

18 September 2018

14562

Ms. Carolyn McNally  
Secretary,  
Department of Planning and Environment  
320 Pitt St  
Sydney NSW 2001

Attn: Matthew Rosel, Senior Planner - Key Sites Assessments


Dear Matthew,

## SSD 7684 – COCKLE BAY, FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST

We refer to your emails of 17 August 2018 and 6 September 2018 requesting additional information in relation to the above SSD application. A consolidated response to your queries are provided in the below table.

Item	Request	Response
Design / Design Excellence		
1	Provide the design excellence strategy for the Department's consideration and consultation with the Government Architect NSW and Council	This will be provided under separate cover.
2	For clarity, provide a consolidated document confirming the final proposed Built Form and Public Domain guidelines. Any guidelines superseded by the RtS proposal should be amended/deleted	This will be provided under separate cover.
3	Provide additional justification for the projection of the podium articulation zone into the foreshore promenade	<p>The podium articulation zone is envisaged to accommodate projections which may include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variable architectural features and projections;</li> <li>• Balustrades; and</li> <li>• Awnings.</li> </ul> <p>The articulation zone is not intended to accommodate significant habitable floor space. Rather, it will provide the flexibility for an interesting and innovative design solution along the foreshore facade. The articulation zone is proposed to be limited to a 40 percent volumetric utilisation, limiting the massing and extent of any use.</p> <p>The inclusion of the articulation zone will ensure maximum useability, amenity, and desirability of the podium retail usages along the foreshore and ensure that the environment is appropriate for patrons.</p> <p>The presence of this articulation zone is justified as it will allow the competing architects the scope to provide visual interest and form articulation along the length of the building's podium without eroding the area of habitable floor space within the already narrow building.</p>
4	Provide confirmation of the approximate storey height of the building	The indicative height is approximately 42 storeys. Refer to the envelope section at <b>Appendix A.</b>

Item	Request	Response
	envelope (for indicative reference purposes only).	
Amenity		
5	Provide an assessment of the overshadowing impact on the Astoria Tower, including overshadowing impacts after 3pm	<p>The requirement for solar access to residential apartments is established by the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). The ADG recommends that 70% of apartments in urban locations, such as the Astoria, receive at least 2 hours of solar access between 9am and 3pm on June 21 (mid winter). As the shadow impact of the proposed Concept Envelope was not anticipated to affect the Astoria building until after the control period ends at 3pm, no solar study was previously completed.</p> <p>As now requested, a sun-eye study has now been provided as <b>Appendix A</b>, which demonstrates that the Concept Envelope will not overshadow the Astoria residential apartments at any time on the ADG performance measure day of 21 June.</p>
6	Provide an updated assessment of the overshadowing impact on Crescent Park	An analysis of the overshadowing impacts on the existing Crescent Garden has been prepared by FJMT and is provided at <b>Appendix A</b> . A building within the proposed Concept Envelope would reduce solar access to the immediately adjacent western portion of the crescent garden, however the eastern portion of the Crescent Garden is largely unaffected and maintains up to 2 hours solar access throughout the day in mid winter. Any reduction in solar access to the west of the existing garden is offset by the availability of new open space created by the Concept Envelope within the site to the north to the Crescent Garden.
7	Provide an image (eg figure 110, p72 of the View Loss Impact Assessment) or an elevation showing which apartments within the Astoria Tower have been assessed.	Refer to <b>Appendix B</b> .
Vehicle Access		
8	Provide updated vehicle swept path analysis for the southern access. It is noted the current diagrams relate to 'Base Case + Option 2', which is no longer proposed	An updated vehicle swept path 'Base Case' and 'Option 1' has been prepared by Aurecon and is provided at <b>Appendix C</b> .
9	Provide evidence the proposal does not conflict with the approved updated design of the IMAX port cochere.	<p>Please refer to the civil plans prepared by Aurecon at <b>Appendix C</b>.</p> <p>It is noted that Interface Design meetings were held with The Ribbon on the following dates 29/8/2017, 6/9/2017 and 29/9/2017 at The Ribbon's Site office.</p> <p>It is noted that both options proposed for the southern entry of the site align with current approved designs for the vehicular entrances of The Ribbon. Co-ordination has been conducted using Drawing no. ARC-HSL-DD-1100 RevN1, this being the latest stamped drawing for The Ribbon, dated 20/10/2017 stamped on the 2/11/2017 for MOD 3 SSD7388.</p>
Pedestrian Access and Open Space		
10	Provide a pedestrian capacity analysis of the existing foreshore promenade to accommodate pedestrian movements	<p>The Concept Proposal will maintain the existing promenade width surrounding the site whilst greatly increasing the pedestrian connectivity of the locality by delivering an additional pedestrian path, located centrally between Pyrmont Bridge and Druitt St bridge, which will allow movement of people along existing and future desire lines.</p> <p>By maintaining the existing boardwalk width, and also introducing additional pedestrian routes, the capacity of the promenade is increased and users are able to enter and exit the precinct at a range of locations without the need to be funnelled along the existing foreshore walk, as they are under the existing scenario.</p> <p>A key finding by Arup in the Pedestrian Assessment provided within the 2017 EIS is that the proposal will reduce demand on the boardwalk in event mode. This is due to the increased</p>

