

MR P. DUNCAN: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, and pay my respects to elders past, present, future and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today on the state significant development application 7684, for the concept of a commercial building down below the Cockle Bay Wharf, 241 to 249 Wheat Road, Darling Harbour, and stage 1 early works for demolition of existing building structures.

My name is Peter Duncan. I am the chair of this Commission Panel. And with me today is Professor Alice Clark and Dr Peter Williams. The other attendee is Robert Bisley from the Commission Secretariat, and he is assisting us with the Commission on this project. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission website.

The meeting is one part of the Commission's process of determining this application. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of the process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its final decision. It is important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues wherever we feel appropriate.

However, if you're asked a question and you're not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice. And you're able to provide us additional information in writing. And that subsequent information will also be put on our website. So we will now begin, open for your presentation to start with. And then we can have some questions at the end. We may ask for clarification along the way, but we will let you go through your presentation first. Thank you.

MR M. FADDY: Thank you, Peter. I'm going to start, please.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FADDY: We're very pleased to meet with you today. Thank you for your time to consider this proposal. My name is Matthew Faddy and I represent the consortium of three owners. So with me today we have Murray Middleton, head of development for AMP Capital; Carl Schibrowski, head of development for Brookfield; and Jamie Nelson, head of development for GPT. We are here today to seek stage 1 concept plan approval for Cockle Bay Park, a unique opportunity to create a world-class employment, leisure and cultural precinct, including a new public park that will re-establish a community connection between the CBD and Cockle Bay. The eight-lane western distributor isolated Cockle Bay from the city in the 1970s. Ever since, the full potential of the eastern edge of Cockle Bay has been limited by its clear separation from the CBD.

Cockle Bay Park is a rare opportunity to remediate the impact of the western distributor on the bay and to realise the original vision for the site, which was to

connect the bay, its workers and visitors directly to the commercial core of our magnificent city. The proposal before you is the culmination of over three years engagement with state government, the city and the general public. Our process has included three periods of exhibition and four rounds of design changes, and all of this
5 has been essential to ensure that the balance between government, public and investment interests is set at the right level, a level that allows confident investment in Sydney's cultural ribbon, whilst creating a unique place for commerce, leisure and recreation for future generations. Sydney's CBD has been the engine room for Sydney, New South Wales and Australian growth since the age of industrialisation.

10 The opportunity to create high-quality commercial space to house the 500,000 workers of today and the future workers is becoming limited. Indeed, Sydney's current vacancy rate of 4.5 per cent is evidence of this. The Sydney CBD is both a victim of its beauty and its success, with harbour frontages on the west, the north and
15 the east, opportunities to meet the growing demand for employment space is challenging.

At Cockle Bay, we are looking to provide an investment that will create 70,000 square metres of additional commercial space, which will continue the economic
20 growth of Australia's most important city. Cockle Bay Park is a commercially viable concept that promises to reconnect the city to Cockle Bay through the creation of public space, including over 6000 square metres of park space on the bay's edge, deliver a revitalised retail and entertainment precinct, create over 70,000 square metres of commercial floor space, desperately needed in a growing global city, all
25 without the use of public funding.

GPT, AMP Capital and Brookfield are long-term owners of property and is each motivated to create and curate exceptional places that attract people through their form and function. We deeply appreciate the significance of this site to our beautiful
30 city, and are acutely aware that there are many objectives to balance in considering this project. With that in mind, we have worked with relevant stakeholders over the past three years to achieve the right balance that will lead to a project that will be a high-quality addition to the built environment of Sydney, with unique attributes, which will enhance the community's experience of place.

35 We present the Cockle Bay Park development proposal to IPC today, knowing that the process we have used to engage with our key stakeholders has been collaborative, transparent, robust and patient, and that the proposal itself reflects our strong ambition to achieve a balance that achieves the aims of all stakeholders.

40 We have three expert speakers today, who will take you through the key aspects of our proposal: Clare Swan, from Ethos Urban, will brief you on the planning matters relevant for this site. Richard Francis-Jones will then highlight the key urban design and city-making principles adopted in the design. Richard will also how we arrived
45 at this solution over the many other options tested and reviewed in conjunction with our stakeholders. Finally, Sasha Coles of ASPECT Studios will explore the potential of the proposed public space and describe the engagement process we intend to

follow to really ensure the community needs are met. We trust after today you will share our view that we have the right concept, the right team and the right process to deliver an exemplary outcome for this city. Thanks for your time and we look forward to receiving your questions at the conclusion of the presentation. I will now hand over to Clare and the team.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS C. SWAN: Hi, so my name is Clare Swan. I'm a director of planning at Ethos Urban. So as you're aware, the site is governed by the Darling Harbour Development Plan. A wide range of build form outcomes have actually been approved in the Darling Harbour area as state significant development in recent years, including the ribbon, the convention centre precinct and Darling Square. The proposal is consistent with the Darling Harbour Development Plan guiding principles, to encourage the development of a variety of tourist, recreational, entertainment, cultural and commercial facilities within the area. We've also consulted the property for New South Wales Darling Harbour framework for landowners' consideration of state significant development, and the proposal is also consistent with key principles within the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan to improve access to the foreshore.

The site is unique, in that it is located on government-owned land that will remain under government ownership and will continue to be subject to a long-term lease arrangement following urban renewal. Property for New South Wales has granted landowners consent for the proposal you see before you today. At this stage, we are seeking approval for a stage 1 concept, which establishes a well-considered framework for the renewal of the land, including design principles and built-form controls, including a building envelope. The design of the building will ultimately be known following the design competition and further design development with stakeholders, at which point we will be lodging an application for stage 2.

In terms of consistency with – probably the next slide – the application is fundamentally consistent with guiding strategic planning frameworks and relevant policies from the state, regional and local level, including the Greater Sydney Commission's greater Sydney regional plan and the eastern city district plan. In particular, it increases employment floor space in a highly accessible part of our harbour city, contributing to a walkable city and also the travel to work goal of a 30 minute city.

We provide new publicly-accessible open space, that will bring together people and enhance the environment, and in that open space assist in increasing the urban tree canopy, through the creation of accessible and enhanced open space and public domain. We're also consistent with – I've sort of put together the greater Sydney region plan and the east district plan together, because a lot of the strategic goals actually overlap. In terms of the Greater Sydney 2030 plan – which is two slides along – we're actually consistent with a number of council strategic directions in Sustainable Sydney 2030.

5 The proposal is green, through its enhanced open space offering; global, through providing premium commercial floor space in a competitive CBD and enhancing Darling Harbour as a destination; and connected, through enhancing connections from the CBD to the harbour. The proposal is also consistent with a swathe of other statutory and strategic policies, as outlined in the EIS and in the department's assessment report.

