

12 November 2018

14562

Ms Liz Devlin
Acting Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
320 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Ms Devlin,

Design Excellence Strategy – Cockle Bay Wharf Redevelopment (SSD 16_7684)

This Design Excellence Strategy seeks to outline a competitive process framework for the proposed Cockle Bay Wharf redevelopment project ('the project'). This strategy has been prepared by Ethos Urban on behalf of DPT and DPPT Operator Pty Ltd (the proponent) and is submitted to the Department of Planning and Environment (the Department).

This document outlines a strategy that is largely consistent with the *Draft Government Architect's Design Excellence Competition Guidelines* (the 'GA's Guidelines') 'Type B' process. Two key departures from this process are proposed, these departures are outlined in this Strategy in Section 3.4 and Section 3.7.1.

The proponent is committed to an integrated design excellence process that complies with the intent of the GA's Guidelines and builds on the available skills and significant experience of the project stakeholders to deliver a specific design excellence outcome that is an exemplar of best practice, is tailored to the needs of the project, and benefits the State-significant urban transformation that this project will bring about.

1.0 Proponent

The proponent is comprised of three international real estate companies who are world leaders in the realisation of global workplaces and city making spaces (AMP Capital, Brookfield, and GPT). The proponent is committed to achieving true design excellence in the broadest sense, including urban design, environmental design and sustainability, architectural design, engineering ingenuity, workplace and human centric design as well as place making and positive community and public benefit outcomes.

The proponents' strong commitment to achieving design excellence is evidenced by its multitude of award winning developments, many of which are the result of significant and exemplary design competitions including:

- AMP Capital's Quay Quarter, Sydney;
- Brookfield's Wynyard Place, Sydney; and
- GPT's 161 Castlereagh Street, Sydney.

The strategy adopted by the co-owners intends to follow a robust design excellence process that includes the selection of a world class team that has a demonstrated capability to achieve excellence in the design of commercial towers and significant urban spaces. Examples of benchmark design excellence processes already undertaken by all three co-owners are shown in **Appendix A**, which demonstrates a proven track record in running design competitions and delivering design excellence.

2.0 Integrated Design Excellence Process

The site of the proposed development is complex and requires diversity of thought in the resolution of a design solution. In light of this it should not be expected that a detailed concept, capable of optimising all urban design, commercial and architectural objectives, can be delivered solely from a short term competitive design competition.

To achieve true design excellence, the proponent proposes that the Competitive Design Process outlined in this Strategy forms part of broader design excellence process, which does not intend to finalise the design outcome for the site. Rather, the competitive process will identify a design team that is capable of delivering design excellence across the entire precinct, and a concept design for both the built-form and open space.

The team and concept will be selected by the Jury as having the greatest potential for achieving design excellence and meeting the relevant project objectives. The Jury will also provide recommendations that should be considered in the development of the detailed design for a final design excellence submission.

3.0 Design Competitive Process

The proponent is committed to a whole-of-site design approach for the winning design and, as such, the competitive process will largely follow the 'Type B' process outlined within the GA's Guidelines and will apply to the whole of the proposed project as detailed in SSD 7684. No additional height or FSR bonus is being sought through the Competitive Design Process.

3.1 Timing of the Competitive Design Process

The competitive process will commence following the determination of the SSD16_7684 and following the endorsement of the Competitive Design Process Brief (see **Section 4.2**). A draft competitive process program is provided in **Table 1** below.

Table 1 – Draft Competitive Process Program

Week	Milestone / Competitive Process
Prior to commencement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EOI process to establish architectural and open space design teams. Competitive Design Process Brief drafted and reviewed by DP&E and GANSW. Competitive Design Process Brief endorsed by DP&E.
Week 1	Commencement Date or Prior: Brief issued to competitors
	Briefing Session & Site Visit (mid week 1)
	Working time
Week 2	Working time
Week 3	Working time / Mid Point Review (end week 3)
Week 4	Working time / Mid Point Review (mid week 4)
Week 5	Working time
Week 6	Working time / Final Submission (target end week 6)
Week 7	Technical Review
Week 8	Presentation Day (end of Week 8)
Week 12	Announcement: All competitors to be notified within 14 days of decision of winner.

3.3 Preparation of Competitive Design Process Brief

The proponent and its consultants will prepare the Competitive Design Process Brief for the Competitive Design Process generally in accordance with the GA's Guidelines. The Competitive Design Process Brief will include specific assessment criteria, against which the submissions will be judged and will include specific ESD targets for the project.

The draft Competitive Design Process Brief will be submitted to the Department and the GANSW for review and comment. Additions or modifications will be made to the Competitive Design Process Brief subject to the outcomes of any Independent Planning Commission (IPC) decision, and any further requirements of the Department, before finalisation.

Prior to the commencement of the Competitive Design Process the Competitive Design Process Brief will be endorsed by the Department and the GANSW.

