

5 February 2020

218062

Anthony Witherdin
Director, Key Sites Assessment
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Level 22, 380 Pitt Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Attention: Lewis Demertzi,

Dear Mr Withderdin,

**RE: RESPONSE TO THE REJECTION OF RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS
Block 4B Central Park Adaptive Reuse (SSD-9374) + S75W CENTRAL PARK CONCEPT PLAN
MODIFICATION 16 (MP06_0171)**

This letter has been prepared by Ethos Urban on behalf of the proponent, IP Generation, in relation to the adaptive reuse of Block 4B within Central Park (SSD-9374) and Section 75W Modification Application (MOD 16) to Project Approval MP06_0171, relating to the adaptive reuse of Block 4B.

The application was publicly exhibited between 10 and 31 October 2019. During the exhibition period, a number of submissions were received by the relevant agencies. Of particular importance, the City of Sydney Council submitted an objection to the modification and requested additional information and design amendments to the proposal be submitted, with a specific focus on issues perceived by Council's heritage team.

To address the comments made by Council in their objection letter, a meeting was held at City of Sydney Council on 5 December 2019 in which the applicant and associated consultant team attended. The meeting discussed each issue presented in Council's objection letter in great detail, which resulted in some design changes to the overall development proposed as part of the modification.

A formal Response to Submissions letter was submitted to the Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Environment (DPIE) via the Major Projects portal on 20 December 2019 which addressed the changes to the modification in response to Council's issues, and also responded to general comments presented by the other relevant agencies.

This letter has been prepared in response to a further letter dated 16 January 2020 issued by DPIE in relation to a request for further clarification before the previously submitted Response to Submissions can be formally accepted.

Table 1 summarises the key issues raised in the letter dated 16 January 2020 submissions and the applicant's response. It should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

- Attachment A** – Revised Architectural plans prepared by Tzannes and Associates dated 3 February 2020.
- Attachment B** – Additional Traffic Response prepared by GTA dated 31 January 2020.

1.0 Response to further clarification

Table 1 addresses further matters raised by DPIE in the correspondence dated 16 January 2020.

Table 1 Response to further clarification

Item	Response
Design Excellence	
<p>The Department’s request for the proposal to be presented to the Design Integrity Panel (DIP) remains outstanding. You are advised that as a requirement of the Concept Approval, you are required to provide evidence that the proposal has been presented to the DIP, including a report summarising any recommendations of the DIP and how they have been addressed.</p>	<p>The Design Integrity Panel (DIP) has not been constituted for some time and many of the recent development approvals have been granted notwithstanding the fact that the designs had not been reviewed by a DIP. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) MP10_0217 – Brewery Buildings b) MP11-0089 – Block 3A c) MP11_0090 – Blocks 3B, 3C & 10 d) MP11_0091 – Blocks 6&7 e) SSD2012-5700 – Block 4S <p>In the case of the former Brewery Yard it was recognised that the design of the building was influenced by the heritage significance of the building as opposed to urban design and as such the proposal was influenced by discussions with DPIE officers at the time of assessment and the City of Sydney.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above we understand that DPIE would now like the current application to be reviewed by the DIP. Due to the panel not being constituted for many years, the original panel members are no longer available to undertake a peer review of the subject application. The applicant is therefore proposing to constitute a new panel to undertake a peer review.</p> <p>Given the heritage significance of the buildings, the following panel members are suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Graham Brooks – Director at GBA Architects;</i> • <i>One of the directors at Tonkin Zulaikha Greer:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Brian Zulaikha;</i> ○ <i>Tim Greer;</i> ○ <i>Peter Tonkin.</i> • <i>Luke Johnson – Principal at Architectus.</i> <p>The applicant would welcome further discussions with DPIE in relation to the above before approaching the suggested members to co-ordinate the panel review.</p>
Parking Bay	
<p>The RtS notes that discussions are currently occurring with the City of Sydney regarding the parking zones on the west side of Central Park Avenue and alternative loading and servicing arrangements within the site. The Department requests these revised arrangements are finalised prior to submission of the RtS for consideration in the assessment.</p>	<p>The applicant has entered into discussions with City of Sydney Council regarding an on-street primary loading and servicing solution for the site. Specifically, this is proposed to involve the conversion of existing short-term indented parking spaces on the west side of Central Park Avenue, to a loading zone during business hours. While City of Sydney officers have not raised any objection to either an on-street parking solution, the project team has been advised that any proposed changes to on-street parking restriction would need to be referred to Local Pedestrian, Cycling and Traffic Calming Committee (LPCTCC).</p> <p>As such, the applicant is proposing make a detailed application, outlining the proposed signage changes and justification of the proposed arrangements (including any impacts), to the LPCTCC following approval of SSD-9374. The LPCTCC detailed design submission requirement would be expected via a</p>

