

| Table 1. Response to Public Submissions | |
|---|--|
| Matter Raised | Response |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed design lacks the timeless qualities of the existing heritage buildings on site (eg. Old Main Building) which have over a period of 100 years consistently demonstrated their robustness by accommodating change over time. | <p>The south facade has been designed with the long term plan of becoming a backdrop to the 'Old Main' heritage building and being read in the context of the new link building once the Wallace building is eventually demolished. It draws subtle reference from the Main building in the size, repetition, hierarchy of openings but avoids any literal copying of these elements to ensure it reads appropriately as a modern interpretation and fulfils the daylight requirements of the learning spaces beyond. Incorporating the plant into the overall facade resolution provides the southern facade with a scale and articulation more in keeping with the 'Old Main; Heritage building.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current design proposal is a 'foreign object' on the campus, that appears to take cues from the unfortunate design language of the recent the Therry Building project and offers only superficial reference to the context in the architectural design language - the landscape architecture is more successful in this regard | <p>The redesign of the sun shading devices contributes to a more unified and contextual outcome with the replacement of the perceived 'foreign' diagonal pattern with simple vertical and horizontal elements achieving the same sun shading objectives to meet Section J requirements.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The material selections proposed are contrary to the written text in the Site Analysis and Existing Building Material section of the report (p.11) | <p>Updated Site Analysis and existing building materials have been provided as part of the RTS documentation.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inelegant façade and proportions of the proposed design do not mitigate the building mass and bulk (and its understandably deep floorplate due to functions and pedagogy). There is a lack of rhythm in the façade proportions and subdivision that could take cues from the underlying rhythm of the traditional buildings on campus. Not in seeking to replicate the traditional but to analyse and understand the inherent design characteristics that these buildings possess and why they endure | <p>The revised design draws greater reference from and achieves better adherence to the immediate building context insofar as simplifying the lines of the sun shading from diagonal to horizontal and vertical elements and the more ordered arrangement of the window openings.</p> <p>The change in window arrangement reinforces the horizontal nature of the NNE facade, directly referencing the adjacent O'Neil building and the backdrop of the Wallace (temporarily) and Ramsay buildings.</p> <p>The southern facade draws subtle reference from the Main building in the size, repetition, hierarchy of openings but avoids a literal copying of these elements to ensure it reads appropriately as a modern interpretation and fulfils the daylight requirements of the learning spaces beyond. The materiality of this facade has been simplified to that of the masonry base, Equitone upper volume and standing seam cladding the plant</p> |

| Table 1. Response to Public Submissions | |
|--|---|
| Matter Raised | Response |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Massing at the East end of the building is far too bulky and the architectural gesture of a canted façade is overwrought and unnecessarily fussy. The bulkiness could be mitigated by vertically breaking into smaller forms (with them potentially offset in plan). This could reflect the internal functions House Areas in that area of the floorplate. | <p>The revised design acknowledges the concerns for the canted facade, recognising that, despite its origins from Therry Stage 1, in its location in Ignis Stage 2 it may not be as appropriate a gesture. It was noted that the application of the sun shading device to this canted facade added to the bulk and presence of this facade.</p> <p>Considerable investment has been made into developing a solution for the sun shading that draws greater reference from Stage 1 and respect the horizontal and vertical nature of the existing flanking buildings.</p> <p>The whole end of the building on the eastern elevation has been designed as one shading element, as opposed to an element applied to the end of the building. The vertical screens enable greater visibility into and out of the building, providing the opportunity to better celebrate the use beyond and frame key views to the College and broader Sydney context</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The architects state they decided to deliberately move away from horizontal expression of the nearby buildings (acceptable in of itself) but then in massing the building, the three major vertical forms to the NE fail to appreciate the scaling of the façade and fenestration of the existing heritage context underpinning the character of the campus and school ethos | <p>As per above comment.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is exemplified in the relatively crude (over scaled and disproportioned) masonry reference in the cladding proposed | <p>It was determined that a literal use of masonry for the upper part of the building was neither practical nor appropriate. Hence several lightweight cladding options were explored that better supported the lightweight construction and finish appropriate to the 'floating' nature of the main building volume over its masonry base. Of these Equitone was deemed the obvious choice due to its earthiness and natural tonal qualities, options for colour choice appropriate the context and the inherent nature of the colour finish throughout the material.</p> <p>Obviously durability and maintenance were also considerations in this choice as was the ambition to play down the building's main facades so as not to compete with its two feature shading elements.</p> |

