

Mr Justin Clark  
Senior Design Manager  
Grocon  
Level 4, Legion House  
161 Castlereagh St  
Sydney NSW 2000  
Australia

24 March 2016

Dear Justin

**Project: The Ribbon Hotel, Serviced Apartments and Retail, Darling Harbour, Sydney.**

In response to our recent Development Application Submission please find below an itemized table listing the issues raised with a corresponding commentary and document reference if applicable. This table responds to (in order):

*\_City of Sydney's letter dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2016 regarding the submission of the State Significant Development Application for the redevelopment of the IMAX Theatre and surrounding public domain (SSD 7388), 31 Wheat Road.*

*\_NSW Government, Planning and Environment letter dated 10/3/16 regarding the State Significant development Application for redevelopment of IMAX, Darling Harbour (SSD 7388) by Ben Lusher, Director, Key Sites Assessments.*

*\_NSW Government, Transport for NSW letter dated 8/3/16 regarding the Redevelopment of the IMAX Theatre and Surrounding Public Domain Upgrades Darling Harbour (SSD 7388) – Notice of Exhibition by Marg Prendergast, Coordinator General, CBD Coordination Office.*

*\_NSW Government, Heritage Council of New South Wales letter dated 3 March 2016 RE: Heritage Council comments on Environmental Impact Statement for the Redevelopment of the IMAX Theatre and Surrounding public domain upgrades, Darling Harbour (SSD 7388) by Rajeev Maini, A/Manager Conservation, Heritage Division, Office of Environment and Heritage, As Delegate of the Heritage Council of NSW.*

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASELL Comments	HASELL Document
<b>City Of Sydney</b>			
5(a)	The reveal proposed along the east west direction (between the hotel wings) should be more fluid and visually legible.	The use of horizontal elements between the north and south elevations allows long distance views from the units on the west complementing the design intent by creating a continuous façade/roof treatment; these horizontal elements further enhance the visual fluidity of the form by highlighting the 'contour' like nature of the geometry.	No updates proposed
5(b)	The peripheral edges of the built form should incorporate finer, curved rounded details to reduce visual bulk.	The building design intent is based on a ribbon which emerges from the geometry generated by the site's context; the legibility of this ribbon is enhanced by the sharp edges along the north and south facades; introducing a rounder edge	No updates proposed

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASSELL Comments	HASSELL Document
City Of Sydney (cont.)			
		would be in contradiction to this design principle diluting the uniqueness of the East-Roof-West ribbon element. The design development will ensure a smooth curvature throughout the ribbon edges.	
7	The proposal show the northern edge of level 1 podium projecting beyond the ground floor footprint. This projecting contributes to the buildings bulk and the pedestrian scale and disintegrates the scale of waterfront address. Level 1 should follow the alignment of the ground level to provide an appropriate two level scale.	One of the design principles of the podium levels was to break the scale to better address the conditions generated by the Western Distributor; as such the first floor perimeter does not follow the ground floor along any of the public interfaces, the small cantilevers and setbacks help articulate the commercial nature of the podium and better relate to the pedestrian scale of the public realm.	Please refer to HASSELL's Public Domain Interface ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-014.1-3
8	The reflectivity report suggests the use of cladding and/or double glazing at various elevations to mitigate the impacts of glare to drivers and pedestrians. The submitted schedule of finishes, elevations and photomontages do not provide adequate information in terms of addressing these reflectivity requirements. The proposal should be amended to detail the variation in materials required to address reflectivity.	All building envelope materials will be in compliance with CUNDALL's Reflectivity Study dated 16/12/2015 Rev B. in order to meet the requirements.	Please refer to revised HASSELL's Artists Impression 1 to 3 ARCH-HSL-DD-1950, 1951 & 1952 all revision D
9	The study also suggest that some vertical shading elements may be required to mitigate glare from the building. The proposal should be amended to consider the use of shading elements and their potential impact on the façade design.	CUNDALL's Reflectivity Study dated 16/12/2015 Rev B. items 3.6.1 and 4 state that ' <i>if double glazing is selected and the reflectivity is less than 15%, then some vertical elements <b>could</b> be used to mitigate the glare for pedestrians on the elevated walkway.</i> ' From an architectural point of view -as a hospitality project- the addition of lips, fins or frames will be detrimental to the design intent, any potential glare issues will be mitigated using specific coatings on the external glass pane in order to meet the Reflectivity Study requirements.	No updates proposed

