

DESIGN EXCELLENCE COMPETITION JURY REPORT

City of Parramatta



Phase 2 Competition for Architectural Design
Block H, Precinct B, Wentworth Point
21 November, 2019



Acknowledgement

Jury Report template has been prepared by City Plan Strategy and Development for the City of Parramatta Council.

Report compiled from competition entries and jury comments by:

Greg Dowling, BAS (Env Pl) M Urb Des (Syd) MPIA,
Dowling Urban Pty Ltd, Suite 302 4-14 Buckingham St, Surry Hills NSW 2010.

Table of Amendments

Revision	Date	Amendments
A	12.12.2018	Prelim Draft
B	20.02. 2019	Jury conclusions and council comments
C	25.02.2019	Draft for Council adoption
D	10.04.2019	Draft final for Council Adoption
E	24.10.2019	Final for Council adoption
F	21.11.2019	Jury review and signoff

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	ii
Table of Amendments.....	ii
Summary	1
Competition Summary	1
PART A - Introduction.....	2
A1. Overview	2
PART B - Design Competition Overview	3
B1. Overview	3
B2. Participating Architectural Firms	3
B3. Jury Composition	3
B4. Technical Advisors	4
B5. Design Competition Timeline	4
B6. Requests for Information.....	4
PART C - Review of the Competition Entries.....	5
C1. Entry 1 - Bates Smart and Hargreaves Associates	5
C1.1 Overview	5
C1.2 Jury Evaluation	8
C2. Entry 2 - Durbach Block Jagers and Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture	10
C2.1 Overview	10
C2.2 Jury Evaluation	13
C3. Entry 3 - FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners	15
C3.1 Overview	15
C3.2 Response to Preliminary Jury Comments	17
C3.3 Jury Evaluation	19
PART D - DRAFT JURY RECOMMENDATION	23
D1. Draft Jury Recommendation - Winning Scheme	23
D2. Design Development and Conditions.....	23
PART E - DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	25
E1. Jury Recommendations for Design Development.....	25
E2. Design Response to Jury Recommendations	25
E3. Jury Feedback to Design Development.....	26
E4. Response to Jury Feedback	27
E5. Jury's Final Design Excellence Recommendations	31
E6. Supervision of Design Development	33
PART F - ENDORSEMENT BY COMPETITION JURY	34
Appendix 1: Preliminary Jury Comments	
Appendix 2: SLR Wind Assessment for Jury	
Appendix 3: Correspondence Schedule	
Appendix 4: Competition Brief	

Summary

Competition Summary

Site Address	Block H, Precinct B, Wentworth Point			
Site Legal Description	Lot 24 and Part Lot 11 DP 270778			
Project Name	"Block H"			
Competition Type	Invited Architectural Design Competition			
Proponent	Billbergia Pty Ltd			
Competition Manager	Greg Dowling, Dowling Urban Pty Ltd P 02 9516 4377, m 0407 404 898, e greg@dowlingurban.com.au			
Architectural Design Competition Competitors	Bates Smart and Hargreaves Associates Durbach Block Jaggers and Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners			
Competition Winner	FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners			
Technical Advisors	Town Planner: Greg Dowling, Dowling Urban Quantity Surveying: RLB, Stephen Mee Wind Engineering: SLR Structural, Mechanical and Electrical, Hydraulic and Fire Services, Façade Engineering, Lift Engineering and Flood Engineering: WSP Group			
Technical Advisors to Jury	Brendan Randles – Architecture and Urban Design Garth Paterson – Landscape Architecture and Urban Design			
Jury Members	City of Parramatta Council - City Architect – Kim Crestani Government Architect NSW – Paulo Macchia, Director Design Governance Proponent - Bob Nation AM, Design Advisor, Barangaroo Delivery Authority			
Key Competition Dates	13 July 2018 - Design Competition Brief endorsed by COPC 13 July 2018 – Design Competition Commencement (7 weeks) By arrangement - Briefing session for each Competitor (proponent only) Fourth week - Midpoint check and costings review (proponent only) 3 Sept 2018 - Lodgement date for Proposals to Competition Manager 5 Sept 2018 - Proposals issued to CoPC by Competition Manager 5 Sept 2018 - Proposals issued to Jury by Competition Manager 19 Sept 2018 - Presentation by Competitors to Jury 23 Nov 2018 - Representation of preferred scheme to Jury 20 Feb 2019 - Deliberation by jury and recommendation made to Proponent; 1 Feb 2019 - Formal appointment of successful Competitor; and 21 Nov 2019 – Design Excellence Jury Report endorsed by Jury 22 Nov 2019 - Jury report issued to CoP for endorsement			
Site Area	Approximately 30,800 m ² inclusive of foreshore linear and main parks			
Winning Scheme Summary Development Statistics	Statistic	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	
	GFA (Residential)	54,354 m ²	84,982 m ²	
	Max Height (storeys)	40 storeys	50 storeys	
	No. Apartments (approx.)	642 apartments	997 apartments	
	Apartment Mix	3 bedroom 35% 2 bedroom 35% 1 bedroom 30%	3 bedroom 35% 2 bedroom 35% 1 bedroom 30%	
	* as required by DCP to activate all public domain interfaces	Commercial	> 2,650 m ² *	> 2,650 m ² *
		Club	4,027 m ²	4,161 m ²
		Community/childcare	709 m ²	< 2,923 m ²
		Public open space	24,050 m ²	24,050 m ² + pool facility
	** includes existing parking	No. Parking Spaces (est.)	910 (res) 700 (non-res**)	1,334 (res) 700 (non-res)
	Construction Cost		\$ 700 M (approx..)	

