

## Panel Recommendation Report Design Integrity Panel Meeting 20 March 2020

### **Brewery Yard, Central Park, Chippendale Alterations , Additions and Adaptive Re-use.**

#### **Panel Members**

- Graham Brooks – Director at GBA Heritage;
- Brian Zulaikha - Director at Tonkin Zulaikha Greer Architects
- Luke Johnson – Principal at Architectus

Due to the prevailing COVID-19 restrictions and government recommendations, Graham Brooks and Luke Johnson participated in both the site inspection and the meeting via ZOOM video link.

#### **Purpose of the Design Integrity Panel**

MP 06\_0171, as modified, is a Concept Plan Approval applying to the Central Park site (formally CUB Broadway) which permits the construction of a mixed-use precinct. The Concept Plan sets the planning framework for the future development of the site. The Concept Plan remains in force as per clause 3B, Schedule 2 of Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation (Savings, Transitional and Other Provisions) 2017.

Statement of Commitment 3 of the approved Concept Plan requires a Design Integrity Panel to be established to oversee the development of proposals on certain blocks within the Central Park development, including Block 4B.

The Design Integrity Panel is therefore established with the purpose of fulfilling this commitment and ensuring that the proposed development exhibits design excellence.

#### **The Site**

Central Park (formerly Frasers Broadway/CUB Broadway) is located on the southern edge of the Sydney CBD. The site is in proximity to Central Station, Broadway Shopping Centre, the University of Technology, Sydney and the University of Notre Dame.

The Brewery Yard site is located at Block 4B on the Frasers Broadway site in Chippendale (see Figure 1). The Brewery complex comprises seven elements including the:

- Filtration Building (Building 22);
- Malt Silos (Building 23);
- Staircase Block (Building 25);
- Substation (Building 26);
- Old Boiler House (Building 30);
- Chimney Stack (26); and
- Brewery Yard (52).

Approval was granted on 15 May 2012 under MP 10\_0217 for alterations and additions to the existing Brewery Yard buildings for retail and commercial uses, and public domain works. The development was proposed to be staged and the first has been constructed in accordance with the consent. The stages comprise the following:

- Stage 1: construction of associated plant related to the approved Central Thermal Plant including cooling towers and metal enclosure to the roof of the Old Boiler House, external chimney flutes, reuse of chimney stack and stairs and air ducts within the Brewery Yard (Stage Complete).



## The Stage 2 Project

The Development Application (DA) seeks approval for the following development:

- adaptive reuse of the Brewery Yard buildings for the purpose of commercial premises, accommodating 6,386m<sup>2</sup> of GFA.
- demolition of some internal walls and structures;
- removal of brewery machinery and structures including:
  - one of the three metal coal hoppers and six of the eight malt silos in their entirety;
  - partial removal of two of the remaining malt silos with the works limited to Level 3 and above;
- external additions within the southern portion including a reduction to the floor to ceiling heights and the removal of the Level 5 ceiling to accommodate two levels above, including an additional storey above the existing parapet;
- inclusion of heritage interpretation/display areas;
- demolition and reinstatement of the fire stairwell between Building 22 and Building 26;
- introduction of a full-height glazed façade on the northern elevation of Building 30;
- addition of an external fire stair connecting to the northern elevation;
- inclusion of a new roof; and
- external public domain works within the forecourt.

## Presentation to the Panel

The meeting commenced with a general site orientation inspection before returning to Tzannes office for the presentation and discussion.

The project architect, Alec Tzannes of Tzannes and Associates made a presentation to the Design Review panel. The presentation:

- Included, but did not discuss in any detail the 2012 Final Preferred Project Report drawings and the proposed Stage 2 demolition drawings that had been contained in Appendix C of the SEE report.
- Provided an overview of the heritage significance of the building;
- Provided an overview of the existing approval currently in force on the site for the adaptive reuse of the building;
- Explained the design rationale for the project; and
- Explained the specific design responses that are proposed to respond to the heritage constraints of the project.

The Panel members were not given access to any detailed feasibility material. Comments made by the Architects and Client representatives were limited to the extent that all of the additional floor areas contained in the Stage 2 proposal were required to make the project economically viable.

The architect and project team were then available for the Design Integrity Panel to answer any questions that they may have on the proposed development. The presentation and question session was observed by a staff member of the DPIE.

Given the scale and complexity of the project, the Panel members subsequently spend a considerable amount of time reviewing the submitted drawings in detailed and held two subsequent discussions in the process of completing this report.

## **Matters Considered**

As per the Panel brief, , as set out in the Ethos Urban *Response to Submissions*, dated 20 December 2019 in reviewing the development application, the following decisions were formulated by the Panel Members:

### **1. Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved?**

1. The Panel agreed that a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location has been achieved.
2. The Panel did recommend that the proposed roof addition over Buildings 22 and 23 could be reviewed by the architect with the intent being to achieve a more elegant design for the main roof and eastern access stair over the additional floor in that location.

