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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. OVERVIEW

The purpose of this Architectural Design Competition Report is to inform the City of Sydney Council (City of Sydney) of the process and outcomes of the Architectural Design Competition (Competitive Design Process) for the redevelopment of 210-220 George Street, Sydney, and the selection of the winning architectural design.

Poly Australia (the Proponent) invited six competitors to participate in the Architectural Design Competition and prepare design proposals for the site. The six architectural firms that participated in the Competitive Design Process were:

- Hassell
- Fitzpatrick + Partners
- BVN
- Grimshaw
- PTW in association with Skidmore Owings & Merrill (SOM) San Francisco (local and international partner)
- DBJ (emerging architectural firm)

All six competitors participated in the Competitive Design Process and produced a final submission for consideration and assessment by the Jury.

The Competitive Design Process was undertaken in accordance with the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (Sydney LEP 2012), the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (Sydney DCP 2012), and the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2012.

Clause 3.5 of the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2012 sets out the requirements for an Architectural Design Competition Report, as follows:

1. Following its determination, the jury is required to prepare a report (to be referred to as the Architectural Design Competition Report) detailing:
   a. The competition process and incorporating a copy of the competition brief;
   b. The jury’s assessment of the design merits of each of the entries;
   c. The rationale for the choice of preferred design which must clearly demonstrate how it best exhibits design excellence in accordance with the provisions of Clause 6.21(4) of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and the approved Design Excellence Strategy; and
   d. An outline of any further recommended design amendments or proposed conditions of development consent that are relevant to the achievement of design excellence.

2. The jury is expected to reach a decision on whether to request a redesign within 14 days and will submit a jury report (referred to as the Architectural Design Competition Report) to the developer and the consent authority, within 14 days of its decision.

3. Following the jury’s decision, the consent authority may require the developer to hold a public exhibition of the design competition entries.

This report has been prepared in accordance with this Clause and outlines the Competitive Design Process, the Jury’s assessment of each scheme, and demonstrates the Jury’s rationale for selection of the winning scheme. Each Jury member has reviewed and endorsed the content contained within this report.

The Competitive Design Process was undertaken in accordance with the approved Design Excellence Strategy (dated April 2017) for the site, and in accordance with the Architectural Design Competition Brief prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the City of Sydney on 30 May 2017.
1.2. **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The Competitive Design Process relates to the site known as 210-220 George Street, Sydney which forms part of the APDG Precinct. The subject site is legally described as Lot 21 in DP 1063401, Lot 1 in DP 75111 and Lot 1 in DP 70970.

1.3. **THE PROPOSENT**

Poly Australia is the Proponent for the Competitive Design Process, and invited six architectural firms to prepare design proposals for the site.

1.4. **THE CONSENT AUTHORITY**

The subject site is located within the City of Sydney Local Government Area (LGA). The Consent Authority for the approval of the Stage 2 development application will be the Central Sydney Planning Committee (CSPC) since the estimated value of the project is likely to exceed $50 million.

The Competition Process Manager liaised with Council officers throughout the Competition. Council officers observed the Competitive Process and the competitor’s final presentations to ensure the integrity of the outcomes.

1.5. **REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

The key planning instrument that applies to the site is the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012* (Sydney LEP 2012).

Clause 6.21(7) of the Sydney LEP 2012 allows the Consent Authority to grant an amount up to an additional 10% of floor space or height if it is satisfied that the development is the result of a Competitive Design Process and that the building exhibits design excellence.

The Proponent is seeking to be granted up to 10% additional floor space in accordance with Clause 6.21(7) of the Sydney LEP 2012.

1.6. **ASSESSMENT OF THE SCHEME AND WINNING DESIGN**

An analysis and assessment of the designs was undertaken in accordance with the assessment criteria contained within the Architectural Design Competition Brief. This included the design, planning and commercial objectives of the Brief, compliance with the relevant planning controls (SEPPs, LEPs, DCPs) and the Stage 1 DA approval (D/2016/1675).

The Competitive Design Process has resulted in a winning scheme that was determined by the jury to demonstrate a high design quality. The jury resolved that the Grimshaw scheme best demonstrated the ability to achieve design excellence as per Clause 6.21 of the Sydney LEP 2012 and the Architectural Design Competition Brief requirements. The Grimshaw scheme was subsequently awarded the winner of the Architectural Design Competition. Detailed within Section 4 of this report are those features that the Jury considers to be fundamental to the design integrity and those issues that need to be resolved in design development.

Details of the competitor's schemes and Jury's deliberations are discussed in the following sections.
2. **ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION PROCESS**

2.1. **OVERVIEW**

The Proponent invited six competitors to prepare submissions in response to a Design Brief as part of the Architectural Design Competition. The Brief was prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the City of Sydney Council. The process undertaken is described in more detail as follows:

- Four established architectural firms, one emerging architectural firm and one local and international partner were invited to participate in the Architectural Design Competition, held over a period of 7 weeks.
- A briefing session was held on 1 June 2017 to provide an overview of the site, outline the planning parameters and the Competition Brief, and provide an opportunity for the competitors to ask questions and seek clarification regarding the Brief and the Competition procedures. This was followed by a site visit.
- The Jury members were provided with a copy of the Brief on 8 June 2017.
- An optional meeting with the Quantity Surveyor (QS) was made available to each competitor during the Competition, and was attended by five out of six competitors.
- A Register of Enquiries was kept during the Competition to document questions and responses without revealing the source of the question.
- All competitors submitted an A3 Design Report (Final Submission), articulating their proposed architectural scheme for the site.
- Each competitor presented their proposed architectural schemes to the Jury during the Final Presentation dates held on 31 July 2017 and 1 August 2017. The Jury deliberations were held on 1 August 2017, however a decision was not able to be made on a winning scheme. After further discussions, one scheme was chosen as the winner of the Architectural Design Competition. This decision was made on 3 August 2017.

The Competitive Design Process was undertaken in an open and transparent manner in full consultation and disclosure with Council officers in attendance as observers. In accordance with the City’s Competitive Design Policy 2012, the consent authority was involved in the Competition Process Brief as follows:

- Reviewed, provided comment and endorsed the Brief.
- Provided clarification on planning compliance and Competitive Design Process procedures.
- Council observers were copied into all correspondence between the competitors and the Competition Process Manager regarding questions or requests for additional information.
- Attended the Briefing Session, invited to attend the optional meeting with the QS, the Final Presentation dates and were present for the Jury deliberations.

2.2. **PARTICIPATING ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS**

The six architectural firms that participated in the Competitive Design Process were:

- Hassell
- Fitzpatrick + Partners
- BVN
- Grimshaw
- PTW in association with Skidmore Owings & Merrill (SOM) San Francisco (local and international partner)
- DBJ (emerging architectural firm)
All competitors participated in the Competitive Design Process.

2.3. TECHNICAL ADVISORS

Technical advice was provided to competitors throughout the Competition and an assessment of schemes was undertaken on the final submissions. The technical advisors involved in the Competitive Design Process were those outlined in Table 1.

Table 1 – Technical Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toni Walter</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>Competition Manager / Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashleigh Ryan</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>Competition Manager / Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Brown</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>Competition Manager / Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Rigby</td>
<td>Rider Levett Bucknall (RLB)</td>
<td>Quantity Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Seretis</td>
<td>Rider Levett Bucknall (RLB)</td>
<td>Quantity Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Fang</td>
<td>Rider Levett Bucknall (RLB)</td>
<td>Quantity Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Tomlinson</td>
<td>Arup</td>
<td>Vertical Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Huang</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davina Knox</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhys Hardwick Jones</td>
<td>WMA Water</td>
<td>Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hanna</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. CONSENT AUTHORITY OBSERVERS

The Competition and assessment was overseen by several observers from the consent authority who attended the Final Presentation dates and provided planning and procedural clarification to the Jury.

The following observers from the City of Sydney Council were present at various stages of the Competition:

- Graham Jahn – Director City Planning, Development and Transport
- Christopher Corradi – Area Planning Manager
- Bridget McNamara – Senior Planner
- Anita Morandini – Design Excellence Manager
- Marie Ierufi – Strategic Planning and Urban Design Coordinator

2.5. JURY

The Jury appointed by the Proponent for the Competitive Design Process included the following:

- Peter Mould – Adjunct Professor (UNSW Built Environment) and Former NSW Government Architect, and Jury Chairperson
- Professor Helen Lochhead – Dean (UNSW Built Environment)
- William Smart – Creative Director (Smart Design Studio)
- Xiaowei Xue – Head of Design and Development (Poly Australia)
• Steve Wang – Associate Director (Poly Australia)
• Baijian Yang – Executive Director (Poly Australia)

Three Jury members were nominated by the City of Sydney and three were nominated by the Proponent. All members of the Jury have extensive experience in architectural and urban design, and development.

2.6. KEY DATES OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION

The key dates for the Architectural Design Competition were as follows:

Table 2 – Key Dates of Architectural Design Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 May 2017</td>
<td>Commencement Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June 2017</td>
<td>Briefing Session and Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 July 2017</td>
<td>Final Submissions Lodgement Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 2017</td>
<td>Technical Assessment by Proponent’s Technical Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 2017</td>
<td>Presentation Date Material Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July 2017 and 1 August 2017</td>
<td>Presentation Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 August 2017</td>
<td>Notification to Competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 August 2017</td>
<td>Architectural Design Competition Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. ASSESSMENT OF FINAL SUBMISSIONS

3.1. OVERVIEW

Following the submission of the final competitive design schemes, a technical assessment and compliance review of the competitor’s submissions was undertaken by the technical advisors. This review was provided to the Jury five days before the Final Presentation dates.

Each competitor presented their scheme to the Jury explaining their approach to the site, design concept, compliance with planning controls and the design, planning and commercial objectives of the Brief, as well as the benefits of their respective schemes.

In accordance with the assessment criteria within the Brief, the design schemes presented by the six competitors were analysed and assessed by the Jury with a focus on design quality, compliance and the design and commercial objectives of the Brief. Based on this method of assessment, a winning scheme was recommended by the Jury.

An assessment of the design merits and areas for further development were also identified and discussed during the deliberation process. The Jury noted that all schemes demonstrated a clear understanding of the design Brief, site context and Stage 1 consent requirements, LEP and DCP controls. All schemes were accepted as generally fulfilling the submission requirements.

All schemes recognised the strategic importance of the site and its context, and the need to respond to both the commercial drivers of the Brief and the building’s response to the public realm. However, all six schemes exceeded the budget. All competitors developed an appropriate approach to ESD and included a public art strategy.

The following section outlines each of the six design schemes in more detail.
3.2. BVN

BVN presented a thorough analysis of the market opportunities and the response to workplace design.

The scheme rethought the volumes of the Stage 1 Envelope by carving out the podium and reshaping the tower. It maintained the lobby off the south east corner allowing a George Street address, and stretched the vertical circulation and services along the eastern boundary with the high-rise lifts in the north east corner. The proposed structure was to be timber and this was also intended to inform the Public Art Strategy.

The tower and podium forms had rounded corners and this was seen to be a good response to 200 George Street immediately to the north. The podium and tower roofs were activated with outdoor spaces. Retail activation was provided to George Street and Dalley Street, and a basement club was also provided.

The Jury believed that this scheme was a refined and well-resolved solution. It achieved excellent office space and met the base requirements of the Brief. The solid base responded well to its context and the tower was given texture by the expressed frame to the outer skin. The distortion of the tower form was seen to be less successful, as was the high-rise core location and its impact on multi-tenancy layout. The timber structure would require further research and market testing in terms of supply and deliverability.

Figure 1 – Indicative Ground Level Perspective of BVN Scheme

Picture 1 – Ground Level View of Entry Lobby

Source: BVN (2017)
Figure 2 – Indicative Podium Perspective of BVN Scheme

Picture 2 – Mid Level View of Podium

Source: BVN (2017)
3.3. **DBJ**

The DBJ scheme was a sculpted form referencing Sydney’s heritage such as the AMP Tower in Circular Quay. It moderated the tower / podium model by ‘splicing and arching’ the forms for greater integration, and curved and raked the tower. The built form was slightly inflected to open views from Dalley Street towards George Street. The “masonry” base of the Brief was reinterpreted as glazed sandstone with a combination of cast, textured and clear glass. This base sat on concrete arches and vaults, which defined the character of the George Street interface at street level and gave sculptural form to the commercial lobby and retail.

Communal spaces were provided on the roofs of the podium and tower with lookouts providing views and articulating changes in the base volumes. The Jury was impressed with the approach to form and materials.

The structure was simple reinforced and pre-stressed concrete and avoided transfers. Structure floors were precast panels with curved soffit. The glazing was arranged into standardised panels for prefabrication and ease of installation. The core location was as per the reference design. The raking facade caused the tower footprint to be smallest at the top where there is highest value.

Figure 3 – Indicative Podium Perspective of DBJ Scheme

![Figure 3](image.png)

Picture 3 – Mid Level View of Communal Garden Terrace

*Source: DBJ (2017)*
Figure 4 – Indicative Ground Level Perspective of DBJ Scheme

Picture 4 – Ground Floor View of Retail and Entry Lobby

*Source: DBJ (2017)*
3.4. HASSELL

Hassell’s scheme made a series of formal gestures to respond to the site’s context and created commercial opportunities that differed from the reference scheme. The core was moved to the north allowing the tower’s commercial space to be well lit from both east and west. This also allowed the redistribution of floor space to the upper levels and the creation of a laneway to the east, and the creation of three interlocking volumes with the tower coming to ground as a glazed element at Dalley Street.

The podium was a clearly defined ‘masonry’ base expressed with a strong rhythm of offset sandstone clad frames screening a glazed facade. The frames were of a scale and depth to give appropriate visual weight to the base and reflect the masonry character of the nearby heritage buildings.

