

**Submission
No 137**

**INQUIRY INTO GOVERNMENT'S MANAGEMENT OF THE
POWERHOUSE MUSEUM AND OTHER MUSEUMS AND
CULTURAL PROJECTS IN NEW SOUTH WALES**

Name: Ms Kylie Winkworth

Date Received: 20 May 2020

Submission to the Select Committee on the Government's Management of the Powerhouse Museum and other Museums and Cultural Projects in NSW

Kylie Winkworth, museum and heritage expert: see, biographical note at the end of this paper

Thank you for opportunity to contribute to this inquiry. The following notes are addressed to Terms of Reference 1 (a) the proposed move of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, the Powerhouse Museum, from Ultimo to Parramatta, including:

- (i) the core visions behind the move,
- (ii) the governance of the project, including the effectiveness and adequacy of planning, business cases, design briefs, project management, public reporting, consultant selection and costs, project costing and cultural and demographic justifications
- (iii) the risks in the move, including damage to collections, cost overruns and the future cost of operations at Parramatta

1 Introduction

When the Hon Robert Borsak asked the CEO of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences (MAAS) at the March budget estimates how people would get into the Parramatta museum the response was that 'it is part of the design process, an important part of the design process because what we are looking at achieving is having at least two million visitors a year'.¹

It is notable that the visitor estimates for the Parramatta facility have now soared to 2 million year, based on no available evidence. While the back and forth in the committee hearing was sometimes at cross purposes, what was not revealed is that the Stage 2 Design Brief for the Parramatta facility specifies that there **should be no front door**. . . . *It should be porous at the edges, with no front door. There should be multiple entry points, multiple approaches and multiple places to stop.*²

This project is unique in the history of museum design in having no front door and multiple points of porous entry across two buildings. The security, management and cost implications of this stated design requirement do not appear to have been considered by MAAS, or the people who wrote the brief, particularly the security implications for loans and international exhibitions. Nor would the increased costs of staffing and security have been factored into the business case BCR calculations.

When the MAAS CEO was asked about where the No 1 Locomotive would go in the Parramatta facility she said *We are working through that as part of the next stage of the design process now that the winning architectural team has been selected and we are also beginning the process with the curatorial team to develop the opening exhibitions for the new museum*³

I have been advised that to date the curatorial staff at MAAS have **not been asked** to do any work on the exhibition concepts for the Parramatta facility.⁴ The concept designs in the Request for SEARS and the architectural plans that were briefly released with the EIS on 13 May 2020, suggest that there is nowhere to put the PHM's large objects that will not be exposed to a Probable Maximum Flood on the ground floor, or be exposed to uncontrolled spikes in in temperature and humidity.⁵ The Stage 2 Design Brief reveals that the two spaces intended for large objects will not have museum standard climate controls.⁶ Because of the riverside location

and priority given to opening the building to the river for big events and concerts, these spaces may have uncontrolled spikes in humidity and temperature.⁷

The Powerhouse Museum's (PHM) renowned collections received scant attention in the Stage 2 Design Brief. While there is a section on the collection in the brief, the collection appears to have no relevance to the type of facility that is planned. There is only one reference in the brief to the display of any particular object. That is the suggestion that the PHM's 1785 Boulton & Watt rotative beam engine could be displayed in a circulation space.⁸ The Boulton and Watt is 10.25m high. The design brief reveals the circulation spaces above the ground floor will be 10m high.⁹ The circulation spaces will not have international museum standard environmental controls.¹⁰ Circulation spaces are rated A, with a wider range of temperature and humidity fluctuations. This is not desirable for museum objects. If it is built to spec, it will represent a substantial downgrading the environmental conditions for the collections. The brief notes that it is accepted that the temperature and humidity in these spaces may be uncontrolled above 4m.¹¹

The Boulton & Watt is the foundation object for the industrial revolution. One of just three surviving Boulton & Watt beam engines, the PHM's is the oldest and the only one operating under live steam – until recently. The engine is so significant it has been likened to the Mona Lisa of the industrial revolution. To my knowledge it is the only object in any Australian museum collection which is not able to be valued. The accounting note in the last MAAS annual report says, p.30

g) (iii) Assets not able to be reliably measured

The Museum holds a certain asset that has not been recognised in the Statement of Financial Position because the Museum is unable to measure reliably the value for that asset and that asset is likely to be material. This asset is the 1785 Boulton and Watt steam engine. The steam engine is one of the earliest rotative (wheel turning) steam engines to be built and is the oldest in existence. The engine is also one of the few in the world to work regularly under steam. The Boulton and Watt was excluded from the last valuation of the Museum's Collection on the basis that its value was deemed by the independent valuers to be unable to be reliably measured due to its unique nature.¹²

In other words the Boulton & Watt is priceless. But destined to be marooned in a circulation space.



After five and half years of planning the controversial Parramatta ‘New Powerhouse’, it seems the best idea that MAAS and the project consultants have for this priceless object and its profound meanings is to put it in a circulation space like a piece of redundant industrial sculpture, devoid of context and thematic relationships with other transformative steam technology, including the No 1 loco, which is how we see them in the real Powerhouse Museum. It contrast, the collection planning for the real Powerhouse Museum was an integral part of the architectural concept and design thinking from the very beginning of the design process in 1980. The whole investment case for the Powerhouse Museum in Ultimo was based on providing appropriate and conceptually resonant spaces for the display of the museum’s large transport and engineering objects. It’s especially poignant that it is these collections that will be evicted from the real Powerhouse. They will not be displayed at Parramatta, and the NSW Government has not even budgeted for their storage, see 2.12 and 4.3 below.

The following analysis and comments are drawn from the business case papers, the open competition brief, the Stage 2 Design Brief, the Request for SEARs and the plans in the briefly released EIS. It is recognised that some of these issues may be resolved in future stages of the design work. However many of the access and functionality issues arising from the site selection of a constrained flood prone river bank, and the winning competition design, will be intractable and expensive when it comes to running a museum, and will entail high recurrent and staffing costs. It is doubtful these costs have been factored into the latest iteration of the business case, unless it has been redone since the announcement of the competition winner. There is a Stage 3 design brief which has not been released.

2 Key Points and Highlights

2.1 The Parramatta facility is not a museum. It is a multi-purpose 24 hour event facility for performing arts, concerts, conferences, cafes, kitchen, accommodation, trade fairs, farmers’ markets and commercial spaces, and some exhibitions. The Stage 2 Design Brief reveals that the PHM’s collection is redundant to the kind of facility planned for this site, and to the radical practice or new found museology that is outlined in the design brief.¹³

2.2 The 21st century science and innovation museum proposed in the Extended Final Business Case has disappeared. The core vision has radically changed. Between the Open Competition Brief and the Stage 2 Design Brief there has been a considerable shift in thinking about the purpose and function of the building and what kind of cultural facility it will be. What was billed as 21st century museum focussed on science and innovation has morphed into a cultural industries facility and a 24 hour entertainment precinct that is more like Carriageworks West than a science museum or a museum in any way resembling the real Powerhouse. In the two years since the NSW Government announced its new international science museum at Parramatta it has not resourced the appointment of any scientists to the MAAS staff or the project.

