

MEETING SUMMARY

SOUTH EVELEIGH HERITAGE SUB-PANEL

MEETING	Response to Submissions (RTS) for Modification request for Bays 5-15 of the Locomotive Workshops (8449 Mod 4)
DATE	Tuesday 14 January 2020
TIME	3:00pm – 4:00pm
VENUE	Mirvac Site Office, Yerrabingin House, Level 1, 2 Day Road, Eveleigh

MEETING ATTENDANCE LIST

Chair:	Philippa Williams (PW)	Assistant Development Manager, Mirvac
Attendees:	Uma Springford (US)	Senior Development Manager, Mirvac
	Zac Langford (ZL)	Assistant Development Manager, Mirvac
	David Nix (DN)	State Heritage Assessment Officer, Heritage Council of NSW
	Priyanka Misra (PM)	Heritage Specialist, City of Sydney
	Reinah Urqueza (RU)	Specialist Planner, City of Sydney
	Aidan Ryan (AR)	Consultant, Mirvac
	Natalie Vinton (NV)	Director, Curio Projects
	Anne Colenbrander (AC)	Associate, Sissons Architects
	Andre Szczepanski (AS)	Associate Director - Planning, Ethos Urban
	Thomas Atkinson (TA)	Urbanist – Planning, Ethos Urban
	Fay Edwards (FE)	Senior Urbanist – Engagement, Ethos Urban

ITEM	ACTIONS
1. Welcome and introductions	
	PW opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.
2. Bays 5-15 of the Locomotive Workshops (8449 Mod 4)	
	PW provided an overview of Modification 4 of the State Significant Development (SSD) Modification Application for the ATP Locomotive Workshop Bays 5-15.
3. Comments Received RTS1 – Gridline 8 Sliding Door	
	PW provided an overview of the proposed sliding door along gridline 8 in Bay 7. - The proposed sliding door is the threshold between the retail and commercial areas. - The sliding door is required ensure that the design of Bays 5-15 of the Locomotive Workshop complies with the BCA, which requires that members of the public must be within 20m of a point of choice egress

MEETING SUMMARY

	(under the current configuration, the distance between Gridline 6 and the door on Gridline 9 Door is approximately 50m). Under the fire engineering strategy for the base building, an alternate solution permits this door to be located at no greater than 28m from Gridline 6. - The proposed sliding door has been designed to minimise any obstruction of views along the central spine of the Locomotive Workshop, with a semi-frameless glazing and only structural head supports. Curio Projects confirm that the proposed sliding door will have an overall neutral visual impact, generally consistent with SSD 8449. Discussion: - AR – BCA regulations require three points to an exit. - DN - concerned that it introduces another barrier. We originally discussed it being a low height barrier - it's now morphed into a full height barrier that has considerable visual impact. - DN - what are the alternatives? - US - we need the point of choice. There are other solutions, but there is a significant impact on the design and use if the tenancy space. - DN – <i>[refers to floor plan]</i> that area is not part of any tenancy - what would you define this space as? - AR - tenants from Quantum could use this section. - DN - can the Quantum tenancy wall be removed? - AR - high-level glazing will still be required. We're trying to get the best outcomes for everyone and make the barrier as delicate as possible. - DN - could you lower the barrier? - AR - yes. - NV - are you suggesting that we extend the tenancy so that there is only one entry? - US - depends on who the final tenant will be, and how much area they want. There is still the option for there to be two separate tenants. - DN - preference on gridline 8 is for here to be a low-height security barrier rather than a full-height barrier. - NV - sometimes you get dispensation for heritage assets. David - any examples? - DN - we have examples for dispensation of entries to heritage assets. - DN - can you remove the metal lintel of the entrance? - AC - it's as low and as subtle as it can be. - AR - we could drop it to the floor. - AR - we can consider other entrance styles. i.e. a low gate driven by a motor above. - DN - access is of a lesser concern to me than visual impacts. - DN – we will investigate if there is the possibility of some dispensation for heritage assets. - NV - let me know if there is any other precedent. - US - we are required to restrict public access. - PM - will the barrier have to be closed at all times? - US – yes.	
--	---	--

MEETING SUMMARY

	- PW – so we have two options. One is to seek dispensation for BCA requirements, another option is to investigate a low-height barrier. - US - are you ok with these two options? - PM - yes. - DN - yes.	Mirvac to investigate whether there could be any dispensation for BCA requirements for heritage reasons.
4.	Bays 5-15 of the Locomotive Workshops (8449 Mod 4)	
	ZL provided an update on the proposed design of the Foundry Tunnel. - We decided to explore ways to improve the public amenity around the Foundry Tunnel entrance into the Locomotive Workshop (in the front of IGA). - NV – consider how the Foundry Tunnel relates to the retailers (i.e. IGA and The Grounds). - US - The Grounds are developing their designs and we'll re-engage with them next week. - ZL – our focus is on the key thoroughfare between the Foundry Tunnel and The Grounds Roastery. <i>[Renders shown]</i> - Public seating, lighting and planter boxes proposed to conceal the precast concrete foundation of the Foundry Tunnel. - DN - the main entrance looks restricted. - NV - internally, nothing has changed. We're just trying to pare it back / make it more industrial. Adding seating. Lighting makes it more beautiful and integrated with the rest of the space. <i>[Render shown - plain precast shape without the embellishments]</i> - Without the embellishments, the Foundry Tunnel looks more industrial and blends in better with the heritage. - US - we want all your feedback. - DN - reduce the embellishments between the Foundry Tunnel and The Grounds Roastery. - DN - potentially get rid of the seating. It would also be good to see what The Grounds are proposing. - AC - when you introduce seating there is a fall hazard, so the wall behind must be a certain height. - ZL - you could add a glass balustrade. - NV – it is better if we keep it looking more industrial. - AR - good to give the opportunity for seating outside of The Grounds. - DN – I'm not sold on the vertical elements. - NV - what do you think of the base form? - DN - the precast concrete foundation? It fits the space a bit better. - US - can we send these renders to you to get your initial thoughts? - DN - I'll run this passed Sarah Jane. - NV - I agree that the planter boxes remind me of shopping centre.	

MEETING SUMMARY

	• PM - is there wiring between the poles on the side? • NV - these were for the vines - but we haven't worked this out yet. Might be a bit much. • AC - I think they conflict with the trusses. • PM - is the digital interpretation going to happen? • NV - yes, within the arch of the Foundry Tunnel. • NV - would you like us to leave in the planter boxes and seating for your review? • DN - yes.	
5.	Next steps	
	PW closed the meeting and confirmed that Mirvac would investigate two options for the sliding door on gridline 8: • Option 1: Dispensation for heritage assets. • Option 2: A lower-height barrier. PW also confirmed that the material shown would be circulated to members for their review and feedback.	