PART A - Introduction

A1. Overview

This Jury Report provides a summary of the Architectural Design Excellence Competition undertaken by the Proponent, Billbergia Pty Ltd in relation to the site at **Block H, Precinct B, Wentworth Point**.

The purpose of this Jury Report is to inform the City of Parramatta Council on the competitive design process undertaken and the outcomes of the Architectural Design Excellence Competition for the site.

The Architectural Design Competition was conducted in accordance with a Competitive Design Process Brief dated 13th July 2018 (the "Brief") for two development scenarios (54,356 m² and 85,000 m² residential) which may be staged.

This Brief was endorsed by the City of Parramatta Council ("Council") and issued to all competition entrants on 13th July 2018. A copy of the Brief is at Appendix 4.

By way of background, in 2017, the Proponent sought expressions of interest from six selected architectural practices, from both Australia and overseas regarding their interest in competing in the design competition for a phase one concept. As a consequence, three of those architectural practices were selected by the Jury to proceed to a phase two competitive detailed design process which was undertaken in the form of an invited Architectural Design Competition. Three responses were received confirming their acceptance to the invitation to participate in the competition in alphabetic order:

- Bates Smart and Hargreaves Associates
- Durbach Block Jaggers and Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture
- FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners

The competition entrants had seven weeks to prepare their submission for the competition. The submissions were lodged with the Competition Manager on 3 September 2018 and each of the entrants presented their schemes to the Competition Jury on 19th Sept 2018.

At the conclusion of the Design Competition Jury Presentations, the Jury unanimously agreed that none of the three schemes presented achieved Design Excellence at this time. The Jury, however, believed that the scheme prepared by **FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners (FJMT+MSP)** had the potential to achieve Design Excellence.

The Jury requested that further information and design development be undertaken by FJMT+MSP to assist them in their assessment of Design Excellence. FJMT+MSP re-presented additional information and design development to the Jury on several occasions with the latest occurring on 14 October 2019.

Following further deliberation, the Jury unanimously agreed that the scheme presented by FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners exhibits design excellence. However, a number of design amendments which are set out in Part E of this report will need to be addressed at DA stage.

As the winner of this Design Competition, FJMT+MSP will be commissioned by the Proponent as the Project Architect and Landscape Architect for the Development Application for the redevelopment of the site.

As required by the Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines, this Jury Report will:

- Summarise the competition process incorporating a copy of the competition brief;
- Outline the assessment of the design merits of each of the entries;
- Present the jury's decision, including the rationale for the choice of a nominated design and how this exhibits design excellence; and
- Outline any recommended design amendments or propose conditions of development consent that are relevant to the achievement of design excellence.

This Jury Report has been endorsed by all Jury members (refer Part E) and will be submitted to the Proponent and the Consent Authority (City of Parramatta Council).

The Jury Report has been presented to City of Parramatta Council for endorsement.

PART B - Design Competition Overview

B1. Overview

The competitive design process was undertaken as an invited Phase Two Architectural Detailed Design Excellence Competition for two development scenarios (54,356 m2 and 85,000 m2 residential), with three competitors chosen by the Jury from a previous Phase One Concept Design Excellence Competition process.

The following has been undertaken as a part of the competitive design process:

A Competition Brief for two development scenarios (54,356 m2 and 85,000 m2 residential potentially staged) was prepared by Greg Dowling and endorsed by Council on 13 July 2018.

Three architectural firms were invited to participate in the competitive process (refer to Section B.2 below).

The Architectural Design Competition formally commenced on 13 July 2018.

A "mid-point review" progress session was held with each architectural firm midway through the competitive design process period in the fourth week by arrangement.

