

Rubric Detail

Select [Grid View](#) or [List View](#) to change the rubric's layout. [More Help](#)

Name: **2024-A03**

Exit

Grid View

List View

	1. Low fail	2. Fail	3. Marginal fail	4. Pass	5. Credit	6. Distinction
Research and creative imagination	0 (0.00%) - 1.2 (2.40%) Research and creative imagination are absent: Little or no evidence of inquiry, analysis and creativity.	1.25 (2.50%) - 2.2 (4.40%) Research and creative imagination are minimal: Limited evidence of inquiry, analysis and creativity. Opportunities for the project are not identified, or are severely limited by constraints.	2.45 (4.90%) <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed gray;"/> 2.25 (4.50%) - 2.45 (4.90%) Research and creative imagination are developing: Some evidence of inquiry,	2.5 (5.00%) - 3.2 (6.40%) Research and creative imagination are functional: Demonstrated evidence of inquiry, analysis and creativity. Some new opportunities for the project are identified, albeit partially limited by	3.25 (6.50%) - 3.7 (7.40%) Research and creative imagination are proficient: Demonstrated evidence of inquiry, analysis and creativity. New opportunities for the project are identified	3.75 (7.50%) - 4.2 (8.40%) Research and creative imagination are advanced: Demonstrated evidence of advanced inquiry, analysis and creativity. New opportunities for the project

			analysis and creativity. Few opportunities for the project are identified, and are limited by constraints.	constraints.	that largely overcome constraints.	are identified that overcome constraints.
Form and spatial design	0 (0.00%) - 2.4 (4.80%) Creative 3D design ability is absent: Little or no evidence of spatial design skill.	2.5 (5.00%) - 4.4 (8.80%) Creative 3D design ability is minimal: Limited evidence of spatial design skill, with a problematic plan and uninteresting forms.	4.5 (9.00%) - 4.9 (9.80%) Creative 3D design ability is developing: Some evidence of spatial design skill, but with some problem areas in the spatial resolution.	6 (12.00%) ----- 5 (10.00%) - 6.4 (12.80%) Creative 3D design ability is functional: Demonstrated evidence of spatial design skill, albeit to a limited level.	6.5 (13.00%) - 7.4 (14.80%) Creative 3D design ability is proficient: Demonstrated evidence of spatial design skill at a competent level.	7.5 (15.00%) - 8.4 (16.80%) Creative 3D design ability advanced: Demonstrated evidence of advanced spatial design skill delivering a functional plan and pleasing 3D form.
Site analysis and site planning	0 (0.00%) - 1.2 (2.40%) Site analysis, site planning ability and	1.25 (2.50%) - 2.2 (4.40%) Site analysis, site planning ability and code	2.25 (4.50%) - 2.45 (4.90%) Site analysis, site planning ability and code	3.1 (6.20%) ----- 2.5 (5.00%) - 3.2 (6.40%)	3.25 (6.50%) - 3.7 (7.40%) Site analysis, site planning ability and	3.75 (7.50%) - 4.2 (8.40%) Site analysis, site planning ability and

	code compliance are absent: Little or no evidence of site analysis and site planning skills and code compliance.	compliance are minimal: Limited evidence of site analysis and site planning skills and code compliance.	compliance are developing: Some evidence of site analysis and site planning skills and code compliance, but with some problem areas.	Site analysis, site planning ability and code compliance are functional: Demonstrated evidence of site analysis and site planning skills and code compliance, albeit to a limited level.	code compliance are proficient: Demonstrated evidence of proficient site analysis and site planning skills and code compliance at a competent level.	code compliance are advanced: Demonstrated evidence of advanced site analysis and site planning skills and code compliance delivering an efficient and compliant site layout.
Application of building and environmental sciences	0 (0.00%) - 2.4 (4.80%) Resolution of construction and environmental systems is absent: Little or no evidence of design resolution and synthesis of systems. Absence of constructible	3.5 (7.00%) ----- 2.5 (5.00%) - 4.4 (8.80%) Resolution of construction and environmental systems is minimal: Limited evidence of design resolution and synthesis of	4.5 (9.00%) - 4.9 (9.80%) Resolution of construction and environmental systems is developing: Some evidence of design resolution and synthesis of systems. Systems and construction details lack coherence and/or are confused. Detailed design is	5 (10.00%) - 6.4 (12.80%) Resolution of construction and environmental systems is functional: Demonstrated evidence design resolution and synthesis of systems. Systems and construction details are logical and substantially resolved. Detailed	6.5 (13.00%) - 7.4 (14.80%) Resolution of construction and environmental systems is proficient: Demonstrated evidence of proficient design resolution and synthesis of systems. Systems and	7.5 (15.00%) - 8.4 (16.80%) Resolution of construction and environmental systems is advanced: Demonstrated evidence of advanced design resolution and synthesis of systems. Systems and