### **2. Whether the form and external appearance of the building will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain?**

1. The Panel agreed that the overall renovation, conservation and adaptive re-use of the building will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain.
2. The space within the Brewery Yard, as enclosed on the south and east, which has been inaccessible to the public for security reasons will be upgraded and included in to the overall public domain.
3. The immediate sections of the public domain around the northern, eastern and southern facades, which have also been physically inaccessible, will be incorporated into the adjoining public domain.
4. The most dramatic improvement in the wider public domain of both the adjoining parklands, streets and public footpaths will be generated by the upgrade and rejuvenation of the industrial buildings as a whole and the backdrop they provide to all of the nearby public spaces.

### **3. Whether the building meets sustainable design principles in terms of sunlight, natural ventilation, wind, reflectivity, visual and acoustic privacy, safety and security and resource, energy and water efficiency?**

1. To the extent that it was discussed, the Panel agrees that the building project meets sustainable design principles in terms of the identified criteria.

### **4. Whether the proposed removal of heritage fabric and reorganisation of the internal structures within the Brewery Yard building are appropriate, having regard to the issues raised by Council and Heritage NSW?**

1. Unfortunately, the presentation to Panel did not include the proposed demolition drawings, although these were contained in Appendix C of the SEE report. Due to the access issues related to COVID-19 restrictions, the site inspection did not include the interiors. The demolition drawings were reviewed during subsequent panel discussions,

The various issues identified by the Council and Heritage Council are set out below:

**Removal of the single line of roof trusses and one of the existing roof level towers from Building 22/23 to accommodate the proposed two new floors. (DA 3000/D and 3002/D)**

1. This matter was discussed at length. The key issue for the applicant is the need to gain the additional floor space at levels 5 and 6 across the whole of the length of Buildings 22 and 23, including direct access via the lift near the main foyer. In order to achieve the additional floor space, a new Level 5 floor is to be introduced, and in order to create sufficient head height for the new Level 5, the roof trusses are proposed to be removed. The new Level 6 space extends to about half the width of level 5 below, as it is set well back from the southern façade and below a sloping roofline. The design of the roofline of the new addition has been carefully modelled to avoid throwing any new shadows onto the nearby parkland open space.
2. In addition to these upper level internal changes, the proposed design also includes extensive removal and/or reworking of internal floors, particularly within Buildings 23 (DA 3001/D)
3. In order to achieve these new floor levels, a considerable amount of existing historic fabric is proposed to be removed, particularly the entire set of roof trusses over Buildings 22 and 23 and all associated roofing and one of the small towers that projects beyond the existing roof near the western end of Building 23. In addition there are a number of small areas of flooring at Levels 3 and 4 which are to be removed for the new floor structures.
4. The only reason for the removal of the roof trusses and projecting tower was to achieve the additional floor space at levels 5 and 6.
5. An alternative option was discussed that deleted the new Level 6 but raised the existing timber roof trusses and associated roofing to the same level as the currently proposed southern roof slope, thereby staying within the required shadow control angle. While not discussed in terms of final dimensioning, this option could provide a reasonable head height clearance under the relocated trusses for Level 5.
6. After considerable discussion, the Panel members accepted that the removal of the roof structure etc over Buildings 22 and 23 was justified as the only means to achieve the additional floor areas a Levels 5 and 6.
7. This decision was primarily supported on the grounds that it was not visible from the surrounding parklands and pedestrian areas. Equally, with the exception of longer distance views, the new roof composition would be particularly visible from the open spaces to the south and east of the industrial buildings.

**Penetrations into the northern façade of Building 23 for floor by floor access to the new external stair tower (DA 3002/D)**

1. Enlarging of the panel of windows on the northern façade of Building 23 in order to provide connection and access to the new external stair is a satisfactory conservation response in an adaptive re-use project for a large redundant industrial building. Its success will be in the detailed manner that the alterations are designed and installed.
2. The Panel members supported this intervention, but called for detailed architectural drawings showing how the window openings will be enlarged and lined.

**Removal of one (central) of the three large coal hoppers from Building 30 (DA 3000D)**

1. This issue was also discussed at length during the meeting. City Council has expressed concerns about the loss of such a large scale item of industrial heritage within the building.
2. There is no doubt that the removal of the centre coal hopper will reduce the capacity to demonstrate and appreciate the full scale of the industrial nature and operation of this part of Building 30.

