

| Item No. | Comment | Response |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Department of Planning | | |
| 1 | <p>Built Form and Urban Design</p> <p>Concern is held that:</p> <p>a) the proposed design of the new entry on Bay Road would not provide an open and inviting entry off Bay Road and its ground area and stairs leading into the school would be constrained potentially not accommodating the number of students likely to use the entry. Further, the proposed dimensions of the access ramp appear to be minimal and could result in access issues for pedestrians and strollers.</p> | <p>In light of the layout and configuration of the entry ramp and stairs and been revised in the following ways –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Configuration of the entry stair and ramp have been modified to allow the stair to sit centrally under the awning roof. 2. The entry gate has been reconfigured to be a sliding gate rather than swing gates. This limits the space required for the entry gate and allowing for a more generous footpath / gathering space at the bottom of the entry stairs behind the gate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note that the width of the gate was reviewed as part of this process. Having discussed the widths with School Infrastructure NSW it was felt that the 3500mm width of the opening in the fence was sufficient for the pedestrian movement needs of the school. Therefore, it is proposed that the gate is not widened in order to limit the impact on the heritage listed fence to Bay Road. • However, the change in the operation of the gate to a sliding gate will allow for the full width of the opening in the fence to be kept clear when the gate is open. • We also note that we did explore the option of creating multiple gate entry points off Bay Road, however, this was not supported by the Heritage consultant due to the impact on the heritage listed fence. 3. We have reviewed the planning of the stairs and ramps in order to widen all circulation paths – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stair has been widened from 3500mm to 4500mm • The ramps have been widened from 1750mm clear to 2100mm clear 4. The configuration of the ramps, stair and landscaping have been adjusted to create an increased forecourt area at street level at the bottom of the stair. This creates spaces for seating and gathering on the Bay Road frontage level at the base of the stairs and ramp. <p>We believe that the outcome of these changes is an entry space that is more generous and welcoming.</p> |

| Item No. | Comment | Response |
|----------|---|---|
| 2 | b) the proposed vertical alignment and predominant use of light-coloured panelling on levels two and three of the southern façade of Building I do not relate well to proposed brickwork on level one and the surrounding streetscape. Further, the lack of fine grain relief (e.g. sills, reveals and parapets) and in parts full length panelling, would result in an expansive and visually dominant presentation of panelling across the southern façade. | In light of these comments we have revised the following components of the façade design – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have reviewed the detailing of the proposed glassfibre reinforced concrete (GRC) panelling in order to move from large format panels to a smaller-scale panelised system. The proposed system allows for the façade to be articulated with a finer grain of detail that reduces the overall scale of the panels and the building. 2. Further to this, the product that is proposed allows for the provision of a variety of texture finishes within the panelised system. The use of these textures creates an additional layer texture to the façade as well as a depth of colour and tone that softens the overall impact of the façade 3. The detailing of the ‘punched’ windows and the associated panelling between the windows has been reviewed. The depth of the placement of the windows within the façade has been increased – accentuating the ‘punched’ nature of the windows. A framing element has also been added to tie the vertical panels of windows together in a similar structure to the detailing on the existing brick buildings on the site (most notably Building A). We believe this increases the impact of these windows – adding a layer of depth and interest to the façade. |
| 3 | c) the eastern elevation of Building I proposes full height panels without windows, presenting massing and scale impacts when viewed from Bay Road. | The Eastern elevation of the building has been reviewed in order to ensure it is more consistent with the remainder of the building form. Windows have been created in the façade (within the joinery of the Home Bases in that portion of the building). Further to this, the additional detailing and texture provided by the modification to the façade cladding (as discussed above) softens the impact of this façade and makes it more cohesive with the remainder of the building. |
| 4 | The RtS must include additional information to address the above concerns, including: d) detailed streetscape character analysis of the Bay Road streetscape and identification of any defined use of colours and materials and commonality of architectural expression. | A streetscape character analysis of the Bay Road frontage has been prepared and is attached to this submission. |

