

12<sup>th</sup> August 2022

J4359

## Department of Planning Industry and Environment

**Re: Response to Submission – Built Heritage  
Cockle Bay Park SSD 9978934 and SSD 7684-Mod-1**

This letter responds to the built heritage submissions received from the EIS for the Cockle Bay Park SSD 7686 and SSD 7686-Mod-1.

Stage 2 - SSD 9978934

Issue	Response
<b>Department of Planning, Industry and Environment</b>	
<b><i>Building design and heritage</i></b>	
<b>Podium</b>  The northern part of the podium at RL13.5 is higher than the approved Concept Plan of RL 12. The approved concept plan with the proposed maximum height being commensurate with the balustrade of the Pyrmont Bridge was to ensure that the building did not affect an expansive view of Darling Harbour and the curtilage of the Pyrmont Bridge. The increased building bulk and height at this part of the site limits the field of vision and views towards Darling Harbour upon approach from the east and should be examined for reducing the height where possible.	<p>While the northern part of the podium has an increased height of RL13.2, the overall envelope of the podium has been pushed to the south to separate it from the southern side of the eastern approach of the Pyrmont Bridge.</p> <p>The photomontages produced by design pack prepared by Henning Larsen (refer to the RTS package prepared by Ethos Urban) illustrate that the setback from the Pyrmont Bridge ameliorates the impact of the height increase. As outlined above, the section of retail area will increase in height as viewed from the bridge deck looking to the south east it largely mitigated by the proposed separation which will allow the retail area to read as part of the wider development backdrop of the development.</p>
<b>Curtilage of the Pyrmont Bridge – Promenade</b>  Similarly, the proposal should provide a curtilage to the Pyrmont Bridge at the promenade level. As proposed, the development removes the existing landscaped buffer and reduces the setback from the Pyrmont Bridge. The proximity of the proposed building and retail at the north-west corner of the podium impacts the visibility of Bridge, notably its truss and stone pylon.  Therefore, the City recommends that the north-west corner of the podium be redesigned so that its western edge allows the Bridge and its elements to be more legible. This can be achieved by aligning the western edge of the podium with the edge of retail tenancies or by providing a setback and separation to the Bridge that emulates the existing building. This	<p>As outlined above, the entire building envelope has been moved further to the south to give primacy to the southeastern side of the bridge including the trusses and stone pylon. This allows the Bridge and its elements to be more legible and would also retain the movement of pedestrians at this key point along the water promenade.</p>

# Weir Phillips Heritage and Planning

Issue	Response
<p>would also retain the movement of pedestrians at this key point along the water promenade. Refer to Figure 2 below.</p>	
<p>Heritage Interpretation Strategy</p> <p>The City has reviewed the Heritage Interpretation Report, prepared by Wier Phillips. It is understood that the heritage interpretation strategy is preliminary at this stage and requires further development to provide meaningful guidance for specifying interpretation plans. Place Management NSW has rightfully pointed out that an analysis of nearby developments is needed to examine the key themes, stories and histories that have been interpreted. In addition, to develop and underpin the proposed interpretation themes and concepts, the City recommends a survey and audit of any historical and heritage interpretation elements within the existing development be included in the strategy. This includes the interpretations embodied in the design concept, building form, landscaping and public arts and selection of building materials. Additionally, an investigation of findings of past archaeological and heritage studies associated with the development site should be included in the strategy.</p> <p>The strategy should develop a reference interpretation plan demonstrating how the strategy can be properly incorporated into the development. This reference plan should specify the works and devices to interpret the history and significance of the development site. It can set up a minimal interpretation requirement and provide references on the construction budget and coordination needed for design teams.</p>	<p>The heritage interpretation strategy is intended to be further refined to analyse the content of other recent developments in the vicinity to avoid duplication in the key themes, stories and histories. It should be noted that the Interpretation Report will not be complete without the results from archaeological investigation.</p> <p>Further refinement of the interpretation strategy to better integrate the site's history is currently being undertaken. This will be issued prior to Construction Certificate.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of the non-original eastern end of the Pyrmont bridge (constructed in the 1984) is supported as the works would not impact on significant fabric.</li> <li>• Retention and restoration of the sandstone piers at the eastern end would have a positive impact and is supported.</li> <li>• The re-establishment of the connection between Market Street and Bridge Street and the restoration of the original approach path is supported.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>