The foyer was placed centrally on George Street and was open to light and views to the east with the newly created laneway. It was flanked by retail to George Street and more retail at the lower level facing the new laneway – a new urban gesture designed to complement the pedestrian network being established for the APDG Precinct.

The structural system used conventional construction techniques. Environmental design was well considered. The glass facade on the eastern boundary would require negotiations with the neighbouring property to secure long-term access to light and views.

Figure 5 – Indicative Ground Level Perspective of Hassell Scheme

Picture 5 – Ground Floor View of Entry Lobby

Source: Hassell (2017)
George House will be a signature building both distinctive and respectful to the city of Sydney.

Figure 6 – Indicative Podium Perspective of Hassell Scheme

Picture 6 – Mid Level View of Podium Terrace

Source: Hassell (2017)
3.5. PTW / SOM SAN FRANCISCO

The PTW / SOM team presented a view of the 21st Century workplace which informed their thinking. They also provided an urban analysis of the immediate context of 210-220 George Street. The design approach was to unify the architectural and structural form as an exoskeleton, referencing structures such as Sydney Harbour Bridge. This approach wove the podium, tower and upper level cantilever into a unified composition, defined by the triangulated frame and faceted glazing.

The building envelope was pulled back from the south to create a public plaza on Dalley Street. The entry foyer was placed on the south west corner access from the south with an alternative entry from George Street. The main lobby was at Level 01, accessed by lifts, stairs and escalators from the entries.

Retail opportunities were provided along George St with a club entry off Dalley Street. Terraces were provided on the roof of the tower and the podium, accessible decks provided above the street awning, and a gallery space proposed at Level 10.

The glazed facade was vented along its vertical and raking frame. There was some concern about the proposed shading solution within the window system. The structure was primarily reinforced concrete with supplementary composite and steel elements.

This proposal presented a strong and unified image defined by the geometry of the structural solution and the faceted glass set within it. The creation of a public plaza and integrated artwork offered the opportunity for this scheme to enhance this street corner.

Figure 7 – Indicative Aerial Perspective of PTW / SOM Scheme
Figure 8 – Indicative Ground Level Perspective of PTW / SOM Scheme

Picture 8 – Ground Floor View of Entry Lobby and Plaza

Source: SOM San Francisco / PTW (2017)
3.6. **FITZPATRICK + PARTNERS**

The Fitzpatrick proposal referenced 200 George Street immediately to the north. It picked up on the curved form, reinforcing the rounded edges and developing a visually recessive solution to the massing and materials. The horizontal expression of 200 George is repeated but more boldly expressed with terracotta fins on the tower. The podium by contrast emphasised its verticality with timber columns set behind the glass facade.

The corner entry faced George Street with the lobby at first floor. The entry sequence was celebrated with two storey sandstone clad columns. Retail was provided along George Street, and Dalley Street was activated with a cafe and entries to a bar, restaurant and bicycle parking. An entertainment space was also proposed in the basement, a roof terrace above the podium, and a roof top bar above the tower.

The structure was a simple post-tensioned concrete frame with timber columns and floor as outer structure in the podium where it stepped beyond the tower alignment. Within the tower footprint there is a centrally located flexible floor zone of engineered timber that will allow for future floor penetrations. The tower glazing was made of horizontal panels to maximise panoramic views of the city.

The central lift core on the eastern side of the building allowed for good, clear commercial space that was efficient and easily divisible for multiple tenancies.

The scheme responded well to the commercial requirements of the brief and proposed a polite neighbour to its adjacent buildings. The proposal allowed for good street level activation to both street frontages and a clear and inviting corner entry with a grand lobby, although the proximity of different entries suggested more development.

---

**Figure 9 – Indicative Podium Perspective of Fitzpatrick + Partners Scheme**

---

**Picture 9 – Mid Level View of Podium Terrace**

*Source: Fitzpatrick + Partners (2017)*
Figure 10 – Indicative Ground Level Perspective of Fitzpatrick + Partners Scheme

Picture 10 – Ground Floor View of Entry Lobby

Source: Fitzpatrick + Partners (2017)
3.7. GRIMSHAW

Grimshaw presented a clear approach to the design and experiential qualities of the workplace. In responding to the site context, the building massing proposed a tripartite form separating and articulating the podium, tower and core as distinct volumes with their own material palette.

A major feature was the double height floor space proposed for the podium and the tower with external terraces to the podium floors. The side core maximised contiguous floor space and allowed for easy subdivision for multi-tenancies.

The tower was recessed from the south at the lower two levels creating a small plaza to Dalley Street. Access to the lobby was from the plaza under a projecting soffit to the corner of George Street and Dalley Street allowing for full retail activation to the George Street frontage.

A reinforced concrete structure of core, columns and post tensioned slab was proposed for the tower with two-storey precast concrete arches as the primary structure for the podium volume along George Street. Double height spaces with mezzanines were proposed for both the podium and the tower. The mezzanines were suspended in the tower and simply supported in the podium.

The podium expression consisted of horizontal banding of deep external decks, vertical sun screening and the visual framing of fishbone vaulting seen through clear glazing, creating a memorable and unique response to George Street.

A communal terrace was proposed for Level 12 on top of the podium with a sculpted two-storey space at the top of the tower available for commercial activity such as function space or restaurant. The Jury believed that this design offered a unique and well resolved architectural composition.

Figure 11 – Indicative Ground Level Perspective of Grimshaw Scheme

Picture 11 – Ground Floor View of Retail and Entry Lobby

Source: Grimshaw (2017)
Figure 12 – Indicative Tower Perspective of Grimshaw Scheme

Picture 12 – Mid Level View of Tower and Podium Terrace
Source: Grimshaw (2017)
4. JURY RECOMMENDATION

The Jury assessed the design schemes for the Architectural Design Competition for the redevelopment of 210-220 George Street, Sydney. Of the six design schemes presented, the Grimshaw scheme was determined to be the most convincing response to the planning, design and commercial objectives of the Brief. In the opinion of the Jury, this scheme is the most capable of achieving design excellence.

The Jury selected the Grimshaw scheme as the preferred scheme to progress to the Stage 2 development application (DA) phase. Understanding that the scheme will change as it is developed, the Jury identified the following elements that contributed to its success and should be retained throughout this process:

- The formal composition of three massing elements – the ‘tripartite form’, separating and articulating the podium, tower and core.
- The rounded edges and the importance of curved glass to achieve them.
- The expressive curved concrete structure and the related two storey volumes of the podium.
- The depth of the facade recess to the podium.
- The distinctive profile of the building’s roof which will be seen from the surrounding buildings.

Prior to the Stage 2 DA phase, however, the Jury determined that the following matters should be addressed:

Commercial Entry Lobby
- The functional layout and entry sequence of the commercial lobby is to be further investigated to achieve a grander foyer and entry that is appropriate for the building and its location.
- Consideration is to be given to a more obvious George Street address whilst retaining the importance of retail along the George Street frontage.

Ground Plane, Retail and Public Domain
- Further consideration is to be given to an improved relationship between the lower ground floor, ground floor and first floor spaces in regard to the entry sequence and address to Dalley Street club.

Podium Design
- Whilst maintaining the character and depth of the podium balconies, further design refinement and consideration is to be given to providing a less ‘residential’ presentation to the facade treatment and a more positive response to the Brief requirement of a ‘predominantly masonry character’.
- Consideration is to be given to replacing the moveable double height screens with fixed elements, whilst ensuring that the provision of screens contributes to the overall solidity of the podium composition and necessary environmental protection.

Tower Design
- Explore opportunities to infill the mezzanine floors within the tower to maximise NLA and GFA, and achieve practical and functional commercial tower floorplates.
- Consideration to be given to the internal subdivision of floors both horizontally and vertically, having regard to the relationship with lift lobbies and services.
- Explore opportunities to achieve efficiencies as identified in the Brief, including the delivery of the vertical access core.

Value Engineering
- Explore opportunities for value engineering to reduce the overall cost of construction, as the current scheme exceeds the estimated construction budget.
5. CONCLUSION

This report provides a summary of the outcomes of the Architectural Design Competition for the redevelopment of 210-220 George Street, Sydney.

The Competitive Design Process was undertaken in accordance with the approved Design Excellence Strategy (dated April 2017) for the site, and in accordance with the Architectural Design Competition Brief prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the City of Sydney on 30 May 2017.

This Report outlines the Competitive Design Process and summarizes the Jury’s comments and recommendations for the preferred scheme, as follows:

- An Architectural Design Competition was undertaken for the redevelopment of 210-220 George Street. The relevant provisions of the Stage 1 DA consent (D/2016/1675), Sydney LEP 2012, Sydney DCP 2012 and the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2012 have been considered throughout this Competition.

- The Competition was undertaken in accordance with Clause 6.21 of the Sydney LEP 2012. The submission of this report to Council also satisfies the reporting requirements of Clause 3.5 of the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2012.

- The Grimshaw scheme was recommended by the Jury as the winning scheme of this Competitive Design Process. This scheme is to progress to the preparation of a detailed Stage 2 DA for lodgement to the City of Sydney. The Jury considered this scheme to best meet the objectives of the Brief. It also achieved the highest result in terms of the relevant assessment criteria. The Jury’s decision was unanimous in this regard.

- Subject to further refinement as outlined in Section 4, the winning scheme by Grimshaw fulfils the design, commercial and planning objectives of the Brief, and is considered capable of achieving design excellence.

The Jury confirms that this report is an accurate record of the Competitive Design Process and endorses the assessment and recommendations.
DISCLAIMER

This report is dated 5 August 2017 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd’s (Urbis) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of Poly Australia (Instructing Party) for the purpose of Architectural Design Competition Report (Purpose) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose, and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report, and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.
APPENDIX A ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION BRIEF
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION BRIEF
210-220 GEORGE STREET SYDNEY
**COMPETITION DETAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address</strong></td>
<td>210-220 George Street, Sydney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot and DP</strong></td>
<td>Lot 21 in Deposited Plan 1063401 (210-214 George Street), and Lot 1 in Deposited Plan 75111 (220 George Street), and Lot 1 in Deposited Plan 70970 (220 George Street).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1 DA No.</strong></td>
<td>D/2016/1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Development</strong></td>
<td>A mixed use building comprising commercial, retail and entertainment land uses, and three levels of basement parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proponent</strong></td>
<td>Wynyard 048 Service Pty Ltd and ATF Wynyard 048 Trust (Poly Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name and Title</strong></td>
<td>Xiaowei Xue, Head of Design &amp; Development c/- Ashleigh Ryan (Urbis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone</strong></td>
<td>+61 2 8233 9990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:twalter@urbis.com.au">twalter@urbis.com.au</a> / <a href="mailto:aryan@urbis.com.au">aryan@urbis.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Owner</strong></td>
<td>Wynyard 048 Service Pty Ltd and ATF Wynyard 048 Trust (Poly Australia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Prepared by</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td>Stage 1 DA Documentation</td>
<td>Architectus &amp; Urbis</td>
<td>Documentation from the Stage 1 DA (D/2016/1675) including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Development Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Scaled Approved Plans (Envelope)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Design Excellence Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B</td>
<td>Consolidated Survey Plan</td>
<td>Linker Surveying</td>
<td>Includes subdivision survey, and building envelope survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment C</td>
<td>Planning Controls Summary</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>A summary of the planning controls applicable to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment D</td>
<td>Future Site Context Plan</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>Future site context plan including the currently proposed building forms and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>public domain including new laneways surrounding the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment E</td>
<td>Area Schedule Template</td>
<td>Proponent</td>
<td>Area schedule template to be completed for the Final Submission. Method of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measurement is described on the area schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment F</td>
<td>Assessment Criteria Checklist</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>The criteria the Jury will use to determine the Competition and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proportionate weight given to each criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment G</td>
<td>Perspective Image Locations</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>Details of the prescribed locations for perspective images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment H</td>
<td>Building Services Brief</td>
<td>Poly Australia</td>
<td>For information related to mechanical, electrical, hydraulic, fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>protection and vertical transportation engineering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment I</td>
<td>Structural Statement</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>slab depths, indicative column sizes and grid arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment J</td>
<td>Flood Certificate</td>
<td>WMA Water</td>
<td>This provides the flood assessment and stormwater and flood management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plan prepared for the Stage 1 DA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment K</td>
<td>ESD Targets</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment L</td>
<td>Heritage Impact Statement</td>
<td>Artefact Heritage</td>
<td>This provides an overview of the heritage significance of surrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment M</td>
<td>Preliminary Site Investigation</td>
<td>Douglas Partners</td>
<td>Provides an overview of the likely contamination potential of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment N</td>
<td>Site Photos</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>A series of site and surrounding development photos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment O</td>
<td>Public Art Strategy</td>
<td>UAP</td>
<td>A preliminary public art strategy prepared to inform potential public art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities for the development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. OVERVIEW

The purpose of this Architectural Design Competition (also referred to as the Competitive Design Process) is to select the highest quality architectural, urban design and landscape design solution for the development located at 210-220 George Street, Sydney within the APDG Precinct.

The development of the site is to comprise a 25 storey (110m) tower with commercial and retail uses and entertainment facilities.

1.2. LAND TO WHICH THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION APPLIES

The subject site is known as 210-220 George Street, Sydney and forms part of the APDG Precinct as shown in Figure 3). The subject site is legally described as Lot 21 in Deposited Plan (DP) 1063401, Lot 1 in DP 75111 and Lot 1 in DP 70970. This Architectural Design Competition (Competition) applies to the whole of the subject site area. The following figure shows the full extent of the subject site (coloured blue and red outline).

