Attachment E

Competitive Design Alternatives Report

Competitive Design Alternatives Report

Sites 2, 3 and 4 in the Green Square Town Centre

On behalf of Toga Project Services Pty Ltd May 2021



Project Director

Kate Bartlett

Contributors

Alicia Desgrand

Povision	Revision Date	Status	Authorised	
Revision			Name	Signature
1	4 February	Draft	AD	КВ
2	10 February	Final Draft	AD	КВ
3	15 February	Final	AD	КВ
4	11 May	Final	AD	IC

* This document is for discussion purposes only unless signed and dated by the persons identified. This document has been reviewed by the Project Director.

Name	Panel Signature
Helen Lochhead	Helen to chhead
Camilla Block	Camelle.
Robert Nation	R. Ni
Jeffrey Klein	



Contact

Mecone

Suite 1204b, Level 12, 179 Elizabeth Street Sydney, New South Wales 2000

info@mecone.com.au mecone.com.au

© Mecone

All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, transmitted, stored in a retrieval system, or translated into any language in any form by any means without the written permission of Mecone.

All Rights Reserved. All methods, processes, commercial proposals and other contents described in this document are the confidential intellectual property of Mecone and may not be used or disclosed to any party without the written permission of Mecone.



Table of Contents

1 Introduction		oducti	on	1
	1.1	Over	view	.1
2	Cor	npetiti	ive Design Alternatives Process	1
	2.1	The P	roponent	.1
	2.2	Participating Architectural Competitors1		
	2.3	Technical Advisors1		
	2.4	Selection Panel2		
	2.5	Impatial Observers2		
	2.6	Competition Manager3		
	2.7	Competitive Design Process Timeline3		
	2.8	Over	view	.3
	2.9	Com	petition Brief	.4
3	Jury	Asses	sment of Each Scheme	5
	3.1	Over	view	.5
	3.2	2 Submitted Schemes and the Panel's Assessment		.5
		3.2.1	Studio Bright and Silvester Fuller	.5
		3.2.2	Bates Smart	.7
		3.2.3	SJB	10
4	Cor	npetiti	ive Process Winner1	3
	4.1	Requ	irements of the Brief1	3
	4.2	Reco	mmendations1	3
		4.2.1	Key Principles of the Design to be Maintained and Developed	13
		4.2.2 Devel	Areas for Further Resolution and Refinement Through Design opment	14
5	Sum	imary	and Conclusion1	6



Schedule of Figures and Tables

Figure 1 View of the scheme viewed looking south west
Figure 2 Primary entrance point from Transport Place to the immediate north
Figure 3 View of the scheme viewed looking south west across Transport Place8
Figure 4 View of the active ground plane and the central core suspended above9
Figure 5 Northern elevation viewed looking south from Bourke Road11
Figure 6 Podium design viewed from Transport Place

Table 1	Key dates for the competitive design process	3
TUDIE I.	Rey dures for the compenitive design process	······



1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

This Competitive Design Alternative Report outlines the process, architectural submissions and Selection Panel deliberations, decision and recommendations for the competitive design alternatives process (competitive process) for the site comprising the individual sites known as Site 2, 3 and 4 within the Green Square Town Centre (GSTC) (the site).

This Report should be read with reference to the Competitive Design Alternatives Process Brief (the Brief), including relevant correspondence during the competitive process, which is provided at Appendix 1. The competitive process was conducted in accordance with the Brief, which was endorsed by the City of Sydney (COS) and issued to all competitors at the commencement of the competitive process.

2 Competitive Design Alternatives Process

2.1 The Proponent

The owner of the site is Toga Development No. 15 Pty Ltd and the Proponent for the design competition is Toga Project Services Pty Ltd.