Each of the three competitors lodged a "Statement of Design Intent" 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 Jury and answered questions from the Panel.

Each scheme was assessed by the Jury and none were considered to achieve design excellence at this time. However, a preferred design was chosen as having the potential to achieve design excellence which the Jury then accepted after further information and design development.

The Panel also prepared a list of matters that need further design development during the next stage of the process.

The competitive design process was undertaken in an open and transparent manner.

B2. Participating Architectural Firms

The following architectural firms participated in the competitive design process:

- **Bates Smart and Hargreaves Associates**
- **Durbach Block Jagers and Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture**
- **FJMT and Martha Scwartz Partners**

B3. Jury Composition

Section [insert relevant section] of the Brief prescribed the composition of the Jury. The three (3) members were as follows:

Table 1 Competition Jury members

Organisation	Representative
City of Parramatta	Kim Crestani, City Architect
NSW Department of Planning and Environment, delegated to the Government Architect NSW	Paulo Macchia, Director Design Governance , Government Architect NSW
Proponent's Nominee	Bob Nation AM, Design Advisor, Barangaroo Delivery Authority

B4. Technical Advisors

Technical advisers were appointed to provide technical assistance and advice to the Jury as follows.

Table 2 Jury Technical Advisors

Discipline	Technical Advisors
Urban Design	Brendan Randles, Brendan Randles Architect
Landscape Architecture	Garth Paterson, Paterson Design Studio

Other technical advisers were appointed to provide advice to the Jury and competition entrants as listed below.

Table 2A General Technical Advisors

Discipline	Technical Advisors
Town Planning	Greg Dowling, Dowling Urban
Quantity Surveying	Stephen Mee, RLB
Wind Engineering	SLR
Structural; Mechanical and Electrical; Hydraulic and Fire Services; Façade; Lift and Flood Engineering	WSP Group

B5. Design Competition Timeline

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

Table 3 Key Competition Dates

Date	Action
13 July 2018	City of Parramatta Council endorsed the Competition Brief
By Arrangement	Initial briefing session with Competitors
13 July 2018	Commencement Date of Design Competition, brief issued to Competitors
Fourth week	Mid-Point Review Date with questions answered at Proponent's offices (Council Observer invited to be present)
3 Sept 2018	Final Submissions Lodgement Day
19 Sept 2018	Presentation Date by Competitors of proposed design
23 Nov 2018	Re-presentation of preferred scheme
20 February 2019	Design Decision Date by which submissions evaluated with a recommendation for formal appointment of successful Competitor
5 September 2019	Re-presentation of design development and response to Jury comments
14 October 2019	Re-presentation of final preferred scheme
21 November 2019	Completion of subject Jury Report and issue to Council

B6. Requests for Information

A protocol for the provision of technical assistance to competitors and for the timely response to questions and queries was established, as indicated in the Competition Brief.

Competitors were invited to forward any questions regarding the Architectural Design Competition to the Competition Manager, with responses then provided to all Competitors to ensure transparency and fairness. The Council agreed to alter the brief to clarify the treatment of building height and view sharing in relationship to preferred location of towers of which competitors were informed. Further information can be found in Appendix 3: Correspondence Schedule.

PART C - Review of the Competition Entries

Please note that the following entries, numbered 1 to 3 are in no particular order.

C1. Entry 1 - Bates Smart and Hargreaves Associates

C1.1 Overview



Image: 85k Scenario - View from Bennelong Bridge

The Bates Smart and Hargreaves Associated proposal features two towers to create a sculptural composition on the skyline, celebrating the town centre's waterfront precinct; while maximising water views and existing residential views.




Image: 54k Scenario and 85k Scenario Comparison

The two triangular towers are arranged to alleviate density and also maximise sun and views while retaining outlooks from existing apartments. Bases of the towers taper inwards organically to minimise the buildings footprints while maximising park space, and sliced tops create a sculptural composition on the skyline, creating an identity for the Wentworth Point Town Centre waterfront. Visually, the towers appear to 'organically grow' out of the park.

The residential component is accommodated within two triangular towers located to the north-east and south-east corners of the site and adjacent to the waterfront. The proposed southern tower has 58 storeys (55 residential) whilst the northern tower has 39 storeys (36 residential). Apartments have been designed to maximise residential amenity, 66% of which share expansive waterfront views whilst 33% have views towards the park and the West.





Image: 54k Alternate Scenario and 85k Alternate Rotated Towers Scenario

Two non-conforming alternate scenes for the two scenarios were submitted as shown above which provided for different approaches to view sharing from existing tower apartments and development staging.