10 In terms of consultation, the project team – Matt touched on this – the project team has undertaken extensive consultation with the community and stakeholders across three exhibition periods and also outside the exhibition periods and prior to lodgement of the EIS, which has helped shape and refine the concept. We've met with the department, government agencies, the community and council. As part of the 2017 EIS review the department appointed Professor Peter Webber as an independent urban designer to comment on the scheme. We held a series of
15 envelope refinement workshops so Professor Webber and the department could test the relative merits of various envelope outcomes. Following the workshops a concept envelope was refined balancing all considerations and constraints while also retaining enough flexibility so as to leave the design excellence process unfettered.

20 So, in essence, what we have before you is a concept DA which establishes a building envelope for the tower and podium in a form that is consistent with the way other CBD stage 1 approvals are dealt with. We've included tower built form controls, design guidelines to inform future design development and the design competition and a competitive design excellence strategy. Should the concept be
25 approved by the commissioners we would proceed to undertake the competitive design process, which is not intended to fully finalise the exact design outcome for the site.

30 Rather, the process will identify a team that is capable of delivering design excellence across the precinct of both the open space and the built form. This will then be worked up further with the stakeholders. The jury of the competition will comprise members nominated by the Department of Planning, the Government Architect's Office, the city of Sydney and the proponent. Ongoing community
35 consultation will occur through both the design competition process, the design development stage and the stage 2 DA, including new consultation requirements issued by the department through the secretary's requirements for stage 2. Other than that, here's the plan in context. Over to Richard.

40 MR R. FRANCIS-JONES: Thank you my name is Richard Francis-Jones. I'm from FJMT. We're architects and urban designers, and I want to start by just talking a little bit about this very unique site.

MR: Too far away, maybe.

45 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Too far away, you think.

MR: Just click

MR: Right there.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Click.

5 MR: Click worked just then, I think.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Click worked. Yes. Arrows didn't work.

MR: Working too much now.

10

MR FRANCIS-JONES: So the site at Cockle Bay is a very unusual site in that it's situated very centrally to the city but also at this point of connection of the city to its harbour and, indeed, across to Pymont east and west. So it's a very unusual site in that respect. It is situated within Darling Harbour, and, as Clare has indicated,

15

Darling Harbour, particularly over the last 10 years, has undergone significant transformation: Barangaroo; the convention centre and associated hotel and Haymarket development; The Ribbon, which is almost next door; the removal of the monorail. All of these developments are creating a new sense of Darling Harbour.

20

So here in this elevation of the city you can see where we're located and the relative scale of these developments. Now, one of the things that's most strategic about this site is that at the north end we have Market Street, which connects all the way through the city to Hyde Park and to the west across Pymont Bridge, and then to the

25

very south of the site we have a connection which runs from the south of Darling Harbour waterfront through Druitt Street, a very constrained connection through here, then up through into Park Street, Hyde Park and the town hall civic precinct. So although it is somewhat isolated by the freeways, it's in a very strategic urban position.

30

When we look at this site from the air you can see the existing Cockle Bay building here and then what Matt was talking about, which is this whole series of raised freeways and lower roads, which have cut the city off from the harbour. Perhaps when we look at these images – this is the pedestrian experience at Druitt Street,

35

which you're all no doubt familiar with, but also across at Market Street to Pymont Bridge. So it is possible, of course, in both of these to get from A to B, but the experience is kind of counterintuitive. You feel like you're in a very automobile-dominant environment, and it is very difficult to make your way through there.

40

So there's a unique opportunity that this site really offers – is to bridge this freeway condition. So one of the very first things that we did as a team when we were looking at the development potential of this site was to see if it was possible to develop a plan that could actually have a substantial deck over that freeway and if there was the opportunity with this expanded site to develop a landscape open

45

space that could complement the city's open spaces as they currently are configured, and at the very centre of this proposal was the creation of a major new open space at

this really significant urban threshold and, we thought, a unique opportunity for a development site within the city of Sydney.

5 Another key opportunity and, in a sense, obligation is to reinvigorate the waterfront of Darling Harbour. Darling Harbour has become such a focus for celebrations and gatherings and community activities and visitation. There is an enormous opportunity not only to connect it through to the city but to enhance this experience, and in a sense we've conceived of the lower levels of this development as almost a series of terraces which form this kind of natural amphitheatre into Darling Harbour
10 and which can have a series of uses which really contribute to its public and social uses. So when we're looking at the uses that are proposed central to those is employment workplace uses, which are in the tower, and then arranged within its podium are entertainment, tourism, retail and cultural uses that interlock and engage with the new public domain.

15 Another really significant opportunity for this project is to improve the connection of Pyrmont Bridge to the city. Of course, the Western Distributor cut off the bridge quite decisively at this point, and while there has been a connection there, the kind of coalescence of monorail, pedestrian access, clearances above the freeway and
20 pedestrian equitable access has meant that while the link there was possible it wasn't a very pleasant or, indeed, intuitive experience. So there is the opportunity with this project to enhance that connection to the bridge and to the waterfront. So this led to, really, four key drivers for the development vision.

25 One was the reconnection of the city to its harbour, to Darling Harbour. The other was to really embrace the opportunity to create a new and significant public open space, to reinvigorate Cockle Bay and the uses there that are appropriate do it as a destination, and also strategically important workplace and employment uses. So what I want to now do is kind of outline to you the process that we've gone through
30 and use that to explain the key urban parameters and how we've got to where we are and what the relative impacts of those are. I've listed here six key urban design factors in no particular order, but this is the order I will run through.

35 There's bridging the freeway. As you've seen, it's a considerable thing to bridge, and I want to just explain to you the issues surrounding that. Secondly, height, bulk and scale. Very important urban design factors to be managed sensitively. The setback from the waterfront for any commercial tower: an important issue. The public domain that can be delivered through this project. I'll talk about that in a little more detail. Private view sharing. The impacts on private view, and, importantly
40 too, the impact on sun access, in particular, town hall, the future Town Hall Square. I'll run through each of these quite quickly.

45 Bridging the freeway. Well, in a sense, this is the scale of the issue that confronted us, and this is the end of Pyrmont Bridge that you can see here and the existing footbridge and monorail station just on our left and then the raised footbridge which connects into Darling Park, which is very rarely used. Now, when we study this we realise that there are areas indicated by pink, lime and yellow here where we can land

structural support, and then beyond those there's a few isolated areas between the
freeways and lower roadways where we can actually have some additional lines of
support, and we've gone through quite a detailed structural analysis and quite
detailed consultation with RMS over how can we achieve this, what is possible, and
5 what has come out of that is a design strategy which builds a continuous deck over
that entire length that you can see illustrated in that drawing through a series of
beams at variable depth spanning the full width across those freeways.

10 Now, also, another important factor which is perhaps less visible is the realignment
of Harbour Street at the lower level with a proper slip lane running in through here, a
drop off within the development and then a connection onto the north. Now, what
that does is it actually pushes the support line further west. What that has resulted in
is a diagram that simplifies the explanation of the supports with a line which runs
15 along here. That orange line. You can see that is the reconfigured Harbour Street
line. This is the seawall here. While it is possible to put structure beyond that
seawall, it's obviously a technical challenge, and what that illustrates is that there is a
zone of support for the office tower indicated in that drawing just in that area there.

