

Your ref
Our ref 238566-00/JK
File ref

ARUP

To Whom It May Concern

Level 10 201 Kent Street
PO Box 76 Millers Point
Sydney 2000
Australia

t +61 2 9320 9320
d +61 2 9320 9658
f +61 2 9320 9321

jorg.kramer@arup.com
www.arup.com

4 June 2018

Dear Sir/Madam

Cockle Bay Park Development Reflectivity Statement for Stage 1 SSDA resubmission

This letter supports a Response to Submissions and amended Concept Proposal associated with a Stage 1 State Significant Development Application (SSDA 7684). It reviews the impact of changes to the proposed building envelope for the Cockle Bay Park Development on the findings of Arup's reflectivity study.

Reflectivity impact

Arup has reviewed Revised Envelope drawings prepared by FJMT architects and dated 30/5/2018.

The reflectivity study report titled "Cockle Bay Park Development – Reflectivity Report for DA" (dated 17 August 2017), prepared by Arup to support the amended EIS submission (2017), assessed impact of potential reflections off the facades of a representative building geometry within the amended EIS (2017) envelope, and found that these would not exceed limits of acceptability according to the Hassall methodology adopted in the study, as long as normal external reflectivity of glazing is kept within a limit of 20% (as per Sydney Central DCP limitations).

The modification to the current proposed envelope as contained in the 2018 response to submissions is within the scope of the original reflectivity study report. The representative geometry including podium used in the previous report fits within the currently proposed envelope, albeit with a reduction in height (down to R.L. 183m). Using the same reference geometry, no additional extent of façade area or additional elevation angles can create additional adverse reflection impact beyond effects assessed previously. The current proposed envelope thus still allows design of buildings with acceptable reflected glare effects.

On this basis, Arup is of the opinion that the proposed modification of the envelope will not result in any increase in likelihood of glare impact of reflections off the façade from buildings designed within the envelope, in addition to those impacts identified within the reflectivity study report. The proposed modification thus requires no further investigation or analysis at this stage of planning and design.

As noted in the report accompanying the amended EIS submission (2017), a Stage 2 application will follow a design excellence process, and a further assessment of reflectivity will be required to support the DA for a resulting revised building geometry.

Yours faithfully

Handwritten signatures in blue ink. The first signature consists of the letters 'JK' in a stylized, cursive font. The second signature is more complex, appearing to be 'Haico Schepers' in a cursive script.

Jorg Kramer
Senior Consultant

Haico Schepers
Principal