The forms are sculpted at the base of the towers to maximise park area. Each tower has a presence on the street whereby the southern tower residential lobby is accessed from Footbridge Boulevard and flanked with retail activating the park. The form of the waterfront edge peels away at the northern most corner, allowing the north tower to be expressed to the ground where its lobby and entry is accessed via Burroway Road with retail tenancies at park level to provide activation and a sculpture garden adjacent to the community pavilion which is nestled into a forest.



Images: View sharing analysis from Block C and block E and 85k Scenario Site Model in context

The park is conceived as a new 'urban common' within which multiple activities can occur. Desire lines are expressed as direct & wide multi purpose pedestrian boulevards, which contrast with a meandering pathway. Elliptical fields create outdoor play areas. A forest of trees differentiates from the open fields to define the built edge. Generous splayed public stairs and landscape spaces pre-empt desire lines, connecting the urban common through the forest to the foreshore promenade in strategic locations – adjacent the bridge and centrally between the towers.




Image: 85k Scenario - Open space and park plan

In contrast to the landscape edges, a series of strong urban edges has been created to activate the waterfront and Burroway Road. Retail occupies the majority of the waterfront edge, allowing for generous public pedestrian movement from the podium 'carpet.' The length of glazed frontage and views to water are maximized.



Image: 85k Scenario – Foreshore

The 30 meter width of the foreshore promenade allows for varying daily and seasonal uses throughout the year, and the terracing of the podium and forest above allows for ideal viewing of cultural events such as regional races or neighbourhood parades along the Bay shore. A series of floating islands further activates the waterfront from the promenade in the 85,000 m2 scenario .

C1.2 Jury Evaluation

An evaluation of the entry with regard to the objectives of the Competition Brief as deliberated by the Jury is provided below.

Table 4 Response to Brief Objectives

Brief Objectives	Jury Evaluation	
	Scenario 1 (54,356 m2 residential)	Scenario 2 (85,000 m2 residential)
Design		
Development Scenarios	Two towers of 29 and 34 storeys situated on Footbridge Blvd and Burroway Rd respectively with buildings fronting the waterfront.	Two towers of 28 and 57 storeys situated on Footbridge Blvd and Burroway Rd respectively with buildings fronting the waterfront.
Non-complying Options	A single tower of 57 storeys, GFA reduced to 49,550 m2, situated on Footbridge Blvd on waterfront	Towers are repositioned to the northern corner of the site and centrally along Wentworth place and Burroway Road to minimise view impact on the neighbouring developments.
Building Form	The proposed single tower in the south-east corner presents a holistic approach to the building of 1 complete tower instead of 2 incomplete towers.	The Triangular form and tower locations are respective in maintaining the view corridors to the east from surrounding buildings.
Height and Street Frontage Heights	Both towers have frontages to main streets along with a frontage to the north-south street running through the site.	With no podium, both towers have a minimal street frontage, however, the open space frontage of the park allows the park to feel more like a public space.
Materials and Finishes	The material finishes of brown, beige and copper follow the concept of towers that 'organically grow out of the park' and the finished glazing then 'dissolves' into the sky.	
Landscape & Public Domain	<p>A strong consideration for human scale.</p> <p>The Park's design has a strong directional approach.</p> <p>The execution and maintenance of the forest could pose issues in the future.</p>	
Pedestrian Amenity & Movement	<p>The reinforcement of the Pedestrian Desire Lines from Bennelong bridge (south-east) to the Ferry Wharf (north-west) is an intuitive through-site link for the area.</p> <p>A new fully accessible pedestrian and cycle connection from Bennelong Bridge to the Foreshore Promenade would have been a desired outcome.</p>	
Vehicular Access, Loading and Parking	The added north-south street running adjacent to the towers creates greater circulation and tower access options.	
Wind	Refer to Appendix 2 - SLR Wind Summary	