	detail.	systems. Insufficient constructible detail.	crude.	design is basic.	construction details are resolved but lack refinement. Detailed design lacks technical clarity.	construction details are refined, and clearly relate broader design strategies. Detailed design lacks high-level technical understanding.
Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values	0 (0.00%) - 1.2 (2.40%) Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values is absent: Little or no evidence of heritage and socio-cultural analysis and application.	1.25 (2.50%) - 2.2 (4.40%) Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values is minimal: Limited evidence of heritage and socio-cultural analysis and application.	2.35 (4.70%) ----- 2.25 (4.50%) - 2.45 (4.90%) Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values is developing: Some evidence of heritage and socio-cultural analysis and	2.5 (5.00%) - 3.2 (6.40%) Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values is functional: Demonstrated evidence of heritage and socio-cultural analysis and application, albeit to a limited level.	3.25 (6.50%) - 3.7 (7.40%) Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values is proficient: Demonstrated evidence of proficient heritage and socio-cultural analysis and application at a competent level.	3.75 (7.50%) - 4.2 (8.40%) Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values is advanced: Demonstrated evidence of advanced heritage and socio-cultural analysis and application delivering a meaningful outcome.

			application, but with some problem areas.			
First Nations voices and Country	<p>0 (0.00%) - 1.2 (2.40%)</p> <p>Incorporation of First Nations voices and Country is absent: Little or no evidence of First Nations analysis and application.</p>	<p>1.25 (2.50%) - 2.2 (4.40%)</p> <p>Incorporation of First Nations voices and Country is minimal: Limited evidence of First Nations analysis and application.</p>	<p>2.25 (4.50%) - 2.45 (4.90%)</p> <p>Incorporation of First Nations voices and Country is developing: Some evidence of First Nations analysis and application, but with problem areas.</p>	<p>2.5 (5.00%)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>2.5 (5.00%) - 3.2 (6.40%)</p> <p>Incorporation of First Nations voices and Country is functional: Demonstrated evidence of First Nations analysis and application, albeit to a limited level.</p>	<p>3.25 (6.50%) - 3.7 (7.40%)</p> <p>Incorporation of First Nations voices and Country is proficient: Demonstrated evidence of proficient First Nations analysis and application at a competent level.</p>	<p>3.75 (7.50%) - 4.2 (8.40%)</p> <p>Incorporation of First Nations voices and Country is advanced: Demonstrated evidence of advanced First Nations analysis and application delivering a meaningful outcome.</p>
Presentation	<p>0 (0.00%) - 2.4 (4.80%)</p> <p>The presentation is absent: Little or no</p>	<p>2.5 (5.00%) - 4.4 (8.80%)</p> <p>The presentation is minimal: Limited evidence of work. Presentation is</p>	<p>4.9 (9.80%)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>4.5 (9.00%) - 4.9 (9.80%)</p> <p>The</p>	<p>5 (10.00%) - 6.4 (12.80%)</p> <p>The presentation is functional: Presentation is generally cohesive</p>	<p>6.5 (13.00%) - 7.4 (14.80%)</p> <p>The presentation is proficient: Presentation is</p>	<p>7.5 (15.00%) - 8.4 (16.80%)</p> <p>The presentation is advanced: Presentation</p>

<p>evidence of work. Presentation is substantially incomplete and incoherent.</p>	<p>incomplete and/or incoherent.</p>	<p>presentation is developing: Presentation is partly complete. Documents do not adhere to drawing conventions, and/or are lacking coherence and curation.</p>	<p>and complete. Documents adhere to drawing conventions, but the adopts graphics that are neutral and/or impede the communication of ideas.</p>	<p>curated, cohesive and complete. Documents adhere to drawing conventions, though some communication techniques impede legibility.</p>	<p>well curated, cohesive and complete. Documents are unambiguous. The presentation contributes to the communication of ideas, but may lack graphic refinement.</p>
---	--------------------------------------	--	--	---	---

The rubric total value of 24.80 has been overridden with a value of 25.00 out of 50.

Feedback to Learner

ARCH 7043: Architectural Practice: Design Assignment 3.
Student. Li Ruge

Research and Creative Imagination.