20 The deck, of course, spans across, but this is where we can bring the core down. So
the upshot, really, of that is that it's possible to do all of this, but it's quite a tight fit.
It's quite restrictive. Height, bulk and scale. Now, as Matt said, we have been
working on this project for quite a long time, and we – our first submission went in
in 2016. Prior to that, we analysed some important parameters to determine that
application. And one of the most important of those is sunlight access into public
25 space.

The first sun access plane that we looked at in detail was that into Tumbalong Park
and the children's playground. This was one of the factors that actually affected the
design of the ribbon, which preceded us, and therefore that was an obvious important
30 factor for us to take into account. Then there was the solar access plane into Sydney
Square and Town Hall steps in the LEP, which ran from 11 till 4 from 14 April to 31
August. And we also extended that over to inform our site.

35 We were aware at the time, of course, of the future Town Hall Square. And that was,
in fact, encapsulated in those hours underneath that solar access plane that was in the
LEP. Then we also believed that sun access into the waterfront promenade was
important, and we developed a sun access plan that ran from 12 to 2 lunchtime on 21
June for that access. Also we felt there were two important public view lines running
40 down Market Street. So in coming down Market Street, you will see towards the
water. And we constructed a geometry that ensured you were allowed to do that –
you still could maintain that visual access. And then coming off Druitt Street to open
up that view as soon as possible, bearing in mind how restricted it is to get under the
freeway at that point.

45 What the combination of those factors gave us was a zone for a potential tower
sitting underneath those sun access planes. So what you see here is a potential
envelope – not a building form, but an envelope for the building to potentially sit

within. And this elevation from the west shows the Darling Park towers beyond and it shows that envelope here, which was the subject of the S1DA from 2016. Now, shortly after that application, the City of Sydney's draft central Sydney planning strategy was released. And that strategy – one of the key attributes of that strategy
5 was to maintain sun access into Sydney's public spaces. How this strategy specifically impacted on our development site was in the controls around the future Town Hall Square and also the study of sun access into waterfront and public parks.

All of these, of course, were very much in our thinking and influenced the design
10 proposal, but there were some important variants. One of those was that the future Town Hall Square sun access plane ran from 12 o'clock to sunset. That had the effect of lowering that sun access plane quite significantly from what we had anticipated. And then the other was an indication that the sun access to the waterfront on the western side should run from 11 to 3.

15 Our study had actually gone from 12 to 2 on 21 June. So these were important for us to look at in our response to submissions from 2016. Now, in the response to submissions, we also had meetings and feedback from the government architect and the department. And there was concerns about the public space proposition in that
20 original DA, would that be improved – could that public space be improved. And so the tower envelope was moved further south for the second submission.

So here we see our application for 2016 and then envelope was pushed further south
25 to create a much more extensive public space on Market Street frontage, connecting to Pyrmont Bridge and also facing due north. What that gave us was a – so the tower was then moved south, as part of that study. And also the envelope for the tower was reduced in height. So I've just put back into this drawing those various sun access planes that you saw before, including the 11 o'clock access to the waterfront and the sun access plan in the draft central Sydney planning strategy for the future Town
30 Hall Square. What that did – and this elevation from the west, you can see the Darling Park buildings behind – it gave us a new envelope, which was the subject of our submission from 2017.

Here you can see ghosted on the envelope from 2017, the key difference being the
35 movement of it towards the south, to create the new open space, and the lowering of the building and reconfiguration of the envelope to reduce any overshadowing impacts onto the future Town Hall Square. We, of course, received submissions following that exhibition period. An important set of those submissions was from the City of Sydney. And the City of Sydney, in their attachment C, provided an
40 envelope that you can see illustrated here, which I will just illustrate for your comparative purposes. So, again, this is that elevation from the west, the 2016 envelope, the 2017 envelope, and then drawn in red here the City of Sydney envelope.

45 Now, what you're looking at there is this line is in the foreground, so that's towards us, and this line is in the background. Sorry. It's the other way around. Yes. Sorry. On the wrong lines. Because, of course, that diagram is of the sun plane. Same on

5 this corner through here. As part of that process, following the 2017 exhibition and submissions, we worked with the department on testing a whole series of variants and adjustments to the envelope. We had many sessions with the department's appointed independent urban designer, Peter Webber, and tested a whole series of scenarios, which I've illustrated a selection of those here, including those which moved the tower further south, reconfigured heights and arrangements in various configurations.

10 That led to a revised envelope in relation to the request for submissions – response to submissions, which you can see here. So this is 2016, 2017 and then our response to submissions, which you can see here, which moved the envelope further south and also dropped the height of the envelope further. That was the result of a process of testing various things with Peter Webber and the department. Also on this diagram is the envelope that was provided by the City of Sydney for your comparative reference. And one of the most important things to bear in mind, of course, is that we're talking about an envelope when we look at those drawings, and the actual building won't occupy the whole of that envelope.

20 This orange form here is an indication of what the actual area would look like in one configuration within that envelope. And, of course, it may go further south or further north or be reconfigured slightly within that envelope. And then we had provided an overlay to look at the – try and get a space of the mass of the building that we're dealing with. 9370 is the proximate area of the Cockle Bay site. It's quite a complex site. And we've shown, then, an area that is extended over the freeway over to the Darling Park site and there's also a site just under 900 square metres further to the south. And we've just provided there an indication of what the FSRs for those are. So in the 9370 site, developed at the size of the application, it would be 9.5 to 1 FSR.

30 So when we look at those massings – and now we've just cut the section east-west, so the waterfront here, Pyrmont Bridge, we can see those envelopes, 2016, 2017, the RTS site, which is just there, the size of the building that will potentially fill it, which is shown in orange, and there you can see the envelope that was provided by the City of Sydney just overlaid, so that you can see those differences. And then when we use the same drawing but project back from the western elevation, you can see those envelopes overlaid on each other and also the possible extent of building that might fill that envelope. So this indication here, 52.5 metres, is the potential width of the building that would fill that envelope. So if we were to build that building up to the top of its envelope – the very top of its envelope – and use the maximum east-west dimension, it would give you a width of 53 – or just under 53 metres.

40 Now, another aspect to the development which has undergone evolution during this process has been the setback from the lot line, which we can see there, the lease line that runs through there, which is that red line through there. 2016 had a three-metre setback, 2017 an eight-metre setback and then, in the response to submissions, an eight-metre setback. Sorry. Sorry. 10. Yes. 10. 10. 10. And they are average setbacks dimensions with minimums that are shown on that drawing there. So the

response to submissions has a 10-metre setback as an average and a minimum of eight.

5 Now, I also just have included here the City of Sydney's envelope, which shows a 12-metre setback, and I – and we've just extracted here one of the important factors influencing the city's recommendation there, which was to provide some access into – to the foreshore at 11 o'clock, which 12 metres indeed does, but also a 10-metre setback will also provide some access onto the promenade from 11 o'clock on the 21st of June. Also on this image, you can see one of the perspective studies that was used in consultation with the department and their expert. You will have seen in the documents there are a whole range of these that were used to test envelopes and setbacks. I haven't reproduced them all here, but, just to give you a sense of some of the factors that were considered.