Planning																										
Statutory Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of Building • Residential floor space (max) • Non-resi floor space (min) • Public Open Space (min) • Main park (min) • Main park sun access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max 34 storeys • Residential 53,920 m2 • Non Residential 9,175 m2 • POS 29,900 m2 • Main Park 22,400 m2 • Sun Access 100% all year & 94% mid Winter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max 57 storeys • Residential 81,770 m2 • Non Residential 9,175 m2 • POS 29,900 m2 + pool facility • Main Park 22,400 m2 • Sun Access 100% all year & 94% mid Winter 																								
ESD & Environmental Performance	Shading and PVs incorporated into the design of the towers While the shading already incorporated is a good start, further shading is required due to the full-height-glass shown to the apartments.																									
Car parking estimate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing - 600 cars • New - 1,373 cars • Total - 1,973 cars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing - 600 cars • New - 1,373 cars • Total - 1,973 cars 																								
Public Art	A combination of sophisticated art works along with fun and accessible works that acknowledge the mixed use of the area																									
Commercial																										
Dwelling yield estimate	Apartments: 510 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Unit Type</th> <th>No</th> <th>Mix</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>- 1 Bed</td> <td>159</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>- 2 Bed</td> <td>164</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>- 3 Bed</td> <td>187</td> <td>37%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Unit Type	No	Mix	- 1 Bed	159	31%	- 2 Bed	164	32%	- 3 Bed	187	37%	Apartments: 775 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Unit Type</th> <th>No</th> <th>Mix</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>- 1 Bed</td> <td>239</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>- 2 Bed</td> <td>254</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>- 3 Bed</td> <td>282</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Unit Type	No	Mix	- 1 Bed	239	31%	- 2 Bed	254	33%	- 3 Bed	282	36%
Unit Type	No	Mix																								
- 1 Bed	159	31%																								
- 2 Bed	164	32%																								
- 3 Bed	187	37%																								
Unit Type	No	Mix																								
- 1 Bed	239	31%																								
- 2 Bed	254	33%																								
- 3 Bed	282	36%																								
Non-residential land uses (and FS) estimate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail 3,200 m2. • Club 4,825 m2 • Childcare 1,150 m2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail 3,200 m2. • Club 4,825 m2 • Childcare 1,150 m2 																								
Construction Budget	Reviewed and acceptable to proponent																									
Construction Methodology	Reviewed and acceptable to proponent																									

C2. Entry 2 - Durbach Block Jagers and Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture

C2.1 Overview



Image: 85k Towers Scenario - View from Bennelong Bridge

Durbach Block Jagers and Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture's proposal takes the pivotal site on Wentworth Point and arranges the brief at the scale of a regional intervention. The building's jump in scale and organic skyline is reminiscent of the larger bridges and ships found elsewhere on Sydney's rivers and harbour. This creates both a building and ground plane interlocked and interwoven into the existing built fabric, but unlike anything within the greater precinct and beyond.

The project breaks with the isolated typology of towers in the park and introduces a horizontal landmark to the Wentworth Point skyline. This hybrid building operates at the two scales of wall and tower. Two wall 'hill' buildings both define intimate urban streets and courtyards and reduce the scale of the tower elements. The perimeter transforms into two iconic towers, one angular, the other curved, that sit within the broader geography of the riverfront.




Image: 54k Scenario and 85k Scenario Comparison

Key decisions of the footprint of the building are tested dimensionally with the surrounding development norms and with great urban spaces. The massing and program on the site is arranged to maximise solar access across the site and beyond. The organic silhouette and plan arrangement of the building have been sited to provide maximum sunlight to the newly created park on the site as well as to the communal courtyard held within the building. The massing of the forms has also taken into account the view lines from the taller residential towers in block C and E adjoining as shown below.




Image : 85k Park Plan



Image: View sharing analysis from Block C and Block E

The building is proposed as an assembly of typical horizontal and vertical modules. This not only results in efficiencies due to a high level of repetition in unit elements, but also means there is a typical structural grid. The building structure consists of a conventional gridded concrete structure with prestressed concrete, flat slab and blade columns. The lateral loads, wind and earthquake will be carried by the concrete cores.

The façade is proposed as punched openings within a solid wall. A repeated unit module with six different types and façade opening patterns, appears woven and complex while allowing for the use of precast façade elements. Alternative façade patterning for each element could be applied without compromising the overarching design which could also be done by a single hand or in collaboration with other architects or artists.



Image: 85kScenario - Foreshore

The landscape responds to the context of the site by weaving the idea of the river and the restorative nature of the riparian environment into the urban environment – a transition from the river to the street through a series of transitional, overlapping landscapes. The open spaces of the public domain will create a new public focus for Wentworth Point, connecting the town centre to the foreshore, and bringing a sense of the green periphery into the heart. The broad scale of these spaces allows the place to breathe. Planted spaces add grain, texture, sound and scent into an otherwise quite sterile environment – the wild and the made in balance.

A generous green space at street level with views to the bay, activated on the inside edge, gives an opening in the urban pattern that is now lacking, connecting back to the water setting from the public domain not just from private apartments. The parks fill a gap in the public domain network, providing local spaces for the resident community. There are three key spaces, connected physically and visually; with planted landscape unifying character. The landscape folds between these spaces – through the building and down to the waterfront, making open banks overlooking the water, and intimate spaces in the creases.