Figure 1 – Competitive Process Site Extent

Competitor’s design proposals must consider how the development will relate to and provide an appropriate interface to the surrounding commercial office buildings and the existing CBD context. Refer to Section 3.1 for more details regarding the vision for the APDG Precinct in the context of the Sydney CBD.
1.3. THE PROONENT

Poly Australia is the Proponent of this Competition and has invited six (6) architectural firms to participate. It is intended that the Proponent will appoint the architect(s) of the winning submission to provide the following as a minimum as per 5.1 of the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2012 and the approved Design Excellence Strategy:

- Prepare a Development Application for the winning design,
- Prepare the design drawings for a construction certificate for the winning design,
- Prepare the design drawings for the contract documentation,
- Provide a lead role in ensuring design integrity is maintained throughout the development process, and
- Maintain continuity during the construction phases to the completion of the project.

Poly Australia targets to become one of Australia’s largest developers and is a subsidiary of the Poly Real Estate Group. Poly Real Estate Group is the number one listed real estate state-owned enterprise in China with over 10 million square metres currently under construction and over 250 projects in the pipeline. This has seen Poly develop a proven track record of delivering state of the art and iconic buildings across the world.

With a portfolio of real estate assets worth approximately $87 billion under management, the Proponent will continue to deliver this high standard in the Australian market. This will extend into Poly Australia’s integrated property platform which incorporates property services, funds management, portfolio management and asset management.

This project will become the Proponent’s first A-grade commercial office building in Sydney, and this is envisaged to become Poly Australia’s landmark development in the Sydney CBD. With a core focus on delivering high quality, sustainable and productive work environments, Poly’s extensive global office portfolio accommodates hundreds of tenants which include some of the world’s leading companies and government departments.

Poly’s strength as a global leader in sustainability and design ensures that every development is undertaken with a high level of sustainable building management, ownership and development.

1.4. DESIGN EXCELLENCE STRATEGY

The Proponent developed a Design Excellence Strategy for the site which was approved by the Central Sydney Planning Committee on 11 May 2017. The Design Excellence Strategy is included at Attachment A.

1.5. THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION BRIEF

This Architectural Design Competition Brief (the Brief) sets out the basis for participation, the responsibilities of the Proponent and Jury, the role of the City of Sydney (City) and the Architectural Design Competition (Competition) procedures.

The Brief includes reference material providing more details on the site and Architectural Design Competition requirements. This reference material comprises fifteen appendices as detailed in the table of contents of this Brief. As required by the City of Sydney’s Competitive Design Policy, adopted 9 December 2013, the City of Sydney has reviewed this Brief and has endorsed the Competition on 30 May 2017. This Competition was notified to the Australian Institute of Architects (AIA) on 31 May 2017 for its information.

The outcome of this Competition does not fetter the decision of the Consent Authority in the determination of any subsequent DA submissions for this project. The Consent Authority will not form part of the Jury, however, a representative(s) from the Consent Authority may act as an impartial observer to the Competitive Design Process.

Consistency with the Planning Controls

Note: Nothing in this Brief approves a departure from the relevant planning controls, including any relevant State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (SLEP 2012), Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (SDCP 2012) controls and Stage 1 development consent. Where
there is any inconsistency between this Brief and the relevant SEPPs, LEP, DCP and Stage 1 development consent then the relevant SEPPS, LEP, DCP and Stage 1 development consent prevail.

1.6. **COMPETITION MANAGER**

Urbis has prepared this Brief as the Proponent’s planning consultant and the Competition Manager of this Competition. The Competition Manager from Urbis is:

**Ashleigh Ryan**  
Senior Consultant, Urbis  
Level 23, Darling Park Tower 2  
201 Sussex Street  
Sydney NSW 2000  
Email: aryan@urbis.com.au

Assistance will also be provided by:

**Toni Walter**  
Consultant, Urbis  
Level 23, Darling Park Tower 2  
201 Sussex Street  
Sydney NSW 2000  
Email: twalter@urbis.com.au

All communications with the Competition Manager are to comply with the Communication protocols set out in Section 5.9 of this Brief.

1.7. **CONSENT AUTHORITY**

The subject site is located within City of Sydney Local Government Area (LGA). The Consent Authority for the approval of the Stage 2 development application will be the Central Sydney Planning Committee (CSPC) given that the development cost is over $50million.

1.8. **KEY DATES**

The Competition will run over an approximate seven (7) week period from Commencement Date to the Final Submissions Lodgement Date. Key dates for this Competition are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 – Key Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 31 May 2017 | Commencement Date  
The Competition begins. Brief issued to Invited Competitors. |
| 1 June 2017 | Briefing Session and Site Visit  
Briefing to all Competitors to answer questions or queries.  
The Briefing Session will be held on 1 June 2017 at the Urbis office located at:  
Level 23, Darling Park Tower 2  
201 Sussex Street  
Sydney NSW 2000  
A site visit will follow. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 July 2017</td>
<td><strong>Final Submissions Lodgement Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitors submit Final Submissions (hard and electronic copies) to the Competition Manager by 5:00pm AEST (excluding physical 1:500 model). Competitive Manager to issue hard and electronic copy of Final Submissions to Jury and City of Sydney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 2017</td>
<td><strong>Technical Assessment by Proponent’s Technical Advisors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Advisor’s reports are to be submitted to the Competition Manager for distribution to Jury prior to Presentation Date. Quantity surveyor reports sent to Competitors and City of Sydney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 2017</td>
<td><strong>Presentation Date Material Submission</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Powerpoint’ presentation to be submitted to the Competition Manager by email by 5:00pm AEST. Competition Manager will audit content prior to Presentation Date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July 2017 and 1 August 2017</td>
<td><strong>Presentation Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitors present their Final Submissions and physical 1:500 model to the Jury. Presentations to be held at Urbis’ offices, address provided above. The schedule of the presentations will be provided directly to the Competitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 14 days of</td>
<td><strong>Decision Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Date</td>
<td>Date by which submissions are evaluated by the Jury with a recommendation made for formal appointment of successful Competitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 21 days of Decision Date</td>
<td><strong>Notification to Competitors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date by which all Competitors are to be notified in writing of the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 28 days of Decision Date</td>
<td><strong>Architectural Design Competition Report</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date by which Architectural Design Competition Report prepared by the Proponent is to be submitted to the City of Sydney.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1. SITE LOCATION

The immediate urban context of the subject site is characterised by commercial office towers with ground level retail development. The site is located on the northern edge of the Sydney CBD between two key districts within the CBD, being Circular Quay to the north and the financial district to the south of Bridge Street. The site has a total area of 1,434m² and two street frontages. The George Street frontage is 50.62m and the frontage to Dalley Street is 33.13m in length.

The site is adjacent to George Street which is envisaged to act as a central pedestrian and public transport spine through the CBD connecting key public places from Central Town Hall and Circular Quay. The urban context of the site is highly developed and pedestrianised, and includes a significant amount of ground floor active uses. This is due to the site’s central location and proximity to major tourist attractions, public spaces, and significant employment generating development.

Figure 2 – Aerial Image of the Site

Source: Six Maps (2016)

2.2. SITE CONTEXT

The site is located within the APDG site bounded by Alfred, Pitt, Dalley and George Streets.

The former nine-storey Telephone Exchange Building is located to the east at 4 Dalley Street which has been repurposed by the adjoining development at 200 George Street for plant and services. It is understood that the FSR associated with this site has been utilised as part of the 200 George Street development. Under the existing planning controls, the development potential of this site has been maximised as such. Further to the east of the site is an existing substation, office tower, and the Sydney Marriot Hotel on the opposite side of Pitt Street.

The recently completed 200 George Street commercial office tower (200 George) is immediately to the north of the site. 200 George is a 37 storey commercial office tower comprising 33 office levels and four levels of car parking.

North of Underwood Street to the north east of the site is 33-35 Pitt Street. This is known as The Atrium and 182 George Street, also known as the St George Building. The Atrium is a 12 storey commercial office building. The George Street Building is a 16 storey commercial office building with ground level retail. The City of Sydney recently amended the planning controls for these sites to facilitate the redevelopment of these
sites for a significant commercial tower up to approximately 248 metres in height. This proposal includes a community and bicycle hub and significant public domain works including a large public square on George Street and a smaller square adjacent to Rugby Place. This development is known as Lendlease Circular Quay Tower (Refer to Section 3.3 for more information).

Further to the north of the site are the Rugby Club, Fairfax House, and Goldfields House sites which are currently proposed to be redeveloped for a residential tower and a hotel tower by Wanda One Sydney.

Grosvenor Place is located to the west of the site which includes a 44 storey commercial office tower. This site also includes several low scale heritage buildings (3-6 storeys in height), including the Exchange Courtyard, Royal Navy House, former Brooklyn Hotel, 231 George Street, and Johnson’s Building. Further to the north west of the site is the Four Seasons Hotel Sydney. The National Australia Bank House is also located to the south west of the site which is a 31 storey commercial office tower.

Dalley Street and several commercial properties fronting Bridge Street are located immediately to the south of the site. This small street block between Dalley and Bridge Streets includes a 17 storey commercial office tower (formerly Anchor House), a 12 storey heritage-listed commercial office tower known as the Cliveden, a 5 storey heritage listed commercial office tower (formerly Skandia House), a 14 storey commercial office tower (formerly Associated National House), and a 16 storey commercial office tower known as the Exchange Centre (also referred to as the ASX Building).

Refer to Section 3.3 for more details regarding recent DA approvals within the vicinity of the site that may impact upon the proposed development on the site.

Figure 3 – The APDG Site Plan

Source: Sydney DCP 2012
2.3. SITE CHARACTERISTICS

2.3.1. Public Domain
The existing development on the site has a very high site coverage (approximately 90%), and as a result the existing development has little public domain and/or open area. The existing development on the site includes deep colonnades along George Street which results in a separation between the existing retail frontage and the George Street footpath. Future development on the site has an opportunity to improve the interface between the site and the surrounding public domain along George Street and Dalley Street, as outlined in Section 4.2 of this Brief.

2.3.2. Noise
The Acoustic Assessment, prepared by Cundall and dated 23 November 2016, submitted with the Stage 1 DA found that the principal source of noise at the site is regular vehicle traffic on Bridge Street. However, it is noted that George Street was closed for road works along the length of the proposed development for the duration of the acoustic testing.

Although the final layout of the Metro train lines in the vicinity of the site was not provided prior to undertaking the Stage 1 DA Acoustic Assessment, a conservative estimation of the impact of train movements was made based on the following assumptions:

- Ground type is alluvial fill and/or sandstone.
- The building is to be constructed on piles.
- Trains are to be electric passenger only.
- Metro train lines are to be directly below the site and approximately 20m deep underground.
- Rails are not to be provided with vibration isolation.

Based on these assumptions, it was found that passenger train movements where the Metro lines run directly beneath the site will exceed the recommended vibration levels for offices. As a result, additional acoustic treatments will be required.

In order to address the noise impact of the development on the surrounding community and the noise impact of the future rail operations of the Sydney Metro and surrounding community on the development, including internal noise levels, the site is to comply with commercial noise criteria and the applicable requirements within Stage 1 DA Acoustic Assessment Report.

Noise impacts to the surrounding community will be addressed with noise mitigation measures for external items such as mechanical plant so that the appropriate noise requirements can be met.

2.3.3. Easements and Land Title
The site is subject to a number of easements on title that restrict the future development on the site. These easements and legal restrictions are detailed within Attachment B, however are illustrated within Figure 4 below and summarised as follows:

- Easement for an overhanging wall (AJ),
- Easement for carriageway, light and air (C), limited in height to RL 10.71 (AHD) for area shown as (Z) only,
- Easement for light and air (G),
- Right of way (B),
- Right of access (F), limited in stratum, and
- Ausgrid Easement at the corner of Dalley St and George Street.
As stated above the site includes an Ausgrid substation (easement) at the corner of George and Dalley Streets that will be required to be decommissioned as part of the construction of the proposed development. This is shown in Figure 5. Consultation with Ausgrid commenced prior to lodgement of the Stage 1 Development Application. A “connection application” has been submitted to Ausgrid to augment electrical services on the site.
2.3.4. Heritage

The site is not a heritage item nor is it located in a heritage conservation area. Notwithstanding this, the site is in proximity to a number of heritage items of local and state significance illustrated in the Planning Controls Summary at Attachment C and outlined in the following table.

Competitors may access further historic information regarding the Circular Quay precinct in which the site is located using the following link: [http://trove.nla.gov.au/list?id=850031](http://trove.nla.gov.au/list?id=850031)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Item</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>SLEP2012 Schedule No. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial building “Cliveden” including interiors</td>
<td>4 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>I1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former “Northumberland Insurance” building including interiors</td>
<td>6 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>I1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Hotel including former terrace (246) and including interiors</td>
<td>244-246 George Street</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>I1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Lane</td>
<td>Bridge Lane</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>I1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Item</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
<td>SLEP2012 Schedule No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former “Burns Philp &amp; Co” building including interior</td>
<td>5-11 Bridge Street</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>I1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Stream Fountain</td>
<td>Herald</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>I1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Hotel</td>
<td>229 George Street, The Rocks</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SHR01533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial building</td>
<td>231 George Street, The Rocks</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SHR01540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson’s Building</td>
<td>233-235 George Street, The Rocks</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SHR01554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Naval House</td>
<td>32-34 Grosvenor Street, The Rocks</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SHR01574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional detail on the two heritage buildings located at 4 and 6 Bridge Street adjacent to the site is provided below.