15 Public domain: so one of the most important aspects of this project is its ability to improve these connections and create an expanded and enhanced public domain at this really tight area of waterfront between the freeways and the public promenade. This includes incorporation of the RMS and City of Sydney bike strategy that's going to extend across the freeway here, and access at the lower levels. This diagram shows the extent of that public domain, 10,000 square metres, and an illustration here of the sort of public space that this could be, and Sacha Coles will take us through that in a moment, and, importantly, the way in which that can incorporate substantial new park and connections to the freeway. So we think this project is exceptional in its ability to deliver meaningful public space.

25 Another one of the factors that we've looked at carefully is private view-sharing. That is another item that was looked at very carefully by Peter Webber and the department and by ourselves and, of course, was also influenced to a certain extent by the repositioning of the tower further north. Our submissions included very detailed analysis of the view impacts of the development on adjacent buildings. Perhaps one of them – one of the key buildings affected there is the Astoria Apartments here, and I've just included in this summary a view study from two of the apartments that face west in that building. This is the southernmost building – southernmost apartment, and this is a view taken from that apartment here. You can see its view framed by the two Darling Park buildings and then, in this photomontage, an indication of the potential impact of this building. That – that is not the envelope. That is an approximate width of the building, at 60 metres.

40 Now, the building doesn't need to be that wide. Within our submissions, we recommend that that is the maximum width of the building, in order to give flexibility for the envelope and the following stages that Clare identified, but, in this study, that is showing the maximum impact of a 60-metre building on that apartment – and then the apartment to the north. Now, that apartment is a dual-aspect apartment, of course. It has an aspect to the north as well, and this is the view to the west, and then montaged onto that is the – again, the same 60-metre width that I was mentioning before. Solar access in particular into the new Town Hall Square is the final item that I wanted to cover, and I indicated that, when we first started working

on this, we were working off the LEP, which was protecting Sydney Square and the town hall steps, but, during the process, the draft Sydney Planning Strategy came out and was more detailed in the solar access into public open space.

5 Obviously a key issue, really important issue, and so we've studied that in a great deal of detail. This diagram here shows hours of sunlight into the future square and the time of the year, which is shown across the back here. In the centre of the diagram is the winter solstice, middle of winter, here, and this blue line indicates the amount of sun or shadow that the square enjoys, and, unsurprisingly, of course, the –
10 most of the shadow is in winter, but there is still good sunlight access, and what this has identified is the area of the square and the time of the day that is affected by the proposed envelope in the submission. We've zoomed in on that to show you that impact. So this is the number of hours averaged that the square receives of sunlight, and this is the time of the year.

15 Now, in the 2017, you can see it was this line that you can see there, and then our response to submissions here is how we've reduced it. So we tried to refine this as much as we can to reduce any overshadowing impacts on the new public space. It's a little bit abstract in those diagrams. So I've got a series of shadow impacts here to
20 try and explain that. Now, what we've picked here is the 4th of April. So, of course, these are – these two days here and here are the days where we have the most overshadowing impact. So that's the worst case. So we've picked that day, and this shows you the town hall here, the cathedral and the red line is the boundary of the new square. Sitting outside that line is the public footpath.

25 So this is nine – these are taken at 15-minute intervals, so at 9.45 as we run round, but it gives you a good sense of the shadowing of the square, and that takes us to 12 o'clock, which is the time at which the control, the draft control, is applied. So this is for the – so, of course, we're not – we're middle season, but it's the day at which we so if I run through these: 3 o'clock.

30 So, as you can see there, the – it's at 4 o'clock. We're not having an impact. If you can just see that little bit of pink there, that is the shadow from the proposal, and then, 4.15, that is showing the shadow on the square, and then, at 4.30, that is the shadow on the square. The pink is also the shadow from the proposed building, but
35 it's on the road, which is why we've shown it pink, or it's outside the boundary of the square. Now, this is based upon a 60-metre building sitting approximately in the centre of that envelope. So, obviously, there's a finer point of - - -

40 MR DUNCAN: It would narrow down - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

45 MR DUNCAN: - - - you would think, in design.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. One would expect some small adjustments to that would happen - - -

MR DUNCAN:

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - but this gives you a sense at 4 – just – so at 4.15,
we're there. 4.30, and then, at 4.45, you can see where the shadow is – the square is
5 shadowed at that time.

DR P. WILLIAMS: So at that point, Richard, the square's overshadowed by other
buildings.

10 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Correct.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Correct. The other shadows in this model are shown in
15 grey. So – and then at 5 o'clock, of course, it is – so the study that I just went
through is this middle line of drawings that you can see here. So this is at 4.20. So
you can see the shadow there, and then 15 minutes either side is just shown here, and
then what is also shown above is we've taken the worst case, and we've looked at
20 seven days prior and seven days later. So the intention here is just to explain as
clearly as we can what the shadow impacts are. They are there. It does overshadow
in the later afternoon at that period of the year, and then, if we just extend that a little
bit further so it's another seven days earlier, 21st of March, you can we're off the
square at the same time of day, and then at the 18th of April seven days later, as we
move towards winter there's more shadow. And then this is extending it another 15
25 minutes either way.

So, of course, sun into the new square is important, and we've endeavoured to
minimise it, but there is still an impact, but we've endeavoured to explain that as
clearly as we can. What we see is the great opportunity for this project is the
30 creation of a new public space, and that public space has been positioned after the
various consultations with the department and experts and the Government Architect
in a way that optimises further access into that space as well. So, clearly, the issue is
an important one, and the public space that is being proposed as part of this
development overlooks the water and enjoys good solar access.

35 So what I've really tried to do in this material is to explain to you what we think are
the key factors that have influenced and affected this development over its approval
process, consultation and submissions, bridging the freeway, the height and bulk, the
waterfront setback, public domain, private view sharing and the access of sunlight
40 into the new Town Hall Square. Clearly, it's a balance of all of these issues. Adjust
one and it affects the others, and we've tried to achieve an outcome which is
balanced, but, of course, we've been very much guided by authorities and experts in
that. So I might just hand over to Sacha Coles to talk a little bit more about the
public space.

45 MR S. COLES: Thanks, Richard. Just to re-introduce myself, Sacha Coles. I'm the
director of Aspect Studios, landscape architects and urban designers. We joined the

team in this latest configuration post-SSDA. So what I'd like to do is to walk you through what we talk about as the public realm and the public benefits of the proposal, which have been designed at this stage to set a structure and a brief for the public realm, as described by Clare, and I'll talk about it again. The ultimate end result of this will be the result of more stakeholder engagement, particularly for the public realm ground up, and also a design competition. So that will set the ultimate design.