| Item No. | Comment | Response |
|----------|---|--|
| 5 | e) improved entry Bay Road entry design to increase the areas providing standing, movement and access into the school from the entry point. | The entry design has been modified – refer to comments in Item 1 above. Revised Architectural Drawings are attached to this submission. |
| 6 | f) developed architectural expression and use of materials and colours on southern and eastern elevations. | The Southern and Eastern facades of the buildings have been modified – refer to comments in Items 2 and 3 above. Revised Architectural Drawings are attached to this submission. |
| 7 | Address the Government Architect NSW comments on the EIS dated 6 October 2021. | These items are addressed in Items 9 to 16 below |
| 8 | <p>Shadowing</p> <p>5. Sections 7.3.2 and 7.1.2 of the EIS state that shadows generated by the proposal would not impact surrounding development and that shadows would fall onto Bay Road and the footpath at 3pm in mid-winter. The shadow diagrams lodged with the EIS show that at 3pm shadows are cast across Bay Road and onto properties opposite the site on Bay Road. To allow for proper assessment of shadow impacts, hourly shadow diagrams are required between 12pm and 3pm in mid-winter, and elevation shadow diagrams are required to demonstrate from what time and where shadows will fall on north facing elevations of development opposite the site on Bay Road.</p> | Updated Shadow diagrams have been provided on Architectural Drawings SD-1108 and SD-1108a providing shadow diagrams at hourly intervals as requested. These diagrams indicate that the shadows from this development only begin impacting on the neighbouring properties in mid-winter from 2pm. |

| Government Architect NSW | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| 9 | <p>Bay Street Entry</p> <p>The rationalised ramp (providing parity with the stair for 'arrival' at the building interface) and addition of the awning roof are noted as positives; however concerns remain regarding the overall amenity and quality of this important entry as the centrepiece of the upgrade. Further design development is recommended to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notwithstanding concerns about minimising the opening in the heritage fence, the reduced stair and gate width have significantly impacted the welcoming and generous nature of the site entry. • The reduced stair is no longer aligned with the width of the entry awning and width of the stair to Level 2 courtyard beyond. Accordingly the entry has lost its strong and clear axis. • The reduced stair width and minor increase in ramp width (1750mm clear) are considered minimum widths and not commensurate with generous movement (e.g. two strollers comfortably passing at the ramp) • The rationale that other entries will accommodate parents with strollers is not supported. The Bay Street entry offers weather protection and universal access to the co-located Hall, COLA and Reception (for both School and public uses); this level of amenity will ensure Bay Street is the most functional and convenient entry. • Notwithstanding impacts to the heritage fence, the width of the fence opening does reflect the aggregated width of the stair and ramp, creating a 'bottleneck' scenario. A wider or dual fence openings (to address the issues above) should be considered in conjunction with opportunities for reuse/interpretation of the existing fence. • The outward swing of the reception door impacts the clear unobstructed path to the site entry stair. • Revisit the form and architectural expression of the awning roof to make the entry more recognisable. | <p>In light of these comments, we have reviewed a number of components of the design –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The configuration of the entry stair and ramp has been modified to allow the stair to sit centrally under the awning roof. 2. The entry gate has been reconfigured to be a sliding gate rather than swing gates. This limits the space required for the entry gate and allows for a more generous footpath / gathering space at the bottom of the entry stairs behind the gate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note that the width of the gate was reviewed as part of this process. Having discussed the widths with School Infrastructure NSW it was felt that the 3500mm width of the opening in the fence was sufficient for the pedestrian movement needs of the school. Therefore, it is proposed that the gate is not widened in order to limit the impact on the heritage listed fence to Bay Road. • However, the change in the operation of the gate to a sliding gate will allow for the full width of the opening in the fence to be kept clear when the gate is open. • We also note that we did explore the option of creating multiple gate entry points off Bay Road, however, this was not supported by the Heritage consultant due to the impact on the heritage listed fence. 3. The entry doors to the Reception area have been adjusted in order to move them further back into the undercroft area (allowing more space for the stair) and creating a fixed panel of screening / fencing for the doors to open onto so they don't impact on the circulation paths. 