

Tuesday, 17 April 2012

Sydney Olympic Park Authority  
8 Australia Avenue  
Sydney Olympic Park NSW 2127

Architecture  
Urban Design  
Planning  
Interior Architecture

Attention: Andrew Brown  
Executive Manager, Planning

**RE: 2 Australia Avenue, Sydney Olympic Park  
Major Project Application MP10\_0168**

Dear Andrew,

We write on behalf of Capital Corporation to provide a written response to the design issues raised by the SOPA Design Review Panel meeting of 29 March 2012. This response should be read in conjunction with the amended architectural drawings issued to SOPA today and the traffic and access advice prepared by Traffix and accompanying this letter at **Attachment A**.

Architectus Sydney  
Level 3, 341 George Street  
Sydney NSW 2000 Australia  
T 61 2 8252 8400  
F 61 2 8252 8600  
sydney@architectus.com.au  
www.architectus.com.au

The following comments are made in the order the issues were raised in the DRP meeting as follows:

Auckland  
Brisbane  
Melbourne  
Shanghai  
**Sydney**

- Building exterior
- Retail back of house
- Setbacks
- Service vehicle entry ramp
- Underground car park
- Recommended changes
- Paving palette / urban elements
- Planting/street trees
- New road 16
- Traffic and event management

## 1. External

### 1.1 Façade

The external façade has been further developed following SOPA comment and also incorporates the Design Competition Jury comments, which stated the following:

- Architecturally the volumes of the proposed design are satisfactory however the façade treatment is bland and there is a desire from the jury for warmth and animation;
- The Jury strongly support the use of an alternate palette of materials in lieu of alpolic and metallic finishes;
- The Jury is accepting of the verticality and use of solid façade elements; further review is required as to the ongoing maintenance of the proposed Green Wall and Green Screen. Concern was raised as to whether this will be an effective façade treatment for years to come.

Architectus Group Pty Ltd  
ABN 90 131 245 684

Managing Director:  
David Sainsbery  
Nominated Architect  
NSWARB 5551  
ARBV 13176

The revised external facade character has been enhanced by reducing the long, unrelenting balconies and including bronze anodized vertical to screens the balconies to add warmth and character. The vertical painted concrete blade elements and white terra-cotta cladding are consistent with winning design competition entry.

The proposed green wall identified in the winning design competition entry has been assessed in detail and it was agreed that the long term result would be detrimental to the building and in turn the precinct.

This was identified and accepted in principle by SOPA during the meeting held 29<sup>th</sup> March 2012.

## **1.2 Darker Toned Materials**

It was identified during the meeting held with SOPA 29<sup>th</sup> March 2012 that time of day, lighting and quality of image all had a bearing on the appearance of the colours shown on the perspectives included in the design competition winning entry when compared to the perspective in the DA Submission.

A revised perspective was tabled at this meeting and it was accepted in principle by SOPA that the proposed external colours were as per the design competition winning entry.

## **1.3 Herb Elliot Undercroft Design**

The Café/Kiosk has now been re-instated as indicated on the revised drawings. The landscaping designs have taken into consideration the concerns in relation to the public space and the wind consultants report addresses the concerns in relation to the comment that it may become a “windswept” space.

## **1.4 South East corner fronting Australia Avenue and Proposed East West Street**

The Electrical Kiosk has now been deleted and a chamber substation is proposed. This has been designed in consultation with the project electrical engineers and complies to Ausgrids access requirement guidelines. The garbage and loading dock area has also been relocated to provide more presence to the retail corner, activation and visual interest.

This was identified and accepted in principle by SOPA during the meeting held 29<sup>th</sup> March 2012.

## **2. Retail back-of- house**

### **2.1 Retail Tenancy Access to Loading Dock**

The redesign of the loading dock and back-of-house now provides direct access to the loading dock and garbage room facilities.

### **2.2 Management of Supermarket Operation**

The redesign of the loading dock and back-of-house now provides direct lift access to the basement car park for patrons of the supermarket. The supermarket entry has now been identified on the revised drawings as has the customer parking.

It is understood that shop front presentation (that is to ensure that product is not being stacked up against the glass shop front) will be addressed with the tenant agreement once a tenant is secured.

### 3. Setbacks

The Master Plan 2030 nominates a 3m setback from the boundary of this new street. The intent of the setback is to provide for sunlight access to the public footpaths, and for built forms that reinforce and complement the street, to maintain pedestrian footpaths of minimum 1.8m in width permit and to provide and to provide a transition between the public and private areas and allow for coordinated landscaped settings for buildings.

The southern alignment of the building is proposed to be setback 2.2m to 5.0m at ground floor level. The fire stair is setback 0.2m from the boundary of the new road at ground floor level. It is understand SOPA accept the proposed position of the fire stair.

