so this component assumes a more high-density apartment form. The benefit of this not only provided a more cost-effective form of housing but also added a greater range of housing options and with this the potential for a more diverse demographic. The location of this form of housing was distributed throughout the campus and so attempted to address the somewhat pathological tendency in campus plans to expel student housing to the periphery.
Integrated Non – Academic Program
The integrated programs include a broad range of programs that, owing to their relatively small size and programmatic diversity, suggested that their folding into the campus would blur its programmatic mix and act as a shared space for the residential and university communities. To extend the relationship existing between the university and industry partners, where the question of ownership is already blurred by these public-private developments, many of the commercial retail spaces are sited strategically within the campus to co-opt them opportunistically to aid the formation of the plan figure and to increase the campus programmatic mix to a truly public facility. Many of the retail spaces are therefore located towards the geographic centre of the figure adjacent to the main vehicular circulation points (Figure 3.4.5.3).

Academic Program Types
The very nature of the financing structure deployed by the university ensures that there is an inherent blurring of ownership between the institution and the industry partners. The incorporation of university facilities into the I.S.C.s effectively meant that there was not, initially, the same degree of formal separation as in the non-academic programs. While each programmatic component could therefore be divided according to ownership, essentially between institutional and private, this blurring necessitated two different rationales for programmatic distribution. These played out at two scales, the external urban context and in internal spatial configurations.

As with the non-academic components, the specific quantitative dimensions produced by this scalar differentiation were expressed as a product of both a visual and a physical, quantitative criterion.

As discussed earlier, the initial programmatic separation at an urban scale was based on matching of the total area of each main programmatic type to areas within the figure and on the ability to form visually the figure in plan. The siting of program incorporated an understanding that each programmatic group was inherently accompanied by a variation in the formal and material articulation in the roof plan and the visual density of built to open space. As a result the academic program was grouped into four figural zones according to their shared material appearance in the aerial view.

The density of built form in zone 2, the figural zone was reserved primarily for I.S.C. units, ensured that the completed master plan would have a distinctive visual pattern when compared to the other zones. This claim is based on the typological tendency of material homogeneity as a response to the provision of natural lighting to their large floor plates (Figures 3.4.5.4 and 5). The larger budget allocation for the main I.S.C. allows for a formally more complex solution to the issue of lighting, as indicated in the buildings at the Canberra IT Campus (Figures 3.4.5.7 to 9). This material differentiation figurally and experientially distinguishes this building both from above and inside the unit. The overall result of these strategies ensures that the development of the master plan actually reinforces, rather than dissolves the plan figure.
Zone 3 was reserved for those programs that possessed a thinner floor plate depth and a higher requirement for open space. The ability to deliver natural lighting through the walls rather than the roof ensured that this zone would possess a fundamentally different pattern in the aerial view to that of the main I.S.C. zone (Figures 3.4.5.10 & 11).

The retention of slope within the new topography also works to improve the qualitative amenity to adjacent internal and external spaces as well as to open opportunities to realign program in section to selectively reposition pedestrian zones (Figure 3.4.5.13). The value of a sloping ground plane is evident when we compare the outcome of this type of development on a flat site. For example, the flat topography of the Fyshwick Campus of the Canberra IT campus, which is programmatically similar to Janefield, results in a sectional response that raises most of the learning spaces above the ground plane. Furthermore, the perceived undesirability of the factory floor adjacent to the external ground plane means that the building envelope is insulated to prevent noise pollution. The subsequent closing of the building fabric and the elevation of the teaching spaces rob the scheme of any potential programmatic engagement with the pedestrian.

The retention of a sloping ground plane offers a solution to this problem. At moments within the scheme, slope opens a potential to improve amenity by burying the factory floor relative to the adjacent exterior landscape. It would also offer the option to allow a capacity to oversee the work occurring inside or allow the strategic positioning of the more public programs adjacent to these pedestrian open spaces. Equally this variation in sectional entry points allows the potential of embedding pedestrian-friendly programs as buffer combinations of their possessing a different material quality, as a result of program and their status as signature buildings, and the capacity of landscape to provide a further material and, therefore, visual discontinuity.

The emphasis on the visual formation of the figure through this programmatic differentiation might easily have resulted in an equally strong programmatic separation. This is always an issue, given that a high proportion of the building stock is factories. To guard against this no one zone is purely constituted of one program only. The dictates of the figure in plan and elevation instead instigate an interruption to the programmatic homogeneity by setting up conditions more appropriate to other program types. For example, the requirement to establish the plan and elevational figure in the first phase resulted in the decision to insert high-density residential components into the I.S.C. zone (Figure 3.4.5.12). This juxtaposition could, where necessary, be buffered by the insertion of the I.S.C.'s office and learning spaces. The end result is a programmatic mix that extends the range of activities within the campus beyond the normal academic operating hours. This would subsequently support the retail commercial activities embedded into the campus as well as resist the typical zoning strategies that are often located at the campus periphery.