2.3 There is a remarkable emphasis on events and food programming. All the exhibition spaces are required to function as performance and event venues.¹⁴ While the latest business case for the development, and the stage 3 design brief have not been released, it is clear that the new operation will have a huge focus on generating revenue through the commercial hire of museum spaces, events, performances, conferences, cafes, markets, and accommodation. This will necessarily involve a complete re-think of the museum's staffing establishment given the project was based on there being no increase in staff or recurrent funding, see 6 below.

2.4 The new concept for Parramatta is less a science museum and more of a multi arts, event and commercial facility. There will be multiple concurrent events in the facility attracting up to 10,000 people,¹⁵ aiming for two million visitors a year. To deliver this level of activity it is inevitable that MAAS will replace curators and conservators with event managers. This is foreshadowed in the workforce planning documents in the business case papers.¹⁶ The Stage 2 Design Brief suggests that it will be artists that work with the collection, not curators.

2.5 A word search of 'curate' in the Stage 2 Design Brief suggests the only curatorial activity in the building will be food programs and public art, not collections or exhibitions. For example:

The Powerhouse will actively generate income through establishing an integrated commercial program that includes multiple food and beverage retail offerings, a **curated** annual food events program, major events program, product development and commercial programs that are delivered across the Precinct.¹⁷ And... the communal kitchen will be integrated into the **curated food program** that will include chef masterclasses, producers, events, demonstrations, secondary-school programs and the celebration of culturally specific community days.¹⁸

2.6 The unexplained selection of this constrained and flood prone site for a museum has given no weight or consideration to the risks to the collection and the museum's infrastructure from the regular floods. Nor have the significant risks to the public during flood events been considered in any of the expert business case flood reports. See my separate submission and expert report on the flood risks. It is ironic that Infrastructure NSW, now managing the Parramatta development, first suggested that the Powerhouse should move to Parramatta because it was on a constrained and relatively remote site at Ultimo, only to endorse its move to what is an absurdly constrained and far less accessible site.¹⁹

2.7 There is not one person at any level of decision making in the Parramatta project who has museum planning experience or expertise in collections. The competition jury did not include a recognised museum or collection expert; it was dominated by architects for the purposes of

choosing a trophy building. That may be why the winning competition design has vast walls of north facing glass. Museum and collection needs have come last in the Stage 2 Design Brief and the winning competition design. There will be costly consequences when the building is operational. Much has been made of the fact that this project is the biggest cultural infrastructure investment since the Sydney Opera House. But the government is proceeding on the basis that this investment requires no museum expertise in its decision making structure. Either this is equivalent of designing a hospital with no advice from medical experts, or there is no intention of creating an actual museum.

2.8 It is notable that in seven new appointments to the MAAS Trust in the last eighteen months, the former Arts Minister did not do a skills audit, or if he did, he did not consider that the MAAS Trust should be bolstered with an eminent museum planning or collection expert.

2.9 The Stage 2 Design Brief reveals that the Parramatta facility will have only 25% of the Powerhouse Museum's international museum standard exhibition spaces. See analysis at 5 below.

2.10 The design brief for the Powerhouse Precinct Parramatta proposes a radical concept that bears no relationship to any recognised science museum, museum practice or proven ways of working with a significant historic collection. The nearest comparable facility is the arts and commercial centre The Shed at Hudson Yards in New York.²⁰ This is not a museum or a collecting organisation. See discussion in 3 below.

2.11 MAAS staff have been told that the PHM's large object conservation workshop and exhibition preparation workshop in the Harwood building will not be replicated at Castle Hill as promised. These have now been deleted as the project has run into development and cost constraints. It is shocking that the Powerhouse Museum's world's best practice collection facilities are being demolished and not replaced like-for-like, one of the few demands of the MAAS Trust.²¹ In fact the Powerhouse Museum is being significantly downsized, and its collection facilities and conservation capacity cut. This is the only museum development project anywhere in the world where the new museum will be smaller, less accessible and have grossly inferior facilities to what the museum already owns, for a cost of at least \$1.5b.

2.12 The Extended Final Business Case did not include funding for the movement and storage of the PHM's large objects.²² These will not be stored at Castle Hill due to space and access constraints. MAAS staff have been tasked with asking volunteer museums and heritage organisations to take some of the museum's large objects. See 4.3 below.

2.12 Copies of minutes of the MAAS Trust meetings obtained via a GIPA reveal that the Stage 2 Design Brief was not discussed or formally endorsed by the Trust. The brief was circulated between the May and July 2019 meetings for comment and endorsement. Nor was the Open Competition Brief reviewed or mentioned in MAAS Trust meetings, at a time when former director Dolla Merrillees had resigned and a new CEO had not been appointed. It is clear that MAAS is not the client in its own development project and has had little say in the scheme since it was unilaterally announced by former Premier Mike Baird in November 2014. The client for the Powerhouse Precinct at Parramatta is Infrastructure NSW; it is their idea.

3 Museum Concept, Practice and Museology

3.1 The concept for the Parramatta development has undergone a radical shift since the Final Business Case and Extended Final Business Case. What was billed as 21st century museum focussed on science and innovation has morphed into a cultural industries facility and a 24 hour entertainment precinct that is more like Carriageworks West than an actual museum, see note 13 and 6 below.

3.2 The exhibition spaces in the Parramatta building are all badged as Presentation Spaces and are to operate for performances, events and commercial hire. This is a notable and unexplained change from the open competition Search Statement Brief. The Stage 2 Design Brief has 155 mentions of events and performances, but only 40 references to exhibitions and 16 references to schools. There are 117 references to arts, artists and artistic, but only 23 references to science. There are only eight references to educational, but 35 references to commercial issues. There are just three references to children and families, suggesting families are not part of the core audience for what is planned as a 24x7 event and entertainment facility, supporting the night time economy of Parramatta. There is not one mention of interactives which are an essential component in any science-based museum.

3.3 The Stage 2 Design Brief posits what it calls a radical return to the pre-museum idea of the international exhibitions, which were essentially commercial trade fairs of manufacturing and materials.