2.2 Participating Architectural Competitors

The following three architectural competitors participated in the competitive design alternatives process:

1. SJB

Adam Haddow, Marcus Lewin and Emilly Wombell

2. Studio Bright Mel Bright

and

Silvester Fuller Jad Silvester and Penny Fuller

3. Bates Smart (Winning Scheme) Philip Vivian, Matilda Leake and Marius Hatletveit

2.3 Technical Advisors

Technical advisors were appointed to provide advice to competitors throughout the Competitive Design Alternatives Process. The consultants were:

Planning Consultants Kate Bartlett

Director - Mecone NSW Pty Ltd



233

Alicia Desgrand

Senior Planner – Mecone NSW Pty Ltd

Structural Engineer George Perl Director - MPN Group Quantity Surveyor Ian Menzies National Director – WT Partnership Brendan Browne Associate at WT Partnership

2.4 Selection Panel

The Selection Panel incorporated two (2) representatives nominated by the City of Sydney and two (2) representatives nominated by the proponent.

The Selection Panel comprised the following members:

Two nominated by the City of Sydney

• Camilla Block (Panel Chair)

Design Principle – Durbach Block Jaggers Architects

• Professor Helen Lochhead

Pro Vice-Chancellor, Precincts

Two nominated by the Proponent

Robert Nation

Independent Registered Architect

• Jeffrey Klein

Design Director, Toga Group.

2.5 Impatial Observers

A number of observers from the City were also present during the presentations. These were:

Anita Morandini

Design Excellence Coordinator – City of Sydney

• Marie lerufi

Design Excellence Planner – City of Sydney

Andrew Rees

Manager, Area Planning – City of Sydney

David Zabell

Senior Planner – City of Sydney

In addition, there were two impartial observers from Toga:

Paul Shaw

Exective General Manager, Development



• Dez Wong

Development Manager

2.6 Competition Manager

The Proponent appointed Kate Bartlett from Mecone NSW Pty Ltd to act as the Competitive Process Manager.

2.7 Competitive Design Process Timeline

The key dates and processes for the competitive process are outlined in the table below:

Table 1. Key dates for the competitive design process		
Date	Action	
20 November 2020	Competition Commencement Date: The Invited Competitive Design Alternatives Process behind and the Brief is issued to Competitors.	
24 November 2020	Brief Session and Site Visit	
3 December 2020	Selection Panel Briefing Session and Site Visit	
10 December 2020	Quantity Surveyor Meeting	
18 December 2020	Final Submission Lodgement Date	
11 – 15 January 2021	Review of Final Submissions	
15 January 2021	Cost Estimate by Proponent's Quantity Surveyor	
19 January 2021	Presentation Material Lodgement Date	
20 January 2021	Presentation Date	

2.8 Overview

The competitive design alternatives process was undertaken as an invited process where the proponent sought three competitors to respond to a Competitive Process.

The following actions were undertaken as part of the competitive process:

- A Competition Design Alternatives Process Brief was prepared by Mecone in accordance with City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2013. The Competition Brief was endorsed by the City on 19 November 2020.;
- Three architectural consortiums were invited to participate in the competitive process (refer to Section 2.2);
- Each architectural consortium was invited to participate in consultation sessions with appointed technical advisors including the Quantity Surveyor and Structural Engineer prior to the lodgement of the submissions.
- Each competitor lodged a submission which addressed the Competition Brief objectives and was accompanied by a set of architectural plans/elevations/sections, photomontages and a planning compliance assessment;
- Each architectural firm presented their scheme to the Selection Panel and answered questions from the Panel; and



• Each scheme was assessed by the Selection Panel and a preferred design was chosen. The Panel prepared a list of matters that required further design development during the next stage of the process.

This competitive design alternatives process was undertaken in an open and transparent manner with full disclosure to Council officers.

2.9 Competition Brief

Competitors were sent a copy of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process Brief on the 20 November 2020. The Competitive Design Alternatives Process Brief sent to competitors is included at **Appendix 1**.