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASSELL Comments	HASSELL Document
<b>City Of Sydney (cont.)</b>			
11	The proposal will contribute significant night lighting due to the scale of the building, use and extent of expansive glass façade (north and south) over open landscape. A lighting impact assessment should be carried out.	The large areas of expansive glass on the north and south facades are above the Western Distributor levels which are deemed to generate much more lighting pollution levels than building itself. Further towards the north the public realm area beyond the Western Distributor is approximately 22m away (horizontally) and more than 55m away vertically; to the south the distances are 57m horizontally and in excess of 100m vertically.	Please refer to HASSELL's Building Envelope relationship to Public Realm ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-013.1 & 2
13	The public domain 'take' of the proposal is excessive and will reduce pedestrian circulation and remove visual connectivity between east Darling Harbour, the new SICEEP facilities and the proposed north-south boulevard. The building as proposed with reduce the pedestrian circulation around the south-eastern corner of Darling Harbour, especially during high-use events. The proposal should be limited to the existing building footprint at this corner.	The ground floor footprint along the north and east interfaces with the public domain have been retained within the existing approved Development Application SSD 5397 dated 16 June 2014. The alignment of the SFHA building (identified as building 2) is as per our consultation with SHFA during January – March 2016.	Please refer to HASSELL's Ground Floor Building Footprint Comparison ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-0108 - 9
14	The design approved under SDD 5397 retained the existing porte cochere off Harbour street. The inclusion of the hotel & serviced apartments uses in the current proposal has substantially increased the vehicle requirements, and subsequently, the size of the porte cochere.	The Hotel and Serviced Apartments porte-cochere has been optimized to its minimal size to cater for this program and additional statutory requirements serving the public domain and surrounding facilities; the porte-cochere is an integral part of the arrival and departure experience of a 5 star facility, as such extra care has been placed to enhance all its aspects, including pedestrian interfaces and amenity to counterbalance its compress nature in order to minimise the impact of vehicles on the amenity and accessibility of the site to pedestrians.	Please refer to ASPECT studios visuals.

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASSELL Comments	HASSELL Document
<b>City Of Sydney (cont.)</b>			
15	The proposed vehicular zone and hotel entry projects significantly into the public domain, towards the waterfront promenade area and is a poor outcome for pedestrians. The position of the structural columns of the Western Distributor the hotel lobby entry (including escalator) and the porte cochere result in awkward, cramped spaces and conflicts of movement. For example a busload of people with luggage waiting in this space could potentially block access to the new escalators leading to the Druitt Street pedestrian bridge, as well as the hotel lobby.	Pedestrian and vehicular modelling has been undertaken to ensure safe and fluid unobstructed movement of both pedestrian and vehicles in the area. The northern alignment of the porte cochere is within the existing footprint of the 'Spanish' steps and similar to the existing approved Development Application SSD 5397 dated 16 June 2014. Being a 5 star facility, the arrival of large groups. (including those using buses) will be known by Management in advance and particular procedures to deal with these events implemented as part of normal hotel operations.	Please refer to GTA explanatory diagrams.
16	The entry to the hotel lobby is located away from the main pedestrian area with no clear line of sight, particularly with the impact of the columns for the Western Distributor and the protrusion of the escalator into the public domain. It is recommended the relationship between the lobby and public domain be improved as follows (and shown in Attachment A):  (a) the escalator is to be removed or relocated;	The escalator has been relocated to the southern side of the hotel lobby enhancing the visual connection to the waterfront and public domain.	Please refer to revised HASSELL's Ground Floor Plan ARCH-HSL-DD-1100 rev H
	(b) the glass curtain wall to the hotel entry should be removed and a landing of wide steps, free of obstacles should meet the pedestrian promenade;	Although the Hotel and Serviced Apartments reception is on Level the meet-and-greet lobby on the ground floor is fundamental to the arrival and departure experience, as such it contains integrated guest services like concierge, bell boy, greeting desk, etc. which need to be within the first few metres from the porte cochere. Further issues which are best addressed with an enclosed volume are: _safety and security of guests and visitors particularly during events. _hotel operational requirements. _the facility's energy performance.	No updates proposed