A Radical return: The Powerhouse emerged from a history of 19th Century grand exhibition halls, including the Grand Palais and the Garden Palace. The Powerhouse Precinct will radically return to its origins through the creation of large-scale flexible exhibition spaces that support high visitor numbers, engage communities with new technologies and provide opportunities for collaboration and exchange. Flexible exhibition spaces will ensure a significant increase of access to the Collection through the delivery of a changing, dynamic exhibition program.²³

This shows no understanding of the difference between the trade fair international exhibitions and the museum-making movement that followed with the development of the Victoria and Albert Museum, London's Science Museum and MAAS, among others. In founding these museums, leading designers and thinkers across continents recognised that designers and manufacturers needed museums with a specific brief for collecting, curating and exhibiting the best of the applied arts and sciences, as a way to raise the standard of design, manufacturing and innovation, and foster the sciences and technical education. That is why MAAS was based in Ultimo in the centre of Sydney's industry, trade and design precinct. It is nonsense to propose taking a 137 year old museum and its heritage collection back to the days of an 1878 trade fair.

3.4 The Stage 2 Design Brief posits a new way of operation that no museum in the world practices, where objects and exhibitions are on high rotation cycling in and out of the building. The brief declares:

The Powerhouse Precinct will not operate as per the existing Powerhouse Museum with fixed exhibitions and a touring gallery, with the focus on providing a series of robust functional spaces.²⁴

Responsive: The Powerhouse will retain its contemporary relevance through the delivery of a dynamic program where nothing is permanent. This will future-proof the institution and give it the ability to constantly evolve and expand its programs in response to the needs of Sydney's growing communities. This is a significant development from how the Powerhouse currently delivers programs, wherein the majority of exhibitions have life spans of ten to 30 years.²⁵ The new Powerhouse program will drive visitation, leverage investment and support ongoing collaborations with industry and community. A constantly changing program will increase access to the Powerhouse Collection. Exhibition spaces will support the movement of large-scale objects and high-volume exhibition production.²⁶

3.5 This is a naïve fantasy. No museum anywhere in the world operates like this because collections need curating and interpretation, object based exhibitions need detailed design planning and fabrication, education staff need time to align the content with curriculum based education programs, and marketing staff need time and budgets to prepare advertising and media. If this mode of operation is implemented it will need many more staff, including curators, registrars, conservators, technical support and logistical resources. Museums across the world are full of clever innovative people exploring the edges of museum practice. If this constantly changing program was a viable mode of operation, instead of a fantasy, there would be international exemplars. The inexperienced team in charge of this project do not appreciate that it is major exhibitions that drive museum visitation, not changeovers of showcases or objects.

3.6 Science museums in particular use interactives and experimental exhibits to engage students. These require a high level of planning, investment and management. They cannot possibly be developed and cycled through the building on high rotation. The planned 40 apartments for artists and scientists are not going to attract visitors and are no replacement for the detailed planning, research, design and investment required for exhibitions that will attract and engage visitors.

3.7 More seriously, MAAS and its consultants seem unaware of the huge risks and expensive logistics in moving large objects anywhere, let alone on high rotation into a building in the Parramatta CBD that has very constrained access. The architecture and design of the building does not facilitate the movement of large objects.²⁷ It is not clear how any of the PHM's large objects can be moved into the Parramatta building, either in spaces P1 or P2. The large object access to P1 from busy Wilde Ave appears to be obstructed by a mezzanine for main power distribution. The plans and views in the EIS do not show the hoist and opening for access to P2 on Phillip St. The back of house space for P2 is hardly bigger than the stair well.

3.8 High volume exhibition production and rotation cannot possibly be sustained in a building where the back of house facilities are far too small, there is no parking, no storage, the collection is at Castle Hill or somewhere else, there is only one shared loading dock, and the museum will not have any exhibition preparation and fabrication facilities, even at Castle Hill. If the model of a high turnover exhibition space with multiple rapid object changeovers was viable, then the current management at MAAS could be proving this model at Ultimo, where the PHM's exhibition spaces are co-located with the collection store, and where there is a well-equipped exhibition fabrication workshop on site.²⁸

3.9 The Stage 2 design brief includes 40 apartments for visiting scientists and artists. No museum in the world has 40 apartments. It is possible they will be sold when the business model collapses. It is not clear what the public and cultural outcome is from this investment. The design brief seems to suggest that the Parramatta facility will become a kind of think tank, not for families or students but for artists and scientists.

Concept-driven: The Powerhouse will deliver a concept-driven changing program that engages communities with its Collection and with artists, researchers and scientists to examine contemporary ideas and issues. The program will reflect the connectivity of everyday life. It will move culture forward by championing intersections and in-betweenness as the place where new ideas are formed. The Powerhouse will be an active industry participant through commissioning large-scale new works and supporting and investing in research and ideas.²⁹

The museum will, through interdisciplinary innovation, engage with the problems and challenges facing our city, our State and our world. Bringing together diverse teams to undertake research, **the museum will be an active leader in research and innovation. It might tackle a problem such as ‘How could the Medical Emergency room be reinvented for the future?’, applying the museum’s cross-disciplinary research, collections and array of partners to the problem,** with the findings shared with industry for further modelling and research.³⁰

This is a woke fantasy. MAAS has not appointed a senior science curator in decades. Most of the recent senior appointments to MAAS have backgrounds in contemporary art not science. The PHM’s research capacity and publication output has collapsed over the last decade, following redundancies and lost expertise. In the midst of the Covid-19 pandemic, MAAS as the self-proclaimed contemporary museum, is the only major collecting organisation in the country that is not actively collecting and working with the community to record the Covid crisis and its impacts.

3.10 In the Powerhouse Precinct model, the whole premise of the PHM’s museology of well-designed and researched exhibitions framed around a storyline or narrative will be jettisoned for an unproven fantasy concept.

Flexible: The Powerhouse Precinct is planned to deliver a dynamic, changing program that constantly shifts in scale to accommodate multiple daily activities and large-scale events that will be delivered across the whole Precinct. The Powerhouse will maintain its relevance and connectivity to its communities through having the capacity to be able to respond to change. Nothing will be permanently one thing. Each of the Presentation Spaces will have degrees of capacity for multiple uses including exhibitions, commercial events, live performance, education, conferences and cinema. This flexibility will support the Powerhouse’s entrepreneurial approach to commercial activity through integrating commercial programs across the Precinct.³¹

3.11 The Powerhouse Precinct at Parramatta is not a museum move but a destructive rupture. It will be the end of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences as we know it. A great public museum, endowed, owned and built by the people of NSW, will be shrunk to the status of a regional entertainment facility. What will be lost in this naïve experiment is 137 years of museum culture, collecting and exhibition practice. The PHM was the first major museum in Australia to

be popular, entertaining and educational. Its distinctive museology has had a profound influence on museums in Australia. But this project proposes turning the museum clock back to 1878. The Parramatta scheme is so far from the mission and purpose of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences that the business case flagged that the MAAS Act may need to be amended to effect the project aims.³²

4 Museum Planning, Functional Analysis and Collection Facilities

4.1 The NSW Government and its advisers have ignored the basic principles of museum planning. They have failed to address elementary questions about who the museum is for, or why it is needed. The fake consultations held in 2017 and in April 2020 have not been about listening, but ticking a process box. Nothing that experts or the community have said over the last five and half years has had any impact on the shape of the project. At every stage the scheme has been approached as an infrastructure delivery project, not a museum development.³³ In my more than 30 years as a museum planner I have never seen a museum project with so little genuine community passion. Indeed there is sustained opposition to the project in Parramatta. It is staggering that the largest cultural infrastructure investment since the Sydney Opera House is being imposed on a community that plainly wants a different museum in another location, and does not want to see any more of Parramatta's heritage demolished.