Image: 54k Towers Scenario - View from Bennelong Bridge and 85k Scenario Site Model

C2.2 Jury Evaluation

An evaluation of the entry with regard to the objectives of the Competition Brief as deliberated by the Jury is provided below.

Table 5 Response to Brief Objectives

Brief Objectives	Jury Evaluation	
	Scenario 1 (54,356 m2 residential)	Scenario 2 (85,000 m2 residential)
Design		
Development Scenarios	One tower of 35 levels with two hills at 13 and 9 storeys with building ends situated over the park. The structure of one end becomes an elevated park.	Two tower of 33 and 56 storeys with two 'hills' at 13 and 9 storeys each with building ends situated over the park. A civic park is added to the south west corner of the park
Non-complying Options	N/A	N/A
Building Form	A very interesting and original approach. The 'U' shaped design does take advantage of the waterfront views, however, may create some privacy issues and overshadowing to the park.	The additional building mass may further add to the overshadowing issue mentioned in scenario 1.
Height and Street Frontage Heights	The complete height of the scheme is the tower typology and not a traditional podium and tower typology. The tower fronts Burroway Road and Wentworth place for the full height of the towers at those respective locations.	The complete height of the scheme is the tower typology and not a traditional podium and tower typology. With the additional mass to the tower, the height fronting Burroway Road increases by over 20 storeys.
Materials and Finishes	A judicious selection of materials and finishes such as painted and precast concrete, and, steel frames and U glass.	
Landscape & Public Domain	The context response of open green activated spaces and a Civic Plaza presents as a positive connection between the river and the street. The landscaping requires further development from phase 1.	
Pedestrian Amenity & Movement	The permeable ground floor plane is a great element that allows for free pedestrian movement.	
Vehicular Access, Loading and Parking	The internal road coming into the site from Wentworth place adds accessibility to the tower's south entrances	
Wind	Refer to Appendix 2 - SLR Wind Summary	
Planning		
Statutory Framework • Height of Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max 35 storeys • Residential 53,931 m2 • Non Residential 8,450 m2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max 40 storeys • Residential 84,537 m2 • Non Residential 8,900 m2

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential floor space (max) Non-resi floor space (min) Public Open Space (min) Main park (min) Main park sun access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> POS 22,500 m2 Main Park 16,300 m2 Sun access – stated as compliant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> POS 22,500 m2 + pool facility Main Park 16,300 m2 Sun access – stated as compliant 																								
ESD & Environmental Performance	Good use of passive design and stormwater reuse. Opportunity for better cross ventilation outcomes.																									
Car parking estimate	932 Total	1,348 Total																								
Public Art	Water themed and incorporated into the wetland with potential for secondary rain water treatment, and into the civic plaza as water play.																									
Commercial																										
Dwelling yield estimate	Apartments: 535 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Unit Type</th> <th>No</th> <th>Mix</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• 1 Bed</td> <td>151</td> <td>28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• 2 Bed</td> <td>204</td> <td>38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• 3 Bed</td> <td>180</td> <td>34%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Unit Type	No	Mix	• 1 Bed	151	28%	• 2 Bed	204	38%	• 3 Bed	180	34%	Apartments: 535 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Unit Type</th> <th>No</th> <th>Mix</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• 1 Bed</td> <td>233</td> <td>28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• 2 Bed</td> <td>324</td> <td>39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• 3 Bed</td> <td>277</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Unit Type	No	Mix	• 1 Bed	233	28%	• 2 Bed	324	39%	• 3 Bed	277	33%
Unit Type	No	Mix																								
• 1 Bed	151	28%																								
• 2 Bed	204	38%																								
• 3 Bed	180	34%																								
Unit Type	No	Mix																								
• 1 Bed	233	28%																								
• 2 Bed	324	39%																								
• 3 Bed	277	33%																								
Non-residential land uses (and FS) estimate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Childcare Council 500 m2 Club & Restaurant 4,500 m2 Commercial 3,450 m2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Childcare Council 500 m2 Club & Restaurant 4,500 m2 Park Cafe & Gallery 450 m2 Commercial 2,950 m2 																								
Construction Budget	Reviewed and acceptable to proponent																									
Construction Methodology	Reviewed and acceptable to proponent																									

C3. Entry 3 - FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners

C3.1 Overview



Image: 85k Towers Scenario - View from Bennelong Bridge

FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners proposed a new urban paradigm that differs from the traditional block, park and setback tower approach but complements the existing urban pattern to create an expanded and exciting public parkland, connecting to and integrating with the waterfront. The design for Block H Wentworth Point presents a unique proposition that will become a landmark along the Parramatta River and a destination drawing visitors from across Sydney.

