



**ANGEL PLACE
LEVEL 8, 123 PITT STREET
SYDNEY NSW 2000**

URBIS.COM.AU
Urbis Pty Ltd
ABN 50 105 256 228

4 May 2021

Mr Jim Betts,
Secretary
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
12 Darcy Street,
Parramatta NSW 2150

Dear Jim,

DESIGN INTEGRITY PANEL MEETING - 8-10 LEE STREET, HAYMARKET [SSD-10405]

This letter has been prepared on behalf of the Design Integrity Panel (DIP) for the 8-10 Lee Street, Haymarket Architectural Design Competition in relation to the design integrity process. The DIP previously met on 14 October 2020 with subsequent feedback provided on 3 November 2020 that supported the lodgement of the State Significant Development Application (SSDA) - SSD-10405.

Following the conclusion of the SSDA notification period (16 December 2020 to 3 February 2021), SHoP and BVN presented the amended scheme to the DIP on 13th April 2021 for their review and feedback.

The DIP participating in the design review comprised all members of the original design competition jury as follows:

Table 1 Competition Jurors/ Design Integrity Panel

Juror	Title
Olivia Hyde (Jury Chair) (GANSW)	Director of Design Excellence, GANSW
Scott Hazzard (Proponent)	Head of Global Real Estate, Atlassian (USA)
Graham Jahn (CoS)	Director of City Planning, Development and Transport – City of Sydney
Kim Crestani (Proponent)	Registered Architect, Order Architects
Natalie Vinton (GANSW)	CEO and Heritage Specialist, Curio Projects
Edwin Chan (Proponent)	Architect, EC3 Architects (USA)

It is noted that the DIP presentation session occurred online and was observed by a number of members of the project team. Panel deliberations were observed only by Urbis in their role as Design Integrity Process Managers.

This letter includes the original Jury Recommendations with updated panel feedback where relevant, and separately provides the DIP feedback on the design updates presented at the meeting on 13th April 2021.

1. ORIGINAL JURY RECOMMENDATION

Table 2 Summary of Design Integrity Panel Feedback

Jury Recommendation	Panel Feedback
1. Design elements strongly supported in the scheme that should be retained in order to achieve Design Excellence:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The design and layout of the YHA levels of the building exhibit design excellence and are strongly supported by the Jury, particularly:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The democratic access to services and amenities.</i> ○ <i>The simple modulated approach.</i> ○ <i>The scale and proportion of the atrium space which demonstrate a good human scale.</i> 	<p>Design changes to the external structure at the YHA levels are broadly supported from an environmental point of view, but some of the Panel members have concerns about consistency with the competition scheme and the façade composition in relation to the broader tower.</p> <p>Refer Table 3 below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The location of the “Town Hall” concept at the intersection of the low rise and high rise lift cores is strongly supported. It provides equitable access to the commercial levels within the building and exhibits Design Excellence.</i> 	<p>Design Integrity has been maintained provided it remains in this location.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The ‘double skin’ façade arrangement enables the sustainability and workplace ambitions to be realised. This exhibits Design Excellence and should be retained for both aesthetic design reasons and to help minimise reflectivity from the façade glazing onto surrounding public spaces and transport corridors.</i> 	<p>The ‘double skin’ façade is retained at office levels but deleted at YHA levels. Additional information is sought with regard to performance and appearance of the ‘single skin’ façade at YHA levels. Consider also operability and views up into the YHA at night.</p>

Jury Recommendation	Panel Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The detailing with regard to the operable louvred elements are strongly supported and the Jury encourages further refinement and detailing to address the natural ventilation aspirations of the project. 	Design Integrity has been maintained.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The soft, aerodynamic form and overall proportions of the building (including faceted glass) in both plan and elevation are to be maintained. 	<p>Design Integrity has been maintained. The overall form of the tower and its proportions have been retained and further refined.</p> <p>There were differing views around the impact of the envelope radius change from 9m to 7m. The Panel encourages the Design team to continue to strive for the soft aerodynamic form whilst recognizing the need to evolve the envelope to enable the interior programming requirements.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Jury strongly support the spatial condition of inverted timber framed stepped back floorplates and landscaping elements within the facade, and this should be maintained. 	Design Integrity has been maintained.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The colour, shape, tones and textures illustrated on Page 36 of the Design Statement are strongly supported for incorporation into the final design subject to satisfying relevant requirements. 	Design Integrity has been maintained.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain the proportions of the floors and truss levels. 	Design Integrity has been maintained.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The breathing room (air space) that the scheme allows around the heritage buildings is generally supported. Further design development is required for structural column placement and the interface with the YHA roof form. 	<p>Design Integrity has been maintained. The proposal to lower the tower soffit to RL39m is supported as it maintains the overall design intent to deliver breathing room to the shed roof below and heritage context more broadly.</p> <p>Further development is now required of the soffit to the tower, which remains highly visible.</p>