4.2 In the design brief and architectural plans the needs of the museum and its collection have run last against all the other facilities and commercial spaces. There are no designated storage, conservation or exhibition preparation spaces in the plans. There are no designated collection working spaces. The back of house space is hopelessly inadequate for museum purposes. For some reason all detailed specifications for the functional back of house spaces disappeared from the Stage 2 design brief.³⁴ The back of house is entirely inadequate for the operation of any kind of museum, let alone a facility that wants to have a high rotation of collection objects and exhibitions, as well a multiple events at any one time.³⁵ A note on the Ancillary Spaces says: *Provide a flexible space adjacent to each Presentation Space that could be used for catering, dressing room, technical preparation space or collection management space.*³⁶ It is shocking that this is in the brief for a major museum project. Such an arrangement will be impractical; it will be a security and collection risk, and a logistical nightmare. It will also raise red flags for international lenders.

4.3 In the process of preparing two business cases, to lift the Benefit Cost Ratio up from 0.435 to a bare BCR of 1.02, the Extended Final Business Case stripped many costs out of the project. The Hirst Collections Relocations and Logistics report, noted that no allowance has been made for the storage of the museum's Very Large Objects. This continues to be the case. There is nowhere to store the museum's large objects at Castle Hill, and there is no budget for other storage. The MAAS strategy is to ask volunteer museum and heritage organisations to agree to house some of the large objects. A team has been working in great secrecy to identify and ask organisations if they want to take some of the PHM's objects. This is badged as sharing the collection with the regions. In fact it is cost shifting. None of the museums in regional NSW have empty sheds, and certainly no vacant storage with museum standard environmental controls equivalent to the PHM. There is no budget to build new facilities for the museums that might put their hand up for a very large Powerhouse object. No thought has been given to how these loans would be monitored or administered, or what kind of training and support the museum volunteers would need. Many volunteer museums are only open one or two days a week, if that, so moving PHM objects into small museums all over NSW will not enhance access

to the collection. If volunteer museums do agree to house some of the PHM's large objects the risk is that items from their own collection will be moved into inferior accommodation, or even outside. Museum staff have indicated that in practice these will be long term permanent loans, a one way trip for PHM objects that will never be returned to the museum. This is bad policy. It means the MAAS collection is being broken up.

4.4 There is nowhere to put the museum's large objects at Parramatta unless MAAS has decided they can be displayed in areas at risk of flooding in the ground floor P1 space, which will not have international museum standard climate controls. This will be a big event space and concert venue, open to the river, and exposed to a Probable Maximum Flood of 11.3m.³⁷ Neither P1 nor P2 above, also designated for large objects, will have international museum standard climate controls.³⁸

4.5 In selecting the winning design it does not seem that anyone considered that having walls of north facing glass might be an issue for the environmental conditions in the buildings, their energy use, and control of light, temperature and humidity fluctuations, notwithstanding the usual references to sustainability and energy efficiency. Neither the open competition brief nor the Stage 2 design brief included particular information about the actual climate at Parramatta. There was only general temperature advice about Sydney. Parramatta now regularly experiences 40 degree days and is several degrees warmer than Sydney city in summer.³⁹

4.6 The Stage 2 Design Brief included specified separate loading docks for the collection and general shipments.⁴⁰ The EIS reveals that the 'compact' back of house now has only one loading dock.⁴¹ This means that all the deliveries, supplies and equipment for 10 cafes, the bump in and bump out for sets and equipment for multiple events and performances happening at any one time for up to 10,000 people, food waste, laundry and services for 40 apartments, museum objects in high rotation, and international travelling exhibitions, are all going to use the one loading dock. This is completely impractical and ridiculous.

4.7 Other notable departures from the design brief and the proven principles for museum design include:

- There is no front door and no obvious point of arrival
- Multiple doors and access points to the two buildings will be a security risk and entail higher staffing and security costs for a 24x7 operation
- The design lacks the memorable entry experience that is a feature of all great museums
- The front of house is a small concierge in the western building, akin to a hotel front desk
- What follows in the western building is a retail hall
- It is not clear where the museum is or where visitors should go next
- There are no escalators in the eastern building, making vertical movement difficult and compromising emergency evacuation
- There are just two lifts and small stairs in the eastern building to take visitors to the mezzanines and P2 space above
- This is inadequate in a building expecting two million visitors a year
- There are no amenities of the ground floor of the eastern building, visitors will need to trek west or wait for a lift to the mezzanine
- the PHM's renowned research library is downsized and squeezed into a poky mezzanine above the P1 space when it should be where staff are working in the 'Powerlab' level 6 western building

- The unexplained need for flexibility in the presentation spaces, so that every space can work as a performance space and function venue, means that adapting the big volumes for exhibitions will be expensive and require movable walls, among other infrastructure
- There is no secure working space for staff, only the shared 'Powerlab Co-Working Space'
- There is no conservation space or secure collection storage
- It is unfortunate the competition jury did not include an experienced museum designer to illuminate some of the consequences arising from the winning competition design
- For cost reasons people running this project decided there would be no basement parking and no parking on the Parramatta site apart from what will be a very busy loading dock
- This is completely impractical. It will be a huge hindrance and logistical nightmare every day of the building's life.

4.8 It is not clear if there was a matrix assessment by the competition jury to check if the competition entries complied with the design brief. This should be sought by the Inquiry as part of its investigations.

5 Parramatta Museum Spatial Analysis Relative to the PHM

5.1 Since April 2018 the size of the Parramatta facility and site has been continually misrepresented in public statements and media releases as larger than the real Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo. The following figures are drawn from the business case papers and other museum documents.

Comparison of Museum Site, Building and Exhibition Spaces

Type of Space	Powerhouse Museum	Parramatta Facility
Total Site Area	24,378sqm ⁴²	19,896sqm ⁴³
Total Building Size	42,594sqm ⁴⁴ actual	24,830sqm ⁴⁵ specified
Total Museum Standard Climate Controlled Exhibition Space	21,800 ⁴⁶ actual	5,200sqm ⁴⁷ specified

5.2 Of note in these figures is that the Parramatta facility will have **just 25% of the climate controlled exhibition space** available at the Powerhouse Museum. So the real Powerhouse Museum's exhibition space will be downsized by 75%.