SOPA raises concern with the proposed upper level setback with a varied setback of 0m to 5.0m. The upper levels of the building are built to the southern corner of the site to provide a strong corner element to the Australia Avenue/new road intersection. It is sound urban design practice to provide zero setbacks on corner sites to define the street edge, particularly as Australia Avenue is a wide boulevard with high rise tower on its eastern side.

The proposed setback for upper levels varies from 0m to 5m, is considered an appropriate response, that effectively balances the desire to strongly define the Australia Avenue/new street corner with the intent of the 3m setback control. Strictly complying with the 3m setback across the full frontage to the new street will have very a negligible effect on the amenity of the public domain in terms of the amount of sunlight on footpaths, being on the southern side of the building and adjoining the intersection of the new roadway.

### 4. Service vehicle entry ramp

#### 4.1 Service Vehicle Entry Ramp

The service vehicle ramp has been amended and required clearances have been maintained. This was identified and accepted in principle by SOPA during the meeting held 29<sup>th</sup> March 2012.

### 5. Underground car park

#### 5.1 Basement Car Park Access

The road structure has been designed in relation to GHD road sections and does have capacity to support future street planting and road services. A section is provided for your information.

### 6. Recommended changes

All recommended changes have been addressed in the above commentary with the exception of the temporary basement car park access.

The proposed temporary location for the basement car park access is based on a logical staging of the development, based on the arrangements of Silex Systems under their lease. The suggested ramp location by SOPA is an area of exclusive use by the existing tenant, under the current lease. Locating the ramp in the suggested location greatly effects the operation of this business given that this is also the currently location of the main entry to the building. It is a priority of the existing tenant to have car parking at the main entry. This would not be achievable if the SOPA option was adopted.

Whilst portions of this area (car parking) may be affected during the construction of the project this is negotiable under the current terms of the lease item 17.11, which states:

*"The Lessor reserves the right to vary the locations of the car parks from time to time including in circumstances where reasonably required by the Head Lessor for redevelopment of the precinct of which land forms part off"*

The suggested ramp location by SOPA is not an ideal location as a permanent access ramp for the development, which it may become being integrated with the building. The proposed temporary ramp will need to be removed prior to the dedication of the roads, as the road must be consistent with the Master Plan 2030 and to SOPA's satisfaction.

As identified in the meeting held 29<sup>th</sup> March 2012, the current ramp location is temporary and located on private property. New Road 10 cannot be constructed entirely until the exiting office/warehouse building is demolished. In addition this is reasonable to assume that the proponent would not be required to dedicate the new roads to SOPA until they are completed to SOPA's satisfaction, which aligns with the Occupation Certificate for the final stage of the development. The dedication of the roads will likely only occur once the temporary access location of demolished and the permanent access driveway provided.

As the demolition of the existing office/warehouse is not proposed in this stage of development and provided the location of the temporary ramp remains within the private property, it should not have a bearing on SOPA's decision to approve the development application given that it will be removed at a later date. Capital Corporation would accept a condition on this Project Application for Stage 1 requiring the demolition of the temporary and construction of permanent access driveway in accordance with the staging plans submitted with the application.

## **7. Paving palette / urban elements**

### **7.1 Integration of UDEM**

The updated Landscape design has been prepared in consultation with David Martin from SOPA. We understand that the proposed changes are acceptable and in line with the UDEM Guidelines.

## **8. Planting/street trees**

### **8.1 Street Tree Species**

Landscape Design drawings have been amended to indicate Brush Box street tree planting as required.

### **8.2 Super-Advance Tree in Public Domain**

Though the design completion winning entry indicates a fig tree in the central courtyard, this was done so for illustrative purposes only. After investigating further it has been confirmed that a fig tree of significant size would not survive in this location due to required root depth and width, soil volume and water retention. A large Native tree is proposed for the central courtyard however is not relevant for this development application.

This was identified and accepted in principle by SOPA during the meeting held 29<sup>th</sup> March 2012.

## **9. New road 16**

### **9.1 Road Design**

The road structure has been designed in relation to GHD road sections and does have capacity to support future street tree planting and road services.

## 10. Traffic issues and event management

Refer to attached response to traffic and event management related issues from Traffix at **Attachment A**.

If you have any queries regarding the above response or the amended drawings, please do not hesitate to contact Colin Odbert, Associate Director

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Donaldson', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Murray Donaldson  
Associate Director and Urban Planner  
Architectus

cc.

Darlene van der Breggen, Executive Manager, Sydney Olympic Park Authority

Darren Troy, Manager Planning, Sydney Olympic Park Authority

Adam Wheat, Development Manager, Capital Corporation

Maria Passafaro, Design Manager, Capital Corporation

**Attachment A:** Response to traffic and event management issues prepared by Traffix.

**Attachment A:**  
Response from Traffix