Richard has talked about this particular view a couple of times. It is the centrepiece of the offer because of its ability to restitch the city, but, more meaningfully, it's like nothing else around this context of Darling Harbour other than, if you like, Tumbalong Park to the south or Barangaroo Headland. It's probably more familiar to you as a Sydney type something like Barangaroo Headland or Lady Macquarie's Chair, a piece of elevated open space which sits up high, gives you prospect and allows you to look over the water. The public realm, just to give you a sense of benchmarking and what does a space like this actually mean in terms of size and scale and impact on the city. What's the aspiration?

The dark green that you see here has been transposed over a series of other examples: the Sydney Opera House steps, Federation Square in Melbourne and, probably most relevant since we've just been through that, the new Town Hall Square or the proposed Town Hall Square in Sydney, and what you can see – it's almost a like for like, obviously slightly larger. The area we're talking about is from the waterfront back to Sussex Street, and this is the five and a half thousand square metre green space. So for the public realm how that comes together – there are a series of different tempos or spaces within the public realm. Some exist, like the Crescent Garden, and there is some remodelling proposed in this proposal as well.

I won't talk too much about that today. Really, we're talking about the new public realm that is being offered as part of the scheme. The park, which sits 15.5 metres above the water down through here – so the elevated park is really the centrepiece. The terraces that Richard talked about are the terraces which cascade down to the waterfront from the park. They've all been designed around DDA, all abilities access. So there's a very clear way to get from the public realm of the city through a ramped connection, down a lift in this instance here, either onto the Pyrmont Bridge or down into the podium internally. There are lifts which allow people to come down. There's also the lifts associated with the public realm which exist that allow people to come down to the waterfront.

So a huge amount of stakeholder – expert engagement has been taken up to allow for that DDA access across. The other parts that I'll talk about later are – we call the sky park or the podium park, which sits here above the podium, which is accessible, again, as a public space, the connections of Druitt Street and the restitching of Pyrmont Bridge. So just to go through those in a bit more detail. One of the key strategies for the public realm has been around very intuitive and clear wayfinding and movement through the public realm. The experience from the footpath on Sussex Street is to either come up through stairs to the lobby of the proposed

building here or through a ramped connection back around, and, again, as mentioned, the ramp comes up, either comes down stairs or a lift back onto Pymont Bridge and reconnects the city across Darling Harbour to Pymont Peninsula.

5 All of the key connections have been made to be very clear, intuitive and straight. In terms of the public park, the main strategy for this, really, will be a public park for the people of Sydney. As discussed, it's the main strategy for the public realm offer. It will be a place of event. It'll be a place that'll be curated. At this stage it is proposed that that curation of events and daily life is managed through a shared
10 services agreement with government, but, again, there are precedents for that type of shared services agreement, and that would be something subject to further discussions. It's 24/7 open. It's a real and vital public space offer for the city. In terms of the Cockle Bay steps and terraces, this is really trying to propose an opportunity for sitting within greenery.

15 It embeds retail in here and principally in line with the retail strategy of Darling Harbour is predominantly food and beverage retail through here. There is an amphitheatre, which takes advantage of the level change that I talked about, which would be a gathering place for viewing of events, school groups and the like. We've
20 tried to integrate as much greenery in terms of canopy cover, biodiversity and also trying to ameliorate urban heat island in this particular place. This view is probably the best view – the aerial that shows you the connection of the Pymont Bridge either back upstairs and directly into the city, up the lift or for cyclists who are in the shared environment here back around, as Richard mentioned before, tying into the greater
25 cycle strategy which surrounds this site.

The eye-level view here which looks north-east back up to the park illustrates public lookout, an idea that the public have full access to all of the public realm on the north of the tower. A series of spaces of pocket parks within the terraces for public to use,
30 and the intention of this place is that there is a blend of F and B. To get a sandwich, to just sit within the public realm and people watch down here is the ideal outcome. Druitt Street is an existing connection, and, again, Richard talked about the kind of experience. It's an underwhelming experience which really doesn't privilege
35 pedestrians at the moment, and what we'd like to see is that upgraded through a significant public strategy, potentially one which is curated and themed around movement and light so that it deals with a much more delightful way to enter the city but also provides for safety through that area.

40 And the final space which I talked about before is – sits on top of the podium, is very well connected from either Druitt Street as the city connector or from the waterfront up escalators up onto the podium. In this version, we have shown a design outcome which looks to health and wellbeing, potentially some active uses. Again, this would be the subject of the design competition, but it is an authentic public space on the podium top and connected on the edges – the western edges back around to Sussex
45 Street and the terraces and the major park.

5 So, finally, in terms of the development of the public realm, the proponents are keen and committed to an outcome which is ground up. Particularly for the public realm, there will be targeted stakeholder engagement to set the brief and set the outcomes for that public realm, as well as mentioned previously, the outcomes of the design competition, which is forthcoming. So I will pass back to Matt, to sum up.

10 MR FADDY: Thank you. Thank you. So that's the end of our formal presentation. So now we welcome questions. Hopefully from the presentation – and we've given you some insights into some elements that we've considered over the past three or
15 four years, but you get a sense that there has been a lot of consideration of the various people that have a view on this and are impacted by this. And you get a sense that there is an openness to that discussion and there's an openness to further discussion, as we continue through the next stage of getting this exciting project committed and out of the ground. So with that, we will hand over. Thank you, Peter.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Matthew. I will start off with Alice. Do you have any questions that you would like to ask?

20 PROF A. CLARK: Yes. You talked briefly about, you know, managing the shared public space through, I guess, a shared services agreement with government. Do you have any, sort of, idea about how that might play out? A bit more detail around that would be really helpful.

25 MR FADDY: Sacha.

30 MR COLES: What we've talked about to date has been broadly looking at a model that exists either at Darling Quarter, which some of the proponent's designers have been involved in. I certainly have seen the success of that, where the land owners, the lease holders have had a partnership with government to curate the public realm around Darling Quarter, so including the retail at the base of the Commonwealth Bank Place buildings, the through cycle link, which is called Commonwealth Bank Place, and the children's play space, so yes.

35 PROF CLARK: You mightn't know, but just in case you do, are those by some sort of instrument or legally binding sort of agreements? What's the perpetuity of those?

40 MR COLES: I would have to – I have not been involved in the legalities of it. I'm not sure. But that would be a precedent that we would look to.

PROF CLARK: So I guess the essence of my question is what's the long-term certainty of that enduring over the course? That's one of the things we would probably want to know more about.

45 MR FADDY: Well, perhaps we could come back on that specifically. Obviously, this is a leasehold with the government, as you know. So there's a number of requirements that we have as lessees over this space.

PROF CLARK: And it's a long lease, isn't it?

MR FADDY: Yes. It's 100 year lease, which now expires in 2088, so yes.

5 PROF CLARK: Hence my question.

MR FADDY: Yes.

PROF CLARK: Yes. Thank you.

10 MR DUNCAN: That lease doesn't necessarily set out whether there's open space or retail or whatever, so - - -

PROF CLARK: So it's agreements.

15 MR J. NELSON: No. But the process, I guess, that we're going through is a part of redefining that lease for gain, which would then obviously incorporate these elements.

