

SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK AUTHORITY DESIGN REVIEW PANEL – ADVICE SHEET

Project	Sites 2A and 2B – Australia Ave, Sydney Olympic Park	
Presentation / Review Date	31 October 2018	
Panel Present	Ingrid Mather Caroline Pidcock Michael Harrison	JMD Design (Chair) Pidcock Architects Architectus
COI Declaration	None	
Also Present	Alix Carpenter, Ben Woods, Dylan Sargent and Catherine Modini (SOPA) Daniel West and Candice Pon (Ethos Urban) Bassam Afflak and Michael Azar (Ecove)	
Presenters	James Fitzpatrick (Fitzpatrick + Partners) Matthew Mar (Fitzpatrick + Partners) Michael Barnett (Arcadia)	

ADVICE:

Fitzpatrick + Partners and Arcadia presented 6 matters to the DRP for resolution as identified below:

1. Façade design and solar performance:

Fitzpatrick + Partners presented a modified façade design, which included:

- a façade module around the perimeter of the tower, with equal floor to floor heights to create consistent panel geometry;
- flipping the panel geometry so that the solid triangular panels are pointed down and glass triangular panels are pointed up; and
- introduction of diagonal sunhood elements to the facades, which would vary between a consistent 150mm width on the southern facade and a tapered width of 150mm-450mm on the northern and western facades to optimise solar performance and reduce heat loading.

2. Outlook from lift foyer of hotel and serviced apartments:

Fitzpatrick + Partners presented two options to incorporate natural light and an outlook from the lift foyers. Option 1 involved creating a splayed viewing corridors on either side of the lift foyer that are approximately 800mm wide at the corridor. Given the 8m depth of the hotel rooms either side of the corridor, Option 1 was considered unlikely to provide significant natural light to the lift foyers and would present significant maintenance issues.

Option 2 involved the deletion of one room from each level to create an outlook and lounge area. This option was deemed financially unviable.

Fitzpatrick + Partners expressed their preference to maintain the internalised corridor and create a response with a changing façade design and lighting to assist with internal navigation.

3. Solar access and natural ventilation of habitable areas in hotel and serviced apartments:

Fitzpatrick + Partners presented revised floor plans for the hotel rooms, which placed bedrooms and living areas along the facade and internalised non-habitable areas such as bathrooms and kitchen areas.

Fitzpatrick + Partners also presented an option for a hinged window to provide natural ventilation to the serviced apartments but advised that the hotel operator would not accept operable windows for hotel rooms.

4. Public domain design:

Arcadia presented the revised public domain design, which included:

- alignment of the Dawn Fraser East extension with the Master Plan 2030 (2018 Review) layout and introduction of a turfed area at the eastern end of the street;
- stepped grass terraces from Australia Avenue to the forecourt of the building on Site 2A;
- a preferred option for the treatment of the fig tree on Site 2A involving raising the tree by 2.8m and construction of timber decking around the buttress roots;
- three alternative options for leaving the fig tree in place, including:
 - a sunken deck,
 - a 'net-scape', and
 - a sunken deck and terrace area;
- introduction of brick 'terrain' seating between Australia Avenue and the building on Site 2B;
- extension of the outdoor dining areas of market hall at ground level of the building on Site 2B towards the new road; and
- locating a misting sculpture to evoke mangrove aerial roots near the entrance to the lobby of the building on Site 2A.

Ecove advised that specialist retail consultants would also have input into the final ground plane design and interface with the buildings.

5. FSR non-compliance:

The FSR of the proposed development has been rationalised through the design development and now complies with the FSR development standard for the sites under the SEPP (State Significant Precincts) 2005. While there will be further design development prior to lodgement of the SSD application, it was agreed that the FSR will comply with the development standard at the time of lodgement.

6. Building height non-compliance and overshadowing impacts:

Shadow diagrams were presented that compared the overshadowing impacts of the proposed design with those of the standard tower controls in Master Plan 2030 (2018 Review) on 21 June. The shadow diagrams demonstrated:

- the proposed design would result in marginally better solar access to Jacaranda Square in the morning;
- the proposed design would result in additional overshadowing of the communal open space of the residential development on Site 68;
- the proposed design would not result in any additional overshadowing to any existing or future public open space areas identified in Master Plan 2030 (2018 Review); and
- the proposed design would cause additional overshadowing to the north-facing units at 11 Australia Avenue, resulting in solar access to the lower units only until 10am and after 3pm on 21 June. There is less overshadowing to some of the higher units.

RESOLUTION:

With respect to the six items, the Panel resolved the following:

1. The Panel supported the design development of the façade and recommended that further development continue to be undertaken to optimise solar performance.
2. The Panel supported the decision not to include an outlook or natural lighting from lift foyers but resolved that the internal hallway design concepts needed to be further developed. In particular,

the Panel identified the opportunity to incorporate circadian lighting changes and possibly biophilic design into the hallways.

3. The Panel supported the revised room layouts and inclusion of operable windows to the serviced apartments. The Panel re-iterated their preference for natural ventilation to the hotel rooms and recommended that further design development continue to explore this as an option.
4. The Panel resolved that the public domain concepts are not adequately resolved. Further development of the design is required and needs to consider the following:
 - a. Future-proofing the Dawn Fraser East extension to allow it to function as a shared zone or road extension as development to the east of the site occurs;
 - b. Creating a stronger nexus between each building and the surrounding ground plane design and spaces for public use;
 - c. The response to the forecourt of the market hall at Site 2B, so as to reduce clutter and barriers to movement;
 - d. How the public domain responds to the surrounding streetscapes including accommodating service access and how internal circulation will occur;
 - e. Resolution of the porte cochere design with regard to levels, treatments, interaction with the footpath, sight lines and queuing areas;
 - f. Whether lifting the fig tree at the north-western corner is the best outcome for the tree and the site. The Panel strongly recommended that SOPA obtain a second opinion as to whether the lifting of the tree is viable; and
 - g. Appropriate locations for turf and soft landscaping to maximise its use and minimise risk of failure from overshadowing and foot traffic

The Panel had concerns about the resolution of levels between the public domain, buildings and the surrounding road network across the entire site but acknowledged that this issue could be further developed through the SSD application and post-approval process if the overall landscape concept was improved. The Panel also recommended that a wind analysis be undertaken for the ground plane.

5. The Panel supported the resolution of GFA to comply with the FSR development standard.
6. The Panel recommended that further shadow analysis be carried out to test overshadowing impacts on the ground plane with three dimensional models and accurate levels.

The Panel resolved the integrity of the winning competition design has been maintained but the landscape design has not adequately addressed the issues raised by the Design Excellence Competition jury.

The revised landscape concept is to be presented to the DRP for review by email correspondence.

Approved:

Ingrid Mather
JMD Design
Chair