The retention of slope within the new topography also works to improve the qualitative amenity to adjacent internal and external spaces as well as to open opportunities to realign program in section to selectively reposition pedestrian zones (Figure 3.4.5.13). The value of a sloping ground plane is evident when we compare the outcome of this type of development on a flat site. For example, the flat topography of the Fyshwick Campus of the Canberra IT campus, which is programmatically similar to Janefield, results in a sectional response that raises most of the learning spaces above the ground plane. Furthermore, the perceived undesirability of the factory floor adjacent to the external ground plane means that the building envelope is insulated to prevent noise pollution. The subsequent closing of the building fabric and the elevation of the teaching spaces rob the scheme of any potential programmatic engagement with the pedestrian.

The retention of a sloping ground plane offers a solution to this problem. At moments within the scheme, slope opens a potential to improve amenity by burying the factory floor relative to the adjacent exterior landscape. It would also offer the option to allow a capacity to oversee the work occurring inside or allow the strategic positioning of the more public programs adjacent to these pedestrian open spaces. Equally this variation in sectional entry points allows the potential of embedding pedestrian-friendly programs as buffer
zones to those less amenable programs. These sectional shifts effectively allow a certain degree of programmatic juxtaposition that might foster hybrid programs, while also offering a range of options for dealing and engaging with potentially undesirable programs. Finally it is the deportment of the figure that provides a number of programmatic adjacencies that challenge the normative decisions on programmatic separation. Significantly it is zone 3, with its range of programs and whose boundary wraps around and runs along many of the new and existing campus edges, which opportunistically creates numerous programmatic adjacencies.

The separation of program within the I.S.C. and incubator units along institutional, private and shared components offers the potential of configuring internal circulation as a shared zone. For example, in the main I.S.C. the corridors linking and separating these spaces act as an internal public space functioning as a public right of way. The corridor becomes a public space that provides physical and visual access to all the range of activities within the I.S.C. This principle is reinterpreted in the incubator units, where the provision of academic spaces is transferred to adjacent university buildings (Figures 3.4.5.13 to 15).

This notion of the corridor as a public space is also employed in other buildings. Of note is the sports facility located on the eastern side of Plenty Road, which, as a shared estate program, uses the main corridor as a form of permanent public access way (Figures 3.4.5.16 &17). The location of this facility is to ensure that this circulation space, functioning as an extension to the main pedestrian crossing linking the Bundoora West Campus, divides the secured swimming and sports club from the more unsecured multipurpose gymnasium space. The latter is conceptually understood to operate more akin to an open air facility and as such has a much longer opening time. The importance of this prolonged activity is that this section of the sports facility’s façade is transparent so that the presence of the institution’s figure is temporally extended.
The previous sections have discussed the various tactics employed to ensure the figure’s visual integrity while retaining the potential for the conversion of this figure into a range of complex and simple structural and constructional systems. The value of the geometric properties of the anamorphic projection allows the figure to challenge the tendency to privilege the plan and program as the only formal departure points for an urban design process, without the need to substitute completely and dictate the nature of that final urban form.

The geometry of the initial figural Gordon surface, when translated into built form, creates a pervasive effect that challenges the perceptual visual stability of form. The major test of this decision lies then in a capacity to build such form within the range of existing structural and constructional systems. This testing of this constructional logic has to factor in a build quality that varies from the highly articulated and materially expensive to the cheap standard or generic. This strategic deployment of articulated to standard form is vital in the incremental development of any master plan. In the first phase of the development, where there is a greater desire on the part of the university to exert quality control, the constructional logic would be linked to the ‘public-ness’ of each building according to the respective budgetary constraints. Consequently buildings would strategically distribute expenditure to those areas facing onto the most public areas. For example, buildings around the main public entry points of the campus would possess a higher build quality and have a greater fidelity to the expressive formal ramifications of the figure. This effect, revealed most tellingly in the panoramas on pages 80 to 84, suggests a fairly straightforward material translation of this figural ‘information’. It is worth noting that in those areas where this ‘information’ fails to permit adequate levels of amenity tactics of screening glazing can be employed to retain the visual continuity of each figural zone (Figure 3.4.6.2).

This creates a condition where development is guided by the careful matching of budget and visibility with figural complexity. These conditions result in an economic matrix of four different site types: obscure site and simple figural form, obscure site and explicit form, public site and simple form, and public site and explicit form. Clearly the degree of figural detail and visual prominence of each future development site requires the institution to negotiate with industry partners on the quality of the building stock. The variation in these site qualities offer partners at either end of the market an ability to choose between prestigious or less prominent sites. It also produces a figural hierarchy that produces an act against the mass with intention. Its vastness exhausts architecture’s compulsive need to decide and determine. Zones will be left out, free from architecture’ (Koolhaas 1995, p.512-513).

The idealized building form derived from the extrusion of the anamorphed views becomes reserved for the anchor tenant of the campus’s signature building (Figure 3.4.6.3). Here the potential of the figure is exploited to the limit spatially and formally so that the extra cost associated with the slightly more complex three-dimensional form allows this signature building to distinguish itself and ‘reward’ the major tenants for their contribution to the project. This is not to suggest that the structural and constructional aspects of this building are excessive: the scale of the building ensures that any of the irregularities are extended across a large enough length to make their construction plausible within existing structure.
building systems. The budget can therefore be transferred to the building’s materiality so that experientially it retains the required level of prestige, while simultaneously it provides enough formal variation to break down the scale of the unit.

