



15 February, 2017

Jeremy Hughes
Tonkin Zulaikha Greer

Dear Jeremy,

Stage 2 State Significant Development Application Walsh Bay Arts Precinct (WBAP)(SSD 7689)

Draft Amended Design for Waterfront Square

As you will be aware, RLA undertook the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for the Stage 2 SSDA WBAP (SSD-7689). As a critical part of the SSDA, I assessed the likely visual impacts of the waterfront square and proposed shade structure, which were key elements of the application.

I understand that followings submissions including those made by the Office of Environment and Heritage, amendments have been proposed to the detailing of the grassed area of the square and the supports for the proposed shade structure. Other issues raised included potential blocking of views from strata tenancies in the Shore Sheds caused by the catenary shade structure and whether temporary items such as LED screens, port-a-loos, kiosks extra bins, etc. had been considered in relation to visual impacts.

In that regard, I refer to this the computer-generated perspective images (CGIs) you sent me today by email, showing draft perspective views depicting the likely appearance of the square and catenary shade structure as amended, as seen from Levels 1 and 2 of the Shore Sheds Strata offices. One of these showed the proposed main video screen and six smaller potential temporary screens.

I note that the shade structure supports as proposed have a more industrial/maritime character in keeping with the language of the original gantry cranes, which were formerly a prominent feature of the precinct and an amended plan for the grassed area of the square.

With regard, firstly, to views from the Strata tenancies in the Shore Sheds, I understand that the CGIs represent the correct eye levels of viewers, established by survey. I further note that CGIs shown that the proposed amended catenary shade structure does not cause any significant obstruction of view from the tenancies in the Shore Sheds.

Secondly, as the amendments do not affect the levels or location of the catenary shade structure, there would be no change to the findings of the assessment in the VIA with respect to impacts on views from the public domain.

The amendments to the catenary shade structure provide for a qualitative change to the visual character of the structure and the amended plan for the square include a minor change



to the geometry of the grassed section. The amendments would make no change to the views available of, from, or through, the square and shade structure.

In terms of the objective aspects of the visual impact assessment carried out by RLA, the amendments to the shades structure and square are neutral. That is, they would not cause any changes to the findings of the VIA. Subjectively, the amendments may be considered positive with regard to increased compatibility with the heritage fabric and forms of the precinct.

So far as temporary structures are concerned, temporary structures that could be bumped in or out to accommodate events were considered to be likely features of the multi-function nature of the square. They would be expected as part of preparation for and accommodation for temporary events and logically would be subject to a management plan for such events, consistent with OH&S outcomes. Other temporary items would also be present at times, for example art works, exhibition items, possibly backdrops to displays, etc.

Temporary structures would most appropriately be placed with the objective of facilitating the retention of views to and from the Harbour and within the precinct when reasonable to expect, for example in daylight, and to minimise the time during which there could be temporary impacts on specific view lines, for example public views through the Shore Shed openings. Temporary view blocking was considered likely to occur in some instances, but to be acceptable in the context of flexible use of the space, provided it was largely confined to night-time events and minimised in duration.

Temporary additional video screens would be a logical and acceptable addition to the square during specific events that call for them but would be best removable and the time they are present, minimised, as when not in use they are unattractive and have the potential to cause view blocking effects.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard Lamb', written in a cursive, flowing style.

Richard Lamb and Associates