20 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

PROF CLARK: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: I see. So that would be incorporated in the lease?

25 MR NELSON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

30 MR C. SCHIBROWSKI: There's ways in which a separate volumetric title can be carved out of a leasehold and then we can have an overarching building management statement and that building management statement talks about whose obligation it is to maintain and so on, before we can come back with

35 MR DUNCAN: Yes. The series I think we would be thinking of is maybe, sort of, whether, you know, it can be changed in the future easily or whatever. So that you, sort of, use potential in the open space - - -

MR SCHIBROWSKI: And there's capital replacement and - - -

40 MR DUNCAN: Yes, all those sorts of issues that I think just – we realise it's a process of design and development still, but it would be good to understand how that could work.

45 MR FADDY: Okay. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Sorry, keep going.

PROF CLARK: Yes. That was – I will wait to hear back on that one, I think.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Because we just have had some concerns about just guaranteeing, you know, in 50 years time, for example, the perpetuity of the whole thing, publicly-accessible statements that still remain publicly accessible, so the 5500 square metres on the north and the 1000 square metres on the south. And, for example, that might need to be – could also be considered as being conditioned as part of the development consent. Sure you've got the lease agreements in place, but also there was something – if there was a problem, it also allows the consent authority to be able to enforce it as well. So that's something we might need to consider, in terms of just guaranteeing certainty of use for, you know, the publicly-accessible places that you're providing, so - - -

MR FADDY: Yes. So is that maintenance, Peter, or are you considering whether the park gets turned into something else, is that what you - - -

PROF CLARK: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Basically, yes.

MR FADDY: So given that we have strict requirements around the fact that we're not the landowners, so for us to go and do anything on that land subsequently – or someone else to go and do that would be quite challenging. So it's a part of – one of the key components of our engagement has been with property of New South Wales as the landowners. So they have had to consent to what we're proposing. And if we didn't achieve their consent, then it wouldn't happen. So that rule would apply no matter what any lessee should do in the future on the site. Yes.

PROF CLARK: It would be good to get some clarity on that.

MR FADDY: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: It's just from our perspective that obviously to ensure that, you know, what has been proposed, which is clearly of great public benefit, in terms of the open space, but then there's, well, what's the guarantee that that's going to be

MR FADDY: Yes, understood.

DR WILLIAMS: So that's something that is an issue that obviously needs to be cleared.

MR DUNCAN: While we're on the open spaces, because there's a few issues to get to, but there's probably also an understanding of the calculation, you know, the 5000 to 12,000, what that means – what open space is there to start with, I would say that's probably the first question. Then you're building a lot on it new and, you know, acknowledging that it tidies up a lot of issues and delivers a lot of value, but what is

the calculation? You've got, sort of, alfresco eating areas, you've got walkways, is there an idea of that at this stage?

5 MR COLES: Broadly, the over one hectare is the proposed and existing. So the Crescent Garden is within that, the extents of the – we can probably go back to the
- - -

MS SWAN: Go back to that – no, it doesn't go back to the slide.

10 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. The Crescent Garden is the one between the three buildings now.

MR COLES: Yes. Yes.

15 MR DUNCAN: Can you go back to your diagram?

MR FRANCIS-JONES: It includes the – so we're replacing the existing open space on the Cockle Bay Site, so there's that section of the court shown in the middle and there's an area to the south, which is being replaced. But predominantly it's a park
20 that - - -

MR DUNCAN: It's a long way back.

MR COLES: Yes. It's probably escape and - - -
25

MR FRANCIS-JONES: I think it is a long way back.

MR DUNCAN: That's it in its broad sense, isn't it? Yes.

30 MR FRANCIS-JONES: So that's the calculation. So there is some existing public space in Cockle Bay just here and down this end.

MR DUNCAN: And you're including in that the podium open space down at the southern end.
35

MR COLES: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. But not the promenade.

40 MR FRANCIS-JONES: No.

MR FADDY: Correct.

MR COLES: No. That exists. But there's also retail within those open spaces, so
45 that's a point of clarification.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. It needs a bit of fine tuning there. Okay. And I guess it goes to the question of the promenade too. We had an issue of clarification of how wide it is and the setbacks. And you went through a bit of that, Richard.

5 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: These steps then in front of the site is around 11 metres; is that right?

10 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Existing width of the boardwalk or promenade, I think, is about 11.6.

MR DUNCAN: This is without any additional boardwalk.

15 MR: That's from the lease line – current lease line.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MR: Is that right, Johnathan?

20

MR J. REDMAN: I think so.

MS SWAN: Yes.

25 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MR FADDY: Yes. No. That's right.

MR: It's a little section there. Have you got there?

30

MR: No. I don't think so, actually.

MR: Okay.

35 MR FRANCIS-JONES: It might be on the waterfront setback ones.

MR DUNCAN: It did help, that slide, actually. That reminds me, do we get a copy of the presentation?

40 MR: Yes. We've got one on - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MS SWAN: Yes.

45

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Absolutely.

MR DUNCAN: No. There was another one, I think, more of a cross section.

MR COLES: Point of clarification on this slide, as we were conditioned against the additional timber over the water. So what was proposed was to extend out an additional - - -

5

MR: About five metres.

MR COLES: The department has said no to that.

10

MR DUNCAN: There's already a proportion - - -

MR COLES: The department has said no to that.

MR DUNCAN: There's already a proportion of the site that has it. There's the bit here - - -

15

MS SWAN: Down to the water.

MR DUNCAN: What difference do you think that would make if you actually got that bit?

20

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Well, we felt that there was value in that - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

25

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - and public benefit in that.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

30

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Because what it does is it connects in with an existing promenade.

MR DUNCAN: This other land, yes.

35

MR FRANCIS-JONES: And so it's very good for people who want to get down a bit closer to the water. It is also quite a restricted site, so we – in terms of promenade width, so we felt that that had benefit, but that has been conditioned out.

MR DUNCAN: It does step down as well, there's a - - -

40

MR COLES: Correct, yes.

MR DUNCAN: That's right.

45

PROF CLARK: So what are thoughts - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. We just have a bit of confusion about the actual setbacks, because we're been getting different numbers.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

5 DR WILLIAMS: But what we're looking at is it looks like, putting aside the five metre extension out into the water - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

10 DR WILLIAMS: - - - that the department doesn't like, it looks like you've got about 11 point – so if the water's edge, and you've got about 11.5 I think - - -

MS SWAN: That makes sense.

15 DR WILLIAMS: - - - and then you hit the - - -

MS SWAN: The podium.

20 DR WILLIAMS: - - - the podium.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: The podium, correct.

DR WILLIAMS: And you've got the podium and then you've got a setback from the podium to the building - - -

25 MS SWAN: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - and that was, I think - - -

30 MR FRANCIS-JONES: 10 metres.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - three metres.

35 MS SWAN: Now it's - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Is that 10 metres?

MS SWAN: Yes, yes.

40 MR FRANCIS-JONES: That's 10 metres.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

45 MR FRANCIS-JONES: To the tower.

DR WILLIAMS: To the tower.