Item	Request	Response
		volumes of people that can be moved and accommodated comfortably through and around a building within the Concept Envelope.
11	Provide confirmation of the size of indicative open spaces to the north and south of the tower are (with reference to the indicative public domain concept plan)	<p>Publicly accessible open space shall include an area of at least 6,000m<sup>2</sup> on the northern side of the site between the proposed tower element and Pyrmont Bridge. This area is indicatively identified as Market Park, Cockle Bay Steps, and Garden Terraces on the public domain concept plan.</p> <p>Indicative open space to the south of the tower will comprise the active podium roof top that is shown on the public domain concept plan. The area of, and potential future uses within, the active roof top will be subject to the outcomes of the competitive design process. The indicative roof top area is approximately 1,500m<sup>2</sup> inclusive of covered and enclosed areas and other related uses.</p>  <p>The figure is a site plan of the Cockle Bay Wharf area. It shows a large green area on the left labeled 'At least 6,000m²' and a smaller area on the right labeled 'c. 1,500m²'. The plan includes various buildings, streets, and green spaces. A blue line outlines the area of the tower element. The plan is oriented with the water at the bottom.</p> <p><b>Figure 1 Indicative publicly accessible open space</b></p>
12	Elaborate on the definition of the types of 'transitional space' which would count towards the 6,000m <sup>2</sup> minimum public open space.	<p>The transitional space which may be included in the minimum public open space to the north of the tower includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• circulation spaces around and between areas of different specific use;</li> <li>• stairs that connect open spaces at different levels between Market Street and the waterfront promenade, as indicated on the public domain concept plan;</li> <li>• terraces as indicated on the public domain concept plan between the Market Park and waterfront promenade,</li> <li>• hard and soft landscaping that make up the interface between different spaces; and</li> <li>• other spaces that transition from the leased (internal and external) retail areas to the open spaces.</li> </ul>
Drawings / other		
13	For ease of scaling the drawings (with a standard scale ruler), and in accordance with the SEARs, provide updated concept drawings SK-1-01 to SK-1.10 at a usable	Amended plans have been prepare by FJMT and are provided at <b>Appendix A</b> .

Item	Request	Response
	scale (eg scale 1:500 or 1:1000)	
14	Update the concept drawings to show (including section and RL) the Druitt Street Bridge envelope (currently only shown on drawing SK-1-02)	No Concept Envelope is proposed for the Druitt Street bridge. The proposed development of the site would seek to upgrade the existing bridge and improve the interface of the western landing by incorporating the landing within the development envisaged within the Concept Envelope.
15	Update concept drawing SK-1.05 to include an annotation of the depth of the tower base	Drawing SK-1.05 has been amended as requested. Refer to <b>Appendix A</b> .
16	Provide a higher quality Road Works Harbour Street Access Base Case Option drawing (253427-002-SK-RD-0005-B) from the Traffic and Parking Assessment (Amended EIS)	Refer to <b>Appendix C</b> .
17	It would be helpful if the following images were updated to reflect the indicative amended massing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGIs on pages 18, 30 and 44 of the Design Report (RtS)</li> <li>the indicative public domain concept plan at Figure 22 on page 18 of the Design Report (AmEIS)</li> </ul>	The CGI images are not proposed to be updated as the design competition process will supersede these outcomes, and we believe that the general intent for the spaces are suitably demonstrated by the current imagery.
City of Sydney Submission		
18	"The preferred option is that the overall floor space of the development is proportionally reduced. Alternatively if the total floor space is not to be reduced then the efficiency constraint on the use of the proposed envelope (referred to as "maximum tower volumetric envelope utilisation 65 %") should be removed and the building bulk relocated to lower levels.	<p>The City of Sydney has suggested that the maximum height of the Concept Envelope be reduced to between 150m and 175m. This is a reduction of between 10m and 35m and could reduce the number of storeys by up to 6 (down to 36 storeys at the east of the site). This would potentially reduce the hi-rise floor area by up to 14,100m<sup>2</sup> (average GFA of 2,350m<sup>2</sup> over six storeys) and this GFA would have to be relocated in the mid and low-rise areas of the envelope.</p> <p>Relocating a large proportion of the high-rise GFA to the mid and low-rise areas of the tower would severely inhibit the ability of the Concept Envelope to deliver on the design intent for the site, which includes the delivery of an elegant and proportionally slender tower form that promotes view-sharing, including views from private residences.</p> <p>It is worth emphasising the point that it is relative slenderness and proportions of the envisaged building within the proposed envelope that allows portions of private views from the Astoria apartments to be maintained to the extent that they are. If, as per the City's recommendation, building bulk were relocated from the higher levels to the mid and low levels, the building would be significantly wider and overshadowing and view-loss impacts would be more significant.</p> <p>The exhibited Response to Submissions, and its appended Design Report, provide a detailed explanation of the anticipated impact of the Concept Envelope on the solar access</p>

