

Project site 43/44 Sydney Olympic Park
SOPA Design Review Meeting Stage 1 DA
3pm 29th of March 2012

Present

Andrew Brown	Sydney Olympic Park Authority	(AB)
Darren Troy	Sydney Olympic Park Authority	(DT)
Steve Jensen	Sydney Olympic Park Authority	(SJ)
John Ferguson	Sydney Olympic Park Authority	(JF)
Darlene van der Breggen	Sydney Olympic Park Authority	(DV)
Ray Brown	Architectus	(RB)
Steve Grant	Capital Corporation	(SG)
Adam Wheat	Capital Corporation	(AW)
Maria Passafaro	Capital Corporation	(MP)

Location:

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

Meeting objective:

To table draft responses for review and comment as requested in SOPA letter dated 23rd of January 2012. Note that the meeting minutes should be reviewed in conjunction with the aforementioned letter (Copy attached).

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DATE NOT TO BE EXCEEDED
1.1	AW requested clarification on the process for the DA associated with Stage 2 of the masterplan and if a design competition would be required. SOPA advised that a design competition was not necessary given that the initial Design Competition was for the entire Masterplan.	Note	
1.2	AW advised that following receipt of the Department of Planning response to the Development Application, changes to the design documentation have been made that respond to SOPA's submission dated 23 rd of January 2012.		
1.3	DESIGN ISSUES		

For any further information contact Capital Corporation on (02) 8853 5000
www.capitalcorporation.com.au

Suite 705/12 Century Circuit
 Baulkham Hills NSW 2153

PO Box 6285 Baulkham Hills
 Business Centre NSW 2153

T: 61 2 8853 5000
 F: 61 2 8853 5099



CAPITAL
CORPORATION

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DATE NOT TO BE EXCEEDED
1.3.1	External		
1.3.1.1	<p>MP outlined the comments contained in the Design Competition Jury:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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; <p>RB advised that the external façade had been further developed following SOPA comment whilst incorporating the Design Competition Jury comments.</p>	Note	
1.3.1.2	<p>RB notes that character has been added by reducing the long, uninterrupted balconies and bronze anodized vertical to screens the balconies. Vertical painted concrete blade elements which were consistent with design competition were maintained as was the white terra cotta cladding.</p>	Note	
1.3.1.3	<p>RB also advised that the green wall had been further assessed and as it this was not operationally or maintenance efficient the long term result would be detrimental to the building.</p>	Note	
1.3.1.4	<p>RB also noted that the 3D Images presented as part of the design competition had more light and it was the quality of the 3D Image that was perhaps not consistent resulting in the “dark” comments from SOPA.</p>	Note	
1.3.1.5	<p>DV stated that the updated façade treatment was appropriate principle.</p>	Note	
1.3.2	b) Herb Elliot undercroft design		
1.3.2.1	<p>AW advised that the Café/Kiosk has now been included on the proposed layouts and that this area would be activated by seating</p>	Note	

For any further information contact Capital Corporation on (02) 8853 5000
www.capitalcorporation.com.au