MS SWAN: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Because the department's also talking about a setback that they increased by five metres from - - -

5 MS SWAN: From three.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - three to eight.

10 MS SWAN: So we did originally propose it as three.

MR DUNCAN: Right.

MS SWAN: So that the – the podium - - -

15 MR DUNCAN: So it's gone three to five to 10.

MS SWAN: Yes, correct.

20 MR DUNCAN: Is that right?

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Actually, it was three to five, yes.

DR WILLIAMS: No, three to - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: Three to eight.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Three to eight and then to 10.

30 MR DUNCAN: Now it's 10.

MR COLES: Correct.

MS SWAN: Correct.

35 MR FADDY: So I think something - - -

PROF CLARK: We just need a diagram - - -

40 MR FADDY: - - - along the figure 47 are the departments one – it's one of the older
- - -

MS SWAN: Yes.

45 MR FADDY:

MR COLES: Yes.

MR FADDY: Something that just reflects that - - -

PROF CLARK: Yes.

5 MR FADDY: - - - with the correct measurements, because - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR FADDY: - - - in here it says three and five metres - - -

10 PROF CLARK: Yes.

MR FADDY: - - - to the podium, so - - -

15 MR DUNCAN: It's really a clarity thing for us.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes, yes. Okay. No, we'd be happy to clarify that.

DR WILLIAMS: Because, for example, we had the Sydney City Council saying it

20 should be taken back an extra two metres, but I think you've already taken it back an extra two metres.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Well, we were at - - -

25 MS SWAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: I think where that may come from – so we've gone from – as you say, we've gone from three in 2016 to eight in 2017 and then, in our response to submissions, further set it back to 10 metres.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: In the City of Sydney's envelope that was provided as part of their response to the 2017 application, they were suggesting 12 metres.

35 DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

PROF CLARK: Okay.

40 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Now, we understood that one of the factors that they were considering was the solar access.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

45 MR FRANCIS-JONES: And because that had been extended to 11 o'clock as an element of the draft strategy, and so we did apply that to make sure that we could stick with that. Now, obviously, that solar access isn't just affected by that

dimension, it's also the position north-south of the tower. So at 10 metres, you can still provide solar access at 11 o'clock.

5 MR DUNCAN: You're constrained going back any further to the east either, I would imagine, because you need that core to the ground and that's - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: That's correct.

10 MR DUNCAN: You really can't go back any further.

MR COLES: The distributor becomes an issue for us - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes, yes.

15 MR COLES: - - - going over the western distributor. We have a cantilever already over there and to go further back becomes problematical.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

20 DR WILLIAMS: So within all these setbacks we're talking about - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: I think we've reached – we understand now exactly what the setbacks are - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

30 DR WILLIAMS: - - - if the bit of the extension of the boardwalk that the department doesn't like, if that was put back in, what would be your views on that in terms of improvement to the width of the boardwalk promenade?

35 MR COLES: We put it in there because we thought it was an act of kind of generosity at a relatively tight part of the area where a lot more people will be located either working or visiting, because of this destination. So we thought that that would give generosity to the water edge.

40 MR FRANCIS-JONES: It's obviously a very sensitive issue infilling the harbour, we know that.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, yes.

45 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Of course, it's a very important issue, so we need to be careful and sensitive about it, but as Sacha says, at this point, given its connection to an existing boardwalk, given how tight this site is, we felt that it had benefit. Now, I don't know exactly the department's reasons for recommending against that, but

clearly we thought it had benefit and, on balance, we – you know, it was a timber deck structure.

MR COLES: Correct.

5

MR FRANCIS-JONES: It could be removed. So on balance we felt that it was a benefit.

10 PROF CLARK: I don't – it doesn't seem they've knocked it out as something that could be further considered, it's just that it wasn't, I guess, absolutely resolved with all the authorities now.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

15 PROF CLARK: So I think there's measures by which we could continue to look at it.

DR WILLIAMS: It's just a recommendation of the department - - -

20 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: - - - that could be deleted; that's just a recommendation to us, but –another point – sorry – that you did sort of clarify was a question we had, and I just want to verify it, was the connectivity between the, I think, the podium park, the southern park, as it's about 1000 square metres, to the rest of the open space. We weren't quite sure about how that was going to work, but it seems that you said there would be connectivity through the podium itself.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Correct, yes.

30

MR COLES: Johnathan, could you go to the rendered plan, the master plan is probably the easiest. Yes, that one will do fine. So if you can see on the podium, if you extend where the podium park is around, you have the timber deck which comes up to the east.

35

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

40 MR COLES: And that level there connects you directly around. So, yes, the mid-level, the Pyrmont Bridge level is lower than that, so that's a kind of a mid-level in the terraces, so if you – that's it – if you come off there, you would go in and under into the podium - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes, yes.

45 MR COLES: - - - or up those stairs to the east and then – then you're on to the top of the podium, correct.

MR DUNCAN: So if you just take three layers, then: the promenade, the mid-level and the upper level.

MR COLES: Yes.

5 MR DUNCAN: Are all three of those 24-hour access?

MR COLES: That's the intention. Yes.

10 MR DUNCAN: So that's what connects it.

MR COLES: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

15 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: That's correct.

20 MR DUNCAN: I think we've just about dealt with open space and public domain, but there's one question I have about ticketed events. How would that, in fact, work in that I assume that's in that – in the lawn or large green space area. That would reduce public access, I assume.

25 MR COLES: That would be subject to whatever the agreement is, again, with government.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

30 MR COLES: As the land owner for the site.

MR DUNCAN: So - - -

MR COLES: So going back to the shared services agreement. That would really be subject to that discussion as a – yes.

35 MR DUNCAN: So I'd assume that would be treated in a similar way as an event at Barangaroo Headland or - - -

40 MR: Domain.

MR COLES: Exactly.

MR DUNCAN: - - - some other public open space.

45 MR: Yes.

MR COLES: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

5 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Okay. questions.

MR: Not that I can think of at the moment.

10 MR DUNCAN: A question that comes to mind for me is you've done an enormous amount of work on shadow, for good reasons. It's terrific, and if this proposal goes further, there'll be a lot of design refinement. How much closer to, you know, minimal impact can you get with design refinement? You've got, obviously, a big block now. Have you got a view on that at this stage? Yes. I know it's early, but
15 can there be improvements made on what, in fact, we're seeing in the shadow diagrams at the moment?

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

20 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: There can. There's a little bit of a kind of law of diminishing returns.

25 MR DUNCAN: Yes. I understand that, and I can see that in your various profiles.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. Yes. Yes. So what – over the years we've been working on it we've constantly refined it down, and so you get to the point where now small adjustments make small outcomes.

30 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: And we've shown the envelope from the city of Sydney which would eliminate it, eliminate those 15 or 20 minutes around in that late afternoon period. So it is true that in the next stage during the competition stage
35 because the envelope provides a little bit of flexibility in how you deal with that that you could improve that further, just as, of course, some manipulation of that will also improve the view sharing that is currently shown at 60 metres in those images.