3. A review of the 2012 drawings with the Stage 2 drawings (2012 dwg 3001/H against DA 2000/D) reveals the insertion of three new floors into the upper space of the very large Coal Hopper Hall to gain additional floor space for the project. In addition the approved floor at Level 2 (2012 dwg), which is now Level 1 on DA 3000/D, is to be extended the full width to the glazed northern wall. The impact arising from the proposed insertion of these new floor levels is generated by the proposal to completely remove the huge central hopper to provide internal pedestrian connection and circulation to the new Levels 2, 3 and 3 Mezzanine.
4. During the meeting, the Panel did not fully appreciate that the only reason for the proposed removal of the central hopper was to accommodate newly proposed (Stage 2) floor levels. The focus of the discussions was how to mitigate the proposed demolition.
5. Two options were discussed, being the retention of the central hopper or the reconstruction of the inverted pyramidal section of the base of the hopper, which would in turn be fixed to the underside Level 3 as an interpretive device. There was only limited support within the Panel for the interpretive reconstruction option in the event that the removal of the centre hopper went ahead.
6. Unfortunately, the scale and close proximity of the three hoppers to each other, means that there is no room between them for pedestrians to gain access to the proposed new Level 3 mezzanine and the new floor at Level 3, in Building 30. The additional floor space generated by the insertion of the two floor areas, and the Level 3 mezzanine, into the volume of Building 30 was described as an important component of the viability of the adaptive re-use project.
7. The Panel members considered that the creation a different form of adapted industrial space, when compared with the massive scale of the existing volume, was an acceptable direction for the project. Nevertheless, the Panel members called for some form of future interpretation to celebrate the presence and role of the third hopper. This recommendation was generated during subsequent discussions by the Panel members.

#### **Removal of the group of concrete silos from the western end of Building 23 (DA 3001/D)**

1. The need to remove the silos has been generated by the realignment of floor levels and provide higher quality retail space at Ground Floor Level in Building 23.
2. The Panel members were advised that Structural Engineering investigations had also determined the concrete structure that comprised the silos were in poor condition and needed to be removed.
3. The Panel members accepted this advice and determined that the existing silos should be removed, on the proviso that the proposed interpretive reconstruction is undertaken.

#### ***5. Whether the proposed reconstruction and introduction of internal structural elements within the Brewery Yard building are appropriate, having regard to the issues raised by Council and Heritage NSW?***

1. Unfortunately, the Panel was not provided with a set of as-built element drawings that delineated the extent of reconstruction and the introduction of new structural elements, both internally and externally related directly to this Stage 2 Proposal v what was already approved as part of the Stage 1 approval. Due to the access issues related to COVID-19 restrictions, the site inspection did not include the interiors.

Issues Raised

**Reorganisation of the floor levels internally for additional mezzanine floors in Building 30 (DA 3000/D)** – three issues sufficient setback, partial infill of dramatic internal industrial volume, impact on the visibility of the hoppers through the glazed façade when viewed from the nearby external public realm.

1. The Panel was advised that the additional floor and mezzanine areas within the major void space at the northern end of Building 30 was an important aspect of the feasibility of the adaptive re-use project. The architectural intention for the Hopper Hall is to provide as exciting a space to be experienced internally while enabling as much visibility into the building from the outside as possible, through the large glazed wall.
2. The Panel members reviewed a detailed study of the visibility of the hoppers from the public realm outside the building in relation to the extent of the various new floors internally and their proximity to the glazed wall.
3. It is apparent that the introduction of any new floor levels in the Hopper Hall, above that which already exists, will have a detrimental impact on views to the underside of the three hoppers, through the new glazed wall, from the opposite side of the adjacent street.
4. The Panel considered that the internal views, from Levels 2, 3 and 3 Mezzanine, inside the altered Hopper Hall would be a dramatic and spectacular experience for the occupants, subject to some reduction in the floor plate of Level 3 Mezzanine, while external views into the Hopper Hall would be inevitably degraded should these extra floor plates go ahead.
5. To compensate the loss in views into the Hopper Hall, the Panel recommends the installation of several dramatic and evocative photos as interpretation panels be installed externally in accordance with an amended Interpretation Plan.

#### **Partial reconstruction of the silos in Building 23**

1. The Panel members accepted the need for the interpretive reconstruction to take place, noting that the extent of the reconstruction should be as great as reasonably practical.

#### ***6. Do the proposed additions to the building appropriately relate to the predominant scale and grain of the setting?***

Issues Raised

##### **New External Stair**

1. The Panel members considered that the proposed external stair connected to the north-west corner of Building 23 was an acceptable intervention and related to the scale and industrial grain of the setting.