4. We have reviewed the planning of the stairs and ramps in order to widen all circulation paths – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stair has been widened from 3500mm to 4500mm • The ramps have been widened from 1750mm clear to 2100mm clear 5. The configuration of the ramps, stair and landscaping have been adjusted to create an increased forecourt area at street level at the bottom of the stair. This creates refuge spaces for seating and gathering on the Bay Road frontage level at the base of the stairs and ramp. 6. The planning of the buildings above the entry and the entry awning roof have been revised in order to allow the building form to be recessed at this point. This allows for this area to read as a break between the main building forms and a more legible entry statement. The materiality of the cladding to this portion of the building is modified to accentuate this. |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An entry that is both generous and readily identifiable (important welcoming qualities) is not evident in the EIS or SDRP design. This design challenge is amplified by the entry not aligning with the gap between buildings. It is recommended the design at the current location (grids 5 – 6) revisit the considerations above to optimise these qualities. In regards to the above, the awning roof differs between the sections and the roof plan. It is assumed the sections reflect the design intent. The intent to manage bicycles at other site entries, including bike storage at the northeast corner of the site is noted. | <p>7. Further to this, the main building signage is also relocated from the Hall Building (Building J) in order to sit above the entrance awning – creating a more unified entry statement for the site.</p> <p>We believe that the cumulative result of all of these design adjustments is that the location of the entry is more legible within the streetscape and the entry space itself is more generous and welcoming.</p> <p>Please note that as a result of the modifications to the stair and ramp an additional existing tree to the Bay Road frontage is proposed to be removed (Tree 47). This has been reviewed and accepted by the arborist. Additional planting has been provided in order to compensate for the removal of this tree.</p> <p>Finally, we note the comments regarding how the awning roof is shown in the architectural drawings. We have noted that the roof is not shown on either the roof plan or the floor plans of lower levels. This has been rectified in the revised documents provided with the Response to Submissions package to accurately reflect this roof.</p> |
| 10 | <p>Landscaping</p> <p>The location of additional trees to the western portion of the central courtyard and north-east corner of the site is noted and supported. Noting a comparison of tree removal between SDRP and EIS designs is not available at this time.</p> | <p>These comments are noted.</p> <p>Further to this, we note that details of the extent of trees to be removed were not presented as part of the previous SDRP presentation. However, we confirm that there have been only minor adjustments to the landscaping as a result of detailed coordination and design development.</p> |
| 11 | <p>Façade and roof form</p> <p>The inclusion of 'punched windows' to the southern façade of the main building, addresses a limited selection of SDRP advice and is supportable as a shift in the right direction; however strong concerns remain regarding the use/application, detailing and design quality (in delivery) for prefabricated panels (DFMA) in this heritage context.</p> <p>To enable a contextual fit, SDRP advice advocates for DFMA use and detailing that is fine grained and scale appropriate; this includes not supporting DFMA used in a manner that is similar to basic tilt-up construction (e.g. warehouse construction and the like). In this regard the heritage report (page 131) provides the following guiding principle:</p> | <p>In light of these comments, we have reviewed a number of components of the design –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> We have reviewed the detailing of the proposed glass fibre reinforced concrete (GRC) panelling in order to move from large format panels to a smaller-scale panelised system. The proposed system allows for the façade to be articulated with a finer grain of detail that reduces the overall scale of the panels and the building. Further to this, the product that is proposed allows for the provision of a variety of texture finishes within the panelised system. The use of these textures creates an additional layer texture to the façade as well as a depth of colour and tone that softens the overall impact of the façade |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | <p><i>“The materials, finishes, and façade treatments of new buildings should consist of contemporary solutions that are consistent and cohesive with the original fabric throughout the site, creating a sympathetic transition between modern and heritage fabrics.”</i></p> <p>The ‘punched window’ approach is consistent with this principle; however further design development is recommended, along with process-based design quality measures (potentially applied separate to the planning approval process) – refer below:</p> | <p>3. The detailing of the ‘punched’ windows and the associated panelling between the windows has been reviewed. The depth of the placement of the windows within the façade has been increased – accentuating the ‘punched’ nature of the windows. A framing element has also been added to tie the vertical panels of windows together in a similar structure to the detailing on the existing brick buildings on the site (most notably Building A). We believe this increases the impact of these windows – adding a layer of depth and interest to the façade.</p> |