Item	Response
	<p>condition of consent to be actioned prior to occupation of the building. It is noted that the LPCTCC approval process typically takes a minimum of six weeks and is not a practical requirement of the Response to Submissions process.</p> <p>Refer to Attachment B, prepared by GTA Consultants, which includes a summary of the loading demand assessment completed and the various arrangements investigated during the project and management strategy proposed, in order to justify a single 12-metre long on-street loading bay to service the development. This would form the basis of the future LPCTCC application.</p> <p>It is noted that if the application to convert the parking spaces to a loading zone was unsuccessful, then the alternative of loading within the Brewery Yard during restricted hours would be an alternative solution to the loading of the site.</p>
<p>Removal of coal hopper in building 30</p>	
<p>Provide further clarification and justification regarding the practical and commercial constraints considered to necessitate the removal of the coal hopper.</p>	<p>There are 3 existing former coal hoppers within Building 30, the northern-most building within the Brewery Buildings. These hoppers are located in a row with an east-west alignment, on the southern side of the building at the roof level. The two outer hoppers will be retained in situ and will facilitate the meaningful interpretation of this significant element. The central hopper is required to be demolished to enable practical occupation of this space and allow for the adaptive re-use of this building through the provision of additional floor space. Further, the removal of the central hopper increases interaction with the remaining coal hoppers by providing for up-close viewing and walking paths between the two outer hoppers across their full approximate 10m height.</p> <p>The Brewery Yard is the final site within the Central Park Precinct which has not been redeveloped. The group of buildings comprising the Brewery Yard have undergone substantial alterations since its original construction including the introduction of the coal hoppers in the 1950s. There have been a number of previous uses investigated for the Brewery Yard including hotel, commercial and retail. All of the previous applications have not been pursued due to the viability of the project and the limited floor area within the building. The current proposal has reviewed options to increase the floor area in other sections of the building however due to the constraints with overshadowing and the already constructed trigeneration plant, the additional floors were considered necessary incorporations within Building 30.</p> <p>The previous approval incorporated a large void at the northern section of Building 30, above the first floor. The current proposal includes additional floor space extending Levels 2 and 3 to the glazed northern façade and a mezzanine floor on Level 4 setback from the façade. The total amount of additional floor space gained through the current design is approximately 737m². Following comments from City of Sydney regarding the hoppers appreciation from street views, Tzannes has provided an updated design which redistributes the floor slabs to maximise the visual amenity of the hoppers which has reduced the floor area to approximately 690m² (refer to Attachment A).</p> <p>The additional floor space has been incorporated into the design due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure the project is financially viable; and • Enhancing the interpretation of the hoppers by allowing for closer interaction with the heritage fabric.

Item	Response
	<p>The Brewery Yard proposes a flexible commercial use to the site which has arguably attracted the most tenant interest due to the heritage fabric and flexible floor space layouts to suit a range of commercial floor plates. Tenants have been enthusiastic for the coal hopper features in the upper levels. The retention of the central coal hopper will have a significant adverse effect on the viability of the project by preventing access to Building 30 from level 1 upwards, and the loss of approximately 690m² of lettable area.</p> <p>The owner of the site (IP Generation) has conducted an extensive analysis of the commercial viability of the project. The income earned from the upper floors in Building 30 underpins IP Generation's ability to conduct the development, which includes over \$10m of heritage restoration works. These include the façade restoration, coal hopper restoration, grain silo re-interpretation, and heritage interpretation zones. The Brewery Yard building is intended by IP Generation to be the heritage focal point of the entire award-winning Central Park Precinct, however the heritage restoration works required to achieve this milestone are extensive. Unfortunately, the financial impact due to the loss of this lettable area is enough that the project would no longer be commercially viable.</p>
Plans	
<p>Attachment C – Revised Architectural Plans, contains a basement plan only. Please review and provide complete Architectural plans containing all proposed changes</p>	<p>Amended plans have been provided at Attachment A which include the full suite of updated architectural documentation for the amended design. The new design has been informed by the outcomes of the meeting with Council on 5 December 2019.</p>

We trust that this information is sufficient for the Department to formally accept the RTS submitted on 20 December 2019 and begin to finalise their assessment for determination. Should you have any additional queries please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely,



Julia Moiso
 Urbanist
 02 9956 6962
 jmoiso@ethosurban.com



Jennie Buchanan
 Director, Planning
 02 9956 6962
 jbuchanan@ethosurban.com