The more generic main I.S.C. units with tighter budgets can interpret the figural constraints of the figure in the phenomenal view by using it to establish a cornice line. This line, effectively projected from the external anamorphic viewpoints, treats the figure as a deep but irregular edge applied to a skillion roof whose slope corresponds to the requirements of a generic factory structure. Alternatively the incubator units have roofs generated by transfer of the irregular roof line, a product of the figural outline, into an irregular cornice line (Figure 3.4.6.3).

Plans can also be rationalized by marking out points along the figure at conventional 12-metre portal frame bays, and then straightening the plan edge between these points (Figure 3.4.6.5). Irrespective of the method of translation the scale of the building ensures that what appears to be a highly irregular profile in the oblique is actually formally simple and, therefore, can be applied to the generic without compromising budgets or the retention of the figure. Here the capacity of the figure to divert attention away from the components used in its making is valuable precisely because it diverts attention away from the banality of its materiality (Figures 3.4.6.6 to 8). This permits development of the master plan without seriously affecting the institutional desire to retain the figure in the phenomenal view. Sometimes revealing a generic architecture and at other times a new signature building, further development seeps in and fills the plan edge and frames the more specific first stage of the master plan with differing levels of figural engagement.

Figure 3.4.6.4
Process of changing elevational irregularity within the roof plane into an irregular cornice line.

Figure 3.4.6.5
Process of rationalising figure profile to standard constructional grid.

Figure 3.4.6.6
Distant view of ISC materiality.

Figure 3.4.6.7 & 8
Close up view of ISC materiality.
There was also an intention to use the figure as a mechanism to inform the project at more intimate scales. This can be a product of architectonic translation of the original Gordon surface (Figure 3.4.6.9) or the deployment of the figure as a formal template within those spaces generated from that translation to impart built form across a range of exterior and interior spaces (Figures 3.4.6.10 to 12). This endless duplication and return of the figure creates a figural redundancy that experientially saturates the development. This tactic operates in a similar way to what Zizek identifies as Hitchcock’s technique of ‘tracking’, so the abrupt reappearance of the figure visually disrupts any seamless cinematic unfolding of what might otherwise be conceived as a picturesque experience (Zizek, 1993, p.93-97). This unanticipated return of the figure at unexpected moments across many different scales works against the initial regular siting of the figure profiles. In this way the potential for this siting strategy to create a condition of harmonious rhythmic repetition is subverted and replaced with a condition of discontinuity. Superficially this is helpful to satisfy the requirement for pragmatically loose and mutable envelopes. Operatively this creates an unpredictable eruption of the figure more akin to Bois and Krauss’s notion of pulse, where the temporal discontinuity effects a sensation at each return (Krauss 1997, p.161-165).

The oblique view recalls the strategic nature of Holbein’s Ambassadors (Figures 3.4.6.12 to 15), a technique of anamorphosis when, as described by Zizek, “…viewed straightforwardly, it remains a meaningless stain, but which, as soon as we look at the picture from a precisely determined lateral perspective, all of a sudden acquires well-known contours” (Zizek, 1993, p.90). The uncanny reappearance in this case also allows an opportunity for the figure to provide for the containment of the spatial requirements of program or material specificity.
CONCLUSION

The proposed RMIT Janefield Technology Estate was selected not only as an architectural vehicle to test the generative capacity and the representational import of the figure in architecture but also because this type of institutional brief is one of the few examples where the architect is called to act within the peripheral zone of the city. An important aspect of this research was the use of a ‘figure’ in the experiential realm so as to challenge the privileging of the plan in urban design practice and see to it if it could productively guide the development of the campus master plan. Furthermore, the issue of context and the institutional nature of the program inevitably encompassed issues of representation and signification, particularly how the formal consequences of the figure ‘played out’ within the broader social and political context of this suburban periphery. This required not only testing the figure against the pragmatics of program and site but also assessing its ability to furnish the institution with a recognizable ‘logo’ that could represent and distinguish the unique learning and research activities planned for the Janefield Campus. From the outset this final project aimed to deploy a figure that operated outside any semiotic functioning that rendered it as representationally closed and stable. The ensuing design tactics deliberately aimed to do this via a formal misalignment between expectation and experience so that the selected Janefield figure operates instead in a ‘formless’ and open way. The hope for this Janefield figure was that it uses form to prevent any development of figurative meaning. Thus the ideological aim of this work was to find a formal alignment between expectation and experience that the selected Janefield figure operates instead in a figurative way that contested semiotic specificity.

The status of the Janefield figure logo is different from that of the BHP Billiton logo in two significant ways. The first is that any Janefield logo would sit under the main RMIT logo and, as a ‘second order logo’, would not be required to represent or identify the institution. The diagram to the right illustrates the difference between first and second order logos and attempts to show how the latter, by being able to sit outside the representational economy, avoids the fabricated and hierarchical structure of the former.