5.3 The Stage 2 design brief required 15,000sqm of Presentation Space.⁴⁸ The spatial analysis in the EIS architectural plans shows the total Presentation Space is just 12,644sqm.⁴⁹ This count includes the P7 commercial conference and function space with kitchen on level 4, at 1,182sqm – not suitable for museum exhibitions; the P6 immersive digital screen space on level 3, at 1,486sqm – not for collection exhibitions, and the ground floor flood space exposed to flood and open to the river P1 at 2,559sqm; which is unsuitable for museum objects and exhibitions.

5.4 For some reason recent documents on the Parramatta development, including the Request for SEARs and the EIS have stated that the Parramatta site is 2.5 hectares.⁵¹ Unless more land has been acquired in the last few months the Parramatta site is 1.9 hectares. This includes the flood prone, unusable 20m wide tongue of riverfront land extending from Wilde Ave to the Lennox Bridge at Church St.

5.5 The most recent architectural plans reveal that the Parramatta building will have only 5,094sqm of Presentation spaces that meet international museum standard environmental conditions, across just 3 galleries, assuming the building delivers the environmental controls specified in the Stage 2 design competition brief. This is just 25% of the museum standard exhibition space that the PHM has.⁵²

5.6 In the Stage 2 Design Brief the exhibition spaces are called Presentation Spaces. Every presentation space is required to do double duty for performances, events, functions, and commercial hire.⁵³

5.7 The Parramatta building does not meet the basic functional requirements for a museum. Museum functionality has been sacrificed for performance, events and commercial uses. On every level the Presentation spaces are not supported by adequate back of house space, collection storage, working areas, lift access or amenities. Given the NSW Government, the Department of Planning, Infrastructure NSW and MAAS have continually asserted that the facility and exhibition spaces are larger than the real Powerhouse; it is fair to conclude that the spatial brief and the winning design have been driven by an insecure type of size-ism. The bigger the space does not mean that it is functional or needed. The floor plan is squeezing every last metre of the floor plate for front of house to assert the presentation spaces are bigger than the PHM's. They are not. It seems that the Parramatta building must be declared bigger than the real Powerhouse because that is one of the government's meagre justifications for demolishing the Powerhouse. The more important question is not whether the Parramatta facility is bigger than the PHM, but if it is actually a museum.

6 Business Case

6.1 The first go at a business case for the New Museum Western Sydney came back with a negative Benefit Cost Ratio of 0.435.⁵⁴ An Extended Final Business Case in 2018 revealed a BCR of just 1.02.⁵⁵ This was only achieved by cutting costs out of the project, and predicating the Parramatta museum on massive apartment towers at both Ultimo and Parramatta. Since then, the project parameters have changed dramatically. The super tower development at Parramatta has been deleted, cutting the major capital off-set for the project. The loss of the commercial tower in the Parramatta development must blow a massive hole in the Benefit Cost Ratio. Visitor numbers have been inflated from a projected 715,439 in 2023⁵⁶ – the presumed year 2 of operation to an unexplained 2 million. It is not known if these inflated visitor numbers are now embedded in the calculations in the latest version of the business case to keep the BCR above 1.0; or if the unexplained shift in vision to a commercial events facility is a result of trying to compensate for the loss of the commercial tower changing the BCR.⁵⁷

6.2 The business case papers did not consider the competitive nature of leisure time in Western Sydney. Many of the projections and assumptions around visitation and spending at the Parramatta facility are heroic. While Western Sydney has a large and growing population,

visitation to Western Sydney cultural venues is actually low; and most arts centres do not carry an admission charge. It is a price-sensitive market. Many families in Western Sydney have weekend commitments to sport and they are used to driving everywhere. The lack of parking in the development is a serious mistake and will be an impediment to family access and revenue from venue hire and corporate events. Family budgets are stretched, and while there are parking stations in Parramatta, adding the cost of parking to ticketed entry for a family may be a point of resistance when there are other leisure options.

6.3 In addition there are higher costs in expanding the museum store at Castle Hill; and increased costs in keeping some 'cultural presence' at Ultimo. The Parramatta facility will carry much higher staff, security costs and maintenance costs in running a 24x7 entertainment precinct across two porous buildings and a long strip of flood prone land. New business cases have been prepared, but to date have not been assessed in totality. The combined BCR for the three projects: the Parramatta development, the new storage at Castle Hill and the remnant Creative Industries Precinct at Ultimo, is likely below a negative 0.5.

6.4 As noted above, the Stage 2 Design Brief reworked the whole focus of what was supposed to be a science museum into a multi-purpose 24x7 arts and entertainment precinct. The brief is laden with assertions about the income to be generated from the flexible use of the facilities.

Entrepreneurial

The Powerhouse will actively generate income through establishing an integrated commercial program that includes multiple food and beverage retail offerings, a curated annual food events program, major events program, product development and commercial programs that are delivered across the Precinct. The commercial program will be responsive to the needs of the cultural and social demographic of Greater Sydney.

The ability to effect large amounts of commercial income will rely on the Precinct being highly responsive and flexible so it can accommodate the needs of multiple partners and deliver high-quality outcomes to clients. This includes minimising production times so that public-facing activity is maximised. It will also rely on the provision of distinctive commercial opportunities and experiences that seamlessly integrate into broader Precinct activity.

The Powerhouse Precinct's approach to visitation will see multiple daily activities. Food-event and retail programs will be integrated into artistic, education, exhibition and major-events programs. It will be critical that the Precinct maximises its capacity to present multiple activities and minimises their impact on each other.

The commercial programs will extend the profile of the Precinct. The food- and beverage-event programs will establish multi-year partnerships with new industries and attract new and diverse audiences. The Powerhouse will entrepreneur new major events that contribute to the NSW Visitor Economy and Parramatta's Night Time Economy Discussion Paper and make Parramatta a major national and international destination for cultural activity. The commercial programs will continue to expand the income base of the Precinct and will mitigate risk by ensuring that income sources continue to diversify.

Co-Investment

The Powerhouse will build resilience and sustain growth through placing collaboration at the core of its programs and operations. This will include the development of an integrated Commercial Strategy which will include the utilisation of flexible spaces for

commercial events, corporate events, conferences and major events that activate the Precinct. This self-generated revenue will be re-invested into the development and expansion of Powerhouse programs, in turn generating further revenue on the site, strengthening the cultural and civic role of the precinct. P.90

6.5 There are questions here about the merits of a tax payer funded and subsidised facility competing with businesses in the Parramatta CBD, and hoovering up community festivals and events that have long been associated with other venues such as Parramatta Park. The subsidised Parramatta Precinct will be in direct competition with other businesses in Parramatta also offering function and conference spaces, cinemas, accommodation and cafes. The brief proposes 10 cafes on the site, a floor of retail, and multiple events running 24x7, attracting up to 10,000 people. Will these customers flow out to spend in other businesses in Parramatta, or will they be kept entertained and spending in what might be the cultural version of Westfield?