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASSELL Comments	HASSELL Document
<b>City Of Sydney (cont.)</b>			
	(c) the space between the built edge and the waterfront must be wide enough for an emergency vehicle to move, with minimal disruption to pedestrian activities;	This has been addressed, please refer to GTA's tracking diagrams.	No updates proposed
	(d) the porte cochere should be reduced to the absolute minimum size, and adequate space provided for waiting passengers and clear signage/wayfinding;	As noted under item 14 the porte cochere zone has been optimized to its absolute minimum to accommodate the hotel and serviced apartment's guests and visitors requirements. Clear signage and way finding will be integral to the public domain, interior design and branding of the new facilities and will be addressed during the detail development phase.	No updates proposed
19	The Pedestrian Wind Environment Study applies the criteria of 'walking' to the majority of the building curtilage, and the criteria of 'standing' immediately adjacent to all external doors. The proposal should confirm that no outdoor seating will be proposed within the building curtilage, or alternatively provide an assessment that applies a criteria for 'seating'. It is also noted that un-fixed furniture may not be acceptable in these spaces during a high wind event.	The site's wind conditions exist with or out without a built intervention. Please refer to revised VIPAC's Wind Effect Statement. Any outdoor furniture within the building curtilage will comply with VIPAC's recommendation. Including any landscape mitigating measures integrated into the design.	
20	The report identifies four 1.5m high wind screens to the northern façade of the building, which are required to ensure an acceptable pedestrian environment. These screens have not been incorporated into either the architectural or landscape plans, and represent even further encroachment into an already compromised public domain.	The site's wind conditions exist with or out without a built intervention. Please refer to revised VIPAC's Wind Effect Statement. Any outdoor furniture within the building curtilage will comply with VIPAC's recommendation. Including any landscape mitigating measures integrated into the design.	

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASSELL Comments	HASSELL Document
<b>City Of Sydney (cont.)</b>			
	Additional screens within the landscape are not supported. It is recommended that the building footprint be reduced, and any wind-proof elements be designed as an integrated architectural/ landscape element.		
21	A Signage Strategy has not been submitted as part of the proposal. The EIS references a 'City Screen' to be provided on the lower levels of the western façade of the building, however very limited details of this screen and other signage areas have been provided.	A Signage Strategy and details of the proposed City Screen have been prepared. An assessment of the proposed signage against the relevant provisions of <i>State Environmental Planning Policy 64 – Advertising and Signage</i> has been prepared by JBA.	Please refer to HASSELL's The Ribbon, IMAX Signage document dated 21 March 2016, ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-016.1-15
22	The application should include a detailed signage strategy for the proposal in order to assess the proposed City Screen as well as any other commercial signage and building name signage. The signage strategy should include a schedule of compliance with the signage provisions of Sydney DCP 2012.	Please be aware that our site sites within Sydney's DCP 2012 Sheet 8 which does not have a specific Signage precinct map (noted as <i>Not applicable</i> ) therefore our proposal will be compliant with section 3.16.1 to 18 of the General Signage Controls of the DCP.	Please refer to HASSELL's GA Elevations Sheet 1 to 5 ARCH-HSL-DD-1150 – 1154 all revision E. Please note that as per our Environmental Impact Assessment, signs will be subject of a separate Development Application.
23	The proposed City Screen on the western elevation of the building and associated event space is located within the primary north-south pedestrian route. A crowd gathered to watch the screen has the potential to disrupt major north-south pedestrian movements to and from the area if not sufficiently controlled. The space appears very limited and may not be sufficient for an influx of thousands of people.	The event space has been kept clear of any physical barrier allowing maximum freedom of movement and flexibility within the public realm. An event management plan will be in place to address any public screening, this will ensure that the primary north-south pedestrian route will be kept clear at all times.	No updates proposed
24	In the event that the event space is pursued, a pedestrian plan of management should be prepared outlining crowd and pedestrian management necessities for a series of typical events that would be expected.	An event management plan will be in place addressing the particular necessities of each event.	No updates proposed