There is some evidence of basic research being demonstrated in the design proposition however more extensive reference to both local and international exemplar works would have been beneficial to enhance the design outcome. The resultant design lacks distinction and represents an extrusion of a plan form rather than a considered architectural composition. The buildings are capped and lack any roof edge distinction. The buildings are large and require differentiation to enable individualisation to enable residents to feel a sense of address and belonging. Variation in the use of materials, colour, texture and detailing would provide opportunity to improve distinctiveness and differentiation. Research into ESD strategies would have informed the proposition to reduce the carbon footprint during construction and

future operation and contribute to an improved ESD outcome.

Form and Spatial Design.

The buildings have been arranged into two parallel buildings with both single and double loaded layouts. The southern building is a large floor plate and probably would have benefitted being broken in two to reduce the mass and access travel distances. Rather than mixing apartment throughout the floor plate apartments have been clustered in types across all levels. This is less successful as it congregates similar residents rather than integrating different types, i.e. families, couples, singles.

The unit layouts are adequate however in some there are planning issues including wasted floor space (see square two bedroom floor plan)

The buildings are generally capped with a flat roof and little edge overhang. No window shading has been provided to protect the windows and to provide building modelling. There is a general feeling of unresolved elements and incomplete consideration.

Site Analysis and Site Planning.

Site analysis has been undertaken however the design generators and strategies resulting from these observations have not been developed. A number of strategy diagrams would be beneficial to inform the site response. The required level of site analysis is lacking and as a result the ground level arrangement lacks a clear rationale and does not deliver a clear and cohesive resolution. The ground plane lacks resolution and it is not clear what the distinction is between public, private, garden and access spaces. Uses have been arranged in a disparate fashion with unclear connection for access and servicing. The whole of this level has been given over to retail and commercial use and would have benefitted from residential units at ground level to activate the level, provide surveillance and to accommodate low ambulant residents. The basement plan adopts a functional grid but the layout does not provide a circulation route rather dead end aisles that do require turnaround capacity which is not provided. Aisle widths and carpark spaces should be dimensioned for compliance. Escape stairs from above cannot descend into the basement without separation.

It does not appear that the escape stairs are compliant for the buildings. Escape distances and fire isolation are required to meet the requirements of the BCA. There is a confusion between fire isolated stairs and open stairs.

There is only one lift servicing each building which would not be adequate to service the apartments when one lift is not operating due to maintenance.

Services spaces are inappropriately located, i.e. fire pump room.

Application of Building and Environmental Services.

The submission is seriously deficient on technical resolution including both construction and environmental systems. The 1:50 section is diagrammatic only and does not adequately indicate the appropriate level of detail. Dimensions are required for ceiling and window head heights. The roof edge and balcony detail are not adequate nor accurate. Basic construction requirements such as set downs between indoor and outdoor spaces are not indicated. Materials are not described in all instances nor system such as a ceiling suspension/fixing system.

The ESD systems are diagrammatic but lack real clarity. Passive ESD systems are not described such as cross ventilation, solar shading etc.

Application of Heritage, Socio Cultural and Community Values.

There is little evidence of the student understanding or responding to the adjacent uses of the Avalon Theatre, Guyatt park, the neighbouring retail area, adjoining apartment buildings, traffic, active transport, the Brisbane River and future bridge or the current buildings on site and the surrounding area. By expanding the scope of vision beyond the site there is additional value applied to the project and its influence within its context.

As with all projects it is necessary to think beyond the boundaries of the site. How can the context influence the design and how does the design proposition provide value to the surrounding framework.

First Nations Voices and Designing on Country.

Roof space needs better solar protection, nice idea but needed more thought. Basic understanding of principles at best. Spaces are not connected to Country and seem placed. Design does not develop connected green spaces for wildlife and offers some basic connection to Country spaces.

Presentation.

The presentation presents the design proposition however lacks clarity and resolution in some key areas. It is an inconsistent package in some areas. The site plan on the second page is very difficult to read and expresses no information of value. Line weights in some areas are unsuitable for their use, i.e. site setback. Outline of buildings over to basement level required as well as buildings over ground level. Grid lines would be valuable at upper levels to enable positioning. The colour selections adopted for various drawings is distracting and unnecessary, i.e. apartment wall colours.

Elevations lack notation to indicate materials, Abbreviations and schedule could have been used. Sections are incomplete.

Additional note: This is a low attendance student (59%) who would have benefited from more guidance, feedback and from in-class announcements.

Name: **2024-A03**

Exit