6.6 As noted above, the cost of managing a facility like this can only come at the expense of what was once the museum's core business; collecting, researching and interpreting its historic collection. It will take a lot of staff to plan, manage and deliver this scale of events and programming across two buildings and seven levels, plus outdoor spaces 24x7, plus 40 apartments and school dormitories. The BCR for the Parramatta project was predicated on the basis that there would no increase in the museum's recurrent budget.⁵⁸ So this vision can only be achieved if the PHM's staffing profile is reconfigured to event management. The commercial hire of all or any of the spaces in the building is baked into the vision and design, at the expense of museum functions. It is possible that the mooted flexible exhibitions will only be wheeled into the presentation spaces when they are not required for trade shows, corporate events, conferences, concerts, film festivals, farmers markets and anything else the commercial team can devise. It is difficult to see how the Parramatta operation can balance the needs of the ex PHM and its collection, versus the imperative to operate a large entertainment precinct, when it has already abandoned most of what is recognisably a museum.

6.7 The cultural program and commercial ambitions revealed in the Stage 2 Design Brief are clearly derived from Carriageworks in Redfern, now in administration. The surprising crash of Carriageworks raises questions about the fragility of this business model. Notwithstanding the black swan event of a global pandemic, if Carriageworks went bust when it is located near the CBD with so much business and philanthropic support, how reliable can the business model for the Parramatta precinct be? It is not known if the most recent iteration of the Parramatta business case is based on the new vision for the precinct in the Stage 2 Design Brief, and anticipated commercial income from venue hire and other activities on the site. Did the commercial and 'entrepreneurial' ambitions for the project skew the jury's assessment and decision on the competition winner? A further question is where are the staffing resources to run the commercial and event operations going to come from, and whether the business case is based on using public service museum positions to staff the entrepreneurial commercial activities on the site.

6.8 The PHM to Parramatta project has spent nearly \$40m on consultants, up to June 30 2019. See appendix 1 below. Millions more have been spent since then on the EIS and architects. The design competition alone cost \$11.322m, enough to build a new regional museum. In the five and a half years since the project was announced not a single new cultural job has been created in Parramatta. The Powerhouse Museum Alliance offered the NSW Government many options for

a home grown Parramatta museum, grounded in a sense of place, embedded in the community, and responsive to community cultural priorities. Instead the government stuck to the cargo cult trophy building, now trumpeted as the biggest cultural infrastructure investment since the Sydney Opera House. Culture does not come out of a building it comes from skilled, knowledgeable and creative people. What this project needed from day 1 was investment in Western Sydney's cultural workforce, and their skills and capacity. Following years of drought, devastating bushfires and now a global pandemic it is well past time for the NSW Government's cultural program to invest in people, not edifices.

7 Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Campaigners to save the Powerhouse Museum have always supported a new museum for Parramatta, based on transparent consultations and the community's stated cultural priorities. It is a false proposition to suggest, as the business case documents have proposed, that the only options are that the Powerhouse 'moves', or Parramatta does not get a new museum.

7.2 Numerous submissions, papers and hearings by the previous Museum Inquiry have highlighted the opportunities for Parramatta to create a distinctive new museum in the Cumberland Hospital precinct that will attract international visitors to Parramatta.

7.3 Sydney needs more museums, not a destructive and recklessly extravagant museum relocation plan. The Committee for Sydney 2019 benchmarking report shows that Sydney ranks at the bottom of its 30 global city peers for the number of museums, and also for the authenticity and diversity of local cultural experiences.⁵⁹

7.4 The Powerhouse Precinct Parramatta project is not a museum move or a renewal. The Powerhouse Museum will be demolished. It has been hijacked, and its property assets will be liquidated for the use of an entirely different kind of facility that is essentially a 24 hour event and function space, staffed and funded by taxpayers, in direct competition with other businesses in Parramatta.

7.5 Under the current plans the only part of the real Powerhouse that is moving to Parramatta is the name and the PHM's recurrent funding and staffing establishment. The rest of the PHM's 137 years of history is being demolished. No government anywhere in the world has ever demolished a major state museum to move it out of its historic context and buildings to a less accessible site with grossly inferior facilities to what the museum already owns.

7.6 All the plans to date suggest that the Powerhouse collection is redundant to the needs of the Powerhouse Precinct Parramatta. The collection and exhibition demand from the multi-purpose Presentation spaces could easily be resourced by loans and collaborative exhibitions drawn from all the NSW cultural institutions. This more cost effective option has never been considered.

7.7 The move of the PHM's collection should be put on hold. There are too many questions about the budget, the risks of the move, and the failure to fund equivalent museum standard storage to be confident that the collection will be safe. Double handling puts the collection at risk, especially the large objects. It is also a wasteful use of staff resources when the focus should be on exhibition development.⁶⁰ The exhibition planning for the Parramatta facility needs easy

access to the collection and the museum's library, registration records and archives. These are all together on the PHM site at Ultimo and it makes sense to keep the PHM fully operational until Parramatta is ready. MAAS staff numbers need to double if the government is serious about a museum at Parramatta.⁶¹ Instead of building staff numbers and capacity, MAAS continues to lose experienced staff.⁶²

7.8 There is no chance the Parramatta facility will be open by 2023. The project is already more than a year behind schedule and no work has been done on content. A more realistic opening date is 2025. The real Powerhouse Museum should stay open as a fully functioning museum until the new facility is built and there is clarity on whether it will be a museum or a performance, events and entertainment zone.

7.9 It is hoped that this Select Committee can expose the secret documents underpinning this project. Given there is no commercial tower on the Parramatta site there is no reason why all the costs and estimates cannot be made public. The role and advice from Infrastructure NSW in determining Sydney's cultural infrastructure priorities should be scrutinised. Key questions include whether INSW had appropriate cultural expertise; its management of the secret Urbis site study that mysteriously recommended the Parramatta Phillip St site from a choice of only two options; the belated recommendation for a lyric theatre in the shell of the Powerhouse Museum; the \$371m spent at Walsh Bay, up from a proposed budget of \$139m, and now not even a cultural precinct; and \$240m for Sydney Modern which could have been built at Parramatta, except that too was never considered by INSW because the AGNSW donors have more social and political clout than supporters of the Powerhouse Museum.