Surface form. Interestingly the level of figural detail not only guided internal programmatic distribution but also possessed enough formal information to delineate a range of public spaces that spanned from the grand to the intimate. These opportunistic alignments of program to figure therefore offered a range of different spaces and volumes that were not immediately typical of precedent forms and campus plans. As such the Janefield figure produced an opportunity to establish a unique set of formal and spatial outcomes across all scales of the project.

The most immediate test of the use of the Janefield figure rests with the ability to convince the client of its value, particularly given the origin of the project figure. This issue arises as a consequence of the initial, and potentially antagonistic, selection of a wall defect as a deliberate challenge to the client’s expectation of a more ‘palatable’ figure form. However, the recent commercial acceptance of a new type of logo, one without an identifiable form or explicit reference to the commissioning entity, suggests that the Janefield logo may fit into this new class of ‘loose’ logo. In fact BHP Billiton’s logo was designed to differentiate the company within the mining industry sector (FutureBrand, 2001). These types of logos do not, of course, automatically guarantee that the Janefield figure is non-representational; any formalization of the figure into a logo involves a process of assignation. As the earlier text suggests the avoidance of signification must operate in a different way if it is to avoid figurative qualities. This ability to avoid the assignation of specific meaning is as much an issue of its deployment or representational ‘status’ once ‘released’ into the community.

Forgoing the need to function as an explicit semiotic reference the Janefield logo also avoids the process where a fabricated and idealised identity is mapped over the real. Therefore it could be argued that its functioning corrupts the branding process.

The second distinguishing aspect is that the Janefield figure logo is not as formally ‘loose’ or as visually simple as the BHP Billiton logo. Not only does it possess form without the need for an assigned and explicit meaning but it is also uncannily reminiscent of other known figures and images. It is more than a graphic ‘blob’; it has an indeterminate resemblance to something else. Importantly for the project’s rhetoric, this type of logo is allowed to exist without any application of figurative or narrative structures: it simply haunts the institution. This circumvents any need to undo and collapse the semiotic space between the sign and that which it is asked to signify.

These two factors allow the Janefield figure to assume an indeterminacy and openness that arises from an individual’s

Idealized
Fabricated Image: Commissioned by the institution or corporation

Branding: Process of conventionalising commissioned identity to logo

Semiotic Functioning: Meaning mapped over activities and site of entity. Fabricated identity sits over real activities so that perception if institution or corporation intended to be the same.

Figure

Activities

Identity emerges from activities (and may vary according to individuals)

Emblematic functioning: Identity individuated and mapped against experience of activities associated with entity. Meaning of logo and figure contingent on experience.
experience of the campus and its activities. This in turn offers the potential for the campus culture to evolve and map itself onto the figure. Therefore, while the requirement for a loose figure permitted an exploration of how to suspend semiotic closure and keep it interpretively open it is only when it is allowed to exist as a second order logo that it escapes the intentions of the institutional leaders to conventionalize or fix their meaning to the campus. It is thus emblematic of the physical rather than a symbol representing an ideal. This ‘gift’ of the loose logo, when coupled with the figure’s capacity to generate formal, programmatic and contextual outcomes, reinforces its selection. It is this ability to sit outside any need to impart meaning that distinguishes the Janefield figure and logo. Having achieved an emblematic status the figure obtains what Deleuze (2004) terms as an emblematic ‘matter of factness’. Without symbolic, figurative facility the figure imparts the project with an iconic presence where the figure acts more as an index or marker of form (Deleuze 2004). Moreover, as Mark Hansen (2004) points out, the clearer a figure the better it can function as an index of form. Of course the use of the figure in the phenomenal ground view to challenge the instrumental and empirical determinism of the plan reasserts the possibility of narrative cinematic structure. To avoid the rise of a figurative construct the constant re-presentation of the figure in the phenomenal ground view must do more than simply undo the disciplinary convention of the plan as the prime design generator. To permanently delay figurative narrative means that any attempt to get the figures to assemble into a sequence of events must in some way be frustrated. Therefore, while the generative process asserts equity in the importance of elevational and plan figure the real significance of this figural inundation and repetition rests more with its capacity to set up a condition of what has been referred to previously as an experiential misalignment. Recalling Bois’ (1986) reading of the sublime picturesque, the apparent alignment of plan with the elevational figures conceptually sets up a clear gestalt that one might expect to orientate the viewer and sets up an expectation in advance of the actual architectural experience of those spaces. However, the subtle shifts and discontinuities in the reappearance of the figure institutes a misalignment between expectation of experience and what one experiences when moving through the campus. Much like Bacon’s triptychs, the project figure disrupts the traditional functioning of picturesque space: put simply the figures and signs fail to add up. In this way the presence of the figure in the phenomenological realm works deliberately to set up and then confound any picturesque or cinematic experience one might expect from the generative process (Deleuze 2004).