40 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: And, Richard, the shadow diagrams that have been produced I think that's what the department are saying too – that it's based on the building envelope. The shadows produced are cast by the envelope, not by an indicative mass building that might might, for example, only be 53 metres wide or - - -
45

MR FRANCIS-JONES: The shadow diagrams that we produce there are based on a 60 metre wide - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - occupation of that envelope. It's actually not quite one
- either of those two that you mentioned.

5

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: The envelope is wider than 60 metres.

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: We were recommending that the building not go beyond 60
metres. So, in other words, you couldn't fill the whole envelope. In width you could
only go to a maximum of 60 metres, and our shadow diagrams are positioning a
15 building approximately in the middle of the envelope at that width.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Now, the department - sorry. That was a - - -

20

DR WILLIAMS: The diagram before. It was

MR FRANCIS-JONES: That was a good one you had just a nanosecond before
then, which was the envelope elevation, which showed - - -

25

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - all three of the - all the different envelopes on it. Yes.
That one there. Yes. So you can see there that if we kind of squeeze a building into
30 that envelope it could be at 52.5 metres wide. That is occupying the maximum east-
west depth of the building. It's allowing for void spaces within the building, and it's
sitting right under the envelope. So it's a little bit difficult to produce a building that
is narrower than that, but that is narrower than the overshadowing analysis that we're
showing there.

35

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: And it's also narrower than the view loss analysis that
we're showing.

40

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: So, yes, in the next stage it is possible for that. I think it's
also worth raising here that based on that study I think the department is
45 recommending a maximum width of 53 metres.

DR WILLIAMS: 53. That's in one there. Recommended conditions

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes, and I just wanted to explain that the reason in our RTS response we went to 60 metres was in order to provide scope in the next stage for the designers to develop the building form. If it's a 53 metre maximum, it's actually very restrictive. You could have a 53 metre average, for example, which would still allow you to develop the building form in ways which actually might be more superior. So our only concern with that recommendation is it's potentially very restrictive on the next design competition phase.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. I just wanted to have a bit of a question of looking at, while we've got that diagram there, what actually happens inside the podium, what actually – what uses are there? You've got car parking and all sorts of other things there, but how would that look if you actually could see inside that in the future?

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. So we don't have an image of that

MR DUNCAN: Inside. Yes. Just curious to know it works, how the building works.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. Yes. Well, look, that is a good question. I'm not actually sure what plans we've got. We put into our - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Because we've done so many - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - but the lower-level podiums there are seen as predominantly publicly accessible - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - retail uses, opening out onto al fresco dining on the terraces overlooking Darling Harbour.

MR DUNCAN: So like a series of arcades or something

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes arcades with external terraces.

MR DUNCAN: Coming – people can go up through the building.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: You can go down - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - get to both public spaces - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

5 MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - each three as you move from the primary public space to the north, the central public space and then the smaller kind of threshold space from Druitt Street to the south.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

10 MR FRANCIS-JONES: So they're all connected across those levels - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

15 MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - with activated uses and retail. The workplace entry is over the other side, addressing Sussex Street - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

20 MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - towards the park. So it's pulled aside, and the idea is that those lower levels are part of the kind of almost amphitheatre of Darling Harbour. Places where people can go and watch the fireworks or the Australia Day and sit at restaurants and cafés or sit in the park and the open space around and, you know, populate the edge of Darling Harbour. It's extraordinary how full Darling Harbour gets - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - and how restricted it is, particularly this threshold here.

30 MR DUNCAN: And you've got viewing platform there, just - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - on this corner, I guess.

35 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. And it's important to point out, as Sacha has, that what is shown here is an indicative design to give an impression of what it could be like.

40 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: That is obviously going to be subject to a design competition phase, which will look to improve upon the work that we've done.

45 MR DUNCAN: And access – the access – I think – I guess it's the Druitt Street access.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: If you left the promenade and went out that way, how easy is that access? What are you – what would you be faced with? Escalators, stairs, bridge across the motorway or underneath?

5 MR COLES: At this stage, it's both stairs and escalator.

MR DUNCAN: Stairs and escalator.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: And lift.

10 MR DUNCAN: And then, on the Pymont Bridge side, there's already an escalator on that, isn't there?

MR FRANCIS-JONES: There is.

15 MR COLES: Yes. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And it's public.

20 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Correct.

MR COLES: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So that would stay and

25 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MR COLES: Correct.

30 MR DUNCAN: So you'd have three different - - -

MR COLES: Tie into that.

MR DUNCAN: You'd have three different - - -

35 MR FRANCIS-JONES: These are all additional.

MR DUNCAN: - - - access points, or modes, I mean.

40 MR COLES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Richard, did you say lifts at both - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

45 DR WILLIAMS: Both parks.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Alice.

5 PROF CLARK: No, I don't think so.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: I think that's about it.

10 MR DUNCAN: I think we're there. Is there anything finally that you want to present or - - -

MR FADDY: No.

15 MR DUNCAN: - - - anything we've missed that you want to talk about.

MR FADDY: No. No. There's nothing else that – yes, there is something Clare would like to say.

20 MR DUNCAN: Sorry.

MS SWAN: Well, just for the avoidance of doubt, when Richard raised there might be more flexibility in the competition by not actually limiting it to 53 metres. So

25 we're wondering, given this is an open forum, could it be average of 53 with the – you know how we proposed the maximum extent of 60, but the average would allow sort of tapering and various design solutions rather than - - -

MR DUNCAN: I see what you mean. In the design of the tower, you mean.

30 MS SWAN: Yes. So the department have said a limit of 53, and we're saying an average.

MR DUNCAN: We'll take that question on notice and see if we can

35 DR WILLIAMS: So you're looking at – yes. Sorry. An average of 53.

MS SWAN: Yes.

40 DR WILLIAMS: But a maximum of - - -

MS SWAN: 60.

DR WILLIAMS: So some points might be a little bit narrower than 53.

45 MS SWAN: Correct.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Correct.

MS SWAN: Exactly, and that's why we want that flexibility. Just - - -

5 MR FRANCIS-JONES: It's really - - -

MS SWAN: - - - to not straightjacket it.

10 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. Because otherwise it - - -

DR WILLIAMS:

MR FRANCIS-JONES: If the maximum is 53, you pretty much get a box.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: I think – I understand the intention. We're looking for a slender building, and width is important, but we're suggesting that 53 average may capture that intention more accurately.

20 MR DUNCAN: All right. Well, if that's everything, we can wrap up at this point. However, we will probably reserve the right to come back if we've got any questions. It's the first day we've spent together on it, so we've had a lot to take in today. Public meeting tomorrow and a further inspection tomorrow. At that stage I think I'll close the meeting.

25

MS SWAN: Great.

MR FADDY: Thank you.

30

MR DUNCAN: Thank you very much.

MS SWAN: Thank you.

35 MR COLES: Thank you very much.

MR FADDY: Thank you.

MR COLES: Thanks.

40

MR FADDY: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[3.45 pm]