Biographical Note

Kylie Winkworth is an independent museum and heritage consultant with long experience in museum policy, planning, regional and community museums, collections, movable heritage and heritage places. She has more than 30 years' experience in museum planning, advising heritage places and collecting organisations, museums and local government, developing strategic plans, feasibility studies, exhibitions and collaborative projects. She has a particular interest in museum renewal and sustainability and in the wider issues of government policy and funding for collections. Her publications include *Significance 2.0*, co-authored with Roslyn Russell, which is now widely used by collecting organisations; and *Thematic Studies of Museum and Heritage Collections, a guide for museums, heritage networks and communities*. She has served on many boards and committees including the National Cultural Heritage Committee, which oversees the Protection of Movable Cultural Heritage Act and the import and export of cultural property. She was a director of the Collections Council of Australia; a Trustee of the Powerhouse Museum 1996-2003; chair of the Museum Committee for NSW Ministry for the Arts, and a member of the NSW Arts Advisory Council, 1996-2003 and 2004-2008. She is a donor and Life Fellow of the Powerhouse Museum.

Appendix 1 The Consultants' Picnic: consultant fees and related costs of the PHM to Parramatta Project, as at June 2019

How much has been spent on consultants and costs related to the 'move' of the Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta and the eviction of the PHM's collections, otherwise known as collections relocation? **Figures derived from annual reports total \$38.7m.** This would build three new regional museums in drought-stricken regional NSW. The **\$11.322m** cost of the design competition alone would build an impressive new regional museum.

MAAS New Museum Western Sydney summary of consultant & related costs		
Source	Amount	Purpose
2015-16 MAAS annual report	\$3,380,000	first year of funding (\$10,000,000 over 2 years) relating to the museum's proposed relocation
2016-17 MAAS annual report	\$2,859,000	business case for the New Museum project
2016-17 MAAS annual report	\$2,790,000	ancillary costs in relation to the business case
2016-17 MAAS annual report	\$3,261,000	diverted to the Department of Planning and Environment to address the extension of the business case
2017-18 MAAS annual report	\$2,790,000	collection relocation and Parramatta expenses
2017-18 Dept of Planning annual report	\$5,770,000	expenses for the New Museum Parramatta
2018-19 MAAS annual report	\$2,986,000	employee related costs for the collections relocation
2018-19 MAAS annual report	\$1,207,000	equipment related to the collection relocation
2018-19 Dept of Planning annual report	\$11,322,000	"New Powerhouse Museum" for Parramatta design competition
2018-19 Dept of Planning annual report	\$2,353,000	Creative industries precinct at Ultimo
Total	\$38,718,000	

¹Portfolio Committee No 1 Premier and Finance, 3 March 2020, p.9

<https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/lcdocs/transcripts/2319/Transcript%20-%203%20March%202020%20-%20UNCORRECTED%20-%20PC%201.pdf>,

² The full excerpt reads: Fine Grain: The Powerhouse Precinct will fluidly integrate into the fine grain of the City. It should be porous at the edges, with no front door. There should be multiple entry points, multiple approaches and multiple places to stop. You won't be able to tell where the city ends and the Precinct begins. It should include multi-layered, multi-level social and recreational spaces. The intimacy of its commercial food and beverage offerings will contrast with the iconic internationally-renowned presentation spaces. It will be a short cut through: no one will walk around it. It will be cool and covered with green shade in summer. It will be a place you will want to stay into the night. It will be a place with soft edges, no harsh lights or big signage. It will become what it does and what it provides. It will be defined through how it is used, a mirror of its communities, p.56

Powerhouse Precinct Parramatta International Design Competition Stage 2 Design Brief was prepared for the shortlisted architects in mid-2019, and was finally released to the public just before Christmas following the announcement of the competition winners Moreau Kusunoki and Genton 17 December 2019. The New Powerhouse for Parramatta Design Competition cost \$11.32m, enough to build a new regional museum.

<https://competitions.malcolmreading.com/maasparramatta/competition>

³ Portfolio Committee No 1 Premier and Finance, 3 March 2020, p.8

<https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/lcdocs/transcripts/2319/Transcript%20-%203%20March%202020%20-%20UNCORRECTED%20-%20PC%201.pdf>

⁴ It is highly unusual that no work has been done on the exhibition concepts and content after five and half years of debate, and two years since cabinet approved the project. Whether this is delay is an oversight or is part of what is stated as radical reworking of the museum is not clear. It should be noted that planning and placement for the major objects and collections was an integral part of the design of the PHM from the time the project was announced in 1979. The Galleria for example was purpose designed for the Boulton and Watt and the No 1 Locomotive.

⁵ See plans and elevations under Request for SEARS 4 <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/26576?fbclid=IwAR0bB-du2l8qvLLOoTEoS-6fBmRsQNumHAWb5O2hQsqaoxFSoeAtba7vx11>

⁶ Spaces P 1 and P 2 in the eastern building; Stage 2 Design Brief, p.130-131, p.235-239

⁷ P.238-239

⁸ P.107

⁹ P.255

¹⁰ P.131, 235 and 237

¹¹ P235, 237, and 238,

¹² MAAS 2018-2019 annual report, p.30 <https://maas.museum/about/annual-report/>

¹³ The Powerhouse will be a 24-hour Precinct that fluidly integrates into the daily life of the city. It will have the capacity to accommodate multiple scales of events that occur simultaneously and be robust and porous enough to operate over a 24-hour period. This will require a very clear separation between front-of-house and back-of-house activity to ensure that the visitor experience is not compromised. The Powerhouse will make a major contribution to the night-time economy, drive the visitor economy and become central to the cultural and social life of Parramatta and broader Sydney. This will mark a significant shift in the level of programming and scale of activity that cannot be quantified through current Powerhouse operations.

Stage 2 Design Brief, p.32

¹⁴ Exhibition spaces are called Presentation Spaces, Stage 2 Design Brief, p.237

¹⁵ Stage 2 Design Brief, p.128, 152,182, and 186

¹⁶ See workforce planning documents in the business case papers, papers 28 and 30 among others here

<https://powerhousemuseumalliance.com/find-out-more/business-cases-access-to-documents/>

¹⁷ Stage 2 Design Brief p.28

¹⁸ Stage 2 Design Brief p.133

¹⁹ Kylie Winkworth, INSW; Stitching up the Case to Sell the PHM, June 2016

<https://powerhousemuseumalliance.com/what-the-experts-say/infrastructure-nsw-stitching-up-the-case-to-sell-the-phm/>

²⁰ <https://www.hudsonyardsnewyork.com/discover/shed>

²¹ MAAS President Barney Glover to Arts Minister Troy Grant, 1 September 2016 *The new Museum [should]... not diminish the scale and scope of the museum*

<https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/lcdocs/other/10450/Answers%20to%20questions%20on%20notice%20-%20Museum%20of%20Applied%20Arts%20and%20Sciences%20-%2017%20November%202016.pdf>

²² Hirst Projects, Collections Relocations and Logistics, for Johnstaff, 31 October 2017, attachment U, p.3 [Attachment U Collections relocations and logistics.pdf](#)

²³ Stage 2 Design Brief, p.18

²⁴ Stage 2 Design Brief p,236

²⁵ This is not correct. Almost all the PHM's long term exhibitions have been refreshed and updated but this stopped since the 'move' was announced in late 2014.