This figural inundation and redundancy works across multiple scales and views, from the aerial view right through to the interior. At the scale of the campus the regular setting out of the elevational figure profiles suggests a regular, if not rhythmic, return of that figure. Instead this process produces instances of figural clarity and figural ambiguity. In the former case the expectation of a rhythmic reappearance of the figure fails to be frustrated.
is experientially discontinuous and, due to the project’s scale, always exceeds the viewer’s cone of vision. The ensuing disruption and experiential abruptness is compounded in those zones of figural ambiguity occurring between the elevational profiles, where the extrusion process sees the figure as material ‘staining’ of the built fabric. In these ways the expectation of experience gained from these real and imagined aerial views is constantly defied by the experience from within.

Perhaps the effective use of the figure results from its unexpected reappearance throughout the campus. On one level this functioning of the figure is opportunistically pragmatic: it helps resolve issues of spatial scale, the articulation of entrance, surface detail, and so on. However, their real import is the way in which the figure unexpectedly and abruptly reappears, and in so doing creates a visual and experiential discontinuity across many scales of the project.

The alignment of the elevational profiles to the modified topography also creates a blurring between the landscape and ‘built’ space. Accepting Koolhaas’ (1995) notion that bigness severs the relationship between program and facade the project continually misaligns what one expects from the figure to be interior space, the deliberate exploitation of this misalignment creates a formal indeterminacy that works to blur the boundaries between figure and ground. Again the use of the figure in this way subverts the alignment between expectation and actual experience.

The phenomenal view does not aim to supersede the plan but merely to intercede long enough to reveal other potential urban possibilities. The desire to maintain the Janefield figure over the successive developmental phases of the master plan was inevitably always going to be problematic by decision to use the same figure in the experiential realm. As many precedents testify, the impossibility of anticipating future contingencies was exacerbated by the imposition of a figured formal template on both plan and elevation. It has been noted previously that this type of project is better suited to Asia and the Middle East, where rapid urbanization and a predilection for figural forms makes this a more likely strategy. In the case of Janefield the figure may be ‘loose’ but the strategy is not. To apply it as an inclusive, encompassing formal generator renders it as deterministic as any utopian master plan and there is therefore nothing of this deployment of the Janefield figure that ‘solves’ the issues associated with the incremental master plan. At best its presence is maintained by strategies aimed at embedding its presence in the initial stage of the campus development. This inflexibility is of course compounded by the fact that the geometry of the figure is not immediately suitable to the rectilinear geometry of the average ‘shed’. Conversely one might counter that the master plan ‘image’
might be incredibly useful to the political structure of institution where the figure might provide a consistent vision that may be adopted or adapted by successive university leaders. The use of such a detailed figure might reasonably allow the institution to compel industry partners to deliver a generally higher build quality than is typical of many industrial estates. Of all these arguments for and against the value of the figure as master plan it seems that, as figure 3.4.2.11 demonstrates, the loss of the figure over time may in fact increase a sense of discontinuity. This lessening of the overall presence of the Janefield figure may indeed work to increase a sense of abruptness as it unexpectedly reappears.

Clearly these tactics move the architectural use of the figure away from symbolic signification towards affect. This shift from representation and portrayal to affect not only alters the way in which one understands the significance of the figure to the project but also its material presence. The significant experiential outcome of this operative undoing of representation results in an inability to comprehend accurately the depth and scale of its many exterior and interior spaces, which also makes it impossible simultaneously to read the materiality of each building while forming the figure in one's mind. It allows the figure to act in much the same way as the figural content of a painting, where the reading of the image dominates the reading of its materiality. This affect is, therefore, strategically useful in a scheme where the materiality of the building stock at times lacks enough intrinsic value to establish the prestige required by the institutional client.

Nowhere is this creation of affect more pronounced than in the view of the elevational figures from the anamorphic viewpoints. This was a somewhat unexpected outcome of the combination of the emblematic conversion of the figure to a formal index with the pragmatic need to better distribute the figural information. The ensuing decision to make an anamorphic projection of an oblique view of the original figure creates an uncanny distortion of the figure that makes it difficult to register the depth and scale of that space. As a non-experiential view, this anamorphic projection of an impossibly close oblique view of the original figure may deploy the same geometric construction of linear perspective, but its forms are perceptually deceptive and difficult to interpret spatially. Accordingly, construction of the anamorph from a view outside known analogous scopic regimes of human vision produces a circumstance where the mind has difficulty in reading or constructing the projective space of that view. Recalling Lazzarini’s oblique sculptures and paintings, the incapacity ever to reconcile the perspectival space of the anamorphed figure may well instigate a physical movement as one tries to comprehend and match the figure with its emblematic index (Hansen 2004). This subtle shift in the
mimetic logic of perspective projective techniques converts the formal consequence of the figure as a mechanism of affect. This movement, noted by Hansen (2004) in his discussion of Robert Lazzarini’s skull sculptures, is produced when the representational likeness surpasses signification and instead causes bodily sensation. In the case of the Janefield project the decision to construct this oblique view from a point so close to the picture plane as to render the figure outside the human scope of vision makes this view, like Lazzarini’s oblique extrusions, outside human perceptual experience. Existing beyond the human experiential realm, these elevational figures, unlike Holbein’s anamorphic skull, never coalesce: they remain impossible views. The affectiveness of this figure relies of course on the range of different figural projections that constantly remove any sense of figurative authenticity. They collectively produce only figural variation, ensuring that what is emphasized is the effect of distortion rather than what they might signify. In these ways the figure causes visual slippages and permanently transforms the question of the figure from an issue of signification to one of experiential affect.

