

Hi Fiona,

Having reviewed the modification and supporting documents, the proposed changes and their origins are well understood. Dealing with an important matter by exception, as the majority of the changes have little impact, the key issue for the City relates to the loss of the lobby, reception area, awning and presumably signage along Pyrmont Street which currently give the building an address and highly sought-after activation. In place of the lobby the Proponent is seeking to give an assurance that a future MOD will be lodged for an “active wall treatment” which may or may not include a combination of light, colour and activity along the frontage.

It is not clear from the MOD whether the active wall treatment would span Pyrmont Street and Quarry Road (as implied in the Planning Report, p4), only the area around the former lobby (as implied in the DEM Urban Design Statement) or the entire frontage along Pyrmont Street.

The City’s approach to such a scenario would be to require the Proponent to at least lodge a concept of their approach to ascertain, at a basic level, how successful or unsuccessful the concept may be. Once an understanding of the scope and worthiness is ascertained, the City would typically require the concept to be worked up to sufficient detail prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.

The Proponent’s assertion that a further MOD would be lodged for the “active wall” lacks certainty and finality.

In term of design commentary at this stage:

- The approved glazed wall system appears retained despite the presence of solid walls behind it. Opportunities to maintain a glazed and fully transparent frontage should be exhausted. For example, between grid lines 16 and 18 in plan and elevation there is a meeting room with solid walls, beyond which sits the glazed wall system as a second skin. Surely the meeting room can have genuine glazing. Other opportunities may also be relevant in the technical space alongside; and
- The blade wall around the former lobby, protruding into the footpath zone, should not hit the ground if there is no surveillance of the area. The wall should terminate above the first floor level.

We look forward to reviewing the Proponent’s response to the above in their bid to resolve the loss of interest and activity that would arise from this MOD.

Regards,

Russell Hand
Senior Planner
Planning Assessments



Telephone: 9246 7321
cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au