

## **Attachment A18**

**Consultation Summary – 2 Chifley Square,  
Sydney**

## Appendix K - Consultation Summary

The following table includes a response to Council and the Design Advisory Panel's formal written feedback following submission of the Draft Planning Proposal in September 2020. The relevant text of each request is provided in the left-hand column, accompanied by the Proponent's corresponding response in the right-hand column. The Proponent's responses have been informed by input by the expert consultant team and should be read in conjunction with the revised Planning Proposal and accompanying technical reports.

**Table 1 Pre lodgement Consultation**

Comment	Response
<b>City of Sydney Council – 31 March 2021</b>	
<p><u>Schedule 11 base case envelope requirements</u></p> <p><i>The base case model prepared for 2 Chifley Square appears to meet the requirements under Schedule 11 with regards to tower separation and building setbacks. However, a fully dimensioned base case model, including clear identification of heights above ground is essential to determine that it has been prepared correctly.</i></p> <p><i>Any part of the surrounding site, outside the area to be redeveloped, should be retained in the base case model as it exists. Only the portion of the podium within the extent of development is to be modelled to meet the controls in the draft DCP.</i></p>	<p>The base case includes areas of the site that form part of the extent of the future redevelopment. This includes the podium across the whole site, as there are substantial works occurring within the podium to facilitate the development and allow the creation of a larger site precinct with a unified podium.</p> <p>The base case was first modelled in early 2020 in accordance with the Schedule 11 procedure which was in place in the February 2020 iteration of the draft DCP. The base case was subsequently amended in May 2020 to comply with the exhibited version of the Schedule 11 controls as required by Council at the time and remains consistent with the procedure set out in the current version.</p> <p>The base case was presented and discussed with Council on a number of occasions and confirmed as acceptable via email dated 11 May 2020. The request made is not consistent with the methodology in Schedule 11. Therefore, given the proposal's compliance with Schedule 11, and the material impact of a change to this, the base case as agreed in May 2020 is retained for the purpose of assessment. The base case is presented in detail at <b>Appendix A</b>.</p>
<p><u>Sky view factor and wind testing results</u></p> <p><i>The sky view factor and wind (equivalent 5% exceedance criteria) testing results for the previously proposed envelope are worse than the results for the base case model. As a result, the previous proposal presented to DAP does not meet the City's requirements for varying the heights and setbacks due to these worse impacts in the public domain.</i></p> <p><i>Revisions required to the base case model to meet Schedule 11 may change the sky view and wind results, however the initial testing results suggest that the proposed variations to the controls, especially the proposed setbacks, should be reconsidered.</i></p>	<p><b>Sky View Factor:</b></p> <p>The proposed envelope has been subject to rigorous Sky View Factor (SVF) testing, as detailed within the SVF Report at <b>Appendix I</b>. Specifically, Architectus undertook an analysis of the daylight levels of the proposed envelope to adjacent public places (included as <b>Appendix I</b>) and the SVF analysis confirms that when averaged, there is an overall + 0.064239% improvement in SVF with the proposed envelope compared to the base Schedule 11 envelope. Refer to <b>Section 8.4</b> of the Planning Justification Report and <b>Appendix I</b> for further detail.</p> <p><b>Pedestrian Wind Environment:</b></p> <p>The proposed envelope has been informed by detailed wind testing, including wind tunnel testing to provide the most accurate results. The Pedestrian Wind Environment Study at <b>Appendix G</b> concludes that the proposal is equivalent in wind performance with the base case envelope. Refer to <b>Section 8.7</b> of the Planning Justification Report and <b>Appendix G</b> for further detail.</p>