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASSELL Comments	HASSELL Document
<b>City Of Sydney (cont.)</b>			
25	A Public Art Strategy is to be submitted that addresses the incorporation of public art into the proposal, as well as the integration of existing artworks such as 'Jay flowers' by Robert Parr.	The 'Jay flowers' artwork will be relocated to a more prominent position, the Public Art Strategy will be developed in conjunction with the overall buildings art strategy during Schematic Design Stage.	Please refer to ASPECT Studios diagrams and visuals.
31	The proposal increases upon an already excessive bulk and scale, resulting in a building that further dominates the Darling Harbour basin and reduces view corridors from public places, to and from Darling Harbour. The proposal reduces the visual connection between the water and the reclaimed estuarine valley of Darling Harbour both at ground level and within the air space defined by the ridgelines either side of the harbour. This distorts the geographical understanding of the harbour and its catchment area and severs view corridors to the harbour.	The maximum envelope extent of the main building envelope is within current approved Development Application SSD 5397 dated 16 June 2014 with the only exception of the area directly in front of the porte - cochere. Further, GMU's Visual Impact Assessment Dated December 2015 states on page 114. _ 'the proposal is fairly consistent in bulk and scale to that of the approval and therefore, it is representative of the emerging character of the precinct' _ the proposal faithfully follows the profile of the approved envelope and therefore this is considered to have the same level of impact as the approval on site	No updates proposed
32	This reduction of view corridors is contrary to a number of the planning principles of the Sydney Harbour Catchment SREP, as set out in clauses 13 and 15. These clauses aim to enhance the visual appreciation of the Sydney Harbour Catchment rather than restrict and sever view corridors, and to safeguard against cumulative environmental impacts.	The maximum envelope extent of the main building envelope is within current approved Development Application SSD 5397 dated 16 June 2014 with the only exception of the area directly in front of the porte – cochere which does not affect any identified view corridors.	Please refer to revised HASSELL's Ground Floor Plan ARCH-HSL-DD-1100 rev H
37	Section 3.9 of the EIS states that the stacked car park is to be fully serviced by valet. This arrangement is to be carefully managed as the use of mechanical parking is not appropriate for visitors to the site who are unfamiliar operating such facilities and in turn, adds significant dwell time and queuing.	Fully serviced by valet means that the driver and passengers will leave the car at the porte cochere where the valet service will take over and drive the car to the fully automated car stacker which will only be operated by qualified personnel.	No updates proposed

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASSELL Comments	HASSELL Document
<b>City Of Sydney (cont.)</b>			
38	The application does not clarify how accessible parking spaces will be provided for using the mechanical parking facilities proposed, even with a valet service.	The valet service will attend any driving guests and/or visitors on the porte cochere including people with special needs. Automated parking bays with additional height have been provided within the automated stacker. Provision is a per NCC table D3.5 (7 accessible parking bays)	No updates proposed
39	The application should include improved bicycle parking and end of trip facilities. The staff parking should be located on the ground floor or basement level in a separate location to visitor parking. These facilities should be Class B and comply with AS2890.3:2015. Visitor parking should be Class C, comply with AS2890.3:2015 and be provided at an accessible at-grade location.	Bicycle parking and EoT facilities have been provided for visitors and staff. Provision has been calculated according to Green Star Design & As Built v1.1 Guidelines which are more onerous than the current statutory documents.	Please refer to HASSELL's Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Facilities ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-018.1 and Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Provision calculations ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-014.2
40	It is recommended that the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces and end of trip facilities be provided to reflect Sydney DCP 2012 as follows: Bicycle Parking Type Staff: 70 spaces Class 2 Non-residential visitor: 60 spaces Class 3 End of Trip Showers w/ Change area: 7 Personal Lockers:70	Bicycle parking and EoT facilities have been provided for visitors and staff. Provision has been calculated according to Green Star Design & As Built v1.1 Guidelines which are more onerous than the current statutory documents. Further changing, showers and lockers facilities are also provided as part of the Staff Facilities on Level 2.	Please refer to HASSELL's Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Facilities ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-018.1 and Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Provision calculations ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-014.2
45	The EIS notes ground and first floor podium retail uses will include restaurants and food premises. Restaurants typically create significant kitchen exhaust air discharges (smoke and odour), which has the potential to cause adverse amenity if discharged at low levels, particularly if there are high volumes of pedestrians outside the premises. The design of the lower podium levels needs to include provision for kitchen exhaust air discharges to be expelled from upper levels of the building so that satisfactory	All kitchen exhaust are discharged at high level away from any public facilities.	No updates proposed



Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASELL Comments	HASELL Document
<b>City Of Sydney (cont.)</b>			
	amenity may be provided, should cooking be proposed at lower levels. Failure to do so may result in limitations on the types of food premises that may occupy lower podium levels, including limitations on types of food prepared.		
49	The area identified for toilet facilities on the level 2 podium plan appears to be undersized for the proposed 400+ IMAX capacity. Further, the plans do not identify toilet facilities for the podium retail spaces. It is assumed that these facilities would be provided within each individual retail tenancy.	The facilities provided match the current approved Development Application SSD 5397 dated 16 June 2014. Toilet facilities for retail tenancies are a tenant fit out and will follow statutory and licencing requirements.	No updates proposed
50	No information has been submitted regarding the provision of accessible hotel rooms or serviced apartments.	The Disability Access Review by DCS, dated 8 December 2015 states: on page 10 _16 Hotel and 8 Serviced Apartments sole-occupancy units. All universal access facilities will be compliant with the relevant statutory codes.	Please refer to HASELL's Schedule of Accommodation – Hotel Rooms- ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-005.1 and Schedule of Accommodation – Serviced Apartments- ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-005.2
51	The level 6 plans show corridors as narrow as 1m in order to accommodate the hotel gym entry. This corridor should be increased to a minimum of 1.4m.	Noted, this was a drawing omission.	Please refer to HASELL's GA Plans –Hotel and Serviced Apartments L05 and L06 ARCH-HSL-DD-1105 rev E.
52	Some hotel and serviced apartment suites do not indicate the entry doors.	We have checked our drawings and all units show entrance doors, please note that multi bay suites and serviced apartments only show one entrance door.	No updates proposed
<b>NSW Government Planning &amp; Environment</b>			
<b>Serviced Apartments and Hotel Use</b>			
2	A schedule is required setting out the number of serviced apartments and hotel rooms including typology, size and whether they are accessible/adaptable.		Please refer to HASELL's Hotel and Serviced Apartments Schedule of Accommodation ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-005.1 & 2

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASSELL Comments	HASSELL Document
<b>NSW Government Planning &amp; Environment (cont.)</b>			
1	Further consideration should be given to the porte cochere and hotel lobby area to enhance the public domain, sightlines and pedestrian accessibility at this part of Darling Harbour. The proposed hotel lobby design and orientation should seek to maximize the public domain area and also allow for a clear line of sight through the lobby from the public domain, away from the columns of the Western Distributor	We have reconfigured the hotel lobby allowing a more generous public domain.	Please refer to HASSELL's Ground Floor Plan ARCH-HSL-DD-1100 rev H
2	Additional detailed public domain plans and photomontages are required showing the relationship between the proposed vehicular drop off zone, ground floor hotel lobby and future Druiitt Street escalators including dimensions.	We have modified hotel lobby footprint enhancing the relationship between Cockle Bay, Cockle Bay Waft, the Druiitt Street escalators and the porte cochere. This has resulted in a more generous visual connection and increased pedestrian permeability.	Please refer to ASPECT studios visuals.
<b>Urban Design and Façade Treatment</b>			
1	Further consideration should be given to point five of the Council's submission surrounding the architectural design of the building.	Please refer to HASSELL's response earlier on this document.	
2	Additional photomontages should be provided clearly identifying the extent of visibility of proposed louvres particularly in the northern façade at the podium level	There is only one instance of intake requirement on the north façade, this is not on the podium. The curtain wall system will continue uninterrupted with glass panes cut short of the mullions in a discrete manner, no louvers will be visible as the intake is done through a plenum behind.	Please refer to HASSELL's GA Elevations Sheet 1 to 4 ARCH-HSL-DD-1150 – 1153 all revision E
3	Details should be provided clarifying the purpose of the operable roof panels including photomontages of roof panels when open and visible from the western distributor. In addition, a revised air quality assessment is required.	As clarified by JBA the roof panels are for BMU access only. JBA has confirmed this with the authorities which clarified that further information is not required at this stage.	No updates proposed