3 Selection Panel Assessment of Each Scheme

3.1 Overview

Design Reports were submitted by each competitor and an internal review of each scheme was undertaken by the Selection Panel and technical advisors. At the Final Presentation Day, each architectural competitor presented their scheme and questions were asked in order to clarify any issues. The Panel then evaluated each scheme against the Assessment Criteria provided in the Competition Brief, the planning controls Clause 6.9 XX of GSTCLEP 2013The Panel agreed on a preferred scheme that they deemed to be 'capable of achieving design excellence' and prepared a list of issues to be resolved during the detailed design stage subsequent to the design competition.

3.2 Submitted Schemes and the Selection Panel's Assessment

This section details the key components of each scheme as presented by the architectural competitors and the Selection Panel's assessment.

3.2.1 Studio Bright and Silvester Fuller

The scheme prepared by Studio Bright and Silvester Fuller incorporated the following key features (refer to *Figure 1 to 2* below for further detail):

- The envelope consists of three distinct massings which step down in height towards Botany Road;
- Active rooftops are accommodated on each building and optimise the building's stepped built form;
- The massing strategy aims to provide three primary built form elements above a base of diverse spaces;
- The scheme is characterised by a materiality comprising recycled bagged brick, pre-cast brick, red brick paving, red concrete and aluminum sunshading;
- The podium element comprises a series of 'stacks' reflective of the industrial chimneys historically found across Alexandria;
- The podium is suited to accommodating a diversity of businesses such as creative retailers and food and beverage tenancies;
- The proposal incorporates a highly articulated plinth with a sculptured finegrained appearance reflective of the locality's industrial character;
- The scheme provides a distinctive fine-grained base, articulated by vertical elements reflective of the industrial built form of Alexandria;
- The design sought to respond to the adjoining building to the immediate north at 326 328 Botany Road designed by COX by providing a connection at the ground plane;
- The scheme sought to activate the ground plane fronting Transport Place to improve the pedestrian experience to Green Square Train Station;
- It provides a colonnade that extends the street wall, functions as a protected area for retail and is capable of supporting spill out dining areas;
- The scheme sought to reduce the perceived mass of the development by



ensuring each tower element adopts a varying architectural expression whilst achieving a consistent visual language;

- The public domain that may form Transport Place is envisaged to feature strong geometric features and materials comprising a brick line reflective of the industrial past; a waterline interpreting the alignment of the culvert; and sandstone at the ground plane that presents as being a continuation of the public domain associated with the adjacent Library and Plaza; and
- The design fosters environmental sustainability by incorporating recycled materials, solar panels and mixed mode conditioning.



Figure 1 View of the scheme viewed looking south west

Source: SBSF



Figure 2 Primary entrance point from Transport Place to the immediate north Source: SBSF Merits



The Panel considered that the merits of the scheme were as follows:

- The sculptural elements of the scheme, including the elements at the higher elevations;
- The basement and ground-floor planning were considered to be the strongest of the schemes and acknowledged the importance of the ground floor as a front of house function;
- The EOT facilities were designed in a logical and effective arrangement;
- The design of the building's base along with the flexible abstract tower element;
- The colonnade extension;
- The effort to introduce a unique type of office space was valued by the Panel;

Considerations

The Panel considered that the scheme's key considerations are as follows:

- The sculptural podium height was questionable given the context and that surrounding podiums are typically 6 to 8 storeys;
- The colonnade could be at odds with the retail / active edge;
- The approach to the colonnade and plinths could result in potential CPTED issues;
- Whilst the Panel supported the hub spaces, they are of the view they could have been a mixed mode type space rather than an individual designed place; and
- The effectiveness of the sun shading devices.