| 12 | <p>Façade and roof form (Continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The east elevation of the main building is not supported. This façade has full height panels without windows, the architectural expression at this end of the building (as it presents to Bay Street) is not supported as an appropriate fit with the heritage context. This includes concerns about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the expression and use of DFMA (refer above), specifically the windows providing an ‘in between’ scale consistent with the aforementioned heritage principle. the lack of fenestration generally to deliver amenity | <p>The Eastern elevation of the building has been reviewed in order to ensure it is more consistent with the remainder of the building form. Windows have been created in the façade (within the joinery of the Home Bases in that portion of the building).</p> <p>Further to this, the additional detailing and texture provided by the modification to the façade cladding (as discussed above) softens the impact of this façade and makes it more cohesive with the remainder of the building.</p> |
| 13 | <p>Façade and roof form (Continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elements of the south elevation of the main building are not supportable. The intent for a brick base (Level 1) is supported, however the design resolution in terms of the relationship/connection of the brick base to the revised DFMA panels above (Levels 2&3) is not supported. This impacts the fenestration and presentation of the entire southern façade. Greater design development is recommended to address, the inter-relationship between the DFMA panels and their windows to the windows and brickwork at Level 1. The current configuration is clumsy and incongruous in terms vertical alignment and distribution of Level 1 brick openings relative to the DFMA panels. | <p>In light of these comments, we have reviewed a number of components of the design –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The windows to the brick base of the building have been modified so that they are consistent with the window formats in the GRC panelling to Levels 2 and 3 in order to make the overall façade composition more consistent. The configuration of the feature CFC panels along the Bay Road frontage have been extended so that they continue to the ground – breaking up the brickwork as well as the GRC cladding. <p>We believe that the result of these changes is a more cohesive façade treatment to the Bay Road frontage.</p> |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 14 | <p>Façade and roof form (Continued).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The opportunity to alter the roof profile to increase the general amenity (e.g. daylighting) of the building envelope and breakdown the mass of the roof has not been adopted. The assertion in the EIS that the new vertical elements in the southern façade are considered commensurate with this opportunity is not supported. | <p>As discussed in Item 11 above, the option of creating a higher roof form to align with the feature façade elements along the Bay Road frontage was explored in order to increase the break up of the form along the streetscape and to provide the opportunity for high level light and ventilation to be provided into the Level 3 classrooms.</p> <p>However, following this investigation it was felt that the impact of this gesture on the project budget and structure of the building was not supported by the client due to concerns regarding the additional height that this would add to the building form, the complication and ongoing maintenance that the steps in the roof form would create as well as the additional costs that this would add to the project.</p> <p>As a result, the roof form has been maintained as consistent along the building and the feature panels are used to break up the building form.</p> |
| 15 | <p>Façade and roof form (Continued).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential for DFMA to provide a contextual fit is reliant on the inclusion and refinement of key details (e.g. sills, reveals, parapets, connections/plane separation to brickwork below and the like). The EIS documents infer these details at a large scale; however they are not sufficiently evident in the EIS to provide certainty of good design outcomes (refer below for expanded commentary). DFMA is not considered inappropriate to deliver a contextual / heritage fit for the proposed buildings. The use of DFMA in this project is driven by efficiencies, this combined with the material properties of the product (i.e. its limited application) in combination with value engineering as part of design and construct procurement, presents a risk to design quality and consequently heritage compatibility. | <p>As discussed above, we believe that these concerns are addressed by the modifications that have been made to the detailing of the proposed GRC panelling to the façade and the additional layer of detail added to the façade in general.