4 Bridge Street, Sydney – Commercial Building “Cliveden” Including Interiors

Cliveden, formerly Birts Building, a twelve storey reinforced concrete commercial building constructed in the Federation Free Classical style has a prominent Bridge Street address. The building has high historic significance as a major twentieth century contribution to the consolidation of Bridge Street as a centre of Sydney’s shipping, insurance and trading precinct and was a dominant feature on the city skyline from Circular Quay. The building has moderate social significance for its reflection of the phenomenon of Melbourne architects working in Sydney. The building has aesthetic significance as a representative example of the style and includes many of the identifying elements such as the use of garlanded pilasters and classical decoration on the facade. The building has moderate aesthetic significance for its extent of intact interiors.


6 Bridge Street, Sydney - Former “Northumberland Insurance” building including interiors

The Northumberland Insurance building is a record of the processes of centralised commercial development in the city centre. In particular it documents the importance of Sydney as a regional centre for agencies such as newspaper & insurance agents. It reflects an association of the northern sector of the city with these functions from the late 19th Century onwards.

The architectural expression of the Northumberland Insurance building is rare for its flamboyant Free Classical Style of High Victoria taste, incorporating details derived from the Corinthian order. It reflects the tradition of High Victorian architectural styles expressive of corporate prestige. The building is part of the significant streetscape of Bridge Street.


Figure 6 and Figure 7 show the location of the heritage items around the subject site.
Figure 6 – SLEP 2012 Heritage Map Sheet_014

Figure 7 – State Heritage Items

Source: SLEP 2012

Source: Artefact Heritage Impact Assessment (2016)
2.3.5. Flooding

Development of the property should be in accordance with:

- The findings of the City’s Floodplain Risk Management Study,
- The NSW State Government’s Flood Prone Lands Policy as detailed in the NSW State Government’s Floodplain Development Manual 2005, and
- The City’s Interim Floodplain Management Policy.

The basement should be rendered flood free and protected up to the 1 in 100 year design flood plus 500mm as per the City’s Interim Policy. Protection to this level is not advised with the use of flood gates and should be achieved by alternative design methods.

Due to the flood affected nature of the site, the development will be required to meet the minimum Flood Planning Level (FPL) at the ground floor and for all basement entry points. Flood modelling has been undertaken by WMA water to assess the impact of flooding on the proposed development (Refer to Attachment J). The highest flood levels occur at the south-western boundary of the property on George Street. However, there is less than 0.25m depth on both George Street and Dalley Street. Based on this, the minimum required Flood Planning Levels for the site are as follows:

- For business and retail floor levels, between 8.2m AHD and 8.7m AHD along George Street, at Point B and Point D, respectively.
- For below ground car parking levels (inc. all access points to the basement such as vehicle entrances and exits, ventilation ducts, windows, light wells, lift shaft openings, risers and stairwells):
  - 7.7m AHD at Dalley Street (Point H).
  - 9.4m AHD at George Street (Point E).
  - 7.7m AHD at Dalley Street (Point F).
  - 7.1m AHD at Dalley Street (Point G).
  - 4.28m AHD at Underwood Street (Point J).

A Flood Planning Level (FPL) refers to the permissible minimum building floor level, and in the case of basements or below-ground development, the FPL refers to the minimum level at each access point. FPLs and all access points (including stairs and lift shafts) to basements or below-ground development are to be set in accordance with the City of Sydney’s Interim Floodplain Management Policy.

The WMA Water Flood Certificate included at Attachment J.

2.3.6. Existing Site Access

The site is currently accessed via two separate vehicular entry points from Underwood Lane and from Dalley Street. These access points are associated with 210 George Street and 220 George Street, respectively.

In the long term, it is intended that the existing vehicular access from Dalley Street be removed by way of an agreement with the adjoining land owner with vehicular access for pedestrians, the public and loading services to occur via the north western portion of the site from Underwood Street only.

2.3.7. Contamination

The Preliminary Site Investigation submitted with the Stage 1 development application concluded that the site has a generally low to moderate risk of contamination and further that the site can be made suitable for the proposed development following the recommendations of that report as quoted below.

“It is considered that the site can be made suitable for the proposed retail and commercial land use following the implementation of the recommendations outlined above, followed by any remediation and/or management actions recommended as a result.”

Whilst contamination is not of a high or immediate concern for the site and the proposed development, the recommendations of the Preliminary Site Investigation is included within Attachment M.
2.3.8. Groundwater and Geotechnical

The Preliminary Geotechnical Desktop Study submitted with the Stage 1 Development Application found that the site was mostly underlain by surficial filling which is underlain in turn by sedimentary rocks of the Hawkesbury Sandstone, comprising mainly medium and coarse grained sandstone with minor shale beds. Data for the area and the basement excavation at the adjacent 200 George Street site indicated that the following subsurface profile is likely to be present at the site:

- Filling and stiff to very stiff residual clay soil to approximate depth of 2m along George Street and 4m along the eastern boundary,
- Slightly weathered and fresh massive and cross-bedded, medium and high strength sandstone from a depth of about 3m below ground surface, possible “yellow block sandstone”,
- Sub-vertical north-south trending joints, typically spaced at more than 3m but locally less than 2m apart,
- 0.5m to 1m thick bands of shale breccia at approximate RL-7m, and
- Groundwater from approximate RL -6m.

The existing building on 210 George Street, together with the basement block walls are founded on medium and high strength sandstone at approximate RL 1.0m.

Considering the topography of the site and surrounds, seepage of groundwater may occur from the soil and filling and from discontinuities from rock faces. The seepage, if encountered, is expected to be relatively continuous but of low intensity. Sub-floor drainage, together with a sump and pump arrangement, appears to be a suitable design solution for the management of the groundwater.

2.3.9. Electrolysis

The preliminary Electrolysis Report submitted with the Stage 1 development application detailed the risk to the development from railway stray currents for the site, and presents findings of an in-ground stray current traction assessment for the site.

The report concluded that the present stray traction currents at the site may present a minor corrosion hazard to, on, or in ground metallic structures. It was noted that stray traction current effects at the proposed building site will most certainly change with time, especially with the light rail upgrade on George Street, and the proposed rail tunnel route underneath George Street and could become a significantly higher corrosion hazard.

To mitigate any possible corrosive effects of stray traction currents from existing rail, the report recommended either of the following protective measures where applicable:

- The installation of heavy plastic membrane (e.g. Forticon) under (or behind) all reinforced concrete slabs, piers and walls to electrically isolate the slabs and / or piers from soil and the stray currents.
- The use of plastic, rather than metallic, in-ground pipework where possible. In the event buried metallic pipework and / or cables are installed within the property, installation within sealed non-metallic conduit is recommended.

2.3.10. Wind

The Pedestrian Wind Environment Study submitted with the Stage 1 DA includes the results of a detailed investigation into the wind environment impact of the proposed development at the site. Two design options were tested for the development, as follows:

- Option 1: The Tower Building mass envelope has a 6m setback from the centre line of Dalley Street, and a 1 metre setback of the tower section from the podium below.
- Option 2: The Tower Building mass envelope has an 8m setback from the centre line of Dalley Street, and a 3m setback of the tower section from the podium line below.

Testing was also conducted with the existing site building to determine the impact of the subject development onto the existing wind conditions within the surrounding areas.

The results of the study indicate that wind conditions along George Street and Dalley Street exceed the desired criteria as set out by the Sydney DCP 2012. However, testing of the existing site configuration
indicated that the existing wind conditions also exceed the desired criteria set out in the Sydney DCP 2012 for the areas along George Street and Dalley Street.

With the inclusion of either option of the proposed tower massing designs for the development, it was discovered that the ground level areas along George Street and Dalley Street will experience wind conditions that are equivalent to or better than the existing wind conditions. Furthermore, the results of the study showed that the ground level wind conditions experience a negligible difference when comparing the two design options.

### 2.3.11. Sydney Trains Requirements

The proposed CBD Rail Line (CBDRL) tunnel corridors cross beneath the site in a roughly east-west direction, as shown in Figure 9. This includes the future Sydney Metro Chatswood to Sydenham line. The two sub-parallel tunnel corridors are each about 7 metres in width. The tunnel crowns are proposed to be located about 11 metres below the existing slab level of 220 George Street basement (at about RL -16 metres).

The structural foundation design of the redevelopment at the site must consider the future tunnels. Based on available information, it is understood that there will be twin bored tunnels whose tunnel crown is approximately 27m below existing ground level under Dalley Street beneath the site.

The indicative construction timeframe and activities for the Sydney Metro City and Southwest (Chatswood to Sydenham) is outlined in Figure 8. Based on this indicative program, the early works of the tunnel construction will commence in early 2017 to the first quarter of 2018. The construction of the tunnel will start from the first quarter of 2018 until 2020.

Figure 8 – Indicative Construction Timeline for Sydney Metro City and Southwest (Stage 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction activities</th>
<th>Indicative construction timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early works</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel construction</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station excavation and structural works</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services facility excavation and structural works</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel fit out</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station construction and fit out</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services facility construction and fit out</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing and commissioning</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sydney Metro (2017)

To understand the interaction between the building structure and tunnel corridors and the potential impact to structural design, the future metro tunnels were overlaid on the site boundaries. This is shown in Figure 11. The development is not expected to adversely impact on the future construction, operation and maintenance of the rail tunnel in accordance with Transport for NSW requirements.

However, it is possible that the construction of the proposed building structure will overlap with the construction of the future tunnels. It is also possible that the construction of future tunnels will induce movement to the ground. The proposed structural elements will need to be designed to withstand this amount of settlement, and the structure will likely only experience minimum ground movement during tunnel construction. Refer to the Structural Brief at Attachment I for more details.
Refer to Figure 10 and Figure 11 for more details regarding the depth and location of the CBD Rail Line tunnel corridors in relation to the subject site.

Figure 9 – Indicative Sydney Metro Chatswood to Sydenham Alignment Plan

Source: Transport for NSW (2016)

Figure 10 – Indicative Sydney Metro Chatswood to Sydenham Alignment Section and Depth (Subject to Design Development)

Source: Transport for NSW (2016)
2.3.12. The CBD and South East Light Rail

A new 12km light rail route is currently being constructed between Circular Quay, via George Street and Central Station to Randwick and Kingsford. The Grosvenor Place light rail stop is south west of the site and will run along the western boundary of the site.

Source: WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff (2016)

Source: Transport for NSW (2016)
The CBD and South East Light Rail project will facilitate a one-kilometre pedestrian zone along George Street between Hunter Street and Bathurst Street once completed with light rail vehicles (LRVs) operating overhead generally wire-free within this zone. Outside of the pedestrian zone, George Street will consist of a single kerbside traffic lane in each direction with the light rail running through the centre.

Major construction of the 12-kilometre light rail route from Circular Quay to Randwick and Kingsford is expected to be completed by 2018, with the first services carrying new passengers in early 2019.

3. APDG PRECINCT PLANNING CONTEXT

3.1. VISION FOR THE APDG PRECINCT

The site is situated within the APDG Precinct, which is bounded by Alfred, Pitt, Dalley and George Streets in Central Sydney. The APDG Precinct is undergoing significant transformation into a revitalised destination at the gateway to the Sydney CBD, as shown in Figure 13.

The precinct will be a world class destination, activated by a mix of dining and retail, hotels, commercial offices, residential apartments, and as a key tourist destination. The significance of the urban renewal of this precinct concurrently with this proposed development is to be carefully considered by all Competitors as part of this Architectural Design Competition.

Figure 13 – APDG Precinct Site Location Plan

The following supporting principles outline the key elements to achieve the vision for the site as part of the APDG Precinct.

**Principles**

- Reinforce the urban character and scale of Circular Quay by requiring new buildings to be built to the street alignment, and to have a transition of building heights from Circular Quay to the maximum height of the northern area of Central Sydney.
- Maintain and reinforce the image of the area as a major focal point and its function as a celebratory space.
- Protect and extend morning sun access to Australia Square Plaza.
- Improve and enhance the public domain and pedestrian amenity of the street and promote its image as a grand and civic boulevard.
- Protect vistas that terminate at significant heritage buildings, including nineteenth and twentieth century public ad commercial buildings.

### 3.2. STAGE 1 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

On 11 May 2017, the CSPC granted consent for a Development Application (D/2016/1675) across the site (Figure 1), for the following:

- Stage 1 building envelopes for a 25-storey commercial office development and proposed uses:
  - Maximum building height of 110m (defined by RL117.90) (the building height excludes the height of any architectural roof features),
  - Setbacks,
  - Street wall heights.
- A Design Excellence Strategy.

The Stage 1 DA (D/2016/1675) consent and approved plans are included at Attachment A of this Brief. All competitors are to be aware that conditions and key built form parameters and guidelines of the Stage 1 DA consent must be adhered to within the proposed schemes and subsequent Stage 2 Development Application(s).

The building height of any future building must not exceed the maximum permissible in the Stage 1 DA consent. The maximum height excludes any architectural roof feature that complies with the requirements of Clause 5.6 of the SLEP 2012.

Detailed design, including services, shall be contained within the existing building footprint and envelope approved as part of the Stage 1 DA consent. Refer to Drawing Numbers DA 2-1 – DA 2-4 which includes envelopes and maximum building heights.

Condition 4 specifically addresses the requirements of this Competitive Design Process for consideration.

**4 DESIGN EXCELLENCE AND COMPETITIVE DESIGN PROCESS**

A competitive design process in accordance with the provisions of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 shall be:

(a) Conducted in accordance with the approved ‘Design Excellence Strategy for 210-220 George Street, Sydney’ April 2017, prepared by Urbis on behalf of Poly Australia.

(b) Conducted prior to the lodgement of a Stage 2 development application.

The detailed design of the development must exhibit design excellence, in accordance with Clause 6.21 of Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012.
In addition to Condition 4 highlighted above, Competitors are advised to give particular consideration to the following Stage 1 DA conditions as part of this Competitive Process. The Stage 1 Notice of Determination is included at Attachment A.