3.2.2 Bates Smart

The scheme prepared by Bates Smart incorporated the following key features (refer to Figure 3 to 4 below for further detail):

- The proposal reflects two distinct building elements adjoined by a central core which aim to create a unique contemporary form that is sympathetic to the locality's historic 'sawtooth industrial' building typology;
- The central core is suspended over the through-site link and accommodates collaborative work spaces which are intended to function as the 'social heart' of the development;
- The proposal has been designed to provide a transition in scale with the tower tapering down towards the east to align with adjoining property heights adjacent to Botany Road and the envelope tapering down towards the west to transition to the lower heights along O'Riordan Street;
- To reduce the perceived massing of the development, the envelope reflects a 'sliced' form;
- The materiality is intended to be reflective of the locality's former brick factories;
- The architectural expression is defined by a repetitious arrangement of solar shading devices and glazing, which together achieve a utilitarian character and are reflective of former industrial factories and warehouses across South Sydney;
- The scheme fosters environmental sustainability by incorporating the following



measures:

- Horizontal and vertical shading to maximise solar protection;
- Reduced glass area through solid verticals which maximise insulation;
- Inclusion of a chilled beam air-conditioning system;
- Reliance on thermal cooling and energy efficient lighting;
- Low carbon materials and photovoltaic cells;
- The podium is characterised by arches which define the retail tenancies and are reminiscent of the industrial quality of the area;
- The tower floor plates are designed to provide rectangular workzones that are highly functional;
- The approach to the internal floor planning is to provide a contiguous space that fosters flexibility, large teams and cultural integration; and
- The public domain considered towards Transport Place consists of a series of level terraces with the capacity to accommodate spill out seating and planting.



Figure 3 View of the scheme viewed looking south west across Transport Place Source: Bates Smart





Figure 4 View of the active ground plane and the central core suspended above Source: Bates Smart

<u>Merits</u>

The Panel considered that the merits of the scheme were as follows:

- The scheme reflects an interesting built form, particularily due to the splayed rooftop and height;
- The buildings presents a potential edge to the future development of Transport Place. The Panel requests that Council consider further design and block planning of Site 1 and Transport Place as needed to enable the building to be revealed and appreciated, and to provide an openness to Transport Place;
- That the scheme best addressed the site's constraints and challenges by providing an interesting sculptural form;
- It was concluded that the central wintergarden 'hub' space combined with its connection to the lift lobby and use of CLT is critical to the proposal's capacity to achieve design excellence;
- The blades on the façade are effective at providing a high quality sculptural form;
- The proposal has the capacity to achieve a high standard of sustainability;
- The modulation of the façade fronting O'Riordan Street provides a strong relationship to the adjacent development and is effective in breaking up the building mass and introducing variety;
- That the architectural expression provides an appropriate design response to the site and the objectives of the brief;
- The roof form on Sites 3 and 4 is aligned with the approved Concept DA envelope for the site at 326 Botany Road;
- The colour scheme of the proposal was appropriate; and
- The cantilevered element adds value to the design.



Considerations

The key considerations and recommendations raised by the Selection Panel are addressed in **Section 4.2.2**.

3.2.3 SJB

The scheme prepared by SJB incorporated the following key features (refer to Figure 5 to 6 below for further detail):

- The ground plane consists of three distinct curvature elements containing active retail uses which provide opportunities for through-site links;
- The through-site links are intended to foster pedestrian movements across the site and to the adjacent public domain of Green Square to form a seamless connection to the broader GSTC;
- The workplaces consist of shared social spaces that have the potential to accommodate large commercial tenants or smaller ones;
- The materiality consists of an organic colour pallet with sculptured concrete columns, concrete shading blades and soft timber structures at the ground plane;
- The proposal incorporates an external circulation atrium to encourage active vertical transportation between floors and tenancies;
- Public art will form an integral component of the scheme and will be integrated across the development;
- The design incorporates a large roof terrace at Level 12 that has the capacity to accommodate open lawn and serve as a flexible space for future tenants. A secondary rooftop garden is proposed at Level 15 and is included to maximise the outlook for occupants;
- The façade is characterised by precast concrete blades, upstands and precast rammed earth blades;
- A timber awning structure demarcates the retail tenancies from the upper levels of the building;
- The main entrance to the podium which interfaces with the ground plane is characterised by columns arranged in a geometric fashion which interact with the light and contribute visual interest to the public domain;
- The proposed structural system consists of a timber concrete hybrid system that aims to increase sustainability, reduce dead load and allow for flexible internal spaces; and
- It is envisaged that the proposal will incorporate best practice sustainability measures which will be developed in consultation with a suitably qualified ESD consultant to ensure the achievement of the required NABERs rating.