Comment	Response
<p><i>It is recommended that prior to carrying out any further sky view factor and wind testing, that you confirm with City officers to ensure the base case model has been prepared correctly, and to ensure the testing methodology is in accordance with the requirements.</i></p>	<p>As discussed above, the base case was presented and discussed with Council on a number of occasions and confirmed as acceptable via email dated 11 May 2020. The base case referenced in this Planning Proposal is consistent with the envelope endorsed by Council on 11 May 2020. The base case is presented in detail at <b>Appendix A</b>.</p>
<p><u>Side and rear setbacks</u></p> <p><i>As the advice indicates, the previously proposed tower envelope was not supported by the Panel. In particular, the Panel was concerned that the proposed tower envelope appears to have been pushed to the limit with little regard to its neighbours. The relationship of the proposed tower with 167 Macquarie Street, was not supported as the lack of the boundary setback will limit its neighbour's ability to redevelop in the future.</i></p>	<p>Following receipt of this advice, the project team worked closely with Council and the DAP to develop an alternate planning envelope that would accompany the formal lodgement of this Planning Proposal. Specifically, this included two DAP meetings and three separate workshops with Council staff, including Council's Director of City Planning, Development and Transport. Through this consultation, Charter Hall submitted three building envelope options as well as articulated buildings within each envelope for Council and the DAP's consideration.</p> <p>The three options were tested against the DCP compliant envelope. As outlined in Council's correspondence dated 20 June 2021, the DAP identified Envelope C as the preferred planning envelope. Envelope C enables a contextually sensitive built form drawing on the curvilinear cues of the existing Chifley tower and other prominent buildings in the vicinity of the site. As the proposed envelope, it presents a minimum 13.9m separation to the existing Chifley tower and a minimum 3m setback to northern or 167 Macquarie Street boundary. Block modelling contained within the Urban Design Report has demonstrates that a future redevelopment at 167 Macquarie Street would optimise the principal outlooks to the north and east, with the core to be most likely located facing west or abutting the south-western corner of the site. Therefore, it is highly likely that a non-active façade would abut the proposed envelope at this corner and hence the proposed 3m setback remains suitable. Refer to <b>Section 8.1.3</b> of the Planning Justification Report for further detail.</p> <p>The proposed envelope successfully enables strategic employment generating floor space within a form that accommodates appropriate floor plates for premium global tenants. Further detail is provided at <b>Section 4.0</b> of the Planning Justification Report and in the Urban Design Report prepared by Architectus in <b>Appendix A</b>.</p>
<p><u>Overshadowing of Chifley Square</u></p> <p><i>The previous proposed tower envelope would further overshadow Chifley Square in the mornings, eroding the level of solar access compared to a compliant envelope. The design of the envelope is therefore being reconsidered and alternatives explored to reduce this impact. Currently we have a model with alternative building forms provided by your team to respond to. In the meantime, you have agreed to prepare further analytic drawings and plans of how each of the alternatives respond to place. Solar access studies should be done to evaluate this impact.</i></p>	<p>Under the draft Sydney LEP, Clause 6.19 has been amended to remove Chifley Square from the list of public places to be protected as it is already cast in full shadow by existing development during the nominated period of protection. As detailed within the Urban Design Report at <b>Appendix A</b>, the proposed envelope does not cast any additional shadow onto Chifley Square throughout the day between 9am and 3pm during the period of 14 April and 31 August</p> <p>The shadow analysis has also extended to include the Summer Solstice (21 December). As illustrated at <b>Appendix A</b> the proposed envelope creates limited additional overshadowing from 9am to 12pm to Chifley Square. From 12pm through to 3pm, Chifley Square experiences unrestricted solar access. It is noted that the period of protection does not extend to the Summer Solstice. In accordance with the uplift envisaged under the CSPS, it is inevitable that proposals will generate some additional overshadowing at certain times throughout the year. In this instance, the additional overshadowing is considered reasonable as it is limited to the hotter time of year being the Summer Solstice, where direct solar access is not as desirable.</p> <p>Further discussion is provided at <b>Section 8.3</b> of the Planning Justification Report.</p>