Suite 705/12 Century Circuit
Baulkham Hills NSW 2153

PO Box 6285 Baulkham Hills
Business Centre NSW 2153

T: 61 2 8853 5000
F: 61 2 8853 5099

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DATE NOT TO BE EXCEEDED
	furniture, lighting landscaping etc.		
1.3.2.2	DV raised concerns that this space was to be presented as a non restricted area and that furniture was to be spacious and flowing, however was supportive of the concept in principle.	Note	
1.3.3	c) South East corner fronting Australia Avenue and Proposed east West Street		
1.3.3.1	RB tabled update plan and advised that Electrical Kiosk has now been deleted and that 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.	Note	
1.3.4	d) Retail Back of House		
1.3.4.1	RB advised that the redesign of the back of house now provides lift access for movement of trolleys and pedestrian access to basement parking for retail customers.	Note	
1.3.4.2	DV advised that the retail space planning needs to be carefully considered as SOPA have experienced issues with existing site occupants within the Olympic Park in relation to product being stacked up against the glass shop front. This presentation is critical and needs to be addressed.	Note	
1.3.4.3	SG stated that this would be addressed with the tenant agreement once tenant was secured.	Capital Corp	
1.3.5	e) Setbacks		
1.3.5.1	RB stated that the encroachment on the fire stair was minor and justifiable as this was being used a feature vertical blade and gave the building presence, this does not have any material effect on the quality of the Southern Street.	Note	
1.3.5.2	DV advised that SOPA were more concerned about the upper level encroachments. RB stated that these were minor and had no impact on overshadowing on street as they were on the corner. DV recommended that the DA documents include a justifiable argument for consideration.	Capital Corp	

For any further information contact Capital Corporation on (02) 8853 5000
www.capitalcorporation.com.au

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DATE NOT TO BE EXCEEDED
1.3.6	f) Service Vehicle Entry Ramp		
1.3.6.1	AW advised that the access ramp has been moved back as part of loading dock redesign and required clearances are maintained.	Note	
1.3.7	g) Basement Car Park Access		
1.3.7.1	SG advised that current negotiations with the existing tenant require that the proposed ramp remain in it's current but temporary location.	Note	
1.3.7.2	The suggested area by SOPA is currently an area of exclusive use by the tenant.	Note	
1.3.7.3	It was also noted that the road will not be a dedicated road until completion of the final stage where the permanent ramp location is proposed.	Note	
1.3.7.4	JF stated the ramp in its current proposed location presents vehicular conflict, in particular the location of the boom gate and queuing during major events. AW notes that Capital Corporation will obtain further confirmation from the traffic consultant in order to address these concerns.	Capital Corp	
1.3.8	h) Underground Car Park		
1.3.8.1	RB / AW advised that the road structure has been designed in relation to GHD road sections and does have capacity to support future street planting and road services. AW notes that a section will be provided to confirm this.	Capital Corp	
1.4	Public Domain		
1.4.1	Paving Palette / Urban Elements		
1.4.1.1	AW advised that the public domain items raised would be addressed in the submission response following consultation with SOPA landscape/urban design personnel.	Capital Corp	
1.4.2	Planting / Street Trees		
1.4.2.1	AW advised that the Landscape Design drawings will be amended to indicate Brush Box street tree planting as required.	Capital Corp	
1.4.2.2	RB advised that whilst the design completion shows an image of a fig tree in the central courtyard, it was for illustrative purposes only. Further	Note	

For any further information contact Capital Corporation on (02) 8853 5000
www.capitalcorporation.com.au



CAPITAL
CORPORATION

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DATE NOT TO BE EXCEEDED
	investigation has confirmed that a fig tree of significant size would not survive in this location due required root depth and width, soil volume and water retention.		
1.4.2.3	DV stated that there is a preference to incorporate a fig tree if achievable otherwise a suitable large native tree.	Capital Corp	
1.4.3	New Road 16		
1.4.3.1	RB / AW advised that the road structure has been designed in relation to GHD road sections and does have capacity to support future street planting and road services.	Note	

For any further information contact Capital Corporation on (02) 8853 5000
www.capitalcorporation.com.au

Suite 705/12 Century Circuit
Baulkham Hills NSW 2153

PO Box 6285 Baulkham Hills
Business Centre NSW 2153

T: 61 2 8853 5000
F: 61 2 8853 5099

23 January 2011

Heather Warton
Director Metropolitan and Regional Projects North
Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Exhibition of Environmental Assessment for Mixed Commercial and Retail Development (Stage 1) at 2 Australia Avenue, Sydney Olympic Park (Site 43/44) (MP10_0168)

Dear Ms Warton,

I refer to the Environmental Assessment for the above Major Project Application, which was referred to Sydney Olympic Park Authority (the Authority) for comment. The Authority has considered the development, as submitted, and believes that the applicant needs to revisit the proposal. The following comments are made in this regard:

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The Authority supports the concept of the proposed development however there are a number of areas of concern that must be addressed prior to the Authority being satisfied that the development would provide a positive contribution to Sydney Olympic Park.