Representationally, the figure, by not participating in either the disfiguring operations of modernism (abstraction) or post-modernism (excessive figuration), functions to refuse the negation of the negative (Taylor, 1992), thus preventing any simple closure to the questions of authenticity, meaning and identity. Moreover, if one understands the suburb as a space of infinite figurative duplication, situated primarily in the experiential realm, this continual return of the figure without any sort of figurative hierarchy produces a sense of continual and undifferentiated return of the same. This duplication without hierarchy is crucial in understanding the affect of the Janefield figure because it replaces cinematic or rhythmic order with what Krauss (1996, p 161) terms as “a pulsing movement that both breaks apart and flows together”. Bois, in the same book (1996, p 228-9), would classify this sense of figural repetition “zone”: “a mounting tide of nondifferentiation”. Bois, in reference to Ruscha’s word paintings, goes on to add that “everything that has no informational content, everything that is repeated, predictable, redundant”... [makes the] city itself ... pure noise, pure zone” (1996, p 229). This is where the figural inundation of the Janefield project ensures that it owes its experiential pedigree more to the suburbs than the city.

The figure exists as a tool or method to generate architecture, and its strategic deployment offers itself as a gift to both the institution and to those who inhabit the experiential realm. Finally, as a marking of architecture, it attempts to engage in “a world without urbanism, only architecture, even more architecture” (Koolhaas, 1995, pg. 967). In some senses, at the very least, it makes architecture a part of urbanism, even if it creates even more urbanism.
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RMIT’s stated aims for the Technology Estate

The RMIT Technology Estate will be free of substantial air, noise, water and land pollution, where industry will benefit through links to RMIT’s expertise in research, development and innovation and education and training.

This environment will appeal to companies involved in:

* Research, development and innovation in advanced manufacturing, applied biotechnology, information technology, environmental science and technology.
* Advanced product and process design - with an emphasis on ecological friendliness.
* Information processing and analysis technologies.
* Computer software and hardware development and testing, etc.
* Product development, prototyping and testing, and provision of support services.
* Application of clean manufacturing technologies and industrial ecology, etc.

Common infrastructure, including access, utilities and broadband communications, will be available to all participants. Additional or abnormal infrastructure necessary for particular requirements can be accommodated with ease.

Participants in the RMIT Technology Estate and the surrounding community will enjoy access to the commercial, recreational and community activities and other facilities in the Estate. Facilities proposed include:

- Neighbourhood shopping centre for everyday needs
- Restaurants
- RMIT’s Industry Service Centre - a shop front to RMIT
- Bank ATMs
- High quality hotel and motel accommodation
- Local Government and regional agencies
- Child Care Centre
- 18 hole championship golf course and club house
- Reception and Conference Centre
- Library
- Bike paths and access to the Plenty Gorge Park
- High quality housing
- Quality residential areas
- Schools and Kindergartens
- University amenities
- Broadband Digital Communications

(RMIT Janefield Website)

Synopsis of the Brief

The Janefield Site, located on the northern periphery of Melbourne and adjacent to RMIT’s Bundoora Campus, is the proposed home of a new technology park. An initiative of RMIT, the development envisaged for this site is for a joint industry/university venture. The costs associated with this development will be partially funded through industry, the university and the sale of surplus land for private residential development and recreational development (in this case a championship golf course).

The Campus is to comprise of 16 (in total) Industry Service Centres (ISC) with tenancies ranging from factory building types through to research laboratories. The aim for these facilities will be to act as learning and development spaces housing the industrial tenant and the university’s required teaching facilities. As such these centres will be loose fit buildings all ranging form 6,700 to 10,000m2 in area. Phase One of the master plan will include four ISC’s, one of which will be “…an anchor tenant signaling to the wider community close link between RMIT and industry.” (RMIT draft document for RMIT Technology Estate, pg. 33). The anchor tenant will be an Automotive Company.

Associated (and included within this area) with these ISC’s are university teaching spaces and industry offices.

The University will require a central administrative building and a central resource facility. The University will also oversee the development of student housing on the site.

Within this development is an allocation for Commercial development. Associated with this development will be a Hotel/Conference Centre, again its development to be overseen by the university.

The intent of this research project is to propose a strategic four-stage master plan. The master plan will aim to detail the development of not only the Campus itself but also locate the recreational and residential components of the brief.

Site and Brief

The Janefield site is located 18.5 kilometres northeast of central Melbourne, at the junction of Plenty Rd and the Northern Metropolitan Ring Road, opposite RMIT’s Bundoora campus. The site consists of approximately 110 hectares of undulating ridgetop grasslands, with pockets of woodland to the eastern and northern boundaries of the site. The site affords views to the Kinglake Ranges to the northeast, Macedon Ranges to the northwest and the Dandenong Ranges to the east. The ‘Melways’ reference for the site is Map 10, co-ordinates C8.

