

Bay 15 Impact Studies

Options	1. Retain the platform in original location		2. Partial removal as a mezzanine		3. Relocate platform (raise or lower)		4. Repurpose fabric for interpretation	
	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons
BCA, Fire Engineering and DDA	Nil	The current existing platform does not comply with the BCA or Fire Engineering Report. As Bay 15 is one fire compartment and more than two storeys (in north side). In order to comply with the BCA and Fire Engineering Report, a two hour fire rated wall would need to be constructed between the north and south of bay 15. Alternatively, all the structural elements of the existing platform (columns and beams) must be fire rated with thick intumescent paint if a firewall does not separate the north and south. To comply with the BCA and DDA the platform will need to be accessible by lift and stairs.	New elements of the fitout will comply with BCA and Fire Engineering. If the mezzanine is below 200sqm in area it will not require lift access.	The heritage structural steel will need to be fire rated with intumescent paint forming part of the mezzanine. Travel distances, fire sprinkler coverage, hydrant and hose reel coverage will all need to be further assessed against the BCA. However, a preliminary assessment suggests there may be non-compliances with the approved Fire Engineering Report.	Nil	Same as option 1. The current existing platform does not comply with the BCA or Fire Engineering Report. As this scheme proposes a three level scheme the heritage steel must be fire rated with intumescent paint to achieve compliance.	The current approved design will comply with the latest BCA legislation and Fire Engineering Report	Nil
								

Bay 15 Impact Studies

Options	1. Retain the platform in original location		2. Partial removal as a mezzanine		3. Relocate platform (raise or lower)		4. Repurpose fabric for interpretation	
	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons
Heritage	The timber platform can be retained in its original location.	If no fire wall is constructed the heritage timber platform will have to be dissembled in order to fire rate the top of the steel beams and columns. (est. 30% lost material in removal phase. Refer to the removal method below). Penetrations in the platform would be required for amenities pod, lift shaft, stair access and services reticulation.	The timber platform can be reinstated in its original form with original fabric but not original craftsmanship	Same as option 1. The heritage timber platform will have to be dissembled in order to fire rate the top of the steel beams and columns. (est. 30% lost material in removal phase. Refer to the removal method below) Additional structural support would be required between the heritage and new structure having a physical and visual impact on the heritage platform.	Same as option 1. The timber platform can be reinstated in its original form with original fabric but not original craftsmanship.	The heritage timber platform will have to be dissembled in order to fire rate the top of the steel beams and columns. (est. 30% lost material in removal phase. Refer to the removal method below)	The original fabric will remain onsite and will be used for interpretation purposes; as cladding and flooring. It will ensure the further appreciation of the heritage fabric of the site.	The heritage platform is not retained in its original form and location.
								

Bay 15 Impact Studies

Options	1. Retain the platform in original location		2. Partial removal as a mezzanine		3. Relocate platform (raise or lower)		4. Repurpose fabric for interpretation	
	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons
Architectural	Minimal disruption to existing structure	Lack of natural daylight to ground floor – will require more artificial lighting to meet future commercial requirements. Loses opportunity for scale and volume at entry and within tenancy. Loses opportunity for views through tenancy. North and south Bay 15 no longer on the same levels – stairs and bridge in central spine would need to be redesigned back to a multi level stair configuration. May require further columns to strengthen the platform – diminishes view sight lines. An access floor would have to be installed over the heritage timber flooring to achieve required acoustics between levels and for services reticulation. Heritage fabric no longer in situ	Southern end / entry experience unchanged Higher ceiling height in heritage store and feature of timber ceiling in this area. Daylight access to all floors (assuming top floor to remain set back from west wall).	Visually complicates views from central spine Detailing of full height glazing at northern end becomes more difficult. Removal of heritage fabric.	Retains three levels No loss of NLA Scale and volume at entry retained Underside of timber platform can be viewed from tenancy	Additional columns impact floor layout Heritage fabric no longer in situ Removal of 90-sqm of platform to achieve lighting Lift and stair access required	Retains three levels Sense of scale and volume at entry retained Daylight access to all floors Views through bay retained. Design was intended to ensure that Bay 15 is not 'stuck away' and is an active and attractive part of the development, to align with the standard set throughout the commercial bays. Heritage timber to be reused will remain in the building	Change to heritage fabric
								