Table 3 – D/2016/1675 – Conditions of Consent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Envelope</td>
<td>Condition 6</td>
<td>Subject to other conditions of consent, the building envelope is only approved on the basis that the Stage 2 building design, including services are contained wholly within the approved building footprint and envelope, and comply with the relevant planning controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular Access</td>
<td>Condition 7</td>
<td>The deletion of the vehicular access from Dalley Street is to be explored prior to the commencement of the competitive design process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Condition 9</td>
<td>The maximum height of the buildings as defined in the Sydney LEP 2012 may not exceed 110m with the exception of an architectural roof feature, which must not overshadow Australia Square between 12pm and 2pm between 14 April and 31 August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor to Ceiling Levels</td>
<td>Condition 12</td>
<td>The detailed design of the Stage 2 Development Application shall meet the floor to ceiling height controls in accordance with the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (Clause 4.2.1.2 – Floor to ceiling heights and floor to floor heights).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Vehicle Access</td>
<td>Condition 26</td>
<td>As part of the Stage 2 application, further design analysis of the Service Vehicle access is required which provides a suitable and safe access arrangement at the interface with 200 George Street and Underwood Street. Details to include all service type including waste collection, retail and commercial deliveries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Developments surrounding the site are identified in Figure 14 and summarised below:

Figure 14 – Surrounding Developments

Source: Urbis (2017)

1. 200 George Street, Sydney (200 George)

D/2012/893 – Detailed Development Application (Central Sydney Planning Committee dated 6 December 2012)

Proposal Summary: Demolition of the buildings at 188-194A and 196-208 George Street and part of the building at 4 Dalley Street, remediation and excavation of the site, and construction of a 37 storey commercial building and refurbishment of the remainder of 4 Dalley Street for plant and servicing. The development will include excavation to create 4 levels of basement car parking, 43,270m² of retail and commercial floor space, 63 car parking spaces, 11 service / courier spaces and approximately 318 bicycles, 2 new electricity substations and public domain improvement works.

Report to Central Sydney Planning Committee (CPSC):


Selected Drawings:


2. Lendlease Circular Quay Tower (LLCQ)

S108395 – Planning Proposal and DCP Amendment (Central Sydney Planning Committee dated 21 July 2016)

Proposal Summary: Amendment to the planning controls applying to the city block bound by Alfred, Pitt, Dalley and George Streets, Sydney (the APDG block) to facilitate a development proposal at 174-186 George Street and 33-35 Pitt Street, Sydney (the APDG Block 4 site) for a 248m premium grade commercial office tower. The key elements of the development concept include a major new public plaza at George Street level with comparable dimensions and overall size to Australia Square, along with a secondary plaza at the lower Pitt Street level; a new laneway network at Pitt Street level creating key connections and providing fine grain active uses along all frontages; a new world class sustainable commercial office tower with an elevated lobby providing a controlled through-site link to Pitt Street and retail activated lower levels; a new high quality community building located on the George Street plaza; and remodelling of the Jacksons on George building.

The LEP amendment was gazetted in December 2016. A development application has not yet been submitted for the redevelopment of the LLCQ site at 174-182 George Street and 35-35 Pitt Street.

Report to CSPC:


Planning Proposal and Building Form Studies:


3. 1 Alfred Street (Wanda One Sydney)


Proposal Summary: State Significant Development (SSD) application for a mixed use hotel, residential and retail development including Stage 1 building envelopes and proposed uses for two towers (Tower A and Tower B), a six level basement car park across the site, vehicle access arrangements for subsequent stages of development, and realignment of Rugby Place and new pedestrian link connecting Rugby Place to Herald Square.

Tower A comprises a mixed use (residential and retail) building with a maximum height of 194m (RL 200) and maximum gross floor area (GFA) of approximately 35,438m². Tower B comprises a mixed (hotel and retail) building with a maximum height of 110m (RL 112.5) and a maximum GFA of approximately 21,409m².

Report to CSPC:


as amended by the approved Section 96(2) application:


Selected Drawings:

D/2016/1529 – Stage 2 Development Application (Central Sydney Planning Committee dated 11 May 2017)

Proposal Summary: State Significant Development (SSD) Application (D/2016/1529) seeking approval for a mixed use hotel development. The proposal includes:

- demolition of all existing structures on the site,
- construction of a hotel consisting of a tower (Tower B) with a maximum building height of 110m, ground floor retail, 182 hotel rooms, and common hotel facilities,
- excavation and construction of a six level basement for use by the hotel and the residential tower (Tower A – subject to separate Development Consent D/2015/882/B) for car parking, storage, access, back of house and services,
- vehicular access on Pitt Street,
- business identification signage,
- retail signage strategy for Tower A and Tower B,
- public domain improvements, including pedestrian thoroughfares, landscaping; dewatering, and
- augmentation of physical infrastructure and utilities.

Report to CSPC:
http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/284859/170511_CSPC_ITEM05_ATTACHMENTA.PDF

Selected Drawings:
http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/284861/170511_CSPC_ITEM05_ATTACHMENTC.PDF

D/2015/882 – Detailed Development Application (Central Sydney Planning Committee dated 10 December 2015)

Proposal Summary: Stage 2 Development Application for changes to the existing Stage 2 development consent (D/2010/2029) for mixed use development of the site within the APDG block. The approved DA was for the demolition of the existing building (Gold Fields House), excavation of 8 basement levels and construction of a mixed use development containing two buildings of 55 storeys (Building A) and 15 storeys (Building B) to be used for predominantly residential use and some retail/commercial uses. The changes to the existing Stage 2 DA include demolition of Gold Fields House and construction of a single tower with 57 storeys containing 184 apartments, retail space and landscaping (Tower A). The tower is marginally wider on two sides but retains the previously approved building height.

Report to CSPC:

Selected Drawings:
4. 1 Macquarie Place (Gateway Sydney)

D/2014/1695 – Development Application

Proposal Summary: Alterations and additions to the retail podium and basement (Levels 3 to 10) of the existing commercial office and retail building for new food and drink outlets and indoor seating areas including access upgrades, new facade treatments and awnings, new amenities and expansion of the roof terrace. The application also involves landscape upgrade works to Jessie Street Gardens including tree and pavement removal, relocation of statutes, plaques and art, new lawn and terrace areas and new permanent tables and seats.

5. 50 Bridge Street (Quay Quarter Tower)

D/2015/929 – Stage 2 Development Application (Central Sydney Planning Committee dated 19 November 2015)

Proposal Summary: Stage 2 Development Application for the partial retention, but substantial redevelopment of the existing office tower, including the removal of existing facade and services from the retained building structure, excavation to allow for a new basement and podium and construction of an extension to the existing tower building to create 102,133m² of commercial office and retail GFA. The proposal includes a reduction in existing on-site car parking, alterations to existing vehicle access arrangements, interface works on 33 Alfred Street at basement level and associated landscaping and public domain works.

Report to CSPC:

Selected Drawings:
http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/246313/151119_CSPC_ITEM04_ATTACHMENTA5.PDF

6. Young and Loftus Street Precinct

D/2015/930 – Stage 2 Development Application (Central Sydney Planning Committee dated 19 November 2015)

Proposal Summary: Demolition of existing buildings and basement structures on each subject site (at 2-10 Loftus Street, 16-20 Loftus Street and 9-17 Young Street), associated site remediation and excavation works, construction of 3 new mixed use buildings (Building A, B and C) between 9 and 13 storeys, construction of an integrated five level basement beneath Buildings B, C and Loftus Lane (including parking and loading areas, building services, storage and waste areas) and landscaping and public domain works to Loftus Lane and surrounds.

A Section 96(2) application to modify development consent was submitted to Council in December 2016 for minor design amendments within the Young and Loftus Street precinct including modifications to Buildings A, B and C. The amendments include a reduction in residential apartment numbers from 114 to 106, revised apartment mix, redistribution of gross floor area, a reduction in car parking spaces, and an increase in bicycle parking spaces. This application is currently under assessment.
Report to CSPC:

Selected Drawings:
http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/246327/151119_CSPC_ITEM05_ATTACHMENTA.PDF

7. 23-33 Bridge Street and 35-39 Bridge Street (Sandstone Precinct)

SSD 16_7484 – State Significant Development Application

Proposal Summary: Partial demolition of existing buildings and the conversion and adaptive reuse of the Department of Lands and the Department of Education Buildings (collectively known as the Sandstone Precinct) into a world class luxury hotel. The redevelopment will comprise 253 hotel rooms, ancillary licensed food and drink premises and retail premises, excavation and construction of three basement levels below the Education Building, and a subterranean link beneath Loftus Street between the two buildings. The application also involves three additional levels above the Education Building, and the removal of existing pitched roof elements and replacement of roof structure on the Lands Building.

The application is currently under assessment, with the proponent reviewing submissions received during the public exhibition period.
Figure 15 – Images of Surrounding Development

Picture 1 – 200 George Street
Source: Mirvac

Picture 2 – Lendlease Circular Quay (Indicative)
Source: Lendlease
Picture 3 – Wanda One Sydney

Source: Dalian Wanda

Picture 4 – Gateway Sydney

Source: DEXUS
Picture 5 – Quay Quarter Tower  
*Source: AMP Capital*

Picture 6 – Young and Loftus Street block  
*Source: AMP Capital*
Picture 7 – Sandstone Precinct

Source: MAKE and Ridley (2016)
4. OBJECTIVES FOR THE PROPOSAL

4.1. PLANNING OBJECTIVES

The key planning objective for this Competition is to develop an appropriate detailed design response to the Stage 1 DA (D/2016/1675) and relevant planning control framework, including the relevant environmental planning instruments:

- **SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004**
- **SEPP 55 – Remediation of Land (‘SEPP 65’)**
- **SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007**
- **Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005**
- **Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (SLEP 2012)**
- **Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (SDCP 2012)**

The design should complement the City of Sydney’s street improvement programme, public domain improvements, local safety strategy initiatives, and traffic management initiatives.


Non-compliances are discouraged by the Proponent and the Consent Authority. Any instance of non-compliances in submissions must be justified against the objectives of the applicable planning controls.

The Stage 1 development consent (D/2016/1675) provides the approved building envelope and site constraints with which to design the architectural form for the proposal (refer to Attachment A).

Any other instances of non-compliance with a planning control or Stage 1 Consent must be justified against the objectives and strategic direction of relevant controls. This justification must be included in the Statement of Compliance as part of each Competitor’s submission. Refer to Section 6.5 of this Brief for more information.

A summary of the key planning controls that apply to the site is provided within Attachment C of this Brief. However, competitors are responsible for ensuring that the relevant planning controls are addressed in their design submissions.

The SLEP 2012 allows the Consent Authority, at its discretion, to grant up to an additional 10% of floor space or height if it is satisfied that the development is the result of competitive design process and exhibits design excellence. The Proponent is seeking to be granted up to 10% additional floor space in accordance with Clause 6.21(7) of the SLEP 2012.

Any additional floor space pursued under Clause 6.21 must not exceed the maximum height control and must be justifiable in terms of planning and architectural merit grounds having regard to the objectives and requirements of this Brief.

In calculating FSR, reference should be made to the definition of Gross Floor Area contained in SLEP 2012.

Careful regard needs to be given to the site planning and design of the building relative to sun access protection. The Stage 1 Development Consent provides the approved building envelope (refer to Attachment A). Importantly this envelope has been designed to ensure there is to be no additional overshadowing caused by any part of a building between 14 April and 31 August in any year to Australia Square Plaza, between the specified times of 12:00pm and 14:00pm, as shown in the following figures.
Figure 16 - Sun Access Plane

Figure 17 - No Additional Overshadowing to Australia Square Contours

Source: Architectus (2016)

Source: City of Sydney
4.2. DESIGN OBJECTIVES

The overarching design objectives for this Competition are to stimulate high quality architectural and urban design proposals that:

- Achieve design excellence as defined in Clause 6.21(4) of the SLEP 2012.
- Respond to the site’s context, opportunities and constraints within the parameters contained in the SLEP 2012, SDCP 2012 and as proposed by the documentation approved as part of the Stage 1 development consent (D/2016/1675).
- Create a high quality architectural design and landmark building which responds to and reflects the sites unique and high profile CBD context.
- Create a positive and legible relationship between the building and future surrounding public domain including new laneway network and public plaza(s).
- Manifests an authentic Sydney identity, reflecting the prevailing character of the place, befitting of local climate, geography and cultural context. Particular consideration should be given to Clause 5.1.6 of the SDCP 2012 which states building exteriors in Central Sydney are to be designed so that:
  
  (a) the predominant masonry character and articulation of Central Sydney is reinforced, particularly at the lower levels of buildings; and
  
  (b) the materials used, including glass, are predominantly light in colour to reflect better quality light into the streets and respond to characteristic light colours of Central Sydney.

- Contribute to the pre-eminence of Circular Quay as the civic gateway between Sydney Harbour and the City and George Street as its central spine.
- Address the built form relationship between the subject site and adjoining sites where developments are being assessed, already approved or under construction.
- Minimise the bulk of the building with appropriate facade treatment.
- Protect sunlight access to Australia Square.
- Respond to the architectural features of the recently completed development at 200 George Street, including the street wall height, podium roof terrace, landscape elements, soffit height and awnings.
- Achieve an appropriate visual scale and proportion between the tower and podium elements. Complement and enhance this strategically important context with surrounding landmark buildings providing contemporary architecture.
- Create ground level activation that announces the character of a 24-hour laneway precinct.
- Facilitate a vibrant retail precinct as well as a safe environment with regards to surveillance, resulting in an integrated design solution providing high quality architectural design for the facade and common areas of the development.
- Maximise opportunities for ecological sustainable design and best practice environmental performance.