The urban paradigm is of folded parkland and thin towers emphasising public access and amenity. The parkland extends from Wentworth Place folding down towards the waterfront to create a generous, open and inviting heterogeneous public park integrating a diverse range of facilities and amenity to create a new waterside destination for Sydney and a new green heart for Wentworth Point.




Image: 54k Scenario and 85k Scenario Comparison

The two towers provide a landmark identity that may be optimised for orientation, views, amenity and scalability. Their positions maximise public space sunlight/amenity and create landmark identity for the connected urban quarters of Wentworth Point and Rhodes.

The two towers for Block H are conceived as living parts in a parkland setting in the sense of providing residential accommodation but also by creating active, engaging spaces at the interface with the park. At the mid-level, communal facilities for residents and the opportunity for a publicly accessible restaurant/bar with views to the river, harbour and city will add life to the tower experience

The park, towers and aquatic park form a symbiotic relationship, providing amenity, activation and viability in a balanced way so that each part is able to be realised and enjoyed and a park that is flowing and layered.

The park is a fluid and dynamic space where planting, paving, canopy, water and built form are interwoven into organic interlocking patterns. It has a central community building, a market square opposite the retail and library, an expansive children's playground, playing fields and mounded lawns, with steps and amphitheatres to the waterfront. A consistent and connected ground plane creates a series of integrated flowing spaces, with a variety of active and passive recreational opportunities being offered within the parkland, and forms the predominant force in the approach to the landscape design.



Image: 85k Scenario Open space and park plan

The location of the two towers provides for generous view corridors and also maximises tower separation to Blocks C and E enhancing amenity for existing residents. By positioning the new residential towers to the north-east corner of the site, the outlook for both new and existing residents is optimised with park and/or water views offered to the full extent of surrounding blocks.




Image: View sharing analysis diagram for Block C and Block E



Image: 85k Scenario - Foreshore

Pedestrian links through the park connect the lower promenade and street levels via terraced stairs that create alcoves and indentations into the structure of the building form, punctuating the building mass, activating and integrating the street frontage, and creating laneways and niches for retail frontage.

Burroway Road is activated by street edge retail and commercial activity while food and beverage with club facilities are folded into the ground plane, activating a waterfront promenade. For the 85,00 m2 scenario, the park extends into the water with aquatic pool facilities, boardwalks, floating pontoons, and staging areas, creating an active and exciting public water interface.



Image: 54k Towers Scenario - View from Bennelong Bridge and 85k Scenario Site Model

C3.2 Response to Preliminary Jury Comments

At the conclusion of the Design Competition Jury Presentations, the Jury unanimously agreed that none of the three schemes presented achieved Design Excellence at this time. The Jury, however, believed there is a potential for the scheme prepared by FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners to achieve Design Excellence.

The Jury requested further information and design development to be undertaken by FJMT to assist them in their assessment of Design Excellence which is set out in the Preliminary Jury Comments at Appendix 1.

In responding to the Jury's preliminary comments, the design of the towers has been revised with altered orientations and approaches to articulation to reduce the perception of overall mass as well as introducing vehicle access into the park to the towers and replanning the foreshore building lines.




Image: FJMT response to Jury revised 54k and 85k tower forms





Image: FJMT response to Jury information request 54k and 85k Scenarios (above) and replanned foreshore (below)




C3.3 Jury Evaluation

An evaluation of the entry and requested additional development and design development with regard to the objectives of the Competition Brief as deliberated by the Jury is provided below.

Table 6 Response to Brief Objectives

Brief Objectives	Jury Evaluation	
	Scenario 1 (54,356 m2 residential)	Scenario 2 (85,000 m2 residential)
Design		
Development Scenarios (refer diagrams next pages)	Two towers of 23 and 35 storeys from the highest level of Wentworth Place and a 6 level podium / building fronting Burroway Road	Two towers of 39 and 47 storeys from the highest level of Wentworth Place and an 8 storey podium / building fronting Burroway Road
Building Form	The approach to tower placement ensures view sharing to adjacent developments but the strict parallel alignment and offset of towers may not be the most optimal solution.	Location of the taller tower towards Burroway Road is supported. Both scenarios are well composed.
Height and Street Frontage Heights	The podium to Burroway Road may be able to accommodate an additional level but the address should be strengthened, so that it provides a consistent street wall height.	Height differential between towers should be 10-15 storeys. The publicly accessible bridge link references the predominant height datum established by existing towers and is a positive contribution.
Materials and Finishes	Primarily drawn from the landscape with green terraces folding into the base of the towers. Precast spandrel forms with glazing curved at the corners and horizontal louvres will wrap the tower forms transitioning to glazed lanterns at the roof level.	
Landscape & Public Domain	The concept landscape design by MSP is extremely well resolved, especially given the challenging topography. Concept may need to be adjusted to reflect planned intent of the foreshore promenade.	
Pedestrian Amenity & Movement	The design allows for a high degree of pedestrian permeability and appropriate responses to desire lines.	
Vehicular Access, Loading and Parking	Main vehicle access from Burroway Road may be complemented with a "shared way" that follows the edge of the Village Green linking Wentworth Place to Footbridge Blvd to improve access and legibility to Tower A and foreshore retail uses.	
Wind	Refer to Appendix 2 - SLR Wind Summary	