3.4 Competing Architectural and Urban Design Teams

The proponent will request Expressions of Interest (EOI) from at least 10 potential competitors, which may be comprised of local and/or international architects that will either be a person, corporation or firm registered as an architect in accordance with relevant legislation. This represents a slight departure from the requirements of the GA's Guideline, which requires an open EOI stage.

The Competitive Design Process will encourage the formation of design teams, possibly constituted of more than one individual or organisation, in order to produce a 'best-for-site' outcome that demonstrates excellence in design of the buildings and the open space, as well as the interface between these two elements. The core elements of each design team (which will be stipulated within the request for EOI, but may include Architectural, Urban Design, Landscape, and other key consultants) must remain in-tact throughout the competitive process (and detailed design, as outlined in Section 3.9). Other non-core team members may be substituted at the team's discretion.

The formation of design teams will allow for the inclusion of a range of architectural practitioners, including practices with both architectural and urban design experience. The intent behind the requirement to form design teams is to allow for a diversity of thinking and a range of new ideas to be considered within the Competitive Design Process.

Following the EOI process, the proponent will select 5 or 6 design teams to participate in the Competitive Design Process based upon a clear set of selection criteria as stipulated in the EOI request. This EOI phase will run concurrently with the development and endorsement of the Competitive Design Process Brief. The EOI process will identify four to six design teams who will be invited to participate in the competitive process.

3.5 Mid-point Review

The Competitive Design Process will allow for a review where the competing design teams can present their work-in-progress schemes to the proponent, the Advisory Panel, and Technical Panel, as well as to the consent authority and GANSW representatives.

The purpose of the mid-point review is to allow competing teams the opportunity to seek clarification of technical and planning matters by the Technical Panel and the Advisory Panel. These Panels will not advise on design nor direct any design outcome. Representatives from the OGA, the Consent Authority, and the proponent are able to attend the mid-point review as observers and may not provide advice or design direction at this time.

Due to the size and complexity of the site, allowance has been made to hold the reviews over two separate days. Each competing team would have one opportunity to present.

3.6 Submissions and Jury Briefing Report

Each competing team will submit their entry to the competition manager in the form agreed within the Competitive Design Process Brief and at the time stated. Following the submission of each entry to the competition manager, a Jury Briefing Report will be prepared by the competition manager. The Jury Briefing Report will assess each entry

against the selection criteria provided within the Competitive Design Process Brief and incorporate input from the proponent, the Advisory Panel, and the Technical Panel as required. The Jury Briefing Report will be provided to the Jury before the presentation day.

3.7 Presentation

Each competing team will get the opportunity to present their entry to the Jury. The format of the presentation day will be outlined in the Competitive Design Process Brief. Three panels will be present during the presentation day, as outlined below.

3.7.1 The Jury

The Jury is proposed to be made up of six members, three of which will be nominated by the owners and three of which will be nominated by the Department or the GANSW. As the Minister will be the consent authority for the development application, the Department will request that the City of Sydney nominate two representatives on the Jury, one of which will be drawn from the State Design Review Panel pool. The nominated Jury will be approved by the GANSW and the Department as part of the Competitive Design Process Brief. Jurors may, but are not required to, have pecuniary interest in, or be an owner, shareholder or manager associated with the proponent companies. Six Jury members are proposed in recognition of the unique characteristics of the project, with three key co-owners.

Each member of the Jury will be confirmed within the Competitive Design Process Brief. The Jury is to:

- Represent the public interest;
- Balance public and private interests through consideration of both the public domain and commercial tower proposals;
- Provide input that is appropriate to the type of development proposed;
- Include only persons who have expertise and experience in the design and construction professions and industry; and
- Include at least five persons with urban design and architectural expertise and experience.

The chairperson of the Jury will be the member nominated by the OGA and will have expertise in architectural design and urban design and be a recognised advocate of design excellence. The proposed composition of the Jury represents a slight departure from the exhibited requirements of the GA's Guideline, although it is understood that, when released, the final version of the GA's Guideline will differ from the exhibited version.

3.7.2 The Advisory Panel

For this project, three major international real estate companies are planning to invest some \$1 billion to deliver a world-class project on this site. Each of the companies behind the proposed development is able to bring significant planning and urban design expertise to the project as is demonstrated by the breadth and excellence of their respective portfolios. These organisations are best-placed to advise the Jury about designs' capacity to achieve the high design standards required by AMP Capital, Brookfield, and GPT.

The Advisory Panel will comprise persons who will be nominated by AMP Capital, Brookfield, or GPT and will be available to provide advice to the competitors and the Jury. The Advisory Panel will not be present in the room while the Jury deliberations are taking place, however will have the opportunity to address the Jury prior to, and following, the final presentations. The Jury can request their input after the presentations and prior to the deliberations. They can be present during the presentations but only as observers and must not contribute to the discussion at this time unless called upon by the Jury.