Figure 5 Northern elevation viewed looking south from Bourke Road

Source: SJB



Figure 6 Podium design viewed from Transport Place Source: SJB

<u>Merits</u>

The Panel considered that the merits of the scheme were as follows:

- The presentation was accompanied by a strong urban analysis that gave due consideration to important aspects such as the former wetlands and surrounding canals.
- The approach to public art was supported;



- The presentation was considered to be strong and convincing; and
- The scheme's reference and consideration to the 'Seidler' approach to commercial buildings in terms of functionality, quality and rigour.

Considerations

The Panel considered that the scheme's key considerations are as follows:

- That the ground plane design requires further refinement due to the inclusion of multiple levels;
- The buildling's interface with the approved development to the south was of concern – particularly with the circular stair and natural ventilation for the toilets;
- The inclusion of multiple access points at the ground plane would potentially give rise to pedestrian conflicts;
- That the hybrid and grid structure needed further development, noting that buildings can reach 15 storeys and adopt a CLT building solution;
- Given that the through-site link to the southern site is not guaranteed and unlikely to be public, the additional setback for a contribution to the link along the south-west edge was questioned;
- The void with an external stair along the southern boundary were considered to be of a concern given that they would not facitliate solar access or ventilation to the W/C facilities. The Panel therefore considered that the void would not provide sufficient benefits; and
- The multiple through site routes and void lacked clarity.



4 Competitive Process Winner

Of the three schemes assessed by the Selection Panel, the Bates Smart scheme was identified as the preferred design. The Panel unanimously considered that the proposed scheme provides the best response to the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief and concluded it was capable of achieving design excellence.

4.1 Requirements of the Brief

The purpose of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process has been to select the highest quality architectural and urban design solution for the site. The Competitive Design Alternatives Brief outlined a number of Design, Planning and Urban and ESD Objectives for which the architectural competitors were to meet and would be assessed on.

The Bates Smart scheme is considered to best align with the objectives of the brief for the following reasons:

- The scheme has the greatest potential to achieve design excellence and the requirements of Clause 6.9 of the GSTC LEP 2013;
- The scheme is sympathetic to the surrounding built form, including the approved development to the north,
- The scheme provides a high degree of activation, will improve the pedestrian experience at the ground plane and will positively contribute to Transport Place;
- Delivers ecological sustainable design and best practice environmental performance;
- The built form provides an appropriate response to the industrial heritage that characterises the surrounds;
- The envelope will not obstruct view corridors obtained from O'Riordan Street and Botany Road; and
- The sculptural form will contribute visual interest to the streetscape.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Key Principles of the Design to be Maintained and Developed

The proponent's Selection Panel acknowledged that competitive process design proposals are concepts only and any technical resolution is preliminary. It is understood, while maintaining design integrity, the winning scheme must undergo design development, address technical items and selection panel recommendations in concert with other outstanding matters to demonstrate the achievement of design excellence in any subsequent Detailed Development Application.

The Selection Panel identified a number of key principles and qualities of the concept that should be maintained through the design development and DA. These key principles and qualities are detailed below.