## Mod 1 -

Issue	Response
<b>Department of Planning, Industry and Environment</b>	
<b><i>Changes to the building envelope</i></b>	
<p>The Department raises concern about the potential heritage and visual impacts resulting from the increased height of the building envelope (from RL 12 to RL 13.5) and provision of a lift structure adjacent to the Pymont Bridge.</p> <p>Concern is also raised about the location of escalators/stairs connecting to Pymont Bridge. The design of the building envelope should be reconsidered to address these concerns, as well as the concerns raised in Council's and Heritage NSW's submissions about these impacts (also see points 6 and 7 in Schedule 2).</p>	<p>C) The increase to the height building envelope is limited to the northern portion of the retail area adjacent to the Pymont Bridge. Overall, the building envelope has been reduced to formalise the setback with the Pymont Bridge. This has an improved heritage impact as there is no possibility of any built form encroaching further onto the eastern approach to the Bridge. Views towards the southern side of the eastern approach are significantly improved by the setback of the envelope allowing a full appreciation of the southeastern approach of the bridge. The increase in height as viewed from the bridge deck looking to the southeast it largely mitigated by the proposed separation which will allow the retail area to read as part of the wider development backdrop. From a design perspective the proposed increase in height is driven by the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. There is a minimum requirement for sufficient height in retail areas in the podium below. Any reduction in the height (existing 3.6m) will not allow adequate height for a quality retail space. While there is a height increase in the building envelope and built form is setback from the southern end of the Pymont Bridge to ameliorate much of the impact with regard to height.</li> <li>ii. The diagrams and photomontages provided in Stage 1 - SSD 7684 MOD 1 design pack prepared by Henning Larsen (refer to the RTS package prepared by Ethos Urban) response further highlight how the impact of the increased height of the retail spaces is mitigated by the setback of the entire envelope from the southern side of the Pymont Bridge.</li> </ul> <p>As such, the proposed design modification to address The Department's concerns regarding increase the setback of the podium adjacent to Pymont Bridge have been addressed</p>
<p>The Report further states that: The updated scheme has pulled the built forms away from the Pymont Bridge heritage item as an improvement to the approved Concept Proposal and the competition scheme that had more built volume encroaching on this space.</p>	<p>The diagrams and photomontages provided in SSDA MOD response further highlight how the impact of the increased height of the retail spaces is ameliorated by the setback of the entire envelope from the southern side of the Pymont Bridge.</p>

# Weir Phillips Heritage and Planning

Issue	Response
<p>This needs to be further explained through diagrams as the extent of this improvement is unclear from the documentation submitted. The area of the SHR curtilage affected should also be clearly demarcated in the drawings.</p>	
<p>C10.</p> <p>Future Development Application(s) shall include a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment, which considers the heritage impact of the development including any visual and built heritage impacts on Pymont Bridge, Corn Exchange and Shelbourne Hotel. The Heritage Impact Assessment must include appropriate mitigation measures to address any adverse impacts.</p> <p>Options to relocate the proposed escalators further back from the significant bridge stone piers should be explored to achieve a more sympathetic interface with the Pymont Bridge, which minimises visual and physical impact.</p> <p>The proposed new lift structure in the immediate vicinity of the bridge should be reconsidered in terms of its location, form and scale to minimise visual impact on Pymont Bridge.</p> <p>Extent of 'improvement' (as noted in Attachment A Building Envelope Modification Design Report) to the approved Concept Proposal with regard to impacts on Pymont Bridge, shall be further explained through diagrams. The area of the State Heritage Register curtilage affected should also be clearly identified and demarcated.</p>	<p>Any future Development Application will include a detailed visual and heritage impact assessment which will consider the impact on the Pymont Bridge, Corn Exchange, and Shelbourne Hotel.</p> <p>The remainder of responses for C10 are addressed in the commentary above or through separate appendices.</p>

Yours faithfully,



**James Phillips** | Director