Comment	Response
<p><u>Proposed Tower Envelope</u></p> <p><i>The Panel was concerned that the previously proposed tower envelope has not properly considered its context. It was the view of the Panel that where two towers share the same podium (such as the Governor Phillip and Macquarie Towers), the relationship between the two tower forms should be considered and designed to ensure a harmonious urban built form. In any case, the previously proposed tower envelope shape is not considered to achieve a compatible relationship with neighbouring towers.</i></p> <p><i>The Panel also suggested a curved building façade responding to Chifley Square is likely to sit better with existing towers and have a better relationship with its neighbours. Given the distinctive form and design of Chifley Tower, its design should be a more significant consideration for this proposal.</i></p>	<p>The Architectus Urban Design Report at <b>Appendix A</b> provides a detailed urban analysis of the local context which informed the development of a series of urban design principles, which were then used to develop the proposed envelope. However, the proponent acknowledges the validity of the DAP's comments and saw opportunity to address the DAP's comments and provide an improved architectural and urban design outcome.</p> <p>In response, Architectus has investigated two envelope variations and modelled reference design forms within these envelopes which comply with the articulation requirement of 11% as set by the <i>Guideline for Site Specific Planning Proposals in Central Sydney</i>.</p> <p>This study has investigated successful characteristics of other 'two tower' sites, as well as identifying important characteristics of the existing Chifley tower and its surrounding context that the draft proposal must consider to achieve a successful relationship. This form is also highly responsive to surrounding prominent towers including Aurora Place, 1 Chifley Square, Sofitel Sydney Wentworth and Bligh Street.</p> <p>The culmination of these studies has informed the proposed planning envelope outlined at <b>Appendix A</b>.</p>
<p><u>Environmentally Sustainable Design</u></p> <p><i>The Panel also noted a 5-star NABERS rating does not meet best practice. The proposal should aim for an improved performance rating without involving dark glass.</i></p>	<p>In accordance with the <i>Guideline for Site Specific Planning Proposals in Central Sydney</i>, Charter Hall is committed to delivering the following for the proposed new tower:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum 6 Star Green Star certified rating under Design &amp; As-Built v1.3</li> <li>• A minimum 5.5 Star NABERS Energy rating (Commitment Agreement)</li> <li>• A minimum 4 Star NABERS Water rating (Target)</li> <li>• A minimum 5 Star NABERS Waste rating (Target)</li> <li>• A minimum Climate Active Carbon Neutral Certification</li> </ul> <p>Façade design and materiality will be discussed in further detail with the City and tested through the competitive design process.</p>
<b>Design Advisory Panel – 11 February 2021</b>	
<p><i>The Panel was concerned that the previously proposed tower envelope has not properly considered its context.</i></p> <p><i>It was the view of the Panel that where two towers share the same podium (such as the Governor Phillip and Macquarie Towers), the relationship between the two tower forms should be considered and designed to ensure a harmonious urban built form.</i></p> <p><i>The previously proposed tower envelope shape is not considered to achieve a compatible relationship with neighbouring towers.</i></p> <p><i>A curved building façade responding to Chifley Square is likely to sit better with existing towers and have a better relationship with its neighbours.</i></p> <p><i>Given the distinctive form and design of Chifley Tower, its design should be a more significant consideration for this proposal.</i></p>	<p>Refer to the response to Council's feedback above under the heading '<u>Proposed Tower Envelope</u>'.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Design Advisory Panel – 20 May 2021</b>	
<i>There needs to be an analysis of the options at street views and vistas from the public domain of the surrounding streets. This should include an investigation of the relationship and interface of the tower and the podium at street level.</i>	A Visual Impact Analysis has been completed as part of the Urban Design Report by Architectus ( <b>Appendix A</b> ). The analysis looks at several views from different directions from the surrounding streets and assesses the overall visual impact. The analysis finds that the proposed building envelope will result in an appropriate visual impact and is visibly set back to ensure an appropriate interface with surrounding development and public domain. Refer to <b>Section 8.5</b> of the Planning Justification Report for further detail.
