# MACQUARIE PARK COMMERCE CENTRE WATERLOO RD

SECTION 75W RESPONSE TO NSW DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING QUERIES

> S10758 9TH APRIL 2018



### BATESSMART.

## **1.0 LANEWAYS**



#### Laneways

1. Provide further consideration of the adequacy of the proposed laneway widths to accommodate pedestrian movements, as well as seating, landscaping and other elements. This should include an indicative layout of the laneways with dimensions.

The following diagrams highlight the conceptual approach for the laneways to ensure clear visual links with highly active retail is achieved through the site.



BATESSMART



### 1.0 LANEWAYS BLDG A&B

#### Laneways

1. Provide further consideration of the adequacy of the proposed laneway widths to accommodate pedestrian movements, as well as seating, landscaping and other elements. This should include an indicative layout of the laneways with dimensions.

The laneway between Bldg A& B has been designed to achieve a clear width of 12.25m between glazing lines & a physcial 9m from colonade to glass line. The additional walkway capacity is a response to the location, defined as a primary traffic zone and suitable thoroughfare is achieved between plaza and park. The overall width makes an allowance for a 2.5m minimum designated seating zone on each side. These dimensions have been tested with a pedstrian flow analysis width balances the need for ground level seating and activation against provision for clear unencumbered circulation between the station plaza and park. The 4m deep colonade also provides sheltered access in adverse weather conditions, a key public benefit improvement from the approved scheme.





External seating zone

#### BLDG A & B LANEWAY SECTION





### 1.0 LANEWAYS BLDG A&B







### 1.0 LANEWAYS BLDG B&C

#### Laneways

The laneway between Bldg B & C has been designed to achieve a clear width of 9m. This dimension will accommodate 2.5m external seating zone against the facade line with unimpeded circulation through the centre of lane for pedestrian thoroughfare.

As described further in this report this design approach is consistent with many examples of laneways throughout Sydney & Melbourne CBD. These are considered as highly successful examples of urban laneway spaces that promote retail activation & areas for social gathering.

External seating zone





#### **BLDG B & C LANEWAY SECTION**





### 1.0 LANEWAYS BLDG B&C





#### BLDG B & C LANEWAY







### 1.0 LANEWAYS View Comparison BLDG A&B

#### Laneways

2. Clarify the location of existing views and provide additional views through the laneways, particularly between Buildings A & B, comparing the approved and proposed scheme.

The following diagrams highlight the differences between the approved and proposed schemes for the laneway between Bldg A & B.

Whilst the dimensions of the laneway width has altered, the amenity and activation has significantly improved. These improvements are a result of:

1. the change in use at ground level which is now to be majority retail (food & beverage). By contrast, the approved scheme had a large proportion of commercial office allocation at ground level.

 The introduction of colonade to Building B which provides sheltered thoroughfare between station plaza, other buildings on-site and the park. By contrast the approved scheme glazing line was recessed behind the column only.
 Reduced through -site link distances, which is a result of Building A proportion change and landscape design amendments. (Refer diagrams page 9.)

4. Improved sense of space beyond the site as the adjacent Hyundai building is no longer visually terminating the laneway.



APPROVED\_LANEWAY BLDGS A & B



#### **PROPOSED\_LANEWAY BLDGS A & B**





### **1.0 LANEWAYS** VIEW COMPARISON BLDG A&B THROUGH TO PARK





8

#### **PROPOSED\_LANEWAY BLDGS A & B**





### **1.0 LANEWAYS** VIEW COMPARISON BLDG A&B

#### Laneways

The following diagrams highlight the through-site link distance between the Station Plaza and Coolinga Street & Giffnock Avenue. This diagram highlights that the amended scheme will be create reduced travel distances to each of these pedestrians links.

/ Reduction of 82m between station entry & Giffnock Avenue / Reduction of 18m between station entry & Coolinga Avenue



#### **APPROVED SCHEME THROUGH-SITE LINK DISTANCES**



#### **PROPOSED SCHEME THROUGH-SITE LINK DISTANCES**





### 1.0 LANEWAYS View Comparison BLDG B&C

#### Laneways

2. Clarify the location of existing views and provide additional views through the laneways, particularly between Buildings A & B, comparing the approved and proposed scheme.

The following diagrams highlight the differences between the approved and proposed schemes for laneway between Bldg B & C.

Whilst the dimensions of laneway width has altered, the amenity and activation has significantly improved.

These improvements are a result of:

the change in use at ground level which is now to be majority retail (food & beverage). By contrast, the approved scheme had a large proportion of commercial office allocation at ground level.
 Alternate landscape approach to allow for visibility through to the park beyond.



**APPROVED\_LANEWAY BLDGS B & C** 



#### PROPOSED\_LANEWAY BLDGS B & C





### **1.0 LANEWAYS** Scale Study

The following study compares the proposed laneways of the Section 75W against similarly scaled renowned laneways in Sydney, Melbourne. & Auckland.

This study demonstrates that the proposal is of similar and familiar scale to many successful laneways found in cities of similar cultural backgrounds and climatic conditions. Our proposal suggests a reduced building separation of 9m to achieve this laneway scale and resulting benefits is worthy of approval.







**MACQUARIE PARK SITE** 

ASH STREET

ANGEL PLACE

**KENSINGTON STREET** 









BARANGAROO\_SCOTCH ROW

HARDWARE LANE\_MELBOURNE

DEGRAVES STREET\_MELBOURNE VULCAN LANE\_AUCKLAND





### **1.0 LANEWAYS PRECEDENTS**









### 2.0 SOLAR ACCESS Daylight Comparison

#### Solar Access

1. Provide amended plans/ additional information quantifying the solar access to the park and laneways on the winter solstice (21 June), comparing the approved and proposed scheme in terms of area and duration of solar access.

The following sun access diagrams show the difference in impacts between the approved Concept Plan scheme and that of the Section 75W proposal.

Whilst we have provided the required winter solstice diagrams, we have also added the Summer & Equinox periods in order to assess the impacts throughout the year.

#### Key observations Winter:

a. Reduced daylight access to park for 3hours (9am-11am).b. Increased daylight access to park over 5hour period during the day(12pm-5pm)

c. Improved daylight access to park through the high-priority lunchtime hours (12pm-2pm)

d. Proportion of daylight access is increased due to larger park size in comparison with the proposed scheme.
e. Increased daylight access to Plaza (overall increase of 3756sqm of area with daylight access throughout duration of 21st June, from hours 9am-5pm)

f. No solar access at lunch time peak-usage period with the approved scheme