##### **New Floor space roof form on the roof of Building 22/23 (DA 3000-3002/D)**

1. After considerable discussion, a majority of the Panel members accepted that the new roof composition over Buildings 22 and 23 acceptably extended the creative 3D dynamic of the existing roofscape, which is largely characterised by the new sculptural composition of the Trigen plant. This acceptance is partly based on the fact that the new roof addition would be largely imperceptible when viewed from most of the surrounding external open space.
2. The minority opinion expressed concern that this new element resulted in the only remaining part of the original roofscape of the building being the four-part clearstorey section over Building 26. Given that the overall building is looked down upon by a very large number of surrounding buildings, the final composition of the roofscape would benefit from the retention of the original roof over Buildings 22 and 23. With only such a relatively small retention of original roofscape in the proposed project, there was a danger that the historic building would be reduced in appearance to a collection of brick facades.

3. After some debate, the majority view was accepted, subject to a revised design of the roofscape to give it a more elegant appearance.

#### **Additional Height to the eastern stair tower and introduction of the new Level 5 (DA 3000-3002/D)**

1. The Panel members accepted that the additional height was required if the additional floor levels were to be added to Building 22/23.
2. They requested that the modelling of the additional height be part of the review of the composition of the adjoining new roof.

#### **Design changes to the large glazed panel on the northern façade of Building 30 (DA 3000/D)**

1. There was considerable discussion of the options for glazing of the large northern window opening on Building 30, bearing in mind that this is not an original feature but the result of an earlier demolition event. In particular the discussion focussed on the so-called “bird’s mouth” sloping setback section of the top of the glazed wall.
2. The decision to steepen the angle of the “bird’s mouth” glazing seems to have been partly driven by a need to provide head room for the newly introduced Level 3 mezzanine floor. (see dotted red line of current bird’s mouth glazing on DA 3000/D).
3. In general the Panel considered that the current proposal for a steeper inwards angle on the upper section of the overall glazed wall was a superior outcome than the current flatter slope, irrespective of the internal outcome for the Hopper Hall. This is despite the preference stated by the City Council in their Response.
4. The second issue raised by Council in this context was the apparent use of excessive additional steel framing in the glazed wall, which could detract from the dynamic current composition. The Panel members did not consider that this was a likely outcome of the current design approach.

#### **Revision to the main entry canopy in the internal courtyard**

1. The Panel members considered that the revised design for a smaller canopy was a good outcome.

#### **Introduction of new window glazing generally**

1. The existing building has been changed so often that there is no consistent pattern of surviving window joinery or composition of sashes.
2. The Panel members agreed that the complex variety of window detailing should be retained in the adapted building and generally accepted the architectural approach of a consistent sub-frame and a case by case design and materiality of the actual new window framing and glazing.

#### ***7. Do the proposed additions retain appropriate views towards significant elements of the building?***

##### **Roof addition**

1. The Panel members agreed that the volumetric controls established for the proposed roof addition over Buildings 22 and 23 has been very carefully modelled to avoid any additional shadow impact and that it would generally not be a prominent or even visible component of the building, when viewed from the surrounding ground level open spaces. Therefore it retains appropriate views to the historic buildings.



**8. Do the additions exemplify design excellence in their own right?**

1. The Panel members agreed that, subject to the recommended options analyses outlined above, the additions to the historic buildings exemplify design excellence.

**9. Are the proposed materials appropriate?**

2. The Panel members agreed that the proposed materials are appropriate for the project.

**Recommendations**

1. The Panel members recommended that, subject to the resolution of the additional analyses and options outlined above, which should be settled in a round of informal discussions with the applicant, the proposal as presented to the Panel achieves design excellence and should therefore be granted the relevant consents to enable it to move forward in an expedited manner.
2. The Panel recommended that the floor plate of the proposed Level 3 Mezzanine (DA 1106/D) be pulled back away from the retained Hoppers to match the separation created for Level 3 (DA 1105/D) in order to enable the full scale of the Hoppers to be more widely visible and appreciated from within the adapted space of the Hopper Hall.
3. The Panel considered that the internal views, from Levels 2, 3 and 3 Mezzanine, inside the altered Hopper Hall would be a dramatic and spectacular experience for the occupants, while external views into the Hopper Hall would be inevitably degraded should the proposed extra floor plates go ahead. To compensate the loss in external views into the Hopper Hall, the Panel recommends the installation of several large scale dramatic and evocative photos as interpretation panels be installed externally in a location that enables the visitor to see both the photos and through the glazed wall into the Hopper Hall. The project Interpretation Plan is to be amended to suit this requirement.
4. The amendment proposed by the architects following the Panel Meeting (17007 SK 23/A) to create a hipped eastern end of the proposed new roof over Building 22/23, be adopted and incorporated into the project.

Signed



Graham Brooks – Director at GBA Heritage;



Brian Zulaikha - Director at Tonkin Zulaikha Greer Architects



Luke Johnson – Principal at Architectus