Bay 15 Impact Studies

Options	1. Retain the platform in original location		2. Partial removal as a mezzanine		3. Relocate platform (raise or lower)		4. Repurpose fabric for interpretation	
	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons
Structural	The existing structure is retained as a single level consistent with the current configuration.	Structural analysis and testing of existing materials needs to take place to ensure existing structure is viable according to current standards.	Maintain a representative sample of the heritage platform as the mezzanine.	Structural analysis and testing of existing materials needs to take place to ensure existing structure is viable according to current standards Structural design interface between heritage structure and new structure needs to be carefully considered ie. we need to tie the 2 structures together for lateral stability	Nil	Preliminary investigation indicates footings will not take another 2 levels. Additional footings and columns will need to be installed. If new columns are adopted, column spacing and grid will not match existing beams and further design gymnastics is required creating additional complexity. (Likely) Creates major physical and visual impact in appreciation.	Minimal structural alteration to the current approved design required. Existing structural scheme can be modified easily to suit new design interpretation and integrated into scheme.	Existing structure cannot be retained in existing configuration.
								

Bay 15 Impact Studies

Options	1. Retain the platform in original location		2. Partial removal as a mezzanine		3. Relocate platform (raise or lower)		4. Repurpose fabric for interpretation	
	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons
Financial	Nil	Loss of 400sqm of NLA if platform is retained in original location results in a direct loss of income and therefore a \$7 million loss of capitalised value for the project. Full value management of the project will have to be undertaken on the balance of the project to reallocate costs. Full redesign costs, time, labour and resources would be in excess of \$3 million in additional costs not including delay costs to the builder. 100 tonnes of raw steel materials have been shipped offshore to Thailand for fabrication representing a financial loss of over \$500k. The sum of these potential losses puts downward pressure on our final outcome as we find ourselves in a deepening recession.	Technically maintain the same amount of NLA.	Although NLA is technically is maintained the scheme diminishes the pool of tenants who will lease the space because of the multi-tiered levels. Additional significant redesign costs associated with the complexity of tying the existing structure with the new layout.	Maintaining the NLA	Additional costs are realised for a scheme that has a sub-optimal outcome due to BCA requirements and the intervention to the heritage asset to achieve compliance.	Mirvac can retain the financial value in leasing Bay 15 in accordance with the approved current design. This value will enable Mirvac to contribute further to its heritage commitments and into the precinct.	Whilst there are increased costs with this there is less risk in further issues to do with BCA compliance, services and structure.
								

Bay 15 Impact Studies

Options	1. Retain the platform in original location		2. Partial removal as a mezzanine		3. Relocate platform (raise or lower)		4. Repurpose fabric for interpretation	
	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons
Leasing	Nil	Will result in a significant impact to the leasing attributes of the approved redesigned Bay 15 (mod 7 SSD 8449) and the scheme / strategy for Bays 14 and 15. The approved design enables optionality for single or multi-tenant across levels. There are two level spaces in balance of the building, however Bay 14 and 15 function together as three level spaces. Bay 14 not available until 2023. Mirvac took the long view on the functionality for the space. Retaining the platform will compromise the opportunity for natural light impacting the occupant wellbeing and tenant rating of the space	Nil	Diminishes the pool of tenants who will lease the space because of the multi-tiered levels. Reduces the functionality of the levels in Bay 15 and ultimately reduces the leasing attributes of Bay 15 a whole.	Enables the leasing of three levels without multi-tiered levels and a mezzanine.	The addition of structural support through columns and bracing will have a significant impact of the use of the floor layout and realistic efficient use of the space.	Nil impacts to the current strategy which has attracted significant market interest in the three-level scheme. Interpretation elements create a unique workspace for a future tenant	Nil
								