²⁶ Stage 2 Design Brief, p.24

²⁷ It seems doubtful that this critical issue was even considered by the competition jury.

²⁸ Instead the PHM's last four directors have closed exhibitions and not replaced them. This has been used to justify the case for selling off the PHM.

²⁹ Stage 2 Design Brief, p.19

³⁰ Powerhouse Precinct at Parramatta, International Design Competition Search Statement, p.25

<https://competitions.malcolmreading.com/maasparramatta/competition>

³¹ Stage 2 Design Brief, p.40

³² Johnstaff, New Western Sydney Museum, Legislation and Technical Requirements Review, 17 Nov 2017, p.1

[New Western Sydney Museum 32 Legislation & Technical Requirements Review](#)

³³ Kylie Winkworth, Museum Planning 101, 1 September 2017

<https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/lcdocs/submissions/60866/0149g%20Ms%20Kylie%20Winkworth.pdf>

³⁴ Stage 2 Design Brief, see p.135 and 269

³⁵ In general most museums handling large temporary exhibitions would have around 30-40% of the overall space dedicated to back of house preparation, conservation and storage space. In the Parramatta development the large P2 space at 2,122sqm has around 100sqm of back of house space which is less than 5%. There does not appear to be any back of house space at all to support the P1 ground floor space.

³⁶ Stage 2 Design Brief p. 135

³⁷ The Stage 2 Design Brief advised: *The majority of Presentation Spaces should be designed to be above the overland PMF (RL11.3) to ensure they are suitable for the display of some Museum Collection items*, p.249

³⁸ Stage 2 Design Brief, p.130-131, 237

³⁹ There is a growing body of research on the heat island effect in Western Sydney, and threats from a warming climate. See for example *Benchmarking Heat in Parramatta, Sydney's Central River City* Western Sydney University, and August

2019. <https://researchdirect.westernsydney.edu.au/islandora/object/uws%3A52453/datastream/PDF/view>

⁴⁰ *Separate loading docks for collections/exhibits and general shipments are required to maintain Collection security, legislative compliance and the integrity of integrated pest management. In particular, food stuff and waste disposal should be handled via a separate loading dock.* Stage 2 Design Brief, p.268

⁴¹ *The main point of loading is located in the western building and it is accessed from Phillip Street via Dirrabarri Lane which ensures minimal crossover with pedestrian paths. The loading occurs through one shared loading dock, which facilitates both the Powerhouse Collection loading and smaller deliveries loading to support all retail and function uses.* EIS Architectural Design Report, 4 May 2020, p.56

⁴² Crone Architects for Johnstaff, Ultimo Presence Project 2 Options, Sept 2017, p. 3 [Ultimo Presence Project 2 Project Options](#)

⁴³ Johnstaff, New Western Sydney Museum, Final Business Case, v 4, 8 January 2018, p.32. Or 19,438sqm in the EIS, Appendix B Architectural Plans and Design Report, 1 May 2020, p.42

⁴⁴ Steensen Varming, The Ultimo Presence Project 4 Site Infrastructure assessment 2; attachment F; 8 August 2017, p.13 <https://powerhousemuseumalliancedotcom.files.wordpress.com/2018/06/ultimo-presence-project-4-site-infrastructure-assessment-2.pdf>

⁴⁵ Stage 2 Design Brief, p.126, these are gross floor areas and include the 40 apartments, school dormitory and function spaces.

⁴⁶ *The Powerhouse Museum, Australia's largest and most popular museum, is located in Darling Harbour, Sydney. Its unique and diverse collection of 385,000 objects spans history, science, technology, design, industry,*

decorative arts, music, transport and space exploration. The Museum has an ever-changing program of exhibitions covering approximately 20,000 square metres (equivalent to three international competition soccer fields). It presents 22 permanent exhibitions and several temporary exhibitions, complemented by more than 250 interactives.” <http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/100602/20110120-1007/www.collectionsaustralia.net/org/171/about/index.html> Later the museum converted the Wran building as a temporary exhibition space at 1,800sqm, although part of this space was subdivided a few years ago for UTS to use for lectured because the museum is broke. This does not count other internal conversions of PHM space such as the mezzanine exhibition space at the back of the transport hall.

⁴⁷ Stage 2 Design Brief p.130, 236-239

⁴⁸ Stage 2 Design Brief p.126

⁴⁹ EIS, Appendix B Architectural Plans and Design Report, 1 May 2020, last page

⁵⁰ EIS, Appendix B Architectural Plans and Design Report, 1 May 2020

⁵¹ Ethos Urban New Powerhouse Parramatta, EIS, 4 May 2020 p.7

⁵² See spatial analysis in the EIS, Appendix B Architectural Plans and Design Report, 1 May 2020, last page

⁵³ Stage 2 Design Brief p.132-133 and 236-237

⁵⁴ Johnstaff, Final Business Case 14 February 2017 0.7Gate 2 Review, part 1.10.3

<https://powerhousemuseumalliancedotcom.files.wordpress.com/2018/07/new-western-sydney-museum-3-final-business-case-gate-2-review-140217.pdf>

⁵⁵ Johnstaff, Final Business Case (Supplement) The New Museum in Western Sydney, 24 April, 2018, v6.0, 1.6, p.8 [New Western Sydney Museum 2 Final Business Case Supplement 240418](#)

⁵⁶ This figure was based on the PHM’s current visitation, assuming all the PHM’s visitors would go to Parramatta. Johnstaff, The New Museum in Western Sydney Final Business Case, 8 January 2018, 4.5.2,p.63

⁵⁷ Of note is that part of the business case calculations included a visitor spend per household of \$129.

Johnstaff, The New Museum in Western Sydney, Economic Appraisal, attachment L, p.4 for the New Museum in Western Sydney, Final Business Case, 8 January 2018, v. 4. If the visitor number projections have been vastly inflated over the last two years, presumably so has the income attributed to visitor spending in the precinct.

⁵⁸ Johnstaff, The New Museum in Western Sydney, Final Business Case, 8 January 2018, v. 4, p.61

[New Western Sydney Museum 1 Final Business Case 080118](#)

⁵⁹ Committee for Sydney, Benchmarking Sydney’s Performance 2019, p.41.

<https://sydney.org.au/publications/benchmarking-sydneys-performance-2019/>

⁶⁰ Powerhouse curatorial, conservation, registration, design and technical staff spent eight years planning the opening exhibitions in the PHM exhibitions.

⁶¹ The PHM had 400 people working on the project in the lead up to 1988

⁶² MAAS staff numbers were 213 in the 2018-19 annual report. The museum has struggled to attract experienced applicants, in part because it is toxic and has no credibility in the museum industry.