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 16 | <p>Façade and roof form (Continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure DFMA will deliver an appropriate a contextual fit, process-based design quality measures are recommended. This includes greater design development, a further level of design review and delivery mechanisms that establish and 'lock in' design excellence qualities for DFMA. This broadly could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Returning to SDRP to address these issues Conditions of Approval to promote design quality (e.g design integrity mechanisms) Collaboration between GANSW and SINSW to ensure future design and construct procurement embeds the design intent (e.g make DFMA quality part of a multi-point tender criteria). | <p>These comments are noted and will be considered further by SINSW.</p> |
| <p>Comments from SDRP Review – 10th November 2021</p> | | |
| 17 | <p>Site Entry and Gates</p> <p>The revised configuration of the ramps and stairs is supported. The configuration of the gates and columns to the top of the stairs should be reviewed to try to avoid the column being located in the centre of the stairs.</p> | <p>We have reviewed the location of the column and the configuration of the gates at the top of the stairs. The column has been set at the centre of the stairs in order to create a logical position for the gates to open onto (and fix open to) during peak hours of the school.</p> <p>If the gates were reconfigured to swing in different directions they would clash with the entry doors to the Reception area.</p> <p>As a result, we have retained the proposed location of the column and the configuration of the gates as presented. It is intended that this column will be used as a signage element in this location.</p> |
| 18 | <p>Parapet and Articulation of the Top of the Building</p> <p>The building has developed an expression for the 'base' and 'middle'. However, it is lacking some detailing to the 'top' of the building. Review the articulation and detailing of the roof and parapet.</p> | <p>We have reviewed the detailing of the top of the building and the parapets. In response we have revised the detailing of the parapet edge. As a result we have created a different articulation to the parapet edge over the CFC feature panels to create a greater level of contrast between these areas and the remainder of the GRC panelling.</p> |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 19 | <p>Brick Detailing</p> <p>The detailing of the brick to the base of the building should be reviewed to add an additional layer of interest and a tactile element at the pedestrian level. This will also add an element of 'fun' to the project.</p> | <p>We have proposed changing the brick bond pattern to the base of the building to a 'Common Bond' pattern that will add a subtle banding to the texture of the brick. It is proposed that the detail of the jointing treatment will be used to add a further layer of texture to this brickwork.</p> <p>We did explore adding a greater level of texture to the brickwork at this level, however, it was felt that this could clash with the level of detail being created in the GRC panelling and make the overall affect too 'busy'.</p> <p>It was felt that the best outcome was to add a subtle additional texture to this brickwork.</p> |
| 20 | <p>Feature Red Detailing</p> <p>The red detailing and features to the façade should be reconsidered in order to make it more playful and more integrated into the overall façade composition.</p> | <p>We have reviewed the way the red features are incorporated into the façade. We have retained the feature red 'stripes' on the CFC panels. However, in addition to this we have added a layer of red feature panels in the framing around and in between the windows.</p> |
| 21 | <p>Façade Materiality</p> <p>The details and materials of the façade should be reconsidered to -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplify the palette of materials • Consider the fixing details of the GRC and CFC panels – concealed fixings are preferred • Simplify the detailing and 'banding' across the CFC panelling • Improve the junction between the CFC panels and the brick base • Review the material of the façade over the entry awning so that it isn't the same materiality as the Hall building – leaving the Hall as a 'special' form. • Façade materials should be specified in detail | <p>In response to these comments, we have reviewed the façade detailing in the following ways –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As discussed above, we have extended the CFC panels down to the Ground Level so that they don't interact with the brick base to the building, but layer over the top of it. We believe this improves this junction and simplifies the material palette. 2. As discussed above, we have reviewed the trims around the CFC panel – particularly at the parapet. We also reviewed the vertical banding through these panels, however, it was felt that this simplified the area too much. These bands have been retained. 