3.7.3 The Technical Panel

The Technical Panel will be appointed by the proponent and will provide technical advice and input throughout the preparation of the Competitive Design Process Brief, and assess schemes against the agreed assessment criteria within the Competitive Design Process Brief and provide input into the Jury Report. The Technical Panel will also be available to the design teams throughout the preparation of each submission (to the extent allowed by the

Competitive Design Process Brief). The Technical Panel will comprise technical input on subject areas which may include (to be further confirmed in the final competition brief):

- Statutory Planning;
- Urban Design;
- Architectural;
- Landscape Architecture;
- Heritage;
- Structural Engineering;
- Buildability; and
- Cost.

The Technical Panel will not be present in the room while the Jury deliberations are taking place. The Jury can request their input after the presentations and prior to the deliberations. They can be present during the presentations but only as observers and must not contribute to the discussion at this time unless called upon by the Jury.

3.8 Selection and Award of Design Excellence

The winning concept design will be selected by the Jury. Input and advice may be provided throughout the process from the Advisory Panel and the Technical Panel, however the Jury alone will be responsible for selecting a winning concept and will do so based on:

- input and advice from the Advisory Panel and Technical Panel;
- the Jury Briefing Report; and
- their own expertise.

Following the first round of submissions and presentations, the Jury may require up to two of the design teams (the shortlisted teams) to refine their submission in response to feedback and suggestions from the Jury, the Technical Panel, or the Advisory Panel. Any additional clarifications or design work required, will be limited to a series of specific key issues for resolution in order to select the final winning scheme. Shortlisted teams will be paid an agreed amount for this additional work. The Jury may provide the shortlisted teams with targeted and outcome-focused design advice to assist in developing a winning design for the site as a whole.

3.9 Jury Report

Following presentation day a Jury Report will be prepared by the competition manager on behalf of the Jury. The Proponent will have the opportunity to review and comment on the Jury report prior to its release. The Jury Report will assess each entry against the selection criteria provided within the Competitive Design Process Brief and incorporate input from the proponent, the Advisory Panel, and the Technical Panel as required.

3.10 Design Integrity

The architect responsible for the winning design is to be appointed as the design architect by the proponent to prepare a detailed development application (Stage 2). The core elements of the winning design team will be retained through future stages of the project to ensure design integrity is maintained.

In order to retain design integrity, following selection of a winning team and award of the winning design, the final Jury Report will outline the key 'Measures of Design Excellence' or key elements to be retained within the scheme as it develops. Commentary from the Jury (against these defined key measures) will be required prior to lodgment of a detailed development application, and at any subsequent substantial modification to the detailed development consent. If the original Jury members are not available for subsequent reviews of the design, suitable alternatives may be nominated and agreed by the Consent Authority and the proponent.

4.0 Conclusion

This Design Excellence Strategy sets out the framework for an integrated design excellence process that encompasses all aspects of the design and planning process for Cockle Bay Wharf. This framework will facilitate design excellence for the project, ahead of a Stage 2 (detailed) State Significant Development Application.


Should you have any queries about this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me on 9956 6962 or hquartermain@ethosurban.com.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'H Quartermain'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Harry Quartermain
Principal, Planning
hquartermain@ethosurban.com
9409 4908

Appendix A - Example Proponent Design Excellence Benchmark Projects

Competitive Process	Quay Quarter, Sydney
	
Proponent	AMP Capital Investors Limited
Description	In the heart of the CBD, Quay Quarter Sydney provides a site of 11,000sqm across two city blocks. The site will be a revitalised and vibrant destination providing 8,000sqm of retail floor space, 90,000sqm of commercial floor space, and 102 new apartments across two boutique buildings.
Competition Guidelines	<i>City of Sydney Competitive Design Competition Policy 2012</i>
Competition Winner	3XN
Type of Process	Design Competition Invited, after EOI process.
# on Jury	Six
Jury Representatives	John Denton Bridget Smyth Peter Mould Alex Tzannes Jeff Peers Louise Mason
Design Excellence Bonus Achieved	Yes, as a result of competitive process and achieved in the Stage 2 DA.

**Competitive
Process**

Wynyard Place



Competitive Process	Wynyard Place
Proponent	Brookfield
Description	The largest over station development in recent memory, Wynyard Place includes the upgrade of the eastern access ways to Wynyard Station and the construction of a 27 storey commercial building above a retail shopping area. The project also included the refurbishment of the adjoining heritage listed buildings, 285 George Street and Shell House, resulting in a total of approximately 85,000sqm of commercial / retail GFA.
Competition Guidelines	<i>City of Sydney Competitive Design Competition Policy 2012</i>
Competition Winner	MAKE
Type of Process	Design Competition Invited, after EOI process.
# on Jury	6
Jury Representatives	<p>Brookfield Representatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kurt Wilkinson – President and Chief Operating Officer - John Durschinger – Senior Vice President, Global Design - Carl Schibrowski – Head of Development <p>Department of Planning & Infrastructure Representatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peter John Cantrill - Tzannes & Associates Pty Ltd - Peter Poulet – NSW Government Architect <p>City of Sydney Council Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. Kerry Clare – Director Clare Design
Design Excellence Bonus Achieved	Not applicable