It is proposed that a new University be established in a joint development with business and industry. The New University’s clearly stated goals for the Janefield site are as follows:

“The goal for the Janefield site is to create and sustain a distinctive world class university at the forefront of technical and professional education and real world research, through continuous improvement and all staff committed to quality management processes.

As a world class university, it will be recognised as a leader in its teaching and learning processes, research activities, innovation and community services.”
**SITE ANALYSIS**

Section 1- Site Description

The Janefield site consists of mainly flat undulating land towards the western end of the site. This area is moderately elevated, affording quality long-distance and medium-distance views into the Plenty Gorge parklands network. At the eastern end of the site, the land slopes markedly down towards the northern boundary of the Plenty Gorge Parklands, with slopes between ten to fifteen percent.

Most vegetation occurs on Janefield’s northern and eastern boundaries abutting the Plenty Gorge Park. Small stands of Eucalyptus species exist within the major drainage lines feeding the Plenty River, and around the Janefield Training Centre, with small pockets of Red River Gum scattered throughout the site. Historic Peppercorn trees mark the original location of the former Brock Homestead. Some stands are considered to be of National, State or Regional significance.

The historical site of the former Brock Homestead contains the only remaining area of dense European vegetation on the site. Small stands of indigenous vegetation exist in the major drainage lines and around the Janefield Training Centre.

Access to the site is possible along Janefield Drive via Plenty Road. Janefield Drive leads past the former Brock Homestead, into the existing Janefield Training Centre complex. The Janefield Training Centre will shortly be relocated to Blossom Park at the northern end of the site, to form the new Plenty Residential Services Centre.

The site is bounded by Plenty Road to the west, Plenty Gorge Parklands to the north and east, and is in close proximity of the Metropolitan Ring Road to the south.

The former Parade College site on the southern boundary is currently being negotiated for purchase for inclusion into the existing Janefield Training Centre complex. The area falls under the Whittlesea Shire’s “Local Structure Plan”, “Janefield Precinct Overlay” and the area falls under the “Technology Precinct” overlay control.

The purposes of the “Technology Precinct” are:

- to designate areas appropriate to the establishment of technology intensive enterprises.
- to ensure that the use and development of these designated areas will not prejudice the options for the future establishment of new technology based enterprises.

Janefield also comes under the Whittlesea Shire’s “Local Structure Plan”, “Janefield Precinct Overlay”, and the area falls under the “Whittlesea Open Space Strategy”.

Section 2- Current Zoning Description

The Janefield site is currently under three different zoning precincts. The western sector is designated as “Janefield Urban Development Zone”, the southern area is “Urban Residential 1 Zone”, and the eastern sector is designated “Urban Development Zone - Public Existing.

The Janefield site is also affected by a “Technology Precinct” overlay control.

The purposes of the “Technology Precinct” are:

- to designate areas appropriate to the establishment of technology intensive enterprises.
- to ensure that the use and development of these designated areas will not prejudice the options for the future establishment of new technology based enterprises.

Janefield also comes under the Whittlesea Shire’s “Local Structure Plan”, “Janefield Precinct Overlay”, and the area falls under the “Whittlesea Open Space Strategy”.

Section 3- Slope

Most of the Janefield site does not present any problems for development, but some areas towards the northern boundary do have slopes graded between 10-15%. These areas mainly occur in the gullies feeding into the Plenty River. The major gully is more than 50% of the Janefield site, and the two shallower north-south gullies at the eastern end of the site are both relatively steep in some areas. Steep areas also occur in the southeastern corner of the site and in the northwest sector that exceed a 10% slope. Consideration would have to be made regarding this factor if any development was to occur within these areas.

Section 4- Visual Qualities

The high points at the western end of the Janefield site afford long-range, extensive views to the Kinglake Ranges to the northeast, Macedon Ranges to the northwest and the Dandenong Ranges to the east.

Some areas also give excellent medium-range views into the Plenty River Gorge.

The impact of any development on the aspect from Plenty Gorge Park towards the site has to be given consideration. Any development on the eastern sector of the site will be highly visible from throughout the Valley, although the existing Janefield Training Centre buildings will buffer any development to the west.

Section 5- Aboriginal History

Plenty River Gorge Parklands was home to the Wurundjeri people, who used the area as a source of water, food, tools, and shelter. Fifty Seven Aboriginal sites of significance have been found throughout the park, including artifacts and scar trees. The sites of significance in the park’s boundaries includes; old mines, quarries, river fords, and an RAAF Base, as well as Aboriginal sites.

The quarry, located outside the northern boundary of the Janefield site, is close to a number of historic and aboriginal archaeological sites.