Jury Recommendation	Panel Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The location of the core within the Shed is generally supported as it does not result in a forced programming of this space. As much of the Shed structure and materiality as possible should be retained, so that the unique, utilitarian character of the shed is still understood within the new development.</i> 	Design Integrity has been maintained. The further refinement of the design has ensured that the expression of the shed, both internally and the roof form is maintained and, in many areas, improved compared to the original competition scheme.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Fine grain activation of the ground plane link zone</i> 	Design Integrity has been maintained and improved.
2. Design development related to the following matters is required:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Design Integrity is to be maintained whilst managing project budget constraints.</i> 	In process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A clear understanding of entry and address for both YHA and Atlassian is to be incorporated.</i> 	<p>Satisfactorily resolved.</p> <p>The arrival experience for both the YHA and Atlassian lobbies has been further developed with the location of the Atlassian lobby to the rear. The developed design responds sensitively and with thoughtful interpretation to the heritage context, materials and detailing.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Resolution of the shape, materiality and form of the Shed is required to ensure legibility.</i> 	<p>Further refinement of the design has improved the expression and legibility of the shed, both internally and externally notably the roof edge detailing which is now fine, and the expression of the shed structure.</p> <p>The panel are broadly in support of the latest design changes.</p> <p>The reeded glass is an elegant solution to the industrial interpretation of the original shed.</p> <p>The panel notes that the proposal must ensure that introduction of 'slick' or contemporary details should not erode the industrial quality from which the character of the site originates.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Upper Ground level requires further resolution to achieve a better, more dignified</i> 	Nearing resolution.

Jury Recommendation	Panel Feedback
<p><i>form and use, whilst providing the security requirements for the tenants/ visitors and public.</i></p>	<p>Successful resolution of the upper link zone has occurred including the re-orientation of the lift core which has enabled a wider link zone responding to future pedestrian flow demand. Small retail stores are now located directly along the link zone to provide activation.</p> <p>It is understood that the impact of wind from new developments including the TOGA development are currently being explored but are not yet fully understood or resolved.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The gesture of the 'bleacher' on the roof of the Shed is supportable as an idea (subject to heritage considerations) however it requires further much resolution should this element be incorporated.</i> 	<p>Nearing resolution.</p> <p>The proposal presented significant refinement in approach to the 'bleacher' on the shed roof. This has delivered a response that ensures the thinness of the shed roof remains legible whilst providing an activated publicly accessible zone. The design has delivered on the requested resolution with respect to heritage considerations.</p> <p>The impacts of wind from the east have been well managed in this area. The palisade handrail running around the bleachers is supported.</p> <p>Due to its sensitivity this element requires further review during design development to ensure structure and servicing constraints do not negatively impact the proposed design.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Resolution of greater daylight access at the Lower Ground level within the link zone. Reference is made to Clause 3.1.2 of the Design Guidelines.</i> 	<p>Resolved.</p> <p>The design has been further developed with respect to the lower link zone which cleverly interprets the existing jack vaults. The addition of glazed brick skylights, also an interpretation of existing skylights, as a means to deliver greater daylight to the lower level whilst responding with a fine grain material heritage context is supported.</p>