4.2.1. Ground Plane Functional Objectives and Requirements

The design objectives for the ground plane are as follows:

- Design a building with active frontages along George Street and Dalley Street to create a vibrant public domain.
- Avoid blank walls to the public domain to maximise street activity.
- Maximise entries and display windows and activities which provide pedestrian interest and interaction.
- The design is to address flooding requirements and potential flexibility in design to address compliance with flood planning level requirements.
- The public domain along the George Street frontage is to be column-free to replace the existing colonnade treatment.

- Introduce an awning along George Street to align with the awning of 200 George Street.

- Coordinate any entries for an elevated commercial lobby, any lower ground retail and/or entertainment and club floor space with accessible lifts and highly legible entries and public domain space.

- Maximise retail floor space along George Street.

- Please note that as per the conditions of the consent of the Stage 1 DA, external escalators located outside of the glass line of the building are not supported.

### 4.2.2. Retail Objectives

The design objectives for the retail/commercial components are as follows:

- Recognise the importance of George Street and the APDG Precinct as a new commercial and civic centre of Sydney through highly resolved and fine grain retail tenancies that provide active street frontages to George and Dalley Street.

- Provide an engaging and lively ground plane that creates an activated destination with the finest quality retail experience and food and beverage service.

- Maximise retail area on ground floor, facilitate easy servicing, and maximise exposure to passing pedestrian traffic, especially for the George Street frontage.

- Consider additional retail opportunities within the lower ground floor and Level 1 (with direct access from ground floor) adjacent to an elevated commercial lobby, maximising the ground floor retail area.

- Efficient proposal for goods delivery for all the retail tenancies.

Note: The ground floor and lower ground floor retail tenancies will be delivered by the proponent as ‘cold shell’ tenancies to be separately fit out by individual tenants.

### 4.2.3. Podium Design Objectives

The design objectives for the podium are as follows:

- The podium height should address surrounding buildings (existing and proposed), particularly the existing podium street wall heights including 200 George Street and refurbishment of the former Telstra Exchange building at 4 Dalley Street.

- Treatment of the podium should closely align to the street and laneway edges to maintain the legibility of the historical alignment of the laneway (Dalley Street).

- Provide an opportunity for an elevated Level 1 commercial lobby (maximising opportunities for ground floor retail) which may include design features such as double or triple floor heights, atriums and voids, landscape areas, circulation space etc.

- Consider opportunities for a multi-purpose podium roof terrace which includes an area of landscaped outdoor space at an elevated commercial lobby.

- The inclusion of shared public facilities on a podium roof terrace that may be rented or used by tenants, including communal open space, timber decking, hard surface landscaping and/or recreation areas such as a swimming pool.

- Multi-purpose public facilities such as a conference room or function room for events to be included within the podium or tower.

- Create efficient vertical connections between floors through potential atrium space(s), specific removals panels, and/or fire egress connections.

- Include a maximum four tenants per floor within the podium of the building, with minimal corridor area and coordinated entries to each tenant.
4.2.4. Tower Design Objectives (and Requirements)

The design objectives for the tower component are as follows:

- Maximum building height of 110m (RL 117.90), excluding architectural roof feature.

- The design of the tower including rooftop plant and services is to be contained within the building envelope approved within the Stage 1 DA consent (D/2016/1675) and is to respond to issues raised during the assessment of the application including:
  - consolidated vehicular access from Underwood Street (refer to Section 4.2.9 of the Brief),
  - the exposure of the eastern facade of the tower (adjoining 4 Dalley Street – Telephone Exchange building) and opportunities for public art, facade fenestration or alternative facade materiality and variation,
  - interface with 200 George Street, and
  - the tower setback to Dalley Street.

- The tower designs are to consider the treatment of roofs with respect to overall building form and composition. The Stage 1 DA and SDCP 2012 stipulates the following tower setbacks:
  - 7m setback to the 200 George Street facade (northern setback),
  - 8m setback on George Street (southern setback),
  - 1m setback to Dalley Street (6m to the centre line of Dalley Street),
  - Zero setback to the southern portion of the eastern facade adjoining 4 Dalley Street,
  - Northern portion of the eastern facade is to be setback from the eastern side boundary as there is an easement for light and air benefitting 200 George Street (4 Dalley Street).

- Materials and facade articulations must be considered to respond to and manage environmental conditions.

- Incorporate appropriate materials and facade treatment to complement nearby heritage items and minimise the bulk of the building.

- Create a facade design that provides good visibility, daylight penetration, energy efficiency, and access to views.

- Treatment and finishes for service and plant areas should be designed to conceal equipment and provide an attractive facade.

- Minimise rooftop mechanical plant, and locate and fully screen plant, ducts, vents and fans from view to reduce any potential visual impact on the outlook of neighbouring developments and public domain.

- Consider the tower roof terrace with multi-use court (basketball, futsal, tennis, volley ball) potential communal open space, hard surface landscape, etc.

- As the development potential of the adjacent property at 4 Dalley Street is currently maximised under the planning controls, the proposed development will include a significant portion of the facade that will be visible from the public domain. As such, the eastern building facade adjacent to 4 Dalley Street is to be articulated, engaging and attractive. Include a maximum two tenants per floor within tower portion of building, with minimal corridor area and coordinated entries to each tenant.

- Achieve the following floor to floor targets, and requirements of the Sydney DCP 2012:
  - Minimum 2.8m to 2.9m floor to ceiling clearance heights.
  - Resulting in minimum 3.4m to 3.6m floor to floor heights.
  - Final floor to floor heights to be determined with consideration of mechanical and electrical design.
4.2.5. Facade Treatment to Manage Solar Access and Reflectivity

The design objectives for reflectivity are as follows:

- Facade treatment should minimise the reflection of sunlight from the building to surrounding areas and buildings.
- Ensure that building materials do not lead to hazardous, undesirable or uncomfortable glare to pedestrians, motorists or occupants of surrounding buildings.
- Facade treatment should be designed to include management of summer solar access and in particular mid-summer western sunlight.
  - Shading strategies and devices are to be integral to the architecture.
  - Fixed shading devices are not to substantially restrict access to natural daylight or outlook.
  - Extensive glazing that is unprotected from mid-summer sunlight is to be avoided and reliance upon high performance tinting or glazing as a mid-summer sun control is not appropriate.

4.2.6. Public Domain

Given the location of the site within the APDG Precinct, the delivery of a high quality public domain is important in achieving design excellence across the site.

The Competitive Process provides an opportunity to strengthen the physical and visual connections between Circular Quay and the Sydney CBD. The delivery of the public domain is to be cohesive and well-designed, and be integrated with the vision of the APDG Precinct. This vision includes integration with the public domain for 200 George Street, the Lendlease Circular Quay (LLCQ) Tower and Wanda One Sydney, and the network of laneways to the south and east of the site connecting the precinct to its surrounds.

The design of the public domain is also to address heritage significance and reflect a rich public domain character commensurate with the site’s important location.

Context

This part of the City is characterised by significant spaces including Circular Quay and Alfred Street and the larger scale public domain elements of George Street and Bridge Street. The Light Rail that is currently under construction will transform the character of the area providing an improved pedestrian experience. A series of intimate laneways south of the site connect the gardens of Macquarie Place, Jessie Street Gardens and the future public square fronting George Street.

City North Public Domain Plan

The City North Public Domain Plan adopted by Council in December 2015 incorporates the Competition site and sets out the vision for the wider precinct defined by George Street, Alfred Street, Macquarie Street and the Botanic Gardens and Domain parklands. The specific urban design principles relating to the Competition site include:

- Support and encourage active building edges and high quality activation of the public domain.
- Reinforce a connected public space at Circular Quay and create a unified square from the building edge to the water.
- Strengthen north-south streets and encourage east-west pedestrian permeability with immersive and engaging spaces.

4.2.7. Landscape

The design objectives for landscape design are as follows:

- Provide a high-level consideration of landscaped design with regards to both the public and private domain for the lobby and any outdoor terraces.
- Include consideration that landscaping is as much a part of design excellence as architecture.
- Where landscaping occurs on podiums and roof decks, provide adequate soil depths to support planting.
- The landscape design is to be developed in coordination with the architecture and interior design, both in aesthetic / visual and functional connections, and is to complement the interior functions at the ground level.

- Consider vertical landscape elements, noting maintenance requirements, to enhance the architectural form and create living artworks within the cityscape.

- Consider the spatial, aesthetic and functional relations between the building and its urban context and contribute to the integration with surrounding buildings, connections, urban spaces and infrastructure.

- Consider sustainability issues including local hard landscaping materials and native plant species with low water requirements.

4.2.8. Public Art

The City of Sydney encourages the provision of public art in private developments to contribute to the experience of individual projects and urban form.

The public art objectives for this Competitive Process are to identify opportunities for innovative and challenging contemporary artistic responses in line with the Public Art Strategy provided (Attachment O) that:

- Respond to the site’s history, context and future development of the site,

- Respond to the site’s constraints and opportunities as outlined in the design objectives above and in the attached Public Art Strategy (Attachment O),

- Align with the City of Sydney’s City Art Public Art Strategy 2011 and Public Art Policy 2015, and

- Provide artists with opportunities to integrate public art with the architectural design as per the opportunities outlined in the Public Art Strategy (Attachment O).

While the detailed planning and procurement of public art will occur in the subsequent preparation of the Stage 2 development application (DA), at a minimum competitors will include the following as part of their submissions (refer to the Public Art Strategy at Attachment O for further detail):

- Consider public art opportunities to be developed with the public experience of the artwork front of mind as per the following four locations identified in the Public Art Strategy (Attachment O):
  - Along the eastern facade (adjacent to the Telstra Exchange Building),
  - To address the George Street awning,
  - For the entrance lobby,
  - The podium terrace (level 10).

- Outline the process of collaboration with the public artist and the art consultant appointed by the developer to ensure a high quality outcome.


4.2.9. Vehicular Access and Waste Management Objectives

Competitors are to base the proposal on the ‘preferred scenario’ for access which includes a singular, consolidated vehicular entrance from Underwood Street for the whole site. The integration of basement and loading access via Underwood Street would allow for a further improved public domain interface with Dalley Street.

A concept sketch for the ground floor and basement only for the ‘back up scenario’ of two vehicular access points, one from Underwood Street and one from Dalley Street (separated for service vehicles and regular vehicles) as existing is to be provided by competitors should negotiations to secure right of way from Underwood Street for both properties not be secured from the adjoining landowner.
The design objectives for vehicle access and waste management are as follows:

- Loading and unloading provision to be incorporated into the design solution. Access to loading facilities at the site is to occur from Understood Street only.
- All loading and unloading operations associated with servicing the site must be carried out within the confines of the site, at all times, and must not obstruct other properties/units or the public way.
- Provision of waste material storage and handling / loading area to be incorporated into the design solution.
- No further excavation of the site is to occur at 220 George Street, and the site at 210 George Street is to be excavated by an additional 1 metre only.
- Basement entry points may be required to consider ramp or carpark lift options.
- Where possible, include additional storage areas within the basement for use by tenants.
- Waste collection area must meet the requirements of SDCP 2012 Provision 3.11.13(3), namely that vehicle access for collection and loading will provide for:
  - A 9.25m Council garbage truck and small rigid delivery vehicle,
  - Minimum vertical clearance of 4.0 metres for residential development or else 3.8m clear of all ducts, pipes and other services, depending on the gradient of the access and the type of collection vehicle,
  - Collection vehicles to be able to enter and exit the premises in a forward direction. Where a vehicle turntable is necessary to meet this requirement, it is to have a capacity of 30 tonnes,
  - Maximum grades of 1:20 for the first 6m from the street, then a maximum of 1:8 with a transition of 1:12 for 4m at the lower end,
  - A minimum driveway width of 3.6m,
  - A minimum turning circle radius of 10.5m.
- Car share spaces must be provided in accordance with SDCP 2012 and spaces must be accessible to Car Share Scheme members at all times. This should be incorporated into the building design.
- The proposal must align with the targets and objectives set out in Sustainable Sydney 2030. The proposal must encourage Sustainable Transport such as initiatives which support Public Transport and Active Transport (cycling and walking) and where vehicles are in use, encouraging energy efficient vehicles (i.e. provision of electric car charging), car share and via constraining parking supply.
- Treatment of carpark entries and access ramps and any loading, service holding areas located at street level are to be integrated within the building envelope. All surface areas are to be treated in material quality equal to the standard of the building facade to achieve a high quality interface with the public domain.

4.2.10. Basement Objectives

The design objectives for the basement are as follows:

- End of journey facilities, car parking and bicycle parking and ancillary storage is to be located in the basement.
- Any entertainment and club floor space considered for the site is to be located within the basement.
- The lower ground and ground floors are to provide a relationship with any entertainment and club floor space in the basement.
- Provide an efficient basement layout for car parking, loading areas, delivery, end of trip facilities, retail floor space, services to retail tenancies, and entertainment and club floor space.
4.2.11. Building Services
A Building Services Brief (Attachment H) sets out the requirements for mechanical, electrical, hydraulic, vertical transportation.

Sufficient space is to be provided within the design to accommodate building plant and services. Plant must be fully concealed and if located on the roof, must be within the maximum allowable building height in metres and located behind the parapet. Rooftop plant should be minimised, located and screened to be out of view to reduce any potential impact on the outlook of neighbouring developments and public domain.

Submissions are to be supported by a concept services design only to justify the design intent. All building services will comply with PCA A-Grade requirements.

4.2.12. Lifts
The lift design is to meet PCA A-Grade lifting specifications. The appropriate lifting design concept is to provide efficient service to the basement, podium and all office floors.

4.2.13. Structural Systems
As part of the Stage 1 development application, a consideration of the potential impact of the future Sydney Metro rail infrastructure on the site was required. With the assistance of Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW), a study was carried out to set out and assess the interaction between the proposed development and the future Sydney Metro tunnels. Schemes must consider the required structural systems as outlined in Attachment I.