A detailed archaeological evaluation has not been undertaken over the entire Janefield site. However, detailed work has been carried out within the Plenty Gorge Park, with an overview analysis of the Janefield site was carried out by Isabel Ellender, in December 1991. Ellender’s assessment has determined that most of the site has at least low/moderate archaeological sensitivity to surface/sub-surface artifact scatters. Additionally, the central-eastern portion of the site has moderate sensitivity to surface and sub-surface artifact scatters while the entire river vegetation corridor has moderate sensitivity to cultural scars on large, old trees.
Section 6- Buildings

The Janefield area was the site of an early settlement, the Coulstock flour mill and the Old Plenty Road crossing of the river, none of which have been precisely located or documented.

The Janefield site was first established as a tuberculosis recovery centre, and was later used as the Janefield Training Centre for the housing and training of physically and mentally handicapped people. Some of the buildings from these times still exist on the site, and eight have been given a heritage listing. These buildings have been identified by the Whittlesea Heritage Study and require a permit to demolish.

These are:

1 (HB5) - Janefield Special School - (brick school building)
2 (HB6) - Weatherboard Recreation Hall and adjacent weatherboard garage
3 (HB7) - Weatherboard Recreation Hall and Painters workshop
4 (HB8) - Brick Administration building
5 (HB9) - Brick Ward Building - (Building F2 - c1939)
6 (HB10) - Brick Ward Building - (Building F3 - c1951)
7 (HB11) - Brick Ward Building - (Building F4 - c1952)

BRIEF - Program

The following programs and their projected size are to be accommodated within the new University.

(a) Industry Services Centre
   Building area: 7800 sqm.
   Physical Description:
   Lecture/Seminar: 1200 sqm
   Office/Amenities: 1940 sqm
   Workshop: 6870 sqm

   Objectives: To achieve the provision of capital cost of Industry Services Centre through partnership with private enterprise. Operating cost to be balanced by income from educational activities. Provision of a facility that enables interaction between the University and Industry, allowing industry access to the University's research capabilities and educational and training programs.

(b) Automotive Design Facility
   Building Area: 10000 sqm.
   Physical Description:
   Office/Amenities: 750 sqm
   Office/Level 1: 750 sqm
   Workshop: 8500 sqm
   Carpark Area: 4200 sqm

   Objectives: Visual prominence as anchor tenant signalling to wider community close link between the University and industry. Technologies developed by the University and partners. Close association between Industry and the University; research partnerships, etc

(c) Residential College Model
   Students: 640 students
   Land area (envelope): 10080 sqm.
   Physical Description:
   Block area x2: 667 sqm
   Residential Area: 10672 sqm
   Carpark Area: 5760 sqm
   Landscape: 6013 sqm

   Objectives: Provision of quality student housing at no additional cost to the University. Provision of urban environment conducive to learning recreation etc. Accommodation for an increasing proportion of international students. Provision of housing necessary for core business.

(d) Site Infrastructure
   Completion: December 1998
   Site Area: 611,000 sqm.
   Physical Description:
   Direct site works
   Road Access
   Establishment of drainage catchments
   Sewer Outfall
   Water supply
   Telecommunications

   Objectives: Necessary for the provision of both core and ancillary business. Provision of infrastructure necessary for recreational facility provision.
(e) Residential Allotments

Completion: Stage One by December 1998

Site Area: 611,000 sqm.

Physical Description:
105 Allotments - stage one

University objectives: Necessary for the provision of both core and ancillary business.

(f) Commercial Operation

Completion: According to market demand provision of initial retail in short term (Mid 1999.)

Building Area: 2,950 sqm

Physical Description:
Retail development

University objectives: Necessary for the provision of both core and ancillary business.

(g) Office Space - Commercial

Building Area: 2688 sqm

Physical Description:
Office/Amenities

Lineal development type
Flexible to tenants requirements.

Objectives: Flexible building type, responds to market demand University requirements, modulates to terrain. Preserves visual integrity of design. Particularly suitable for business incubation demand.

(h) Community Buildings

Building Area: to be negotiate with City of Whittlesea

Physical Description:
Community Services complex
Childcare
Health centre
Sports medicine.

University objectives: "Partnerships with the community" - to develop activities and services for the benefit of the University community and for the diverse communities of the region." Emphasize University/Community interface.

(i) University Core Office Facility and R&D Headquarters

Building Area: 4800 sqm

Physical Description:
Office/Research and Development Offices and associated facilities
Amenities
Lineal development type
Flexible to tenants requirements.

Objectives: Allocation of premises for the provision of core business. Flexible building type, according to teaching, training requirements. Quality working environment. Provision of Environmentally responsive facilities.

(j) Exhibition and Convention Business Centre

Building Area: 4,000 sqm.

Physical Description:
Office/Amenities
Lineal development type
Flexible to tenants requirements.

Objectives: Provide a 'showcase' to lift the profile of the University and Business.

(k) Recreational Facilities

Completion: Mid 1999

Site Area: 60 hectares.

Physical Description:
A variety of leisure facilities, sporting fields, and associated pavilions, clubhouses and hotels. Incorporate surrounding and existing vegetation.

Objectives: Essential to attract tenants of commercial and industrial properties; and to residential properties. Significant benefits to employees and students. Recreational resource to the University and the local community. Facilitate interaction between all parties in and around the development.