- The Panel considered that notwithstanding the LEP height breach on Site 2, the proposal is generally consistent with the envisaged built form for the site established by the GSTC LEP 2013;
- The height breach is acknowledged and can be considered on the basis of



merit at the development application stage;

- The architectural expression and articulation are appropriate for the locality subject to some minor refinements at the DA stage through design development;
- The Panel considers that the overall built form, including the sculptural approach to the massing and the interrelationship to surrounding developments, provides a superior design response;
- The Panel advised that the composition of the indents and inflections (found on the west and north-east faces at Levels 6 and 7 upwards, respectively) as essential to the sculptural character of the building form. The Panel raised that this sculptural character should not be compromised in any design resolution in the instance where the proponent is not successful in their consultation with Sydney Water to retain the cantilevered element on the north-west corner.
- The Panel support the treatment at the ground plane and considers that the scheme provides an appropriate transition to Transport Place subject to further design development at the DA phase.

4.2.2 Areas for Further Resolution and Refinement Through Design Development

The recommendations made by the Panel requiring further resolution and refinment are detailed below.

- The Panel advised the composition on the indents and inflections (found on the west and north-east faces at Levels 6 and 7 upwards respectively) as essential to the sculptural character of the building form. The Panel raised that this sculptural character should not be compromised in any design resolution in the instance the proponent where not successful in their consultation with Sydney Water to retain the cantilevered element on the north-west corner.
- The proposal exceeds the maximum height control by the GSTC LEP 2013.
- Whilst the Panel support the colour scheme, they consider that the fins and colour could be further explored.
- The floor planning of the basement, ground floor, access and core design requires re-planning with further attention given to the implications of the connection on the southern neighbour with this being a private and not a public link.
- There is an opportunity to rationalise the internal floor planning by providing one lobby which would benefit the office design.
- The scheme requires further resolution of the BCA compliance matters and the lifting strategy with particular consideration given to:
 - whether the lifts service all levels, or high rise vs low rise;
 - an opportunity to provide a singular lobby which may resolve the proposal's egress issues.
- The proposed loading at street level necessitates a double width driveway which could create conflicts with pedestrians and is too far separated from the lifts which will make servicing arrangements difficult.
- The substation should be moved to ground level and the loading to the basement due to the difficulty in obtaining approval for the basement chamber substation outside of the CBD and to improve the functionality of the internal design.



- Further consideration needs to be given to detailing of the façade treatment. The masonary quality of the façade is essential, and any exploration of alternatives to the terracotta clad should maintain the masonary character which is essential to the success of the scheme. The Panel does not support the metal cladding.
- The sill profile should be increased to desk height in order to solve glass loading and spandrel issues, to improve outlook for occupants, and to enhance the design's solid appearance.
- There is an opportunity to enhance the scale and mass of the ground floor arches in this location by increasing the depth at the top of the arches.
- There is an opportunity to further setback the glassline of the retail uses away from the arches, potentially up to a metre.
- It is considered that the ground plane treatment needs to be further refined in conjunction with COS and the Proponent to improve the transition to Transport Place.
- The ground level to address ramping and access requirements, and flood level requirements needs resolution.
- The Panel noted that the through-site link may not be possible (or only during restricted hours) given the south neighbour's through-site link connection is on private property and anticipated to be open only during business hours.



5 Summary and Conclusion

The purpose of this Competitive Design Alternatives Report is to inform the City of Sydney on the process and outcomes for the competitive design alternatives process for Sites 2, 3 & 4 in the GSTC.

The design alternatives process has been undertaken in accordance with the endorsed Brief and the relevant provisions, including Clause 6.9 of the GSTC LEP 2013 (Stage 2), the GSDCP 2012 and the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2013.

Of the three architectural competitors invited to compete in the process, the Bates Smart design was selected as the preferred scheme. The Panel noted a range of items subject to further refinement as set out in Section 4.2.2; and considers this scheme exhibitis the potential of achieving design excellence.

The Selection Panel confirms that this Report is an accurate record of the competitive process and endorses the assessment and recommendations.





Suite 1204B, Level 12, 179 Elizabeth Street Sydney, New South Wales 2000

> info@mecone.com.au mecone.com.au