DESIGN ISSUES

Design competitions are a key component of the Design Excellence Strategy for Sydney Olympic Park (refer to part 4.6.10 of Master Plan 2030). A design competition is a mandatory requirement for the proposed site (site 43/44) and a competition was held in accordance with the requirements of Master plan 2030. The Master Plan 2030 also requires that 'the submitted Development or Project Application must be consistent with the preferred design of the relevant design competition' (refer to item 15 in Appendix A of Master Plan 2030). In addition to the requirements of Master Plan 2030, the project's DGR's required that the design must respond to the Design Excellence Committee Jury Report dated 23 August 2010 and specifically the seven recommendations for the further development of the design.

The Authority does not believe that the design submitted as part of this project application is consistent with that of the winning entrant, particularly due to a number of significant departures. The project application has also been considered by the Authority's Design Review Panel and the panel noted that the design changes *'diminished rather than improved design quality, to the point where many of the attributes that originally distinguished this project over other entries have largely disappeared'*.

Having regard to the above, the key design issues that need to be considered are:

External

- The modified façade design with the staggered, expressed balconies generates an awkward street elevation that falls far short of the more sophisticated, calmer treatment of the competition winning entry, which featured continuous balconies on all levels, screened by a combination of light filtering devices.

- Instead of enlivening the elevations, the new darker toned materials and finishes are heavy and lifeless.
- Changes to the Herb Elliott undercroft design such as the removal of the Supermarket entry pavilion and the elliptical kiosk, now result in an overscaled, lifeless and potentially windswept space that will actively discourage public use. These concerns are amplified by the staging where, in Stage 1, the undercroft will be the primary public place.
- The south-eastern corner fronting onto Australia Avenue and the proposed East West Street, with an exposed electrical kiosk, interim surface car park and extensive louvered walls, is not acceptable as it appears too back-of-house for this highly visible frontage of the project. In addition to this, the Design Review Panel noted that this open space together with a major fig tree to the southeast generated the pedestrian /open space network in the winning design competition strategy. As such, an appropriate public presence needs to be established in stage 1.

Retail, back-of-house

- Retail tenancies must have direct access to loading dock and garbage store facilities, due to the major event operational requirements and this has not been provided.
- Management of supermarket trolleys will need to be considered especially as there is no lift access from the supermarket to the basement parking. The supermarket entry has not been nominated and therefore the relationship between the supermarket and potential customer parking can not be established, however it would appear no customer parking has been provided for the supermarket.

Setbacks (refer page 11, appendix U MP2030)

- The encroachment of fire stairs and upper floor levels into the 3m setback zone (Park Street Extended) is considered to compromise the openness and solar access into what will become a narrow and overshadowed street. However this could be acceptable if only the fire stairs extended into the setback zone.

Service vehicle entry ramp

- The service vehicle ramp, as proposed, crosses and obstructs the public footpath which presents issues for safe pedestrian travel. There is no opportunity for this ramp to be corrected in later stages and therefore is to be redesigned as part of this application.

Underground Car Park

- The carpark under the future east west street (road 10) should be shown in section and in relation to the future street profiles prepared by GHD. In addition, the roof of the carpark should have bearing capacity to support the future street use, as well as rootable soil volumes required to support the proposed street trees and irrigation. There should be adequate clearance over the roof slab for future street services.

Recommended Changes

To address the above design issues it is recommended that the applicant amend the application as follows:

1. The competition winning design is to be included in the submission to enable the consent authority to determine whether the proposed design is 'based on the preferred (competition) scheme.' (part 4.6.10 (4) of Master Plan 2030).

