

---

**From:** Graham Brooks <grahambrooks@gbaheritage.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, 17 July 2020 12:53 PM  
**To:** Natali Boskovska  
**Cc:** Brian Zulaikha; Luke Johnson; Matt Inch; George Robinson  
**Subject:** Re: 200703 - Brewery Yard - SSSA Update

Hi Natali

Thank you for instructing the architects to amend the Roof and Level 6 plans over Building 22/23 to reflect the remainder of the architectural drawings.

On behalf of the Design Integrity Panel members, I can now confirm that these revised architectural drawings reflect the recommendations made by the Panel in our April 2020 Report.

Kind regards  
Graham

On Fri, 17 Jul 2020 at 12:00, Natali Boskovska <[natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au](mailto:natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au)> wrote:

Thanks Graham,

Apologies there was an error on the roof plan. Please find attached amended roof plan and Level 6 to match.

Can you please confirm this is in line with recommendation from the Design Integrity Panel.

Kind regards,



**Natali Boskovska** Project Manager  
[natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au](mailto:natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au)

**T:** +61 2 8256 0500 **D:** +61 2 8256 0548 **M:** +61 429 158 933  
Level 5, 9 Castlereagh Street, Sydney, NSW, 2000 **W:** [www.johnstaff.com.au](http://www.johnstaff.com.au)

**Legal Disclaimer**

This email and any files attached to it are confidential and are intended solely for the attention and use of the named addressee. Please notify the sender immediately by reply email if you have received this email by mistake and promptly delete this email from your system. Unauthorised use of this email is prohibited. The sender makes no representation or warranty in respect to the accuracy, currency or misinterpretation of the information herein, and excludes all warranties to the greatest extent permitted by law. Unless specifically indicated, this email does not constitute formal advice or commitment by the sender or Johnstaff Projects Pty Ltd or its subsidiaries. Views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, and are not necessarily the views of Johnstaff Projects Pty Ltd or its subsidiaries. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, distorted in transmission, incomplete or contain viruses. As a result the sender does not accept liability for any loss or damage that may arise as a result of this email transmission.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** Graham Brooks <[grahambrooks@gbaheritage.com](mailto:grahambrooks@gbaheritage.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 16 July 2020 5:44 PM  
**To:** Natali Boskovska <[natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au](mailto:natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au)>  
**Cc:** Brian Zulaikha <[brian@tzc.com.au](mailto:brian@tzc.com.au)>; Luke Johnson <[Luke.Johnson@architectus.com.au](mailto:Luke.Johnson@architectus.com.au)>; Matt Inch <[matt.inch@johnstaff.com.au](mailto:matt.inch@johnstaff.com.au)>  
**Subject:** Re: 200703 - Brewery Yard - SDA Update

Hi Natali

I have now examined the drawings related to the Items referred to in your email, cross referenced to the Panels Recommendations of 9 April 2020.

On behalf of the Design Integrity Panel members, I can confirm that the recommendations contained on page 9 of the Panel Report have been considered and addressed in the amended material provided in table format by Johnstaff on 15 July 2020.

The only exception is amended roof plan drawing DA1109 Issue D, in which the expression of the profile and falls of the eastern end of the roof over buildings 22/23 does not conform to that illustrated in the other amended architectural drawings.

Kind regards

Graham

On Wed, 15 Jul 2020 at 15:00, Natali Boskovska <[natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au](mailto:natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au)> wrote:

Hi All,

As per my earlier emails to Graham see below the summary of the Design Integrity Panel's recommendations and how we have incorporated the recommendations. Please refer to the attached document also which includes the updated drawings and additional information.

Ref	Description in DIP report	Recommendation	Incorporation
1	Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the	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	Tzannes have provided an alternative design to address the amended roof recommendation over Building 22/23, included specifically within revised drawings DA1108_RevD, DA1009_RevD,

	building type and location will be achieved? (Page 4) & Recommendation (Page 9)	and eastern access stair over the additional floor in that location.	DA2000_RevC, DA2002_RevE, DA2003_RevC, DA3000_RevE, DA3001_RevE and DA3003_RevE.
2	Penetrations into the northern façade of Building 23 for floor by floor access to the new external stair tower (DA 3002/D) (Page 5)	Detailed architectural drawings showing how the window openings will be enlarged and lined for the new external stair.	Please refer to item 2 in the attached. Detailed drawings were develop during the last design phase by our specialist architectural consultant, Apex. The details can be found at: <a href="https://johnstaff.sharefile.com/d-sdd6f3d91e78446db">https://johnstaff.sharefile.com/d-sdd6f3d91e78446db</a> . Please note that the detail of the windows will be further developed during the DD phase.
3	Removal of one (central) of the three large coal hoppers from Building 30 (DA 3000D) (Page 6)	The Panel members called for some form of future interpretation to celebrate the presence and role of the third hopper	It is proposed to install a mesh form that will mimic the removed hopper which is shown on DA1104_RevE
4	Recommendation (Page 9)	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.	Tzannes have adopted the recommendation within revised drawings DA1106_RevE. The floor plate has been reduced.
5	Recommendation (Page 9)	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.	To respond to this recommendation, an additional interpretation zone is proposed for the installation of large scale dramatic and evocative photos of the existing hoppers. The panels are to be installed externally, on the northern and southern wall of the existing chimney tower at ground level at the northern elevation. The installation will enable visitors to observe the photo installations and view the remaining hoppers through the northern glazed wall.

As advised we need to respond to DPIE by COB tomorrow to achieve the timeframe requested by DPIE. My understanding is that DPIE are just looking for an email confirmation that the recommendations made by the panel have been considered/addressed. Please let me know if there is anything else that we can provide to help receive the email confirmation ASAP?

Kind regards,



**Natali Boskovska** Project Manager  
[natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au](mailto:natali.boskovska@johnstaff.com.au)

**T:** +61 2 8256 0500 **D:** +61 2 8256 0548 **M:** +61 429 158 933  
Level 5, 9 Castlereagh Street, Sydney, NSW, 2000 **W:** [www.johnstaff.com.au](http://www.johnstaff.com.au)