3. The CFC panelling over the entry awning has been changed to be the lighter grey colour tone – matching the feature panels along the front of Building I. This means that all of the CFC panels (and associated elements) apart from the Hall are the one colour. This allows the hall to stand out as the feature / special element in the façade. 4. Details of the fixing requirements of the GRC and CFC panelling as well as the exact product selections for the bricks and other finishes have been specified as part of the tender documents for the D&C contractors. |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 22 | <p>Playfulness and Fun</p> <p>The development is currently missing an element of fun and playfulness in both the landscaping and the building form.</p> | <p>As discussed above, we have reviewed the way the ‘red’ feature panels are integrated into the façade of the building. We believe this adds another layer of playfulness into the design.</p> <p>Further to this, we would note that this layer of playfulness and fun will be included in the design in the following ways –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are a number of elements of signage and artworks that will be incorporated in the design as part of the Connection with Country response. 2. The interior design and wayfinding signage elements of the design that have been documented provide a layer of interest and fun to the design at a scale that will be directly experienced by the students. 3. As discussed, the intention is for the students and staff to be involved in artworks outlined above. Further to this, when the school is occupied the students and staff will personalise the space adding this element of fun. The design allows for this to occur through the display of student work and projects around the teaching spaces and in the communal spaces between the buildings. |
| 23 | <p>Entry Signage</p> <p>The size of the signage panel over the entry is large and out of proportion with the remainder of the building. This should be reviewed.</p> | <p>We have reviewed the layout of the signage in this area – in conjunction with the review of the materiality of the façade in this area. The ‘panel’ that the signage was mounted on has been removed. The signage is now mounted directly onto the CFC panelling in this area and the jointing of the CFC panelling is used to create a framing for the signage.</p> |
| 24 | <p>Vegetable Garden</p> <p>The location of the vegetable garden should be reconsidered in order to make sure that it is functional and well-integrated into the site.</p> | <p>The location of the vegetable gardens is flexible and we appreciate the comments made by the panel in relation to aspect and solar access. The location of the vegetable can be relocated to the western terrace area (closer to the library and COLA) providing good north facing aspect which is easily accessible by the school. It can be integrated into the gardens adjacent to the modular seating nooks which provide access and functional tables/settings in support of teaching and active outcomes.</p> |
| 25 | <p>‘Blank’ Walls around Entry Forecourt</p> <p>There are a lot of ‘blank’ walls along the front of the building and around the Entry Forecourt. These should be considered to make sure that the overall entry is welcoming, inviting and tactile for pedestrians</p> | <p>As discussed above, the brickwork to many of these walls has been reviewed in order to allow for an added layer of texture and tactility through the brick bond pattern.</p> <p>Further to this, a number of the walls around the Entry Forecourt are nominated for a artwork associated with the Connection with Country response as well as wayfinding signage. This will break up the ‘blank’ walls in the area and add a layer of interest for the pedestrians using the area.</p> |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 26 | <p>Entry Awning – Soffit</p> <p>The proposed white colour of the entry awning seems in contrast to the material palette of the remainder of the building. Reconsider this materiality.</p> | <p>We have reviewed this area based on these comments. As a result, we have retained the soffit lining to this roof as CFC sheeting, but we have changed the colour of the soffit to a darker colour to match the façade panelling.</p> |
| 27 | <p>Roof Form</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to breaking up the roof form to add a layer of fun and relief to the building form as well as to provide natural light and ventilation to the internal spaces.</p> | <p>As also discussed in Item 11, this issue has been reviewed with the client. Following these discussions, it is proposed that the roof will be retained as a single plane skillion roof. The parapet walls to the feature CFC panels along the façade will be used to break up the form of the roof to the Bay Road frontage.</p> |
| 28 | <p>Procurement Methods</p> <p>SINSW should give consideration to changing their procurement methods in order to ensure that the design team is engaged for the entire project. This will ensure design continuity and allow confidence that details will be considered and developed as the project progresses.</p> | <p>These comments are noted and will be considered further by SINSW.</p> |