2. Review the elevation design, including material and colour, to restore the lightness and simplicity of the original winning design, in particular the staggered blades at the recessed balconies should be reconsidered in favour of a more continuous façade screening similar to that proposed for the original design. Refer to comparative images at Attachment B.
3. Review the undercroft design and program, including lighting and structures, to create scale and amenity and encourage public use of the space, particularly in Stage 1 of the project. Refer to suggested alternative in attachment A1 and comparative images at Attachment B.
4. The electrical services kiosk is to be integrated into the building envelope, as in the design competition proposal. Freestanding electrical infrastructure is not suitable for the Town Centre public domain, especially sites with such high visibility. Refer to sketch in Attachment A1. To date external kiosks have not been allowed for new developments in street front locations in the town centre.
5. The basement car park access ramp should be located away from the future street corridor, refer to suggested alternative in attachments A1 and A2. This is discussed in further detail below.
6. The service vehicle entry ramp is to be relocated away from the footpath to ensure that the ramp incline/decline commences clear of the public footpath, refer to suggested alternative in attachments A1 and A2. This may impact on height clearances and upper level setbacks will need to be reconsidered. The ramp relocation will also affect loading dock turning circles and adjustments to this area will be required.
7. The application is to be further considered by the SOPA Design Review Panel prior to being submitted to DP&I for assessment and prior to further public notification. This is to ensure that fundamental design issues are resolved in a timely manner.

PUBLIC DOMAIN

Overall the application appears to have gone into great detail on the public domain elements at this stage. Considering that the application has submitted great detail it is appropriate that those areas of noncompliance need to be raised and should be addressed.

Paving Palette/Urban Elements

- It is SOPA preference that there is a seamless integration of the Urban Design Elements Manual (UEDM) urban elements into the public domain and publicly accessible/private domain areas to ensure consistency of place design, quality, function and management. The paving materials shown are non-UEDM. The application also shows bespoke seating with no back/side rests, bins and bike rails which need to be reviewed and coordinated with the SOPA palette.

Planting/Street Trees

- The UEDM nominates street tree species and preferred species palettes for the public domain and publicly accessible private domain. The application indicates retention of Herb Elliott street trees, however the UEDM proposes replacement of existing street trees with Brush Box.
- A super-advanced exotic tree is proposed for the central courtyard which is considered to be inappropriate. The winning design competition entry built a strategy around the 'visual connection' of a new fig in this location to the established fig trees to the north and south

of the site, particularly site 45. An arborist is to confirm that there is adequate rootable soil volume for the feature tree.

New Road 16 (Park St extension)

- Although not relevant until the stage two application, it is noted that street tree planting over the structure should be coordinated with underground services, carpark layout and street lighting. The nominated street tree selection is no longer supported and the preferred alternative for this location is *Cupaniopsis anardoides* (Tuckeroo).

Recommended Changes

1. Prepare a Public Domain Interface Plan, demonstrating that site levels, finishes, pedestrian movements etc have been fully integrated with the public domain ie Herb Elliott Ave, Australia Ave, and the new East West Street footpaths. Greater consultation needs to be undertaken with the SOPA Landscape Design Team.
2. Provide lighting for the new East West Street corridor in accordance with the UEDM.

TRAFFIC

Traffic access, egress and pedestrian conflict are a major concern with this development.

The Ground Floor plan (DA1003) shows the only access to the site for all vehicles is from Australia Avenue. This plan shows that there are three (3) access requirements for vehicles – the temporary ramp for basement parking, at grade parking for supermarket/retail customers and the site's loading area. This creates significant conflict in the various vehicular movements required to access these locations/directions. Furthermore, the expected conflict is certain to have an adverse affect on northbound Australia Ave traffic, especially during the AM peak and busy event days (such as Easter Show & V8 periods). As a result, the current proposed layout of the access arrangements cannot be supported.

The proposed placement of the temporary ramp for basement parking has a number of shortcomings, especially in relation to the construction of New Road 10 and any vehicular access to adjacent development sites. It is recommended that the temporary ramp be relocated to an area outside the footprint of any proposed new road, refer to suggested alternative in attachments A1 and A2

The SIDRA data presented in the Traffic Consultant's report shows that the northbound Australia Ave traffic in the AM peak is currently operating at a level of LOS E through the Sarah Durack/Australia Ave intersection. The trip generation associated with the development will worsen this intersection's performance to LOS F. Strategies will need to be developed to meet this deterioration such as modifying the phasing of the lights at the intersection.