4.2.14. Building Signage
The design objectives for building signage are as follows:

- Consider opportunities to integrate building identification signage into the design of the building.
- Consider potential locations, type, materials, construction etc of indicative signage zones for commercial tenants and retail tenants within the design of the building.

4.2.15. ESD Targets
The Proponent has made the following minimum ESD commitments:

- 5 star Green Star Design and As Built rating;
- 5 star base building NABERS Energy for Office rating;
- Spatial allowance for connection to the future George Street Recycle Water Supply Scheme; and
- Signing Green Leases for new tenants, as per the Better Building Partnership's best practice for office commercial green leases.
  - Competitors are encouraged to nominate additional commercially viable ecologically sustainable development (ESD) initiatives as part of their design proposal.

The proposal is to optimise opportunities for ecologically sustainable design and best practice environmental performance including low running costs in relation to water and energy use. Competitors must seek to attain the environmentally sustainable development targets as set out in the ESD Targets included at Attachment K of this Brief.

4.3. COMMERCIAL OBJECTIVES
The overarching commercial objectives for this Competition are:

- Optimise the maximum allowable GFA. Maximisation of GFA must not compromise the planning and design objectives of the SLEP 2012, SDCP 2012, the Design Excellence Strategy and this Brief.
- Competitors must complete and submit the Area Schedule at Attachment E.
- A column-free floor plate for both the podium and tower to provide open internal spaces.
- Maximise floor space efficiency.
• Base building to achieve 5 Star Green Star, Green Building Council of Australia “Design” and “As-built” rating, and also targeting a minimum 5 Star NABERS energy and 5 Star NABERS water rating.

• Total Net Leasable Area (NLA) to Gross Floor Area (GFA) is no less than 88%; Gross Floor Area (GFA) to Gross Building Area (GBA) is no less than 85%.

• Schemes that seek to incorporate additional floor space of up to 10% (as per Clause 6.21(7)(b) of the Sydney LEP 2012) must be justifiable on planning merits and design excellence grounds. Any additional floor space pursued under Clause 6.21 must not exceed the maximum height control.

The key development objectives are outlined in the following table.

Table 4 – Commercial Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Quantum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall site area</td>
<td>1,434m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. gross floor area (GFA)</td>
<td>19,717.5m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed GFA Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial office</td>
<td>18,017m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,700m² (comprising approx. 500m² at lower ground level, 800m² at ground level, and 400m² at Level 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Entertainment and club floor space’</td>
<td>300m² (within basement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Office)</td>
<td>Net leasable area (NLA) to be not less than 15,855m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Net leasable area (NLA) to be not less than 1,496m² to optimise ground floor retail uses and activate surrounding streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum building height</td>
<td>110m (RL117.90), subject to sun access plane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note that the maximum GFA figure outlined in Table 4 above, includes the maximum potential additional 10% of floor space for design excellence. Proposed schemes are to aim to achieve these maximum figures provided within Table 4. The addition of up to 10% floor space will be determined by the Consent Authority in accordance with Clause 6.21 of Sydney LEP 2012. The achievement of the maximum GFA provided above must be justifiable in terms of planning and architectural merit grounds having regard to the objectives and requirements of this Design Brief.

4.3.1. Buildability

• The entries must have regard to construction methodology, including site access and buildability, while taking into account the proximity to adjoining buildings.

• The schemes are to conform to the construction budget.

• Demonstrate a feasible and efficient construction methodology and align with the project budget, whilst satisfying the functional requirements of the Brief.

• The design is to demonstrate a cost effective structural design which will minimise structural transfers and cantilevers.

• Include designs with innovative and practical solutions, rational structural grids, and floor plate flexibility for tenant integration.

• Selected materials should be durable, fit for purpose and economically sustainable. If innovative materials are proposed, evidence must be provided regarding, durability and examples of prior successful use in the Australian context.

• Competitors are encouraged to provide information and/or advice regarding alternative design and engineering solutions to improve the efficiency of the development.
• The design is to consider the structure of the facade unit, buildability, transportation, connection with structure and installation on site.

4.3.2. Construction Costs

The estimated total capital investment value (CIV) of the project is $90,000,000 (exclusive of GST) including all works, fixtures and fittings associated with the retail, basement, and landscaping components. The submissions are to conform to the construction budget.

Each design submission is to be assessed by the project Quantity Surveyor, Rider Levett Bucknall (RLB), for costing and certification purposes post Final Submission.
5. **COMPETITION PROCEDURES**

5.1. **ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION ENTRY**

This Architectural Design Competition is by invitation only limited to six (6) invited Competitors (architectural firms).

Each Competitor in this Competitive Design Process must be a person, corporation or firm registered as an architect in accordance with the *Architects Act 2003 NSW* or, in the case of interstate or overseas Competitors, eligible for registration.

5.2. **IMPARTIAL OBSERVER**

This Competition will be overseen by an impartial observer(s) appointed by the City of Sydney. This observation includes all briefings of Competitor and Jury sessions. The observer will be present at:

- The Briefing Session and site visit held for all Competitors and Jury,
- Any further information briefings,
- The submission of entries,
- Presentations by the Competitors,
- Jury discussions and deliberations.

Note: All information and response to queries issued to Competitors and Jury are to be copied to the Observer(s).

5.3. **JURY**

The Jury is to comprise a total of six (6) persons in the following composition:

- Three (3) Jury members nominated by the Proponent, and
- Three (3) Jury members nominated by the City of Sydney.

If one (1) of the Jurors has to withdraw prior to the completion of the Competition, another Juror of equivalent professional credentials will be appointed by whoever originally appointed that Juror.

Jury members are to:

- Represent the public interest,
- Be appropriate to the type of development proposed,
- Include persons who have expertise and experience in the design and construction professions and related industries, and
- Include a majority of registered architects with urban design expertise.

5.4. **OBLIGATIONS OF THE JURY**

In accepting a position on the Jury, the Jury members agree to:

- Have no contact with any of the Competitors in relation to the site and the Competitive Design Process from their time of appointment until the completion of the Process, other than during presentations of the submissions,
- Evaluate submissions promptly in accordance with the Competitive Design Process timetable,
- Abide by the requirements of the Architectural Design Competition Brief,
- Consider planning or other technical advice provided by the City of Sydney,
• Refrain from introducing irrelevant considerations in addition to, or contrary to, those described in the Architectural Design Competition Brief, or contrary to the statutory framework relevant to this site,
• Make every effort to arrive at a consensus in the selection of a winner,
• Prepare a report explaining their decisions, and
• Sign a statement confirming that they have read and understood the Jury member's obligations and agree to respect those obligations for the duration of the Competitive Design Process.

5.5. JURY CHAIR

The Jury is to agree on the selection of the Chair. The primary function of the Chair is to ensure that the Jury deliberations proceed in a fair and orderly manner.

In coordination with the Competition Manager, the Chair shall at conclusion of Jury deliberations, supervise:
• Letter of notification to the winning and unsuccessful Competitors,
• The writing of the Jury comments to be included in the Architectural Design Competition Brief as prepared by the Proponent, and
• Review and endorsement of the final Architectural Design Competition Report as prepared by the Proponent.

5.6. PROPOINENT'S OBLIGATIONS

The Proponent agrees to have no contact with Jury members, Competitors, CSPC members or elected Councillors in relation to the site and the Competitive Design Process from their time of appointment until the completion of the process other than what is set out in this Brief.

If the City of Sydney is informed by a Jury member that they have been contacted by the Proponent or a Competitor in relation to the site or Competition, then the process may be terminated.

5.7. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE JURY

The Proponent shall engage Technical Advisors to review each Competitor's submission.

The Jury may seek independent technical assistance, if required. The advice provided by Technical Advisors to the Jury, will be strictly limited to technical and compliance matters pertaining to their professional discipline only. Technical Advisors shall refrain from providing advice on matters outside of their remit.

5.8. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO COMPETITORS

Competitors are encouraged to seek advice to achieve the best possible architectural outcome for their proposed scheme.

All Competitor and Technical Advisor communications are to be carried out in accordance with communications protocols detailed in Section 5.9 Communications and Questions.

Note: It is emphasised that the role of Proponent-appointed Technical Advisors is not to design elements of the development, rather their purpose and role is to review and provide technical advice and clarification on each Competitor's scheme in confidence.

Competitors may elect to appoint their own technical consultants as needed. All Technical advisors will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement with the Proponent that they will keep the content and intellectual property of each scheme confidential.

The Proponent will make available the following Technical Advisors to each Competitor. Such services will be paid for directly by the Proponent (over and above the Competitive Design Process participation fee).
### Technical Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>Toni Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:twalter@urbis.com.au">twalter@urbis.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Surveyor</td>
<td>Rider Levett Bucknall</td>
<td>Richard Rigby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Richard.rigby@au.rlb.com">Richard.rigby@au.rlb.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Susan.Huang@wspgroup.com">Susan.Huang@wspgroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>WMA Water</td>
<td>Rhys Hardwick Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhys@wmawater.com.au">rhys@wmawater.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Transportation</td>
<td>Arup</td>
<td>Peter Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Peter.Tomlinson@arup.com">Peter.Tomlinson@arup.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All questions to advisors and responses to these questions will be compiled and issued in writing to Competitors and City of Sydney without revealing the source of the question. Where exclusive advice is provided to individual Competitors, such advice must be issued in writing and copied to the City of Sydney.

#### 5.8.1. Quantity Surveyor

The Quantity Surveyor (QS) is available to provide one face to face meeting with each Competitor, arranged by appointment only through the Competitive Process Manager. The Competitor Process Manager is to be present as observer at the meeting and provide a summary record of the meeting to the City of Sydney. City observer(s) will be invited to attend all meetings between the Quantity Surveyor and Competitor. The QS will respond to specific questions throughout the Competition, but will not undertake reviews of partially completed submissions.

Following the lodgement of the Final Submissions, the Quantity Surveyor (QS) nominated above will provide an assessment and estimate of the cost of works of each scheme.

The Competition Manager will provide these estimates to their respective Competitors no later than two (2) days prior to Final Presentations. Whilst no additional work will be requested or required of Competitors prior to the Presentation Date, Competitors are encouraged to review the QS statements and consider whether the construction budget has been met, and whether there are any barriers to achieving this budget during detailed design.

All other communications with the QS must be conducted strictly in accordance with communication protocols set out in Section 5.9 of this Brief.
5.9. COMMUNICATIONS AND QUESTIONS

Competitors should submit all communications regarding clarifications of the Competition process in writing to the Proponent’s Design Competition Manager only.

All communications, questions or enquiries regarding this Competition, this document, or the project generally, must be formally addressed in writing (mail or email) to the Design Competition Manager as set out below:

Toni Walter
Consultant, Urbis
Level 23, Darling Park Tower 2
201 Sussex Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Email: twalter@urbis.com.au

Except where specified otherwise in this Brief, Competitors should not communicate verbally regarding clarification of the Competition or the Brief Design Process with:

- The Proponent,
- Jury members,
- Technical advisor(s),
- City of Sydney,
- Consent Authority, and
- Other Competitors.

Competitor’s questions will be vetted by the Competitive Process Manager and addressed publicly or privately according to their nature. All information and responses sent to Competitors are also copied to the City Observers.

5.10. CLOSING DATE FOR FINAL SUBMISSIONS

Submissions must be lodged with the Competition Manager not later than 5:00pm AEST on the submission Lodgement Date.

It is the sole responsibility of the Competitor to ensure actual delivery to the Competitive Process Manager by the deadline set out in Section 1.8 of this Brief.

5.11. LODGEMENT OF FINAL SUBMISSIONS

Competitors shall lodge their submissions in a sealed package, to the Proponent’s Design Competition Process Manager, at the following address:

The Design Competition Manager:
Attn: Ashleigh Ryan and Toni Walter
Urbis
Level 23, Darling Park Tower 2
201 Sussex Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Email: aryan@urbis.com.au

The package should be labelled “210-220 George Street, Sydney – Architectural Design Competition”

The submissions must be lodged with the Design Competition Manager in accordance with the competition procedures.
It is the sole responsibility of each Competitor to ensure actual delivery to the Design Competition Manager by the deadline as set out in Section 1.8 of this Brief.

The City observer may be present when the submissions are opened.

5.12. **LATE SUBMISSIONS**

Unless formally requested by the Proponent for the sole purpose of clarification, the Jury will not take into consideration any new material submitted by Competitors following lodgement of Final Submissions Refer to Section 1.7 Key Dates of this Brief.

5.13. **PRESENTATION DATE – PRESENTATION MATERIAL**

On the Presentation Date, Competitors present their Final Submissions to the Jury.

Competitors are to provide an electronic version of their Presentation Submission material to the Design Competition Manager no later than 48 hours prior to the Presentation Date, in accordance with the Key Dates nominated in Section 1.8 of this Brief.

No new material is to be presented over that lodged as part of the Final Submissions. Presentation material may be a reformatted version of the Final Submissions content and notably must not include revisions to or enhancements of architectural plans and renders.

The purpose of submitting the Presentation Submission in advance is for the Competitive Design Process Manager to audit the presentations for new material. The Design Competition Manager, no later than 24 hours prior to Presentation Date, shall request Competitors to delete any additions to content from the presentations.

5.14. **AMENDMENTS TO THE BRIEF**

No amendment to the Brief is permitted without the written approval of the City of Sydney. Any change to the program is considered an amendment to the Brief.

If the Proponent or Competitors seek a change in program, the Design Competition Manager must notify all Competitors in writing of the proposed change. All Competitors are required to provide written acceptance of the proposed change prior to the City of Sydney granting approval. On the City of Sydney’s approval, the Design Competition Manager will provide written notification to all Competitors of the agreed change in program.