Item	Request	Response
		<p>to Future Town Hall Square. As explained, this impact is minor and fleeting, equating to an average impact of 1.5% additional overshadowing on the most affected day of the year.</p> <p>In light of the small size of the potentially affected area within Future Town Hall Square, the short and transient period of affectation and the potentially significant local (overshadowing and view-loss) impacts associated with further reducing (or removing) this minor impact, the anticipated impact is justified.</p> <p>Further, at this stage it is not possible to undertake a detailed amenity assessment of the overshadowing impact of the Future Town Hall Square because no design for the space is currently available. Nonetheless, the impacts are minor and discrete and limited to a maximum of 30 minutes in the late afternoon on the most affected day as outlined in detail in the RtS. As such, in light of the minor impact and the significant opportunity presented by the increased height in this location, the impact is thought to be acceptable.</p>
19	<p>The reduction in floor plate size to a maximum of 3,000m<sup>2</sup> is an improvement but should be further reduced.</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to the location of a tower and siting it further over the Western Distributor and reducing the width of the envelope to the western facade to reduce its perceived bulk when viewed from the west.</p>	<p>The proposed 'floor plate size' of 3,000m<sup>2</sup> has been indicated to allow some scope for design flexibility and to incorporate building voids (if proposed within the competitive design process), which would otherwise be excluded from the calculation of Gross Floor Area (GFA). The proposed Concept Envelope will provide an average GFA of 2,320m<sup>2</sup> per level.</p> <p>The floor plate size controls that are proposed will work hand-in-hand with other controls, including the maximum GFA for the site and the Design Principles, to shape a building within the Concept Envelope. These suggested controls are anticipated to be included in the Instrument of Approval by the Department.</p>
20	<p>The previous comments remain applicable. Public access should be secured through a planning agreement that includes the details of securing public access to the open space areas.</p>	<p>The site is owned by the NSW Government and subject to a long-term lease to the Applicant. As such, the appropriate mechanism for ensuring the maintenance of public access through the site is the commercial lease between the applicant and Property NSW.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, it should be noted that the Concept Envelope does envisage a 24 hour access through the site and this is reflected in the Public Domain principles, which include a requirement to maintain 24 hour access. This is illustrated within the intended movement diagram provided within the 2017 EIS Design Report, as Figure 59 (Figure 2).</p>

Item	Request	Response
		<b>Figure 2      Envisaged site connectivity diagram</b>
21	The City continues to object to any additional filling-in or expanded decking over the harbour.	The proposed Concept Envelope includes provision for this element but does not rely on its provision for any functional reason or for the maintenance of existing amenity offer. If DP&E were to require the deletion of this element of the Concept Envelope this is likely to be acceptable.
22	The previous comments remain applicable and a minimum 5.5 star Base Building NABERS Energy target should be adopted and 4.5 star NABERS Water target for the commercial office component in both the competition brief and as a requirement for the detailed approval.	The Response to Submissions report outlines a justification for the proposed NABERS targets for Energy and Water. This justification remains valid.

Should you have further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me on 9956 6962 or [hquartermain@ethosurban.com](mailto:hquartermain@ethosurban.com).

Yours sincerely,



**Harry Quartermain**  
Principal Planner  
9409 4908  
[hquartermain@ethosurban.com](mailto:hquartermain@ethosurban.com)