| Table 1. Response to Public Submissions | |
|--|---|
| Matter Raised | Response |
| | <p>Equitone was also selected for its ability to reference the masonry context through expression of the joints in a larger format sliding bond pattern. Concern for this approach instigated review of the pattern, not material, and subtle changes have been made through modification of the pattern to remove any reference to masonry and replacement of expressed joints with butt joints. These changes remove any celebration of the large format bond pattern but retain the appearance of a panelled finish with sufficient texture to break up the expanse of facade.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any form of aluminum panel (either solid or composite) proposed for the façade or soffit is not supported. Under the current Australian Standards for testing façade panels & systems, there remains an inherent fire risk in locating (even if solid) aluminum panels located overhead egress paths and heavily student occupied zones. This risk requires very specific mitigation during documentation and construction phases. | <p>A detailed BCA assessment was provided as part of the EIS (Appendix 23) which will be further development through the construction phase of the proposal. Façade and soffit cladding will comply with the building code.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lack of activation at Ground level due to the functional planning decisions, for example, locating the Paper Store and Print Office on the desirable Eastern end of the building due to aspect and views. This is a lost opportunity for new student spaces | <p>The Ground level is activated by the functional use of the spaces being the Canteen and Multipurpose hall which spill out into a COLA and beyond. Activation around the building is reinforced by the landscape treatment with seating, shade structures and planting to support student outdoor learning and passive play.</p> <p>The location of the print facilities at the periphery of the new building is a specific client brief requirement for supervision purposes. Any student learning in this location, whilst afforded good outlook, is too remote from the main cluster of learning space</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Winter Solstice solar diagrams are not included and appears that the external 'Podium' student spaces would be in shade for most of lunch time | <p>Updated Winter Solstice solar diagrams are included as part of the revised architectural package. It is noted that there is very minor change to the existing level of solar access currently received to the podium level.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gestural response to campus address of the NE façade is supporting in principle however due to the fussiness of the proposed design, realisation of this principle relies on refined detailing and fabrication to be successful. | <p>Considerable time has been taken into developing a solution for the sun shading that drew greater reference from Stage 1 and respected the horizontal and vertical nature of the existing flanking buildings.</p> |

Table 1. Response to Public Submissions

| Matter Raised | Response |
|---|--|
| | <p>A similar approach was taken on the eastern elevation, reinforced by making the whole end of the building one shading element, as opposed to an element applied to the end of the building. The vertical screens enable greater visibility into and out of the building, providing the opportunity to better celebrate the use beyond and frame key views to the College and broader Sydney context</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The design review comments of the GANSW SDRP in Session 1 (21/8/20) Item 03 which states the design proposes “a new style that is superfluous and increases the visual clutter” and consequently requires simplification. These wise words from the panel are effectively ignored by the architects in their design response and report commentary. Similarly, comments (Item 05) regarding bulk and mass of the three primary forms not only dominating the context but also actually make the form unintentionally bulkier. | <p>Appropriate consideration has been given to the revised design of the building in regard to its immediate and greater context. The NNE and E facades draw reference from the flanking buildings of the O’Neil, Wallace and Ramsay Buildings, with a strong horizontal emphasis reinforced by the reduced more ordered arrangement of openings, stacked above one another. This has been achieved through grouping openings into single deep apertures and thereby reducing the number of openings. Within the apertures the screen is a combination of glazing and solid panels in darker tones, to create the appearance of one element.</p> <p>The scale of the building has been reduced by the removal of the parapet and skirt to the upper building volume, making it appear slimmer and less imposing. The raising of the skirt and angling of the COLA soffit under the central atrium better reveals the COLA space and gives greater presence and importance to the base of the building and its connection to the landscape.</p> |