5.15. **CONSENT AUTHORITY ENDORSEMENT OF THE BRIEF**

In accordance with the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy, the Consent Authority must endorse this Brief in writing prior to commencement of this Architectural Design Competition. An unendorsed Brief is not to be distributed to Competitors. Failure to observe this provision will lead to Consent Authority declining endorsement of the brief and Architectural Design Competition.

5.16. **DISQUALIFICATION**

Submissions that fail to meet the Competitive Design Process requirements may be disqualified, where:

- The submission is received after the lodgement time and date,
- The submission is contrary to the objectives of the City of Sydney planning controls and this Brief,
- The submission is not submitted in accordance with the submission requirements, as stated in the Brief, and
- Where a Competitor attempts to influence the deliberations of any Jury member(s) outside of the presentation session.

The Jury will determine any disqualifications.
5.17. **JURY: ASSESSMENT AND DECISION**

In accordance with the Competitive Design Policy provision 3.4(1), a minimum of five (5) competitive submissions must be considered as part of the Architectural Design Competition Process.

The Design Competition Manager shall provide a hard and electronic copy of the Final Submissions to the City of Sydney and each Jury member at least one (1) week prior to the Presentation Date.

The Competitors must present their Final Submission to the Jury in person on the specified Presentation Date. The presentation must be no longer than thirty (30) minutes followed by twenty (20) minutes of questions from the Jury.

Each Competitor’s submission may be graded according to the Assessment Criteria in Attachment F to this Brief.

If in the opinion of the Jury, key design issues require further resolution before a decision can be made, then the top two Competitors may be requested to revise their submissions. The Jury shall list the design issues of the schemes and request that Competitors revise their submission. Competitors must represent their submission within twenty-one (21) days of the initial presentation. Upon completion of the second presentation to the Jury, the Jury will rank the Competitors’ submissions (first and second).

The Jury is expected to reach a decision on whether to request a revision to submissions within 14 days of Final Presentations. The Jury will submit a Jury Report (referred to as the Architectural Design Competition Report) to the developer, within 28 days of its decision.

The Jury’s decision will be via a majority vote.

The decision of the Jury will not fetter the discretion of the Consent Authority in its determination of any subsequent development application associated with the development site that is the subject of this Competition.

The Jury may grade the designs in order of merit. They may recommend that none of the entries exhibit design excellence and thus end the Architectural Design Competition.

5.18. **APPOINTMENT OF ARCHITECT OF THE WINNING SUBMISSION**

The Proponent shall appoint the architect of the winning scheme as selected by the Jury. Full design development and documentation of the winning proposal should then occur.

To ensure that design continuity and the design excellence of the winning scheme is maintained, the architectural commission is expected to include as a minimum:

- Preparation of a Stage 2 DA for the winning scheme, including all required information to lodge a DA,
- Preparation of the design drawings for a construction certificate for the winning scheme,
- Represent the winning scheme in meetings with the community, authorities and stakeholders, as required,
- Provide a lead role in ensuring design integrity is maintained throughout the design process,
- Preparation of design drawings for the contract documentation,
- Maintain continuity during the documentation and construction phases, through to the completion of the project, and
- Providing any documentation required by the Proponent and the Consent Authority verifying the design intent has been achieved at completion.

The Winning Architect refers to principal architect and nominated partner firms as acknowledged in writing by the City of Sydney. The Winning Architect is expected to be appointed within twenty-one days (21) of the Design Decision Date.

The Winning Architect may work in conjunction with other architectural practices to meet the project documentation requirements of the Proponent but must retain control and a leadership role over design decisions throughout the life of the project.
In the event that the Proponent decides not to proceed with the architect of the Winning scheme, or the Proponent limits the architectural commission outlined above in, the Proponent will:

- Provide the City of Sydney with written reasons for this decision, and
- Restart the Architectural Design Competition.

5.19. ANNOUNCEMENT

The Winning Architect will be notified of the Jury’s decision as per the date set out in Section 1.8 of this Brief.

The Competitive Design Process results will be made public within twenty-one (21) days of the Decision Date.

The Proponent’s Design Competition Manager will advise the Competitors in writing of the decision.

5.20. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION REPORT

When the Competitive Design Process submissions have been assessed, the Proponent is required to submit to the City of Sydney an Architectural Design Competition Report. The Architectural Design Competition Report shall:

- Include each of the competitive submissions considered.
- Include an assessment of the design merits of each competitive submission.
- Set out the rationale for the choice of the preferred design and clearly demonstrate how this design:
  - Best exhibits design excellence in accordance with the provisions of Clause 6.21(4) Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and the approved Design Excellence Strategy.
- Any further recommended design amendments relevant to the achievement of design excellence.
- Include a copy of the Brief issued to the architectural firms.

The Report is to be endorsed and signed by all Jury members.

The Proponent is to submit the Competition Report to the City of Sydney within twenty eight (28) days of the final Decision Date.

The City of Sydney may advise the Proponent whether it endorses the Competitive Design Process and the outcome and whether the selected scheme fulfils the requirements of the Competitive Design Process in the form of pre-development application advice.

5.21. COMPETITION FEE

A competition fee of $60,000 plus GST shall be paid to each Competitor for participating in this invited Competitive Design Process.

Where a Competitor is an international competitor, the competition fee will be in addition to an allowance for international and interstate travel, accommodation and related costs and expenses, to a maximum rate as agreed between the Proponent and the Competitor.

The competition fees and/or prizes are to be lodged in trust with the Australian Institute of Architects (AIA) prior to the commencement of the Competitive Design Process unless an alternative arrangement to guarantee fee payment has been negotiated between the Competitors and the Proponent.

Upon receipt of evidence that a comprehensive Competitive Design Process submission has been lodged, the Proponent must pay the agreed Competitive Design Process fee to the Competitors.
5.22. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

Competitors shall observe complete confidentiality at all times in relation to their design submission, including plans, information whether verbal or written, documentation or any advice until the Decision Date. The same strict rules apply to any consultants or other persons or entities from which the Competitors may seek advice.

This Brief and the documents comprising the Competitor’s submission are confidential until the decision is announced and made public. Competitors must not use them for any other purpose without the prior consent of the Proponent.

The Proponent, Competitors and the Jury shall observe complete confidentiality in relation to all submissions received, prior to a decision in relation to the Competitive Design Process that is made public.

5.23. **COPYRIGHT**

Copyright for each submission shall remain in the ownership of the original author(s) unless separately negotiated between the Proponent and the architect.

The Proponent and the Consent Authority shall have the right to display, photograph, publish or otherwise duplicate and distribute submissions, presentations, brief and reports produced as part of this Competition for publication, publicity or other such purposes. Any such reproductions shall acknowledge the copyright owner(s).

Execution of the Competition Invitation and Acceptance letter shall be deemed as legal permission for the Proponent and Consent Authority to publish Competitors designs. No compensation shall be made for such reproduction or publication.

5.24. **RETURN OF DOCUMENTS**

The Proponent retains the right to hold submissions for a period of up to six (6) months from the closing date of the Competition. The Proponent shall retain the winning submission. Other submissions shall be returned to their owners. Competitors shall be notified by letter of the date on which submissions will become available for collection.

5.25. **CARE OF MATERIALS AND INSURANCE**

It shall be the responsibility of each Competitor to wrap, ship, mail or deliver by other means, their submission, ensuring timely and intact arrival. The Proponent disclaims any responsibility for loss or damage in transit.

No liability shall be attached to the Proponent regarding the submissions, whilst in the possession of the Proponent. All reasonable care will be taken to maintain the submissions in good condition, but a limited amount of wear and tear is inevitable.

The Competitors are advised to make copies of their submissions, so as to retain a copy of their work.

Responsibility of insuring submissions rests solely with Competitors.
6. PRESENTATION MATERIAL – SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Competitors are encouraged to optimise the quantity of presentation material to include only essential information to explain the proposed design.

6.1. GENERAL

The submission must be clear and concise, with a preference for design information over graphic presentation.

Presentation material may be printed, photocopied, photographed, or reproduced in any manner chosen by the Competitor. Presentation material must be of a quality suitable for public exhibition.

The submission documents shall be submitted to the Design Competition Manager in the form of:

- Eight (8) bound complete hard copies of all submission documents (A3 format);
- One (1) CD/USB flash drive of all presentation materials (collated into a single Power Point slide show or PDF document).

Each Competitors submission shall include the items detailed in the following sections.

6.2. DRAWINGS AND GRAPHICS

Each Competitor's Final submission should consist of:

- Aerial Photograph (1:2000).
- Location Context plan (1:1000).
- Existing Site Plan (1:1000).
- Site Analysis (1:500).
- Concept Plan (1:500). This must locate new streets, public domain improvements including building form and massing of site and adjacent area.
- Streetscape elevation showing all street frontages (inclusive of neighbouring context) in context (1:500).
- Ground floor plan options including landscape concept plan and relationship to the public domain (1:200).
- Concept sketch of ground floor and basement design based on the ‘back up scenario’ for vehicular access including two vehicular entrance points (from Understood Street and Dalley Street, as existing).
- Typical plans, elevations and sections including all typical basement (parking floor) and floor plans, including roof plan (1:200).
- Streetscape elevations and sections inclusive of neighbouring context (1:200).
- Facade concept design of typical components.
- 3-D massing/modulation study.
- Stage 1 envelope/regulatory controls overlay drawing, illustrating compliance with envelopes. Overlays must include relevant plans, sections, elevations and 3D massing model.
- A digital material/image board and indicative finishes (samples are not required).
- At least three high resolution computer-generated perspective(s)/photomontage(s) include at a minimum the following:
  - Corner of George Street and Dalley Street, looking north east
- Birds Eye – Aerial View (Incl. articulation with 200 George)

A map showing these locations is included at Attachment G.

- Shadow impact diagrams demonstrating compliance with Consent Authority requirements. Diagrams are to clearly present proposed design shadow impacts relative to Stage 1 DA envelope shadow impacts.
- GFA plans, illustrating GFA accounting to be completed as the area schedule included at Attachment E.
- Detailed project schedule according to the requirements, including GBA, GFA, NLA of retail, commercial, office, public area, etc. respectively.
- A digital materials/image board and indicative finishes.
- PowerPoint Presentation (to be used for Competitors individual presentations to the Jury).

In reference to the above submissions:

- Plans, elevations and sections and 3D massing studies must illustrate the proposed design relative to Stage 1 building envelope.
- All plans, elevations and sections are to be presented at the scale specified and are to include the scale, scale bar and north point.
- Critical relative levels to be shown on relevant plans, sections and elevations.
- Site plans, elevations and sections must include adjacent properties to clearly represent the proposed design in relation to neighbouring context.

For the purposes of planning coordination, the winning architect may be required to submit to the Consent Authority a DWG/DGN file of ground floor plan geospatially referenced with MGA (Mapping Grid of Australia) coordinates.

6.3. DESIGN STATEMENT

In addition to Sections 6.1 and 6.2 above, each submission is to include a design statement addressing the Competitor’s approach, the response to the Brief’s objectives and the manner in which design excellence is achieved.

6.4. ESD STATEMENT

Each submission is to include a summary of sustainability initiatives to achieve required ESD targets, together with a description of broader sustainability initiatives associated with the design proposal.

6.5. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

Each submission must include a Statement of Compliance prepared by a suitably qualified person indicating the proposal’s compliance with the objectives of and the controls within the planning framework, primarily, SLEP 2012 and SDCP 2012, the endorsed Design Excellence Strategy and relevant state planning policies.

Each submission must also highlight and justify any non-compliance with the applicable planning controls for the site. A template has been provided at Attachment C for Competitors to complete.

6.6. YIELD ANALYSIS AND AREA SCHEDULE

Each submission should include a yield analysis and area schedule (floor by floor) of areas as per the template at Attachment E. Each table must include:

- Gross Floor Area (GFA) – the area as defined in the SLEP 2012.
- Gross Building Area (GBA), the total of the enclosed and unenclosed area of the building at all floor levels measured between the normal outside face of any enclosing wall, balustrades, terraces and supports. Excludes basements.
- Target Net Saleable Area, the area within the dwelling measured to the inner face of a party wall and/or an external wall and to the face of the glazing line for wall to ceiling openings and excluding the area of a fully enclosed services ductwork within the dwelling.

- Car parking schedule,

- Efficiency rate.

Each competitor must provide both a PDF and digital excel spread sheet of the area schedule using the provided standard Area Schedule provided at Attachment E.

6.7. CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The Final submission will all be costed by the Proponent’s appointed Quantity Surveyor as set out at Section 5.8.1 of this Brief.

Each submission is to include the completed Area Schedule/Yield Analysis spreadsheet (Attachment E). The submission may also include a discussion on how the design is an economically feasible development option.

6.8. MODEL OF PROPOSED SCHEMES

A physical model of the competition entry at a scale of 1:500 may be submitted to the Competition Manager on the Presentation Date.

6.9. DIGITAL ANIMATIONS

Animations or fly-throughs should not be submitted and will not form part of the Jury’s assessment. Digital animations added to the presentation material by competitors will strictly not be accepted.

6.10. PRESENTATION DATE MATERIAL

At the time and date nominated at Section 1.8 of this Brief, Competitors are to provide an electronic version of their Presentation material to the Competitive Process Manager for audit.

The presentation material shall be collated into a single Power Point slide show or PDF document and delivered on USB flash drives or submitted via email.

No new material is to be presented over that lodged as Final Submissions. Refer Section 1.8 of this Brief for more details.
7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The Architectural Design Competition Brief includes additional information to assist the Competitors participating in this Competitive Design Process, as provided in the following Appendices and Attachments, refer to the Contents Page for more information.
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