The location of the Visitor Parking in relation to the Supermarket needs to identify the pedestrian path of travel. The only safe path will be via the west side of the development in order to avoid the vehicle movements off Australia Ave (although it is a little unclear as to the entry point for the supermarket). However, a better solution may be to eliminate the visitor parking altogether from the at grade location. As the full development of the site will see the visitor parking contained within the basement, it would be prudent to establish this arrangement in Stage 1 of the development.

All vehicles entering and exiting the Loading Area must do so in a forward direction. This includes both the access from Australia Ave and into the actual Loading Area of the building footprint.

Recommended Changes

1. The proposed basement access ramp is to be relocated out of the proposed new road 10. The current location provides an unacceptable level of conflict between vehicles in three directions and has the potential to limit the ability to realise the future extension/creation of new road 10. Sketches have been provided at Appendix A1 and A2 that demonstrate one option for the relocation of the vehicle access ramp.
2. Consideration needs to be given to parking and access to the supermarket. There is currently no defined pedestrian path of travel from the supermarket to visitor parking in the basement and or to the at grade parking, should it remain post relocation of the basement access ramp from its current location.
3. Strategies need to be developed to show that the worsening performance at Sarah Durack/Australia Ave intersection caused by this developments traffic generation can be resolved.

EVENT MANAGEMENT

It is noted that the application states an Events Information Statement will be prepared prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. Notwithstanding this commitment, there is very limited analysis on the impact of major events relating to the development. Further consideration needs to be given to the impact of events on the operation of this development at this early stage.

As outlined above there are a number of significant concerns with the proposed development which require further consideration by the applicant. The Authority has an ongoing interest in the development of Sydney Olympic Park as both a land owner and regulator and aims to play its part to ensure that growth and change is appropriately managed

Please contact Darren Troy on 9714 7145 or email darren.troy@sopa.nsw.gov.au, should you require any further assistance or clarifications in relation to this submission.

Yours faithfully



Andrew Brown
Executive Manager, Urban Planning and Design

issue	amendment	date
A	ISSUE FORUM	29/01/11

SOPA markup
Alternative ramp
locations and
envelope changes
Jan. 2012.

—reinstated
kick, provide
lighting and other
amenity to the
undercroft area.

service access ramp to be setback away from (1) foot path zone.

~~3 m boundary setback (MP 2030).~~

20m wide
street
corridor.

architectus™

Architects Sydney
Level 3 3411 Omega Street
Sydney NSW 2000
T (61 2) 8232 6600
F (61 2) 8232 6000
sydney@architects.com.au
AEN 11 009 419 413

SITE 43/44 SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK

GROUND FLOOR PLAN

DA1003

A

parallel parking
10 spaces approx.

PARKING SCHEDULE - BASEMENT LEVEL 1		Count
TYPE	Size	
BICYCLE PARKING	1800 x 600	52
CAR PARKING	2400x5400	94
CAR PARKING - DISABLED	2400x5400	4
COURIER PARKING	2400x5400	2
MOTORCYCLE PARKING	1200x2500	10
SMALL CAR PARKING	2300x5000	12
	small car	

Attach A2.
SOPA markup.
Alternative Ramp
location.
Jun 2012.

architectus™

Sydney
Melbourne
Auckland
Wellington
Shanghai

Architectural Sydney
Level 13 241 George Street
Sydney NSW 2000
T (61 2) 432 8600
F (61 2) 432 8500
sydney@architectural.com.au

A606 11 5001 409 4 40

project
SITE 43/44 SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK

BASEMENT LEVEL 1 PLAN

scale	drawing no	DA1002
1:200 @ A1		
draw	AWIL	

090086
project no
A