Jury Recommendation	Panel Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Strong consideration is required with regard to pedestrian movements through the link zone, both now and when the Central Walk West is opened.</i> 	<p>Nearing resolution.</p> <p>The width of the link zone was demonstrated to respond to the future anticipated pedestrian flows expected once Central Walk West is opened, however concerns remain on wind impacts at the upper levels.</p>
3. Satisfactory resolution of the following:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Design development is to ensure that glare and reflectivity are satisfactorily addressed to limit any impacts on the public domain (not just roads), both immediately surrounding the site and on the periphery.</i> 	<p>Nearing resolution</p> <p>A reflectivity study was undertaken and identifies the development is capable of complying with relevant glare and reflectivity criteria within and surrounding the site. It is noted that detailed assessment of this item will occur as part of the SSDA assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Shadowing of Prince Alfred Park should be consistent with the sun access plane controls contained within Sydney LEP 2012. Opportunities to further reduce overshadowing impacts are encouraged to be explored, noting that it is not expected that such measures would necessarily impact on proposed GFA.</i> 	<p>Resolved.</p> <p>The glass balustrades have now been setback from the edge of the roof terraces and do not encroach the sun access plane.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A façade cleaning regime and maintenance strategy is to be demonstrated.</i> 	<p>Nearing resolution</p> <p>A detailed façade maintenance response was provided which utilises a number of methods to ensure the various components of the façade are maintained, including a BMU for the upper levels of the tower, internal monorail for the internal façade elements, and cranes for the lower levels. It is understood that further detail will form part of the SSDA submission.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Appropriate resolution with regard to the management of wind impacts at ground level.</i> 	<p>Not resolved</p> <p>The proposal presented a response to wind impacts in and around the development site.</p>

Jury Recommendation	Panel Feedback
	<p>It is noted that ongoing resolution of wind impacts is occurring in accordance with the requirements of the Design Guide, but that current proposals do not as yet consider proposed developments on the TOGA site to the west.</p> <p>Wind mitigation measures should be of a high design quality and respond appropriately to the heritage interface of the site. Extensive reliance of glass balustrading was not supported, other, more heritage sensitive approaches are to be explored.</p> <p>The vertical timber batten wind screen on the northern elevation of the Shed is supported.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The location of the pedestrian bridge through the future third square is not supported in its current location, and the entire third square interface requires further resolution.</i> 	<p>Work in progress.</p> <p>The third square interface, as well as relationships with the broader Western Gateway Precinct are in a continued state of resolution with a number of stakeholders. The proposal is to ensure the relationship with surrounding sites and public domain are safeguarded.</p>

2. DIP FEEDBACK ON PROPOSED DESIGN AMENDMENTS

The below summarises feedback in response to design changes proposed through subsequent design development and as part of the Response to Submissions presented on 13 April 2021. The below also summarises responses provided to the key matters raised for further consideration in the previous meeting of the DIP on 14 October 2020 as well as feedback on these items.

Table 3 Summary of Design Integrity Panel Feedback

Design Element and DIP Comment	Panel Feedback
Design changes broadly supported	
Glass Balustrades – Further resolution is required for the following areas with respect to the use of glass balustrades.	The Panel is satisfied that this has been resolved through the following design amendments:

Design Element and DIP Comment	Panel Feedback
<p>Tower – Resolution is required to ensure the glass balustrades proposed at the crown of the tower for wind protection do not encroach on the sun access plane. Tolerance is to be applied with respect to wind mitigation measures.</p> <p>Shed Roof – Wind mitigation measures should be of a high design quality and respond appropriately to the heritage interface of the site. Extensive reliance of glass balustrading was not supported, other, more heritage sensitive approaches are to be explored.</p>	<p>Setting back of the glass balustrade at the crown of the tower has resolved this matter.</p> <p>The palisade handrail running around the bleachers is supported in place of the previously proposed glass balustrade.</p> <p>The vertical timber batten wind screen on the northern elevation of the Shed is supported in place of the previously proposed glass screen.</p>
<p>External Staircase – Need to further consider the resolution of the external staircase located on the southern elevation of the shed, particularly if it is to remain as a more permanent structure, due to the potential visual impact on the readability of the shed.</p>	<p>Relocation of external stair is broadly supported. This is aided by the proposal to cut back the glazing to reveal the cantilevered roof line.</p>
<p>Northern elevation of Shed – Further resolution is to be explored for the northern elevation of the shed to ensure the internal shed structure remains visible and legible whilst managing the internal comfort of the Atlassian lobby.</p>	<p>The panel are broadly in support of the design amendments.</p> <p>The reeded glass is an elegant solution to the industrial interpretation of the original shed.</p> <p>The panel notes that the proposal must ensure that introduction of ‘slick’ or contemporary details should not erode the industrial quality from which the character of the site originates.</p>
<p>Tower Structure and Façade changes Tower structure change at YHA levels from steel cross bracing to concrete rectilinear structure and façade change to single skin from double skin.</p>	<p>The panel is open to the overall change from an environmental point of view, but has concerns about consistency with the competition scheme and the façade composition in relation to the broader tower.</p> <p>The panel would like more information on what is driving the change from a YHA perspective.</p>