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASELL Comments	HASELL Document
<b>NSW Government Planning &amp; Environment (cont.)</b>			
	assessing the appropriateness of the operable roof panels including recommendations for conditions for when the roof panels can be opened.		
4	Revised elevations and photomontages should be provided clearly identifying the different materials and finishes recommended in supporting report including cladding and/or double glazing, shading elements to mitigate glare impacts, and wind screens.	CUNDALL's Reflectivity Study dated 16/12/2015 Rev B. items 3.6.1 and 4 states the required Maximum Visible Light Reflectivity values for all building envelope components; all specified materials meet the Reflectivity Study requirements.	Please refer to HASELL's Materials Palette ARCH-HSL-DD- 1930 rev D and Artists Impression 1 to 3 ARCH-HSL-DD-1950, 1951 & 1952 all revision D
<b>Parking and Traffic</b>			
2	Further details are required demonstrating the final design and amount of proposed bicycle parking spaces and associated end of trip facilities taking into consideration Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 and also the requirements if Condition B5(d) of the existing approval in relation to bicycle parking in the public domain.	Bicycle parking and EoT facilities have been provided for visitors and staff. Provision has been calculated according to Green Star Design & As Built v1.1 Guidelines which are more onerous than the current statutory documents. Visitor parking provision of 56 spaces have been included in the public domain with an identified area for expansion to 100 spaces in the future.	Please refer to HASELL's Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Facilities ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-018.1 and Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Provision calculations ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-018.2 and ASPEC Studios diagrams and visuals.
<b>Additional Information</b>			
2	Comparison plans of the approved and proposed development at each level by footprint is required in order to provide clear point of comparison.		Please refer to HASELL's Proposed and Approved Development Floorplate Comparison sheets 1 -3 ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-006.1 - 3
3	A revised site plan and floor plans are required showing the relationship of the outermost building footprint (overall and level by level) to the lease boundary and surrounding roads.	.	Please refer to HASELL's Proposed Development relationship with Roads and Cadastre sheets 1 -3 ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-010.1 - 3

Item	Identified Issue (verbatim quote)	HASELL Comments	HASELL Document
<b>NSW Government Planning &amp; Environment (cont.)</b>			
4	An elevation and photomontages are to be submitted that identify the location and size of the city screen. Details area also to be provided which demonstrate that the city screen will not be able to be viewed by motorists on the Western Distributor.		Please refer to HASSELL's The Ribbon, IMAX Signage document dated 21 March 2016, ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-016.1-15
5	The Environmental Impact Assessment notes signs will be the subject of a separate Development Application, however signage zones are shown on plans. If signage zones are proposed, and assessment pursuant to SEPP 64 will be required.	Notes relates to signage have been removed from our documentation.	
6	Clarification of whether outdoor seating is proposed within the ground floor curtilage is required. If so, an updated wind impact assessment is required addressing the suitability of any outdoor seating.	Zones of the ground floor curtilage will be used as outdoor seating. Please refer to revised VIPAC's Wind Effect Statement. Any outdoor furniture within the building curtilage will comply with VIPAC's recommendation. Including any landscape mitigating measures integrated into the design.	
<b>NSW Government, Transport for NSW</b>			
Bicycle parking and End of trip Facilities			
1	Bicycle parking and end of trip facilities for pedestrian and bicycle riders in accordance with City of Sydney Council development control plans, standards and guideline documents;	Bicycle parking and EoT facilities have been provided for visitors and staff. Provision has been calculated according to Green Star Design & As Built v1.1 Guidelines which are more onerous than the current statutory documents	Please refer to HASSELL's Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Facilities ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-014.1 and Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Provision calculations ARCH-HSL-DD-SK-014.2
2	Bicycle facilities be located in secure, convenient, accessible areas close to the main entries incorporating adequate lighting and passive surveillance and in accordance with Austroads guidelines;	Bicycle parking is as per relevant statutory documents including AS and Austroads.	

Regarding the request for an additional montage showing the podium as viewed from the north –i.e. floating above the waters of Cockle Bay- please find attached a series of views under the following document:

\_004409\_TheRibbon\_ARC-HSL-DD-SK014.1-014.3\_PODIUM-PUBLIC-DOMAIN  
INTERFACE.pdf

We trust this information is adequate for you purposes but please do not hesitate to contact us should you require further information of clarification.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Ortega'.

Jorge Ortega  
Senior Associate

Email [jortega@hassellstudio.com](mailto:jortega@hassellstudio.com)