<i>The Panel noted that there is a lack of clarity about the strategy around the retention of the existing podium and associated retail and the buildability of the tower.</i>	Architectus has provided a reference scheme attached at <b>Appendix A</b> which illustrates that the southern side of the podium will be demolished to enable the construction of the second tower and a new podium will be constructed and integrated with the existing tower and northern podium. The specific design and extent of podium works is subject to the Design Competition process. Charter Hall has also developed a staging strategy as attached at <b>Appendix A</b> . Refer to <b>Section 4.6.5</b> of the Planning Justification Report for further detail.
<i>The Panel recommended a review of the reported '7% more skyview' – this should be modelled and tested.</i>	The proposed envelope has been subject to rigorous Sky View Factor (SVF) testing, as detailed within the SVF Report at <b>Appendix I</b> . Specifically, Architectus undertook an analysis of the daylight levels of the proposed envelope to adjacent public places (included as <b>Appendix I</b> ) and the SVF analysis confirms that when averaged, there is an overall improvement with an increase in sky visibility of SVF value of +0.064239% with the proposed envelope compared to the base Schedule 11 envelope Refer to <b>Section 8.4</b> of the Planning Justification Report and <b>Appendix I</b> for further detail.
<i>The Panel also recommended thorough wind analysis be conducted, particularly on the impacts on Chifley Square and the surrounding streets and public domain at the street level.</i>	The proposed envelope has been informed by detailed wind testing, including wind tunnel testing to provide the most accurate results. The Pedestrian Wind Environment Study at <b>Appendix G</b> concludes that the proposal provides wind outperformance over the base case envelope. Refer to <b>Section 8.7</b> of the Planning Justification Report and <b>Appendix G</b> for further detail.
<i>The Panel noted that based on what is presented to date, option 'C3' appeared to have the least impact and better resolution with the surrounding built form. This needs to be further studied, at street view as per the previous point and to include the modelling of the tower form and the crescent of the podium.</i>	The proposed building envelope visual impact from street level has been assessed in the Visual Impact Assessment prepared by Architectus ( <b>Appendix A</b> ). It is noted that the tapering setback of the proposed building envelope to Chifley Square gives breathing space to the podium. The proposed setbacks to Chifley Square and Hunter Street ensures that the podium continues to serve as the defining element in these locations. Refer to <b>Section 8.5</b> of the Planning Justification Report for further detail.
<i>There should also be review of amenity impacts on Chifley Square to include potential reflection / glare from the glass façade.</i>	This planning proposal does not seek consent for facade treatments. Notwithstanding this, sun shading and reflectivity will be addressed within the competitive design process.
<i>The Panel was concerned that on some options the proposed envelope was too close to the existing building at 167 Macquarie Street, and potentially future development on that site.</i>	The proposed building envelope maintains a 3m setback from 167 Macquarie Street and increases up to 9.1m in the north-eastern corner as a result of its curved-shape form. Any future development over 55m at 167 Macquarie Street is unlikely due to current controls applicable under the Macquarie Street Special Character Area limiting a commercially feasible floorplate. However, should a proposal eventuate, block modelling contained within the Urban Design Report has demonstrated that a future redevelopment on that site would optimise the principal outlooks to the north and east, with the core to be most likely located facing west or abutting the south-western corner of the site. Therefore, it is highly likely that a non-active façade would abut the proposed envelope at this corner and hence the proposed setback remains suitable. Refer to <b>Section 8.1.3</b> of the Planning Justification Report for further detail.

Comment	Response
<i>Any relaxation of the controls needs to be carefully considered as it will set a precedent for future developments of surrounding sites.</i>	The proposed variations specifically relate to the south, east and north-west setbacks and are appropriate given the site's context and limited ability of surrounding buildings to further develop. The proposed variations are unique to the site and will not set a precedent for future developments. The Environmental Assessment under <b>Section 8.0</b> of the Planning Justification Report clearly sets out why the proposed envelope is considered the optimal design solution for the site, when considering Council and the DAPs advice. Any future redevelopment of sites around the site will also be subject to a rigorous pre-lodgement consultation and formal assessment process with Council and the DAP.
<i>The Panel noted that the original architects should be invited to participate in the competitive design process.</i>	Noted.