Design Element and DIP Comment	Panel Feedback
	<p>More information is required on ventilation in the YHA rooms – what opens, how and by how much.</p> <p>What will pedestrians see from the public domain when looking up towards the rooms (i.e., will curtains, hanging towels etc be visible?)</p>
Losing the tail of the 'C'-shaped atrium	<p>The panel are not opposed to this change but would like more information on:</p> <p>The impact of additional floor space on calculations for naturally ventilated and conditioned spaces, and on accounting for embodied energy (when compared to the SSDA submission)</p>
Change from 9m to 7m corner radii	<p>There were differing views around the impact of the envelope radius change from 9m to 7m. The Panel encourages the Design team to continue to strive for the soft aerodynamic form whilst recognizing the need to evolve the envelope to enable the interior programming requirements.</p>
Minor building envelope non-compliances proposed to southern and western cantilever zones.	<p>The panel is broadly supportive of this design amendment noting that this is a minor non-compliance with respect to the Western Gateway Design Guide.</p> <p>The Response to Submissions package should provide sufficient justification for this design amendment including evidence of consultation with relevant stakeholders and supported by additional wind modelling.</p>
Design changes requiring further design development or clarification	
Shed Roof	<p>The panel agrees that resolution of this space has improved but doubt remains on the desirability to be in the space, particularly in the context of the adjacent Toga development.</p> <p>The panel support the palisade handrail around the bleachers seating.</p> <p>The panel would like more information on the outlook from this space in the context of the Toga building: Who</p>

Design Element and DIP Comment	Panel Feedback
	<p>is going to go here and why? The interaction of the space with the core and the tower above.</p> <p>What are the access and circulation arrangements around and through the space, what are the equitable access arrangements?</p> <p>Concern that the structure required to support the shed roof planting and seating equipment will detract from the heritage interpretation of the Shed roof.</p> <p>The panel acknowledges that overshadowing of the space is not necessarily unfavourable given the Sydney climate.</p>
Platform 1 Wall	<p>The panel are in support of the design resolution at the lower levels, but did not support the current proposed materiality of the upper wall.</p> <p>Greater understanding of the heritage interpretation strategy is sought as this does not appear well developed yet.</p> <p>The Platform 1 Wall is an important location for significant public art and heritage interpretation. Interpretation of the Stolen Generation was noted as of particular importance for this site. Platform 1 was the arrival destination for stolen generation children from across the State, and as such, it was the location where children were either permanently separated from their siblings, or separated for the rest of their childhoods.</p> <p>The panel notes the recent Central Station Metro interchange project designed by Woods Bagot as a good example of heritage interpretation in this context.</p>
Tower Soffit	<p>The panel notes that development of the soffit is still underway and would like to see further resolution of the design when this is more developed, noting that this may be post approval.</p>

Design Element and DIP Comment	Panel Feedback
Wind Impacts	<p>The panel is still concerned about wind impacts, particularly on the Shed roof and resulting from the development of the broader precinct.</p> <p>There is opportunity for the panel to have a continuing role in the development of guidelines in relation to wind impacts and providing direction on a potential peer review of wind studies for all buildings within the precinct.</p> <p>Whilst inherently linked, is noted that resolution of wind impacts for the broader Western Gateway sub-precinct are subject of work separate to this project.</p>

3. CLOSING COMMENT

The Panel commend the design team and client on the continued resolution of design in response to the Panels prior feedback. The Panel are satisfied with the level of resolution and design development of the scheme and believe the design as presented continues to maintain the design integrity of the competition winning scheme. The Panel support the design, subject to consideration of the above items.

The Panel would support the provision of appropriate conditions of consent requiring subsequent review and endorsement by the Panel regarding matters which are noted as requiring further resolution or detail.

In addition to the items above, the following items were previously confirmed as design elements supported by the Jury, and are included for completeness.

- Lowering of Tower soffit to RL 39m
- Eastern pavilion above shed roof and its resolution of wind impacts in this area.
- Resolution of lower link zone form and materiality

Design Integrity Panel (DIP) endorsement:

Name	Signature	Date
Olivia Hyde Panel Chair		4 May 2021
Graham Jahn Panel Member		4 May 2021
Scott Hazzard Panel Member		4 May 2021
Kim Crestani Panel Member		4 May 2021
Natalie Vinton Panel Member		4 May 2021
Edwin Chan Panel Member		4 May 2021