Scenario 1 _ 54,356 m2 residential



Towers


Two towers of 24 and 35 storeys above Wentworth Place high point (10.5 AHD)



Street Wall


6 level street wall facing Burroway Road

Scenario 2 _ 85,000 m2 residential



Towers


Two towers of 39 and 47 storeys above Wentworth Place high point (10.5 AHD)




Street Wall

8 level street wall facing Burroway Road

Scenario 1



Scenario 2



Planning		
Statutory Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of Building • Residential floor space (max) • Non-resi floor space (min) • Public Open Space (min) • Main park (min) • Main park sun access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max 35 storeys from Wentworth Place height & max 6 storey street wall to Burroway Rd • Residential - 54,354 m2 FS • Non-Residential 7,386 m2 FS • POS 24,050 m2 • Main park 17,600 m2 • Sun access 72% all year & 70% mid-winter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max 47 storeys storeys from Wentworth Place height & max 8 storey street wall to Burroway Rd • Residential - 84,982 m2 FS • Non-Residential 9,734 m2 • POS 24,050 m2 + pool facility • Main park 17,600 m2 • Sun access 70% all year & 70% mid-winter
ESD & Environmental Performance	Solar access and heating approach is generally good but greater reuse of stormwater needed. Distribution of openings in car park will provide better natural air and light	
Car parking estimate	- Residential 54K: 910 spaces - Retail 54K: 700 spaces	Residential 85K: 1,334 spaces Retail 85K: 700 spaces
Public Art	Five flexible options of Landscape as Art Canvas, Misty Grove, Water Jet Art, Community Pavilion Project – HOME, Remnant Industrial Fabric Trail	
Commercial		
Dwelling yield estimate	642 Apartments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studios – 13 – 0% - 1 Bed – 225 – 30% - 2 Bed – 215 – 35% - 3 Bed – 189 – 35% 	997 Apartments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studios – 18 – 0% - 1 Bed – 332 – 30% - 2 Bed – 349 – 35% - 3 Bed – 298 – 35%
Non-residential land uses (and FS) estimate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Club (4,027 m2) • Childcare (709 m2) • Retail /F&B (1,556 m2) • Gym (1,094 m2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Club (4,161 m2) • Childcare (709 m2) • Retail /F&B (1,556 m2) • Gym (1,094 m2) • Community (2,214 m2)
Construction Budget	Reviewed and acceptable to proponent	
Construction Methodology	Reviewed and acceptable to proponent	

Jury recommendations are set out in the next sections of this Report, Parts D and E.

PART D - DRAFT JURY RECOMMENDATION

D1. Draft Jury Recommendation - Winning Scheme

At the conclusion of the Design Competition Jury Presentations, the Jury unanimously agreed that none of the three schemes presented achieved Design Excellence at this time. The Jury, however, believed that the scheme prepared by **FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners** (FJMT+MSP) had potential to achieve Design Excellence.

Accordingly, the Jury requested that further information and design development to be undertaken to assist them in their assessment of Design Excellence. Since 5 October 2018, the Jury issued preliminary feedback and requested further information and design development be undertaken by FJMT+MSP (See Appendix 1, D2 and Part E). Jury Presentations where the design team addressed the Jury's comments were held on several occasions from 23 November 2018 with the latest occurring on 14 October 2019.

Based on the evaluation of all of the submitted schemes in accordance with the Competition Brief, **FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners** is formally announced by the Competition Jury as the winning scheme. This decision by the jury was unanimous.

The design development requirements and conditions listed below, and expanded upon in Part E, are considered by the Jury to further improve the design quality of the submitted scheme.

D2. Design Development and Conditions

Despite the deliberation above, the Competition Jury has made further observations and recommendations for the winning schemes as set out below.

The Jury considers that the following items were particularly valued and should be retained throughout the design and delivery phases of the development:

- Tower - location and orientation – The Jury are supportive of the approach to tower placement that ensures view sharing to adjacent developments is respected. The revised approach to tower rotation/orientation is also supported.
- Tower Separation – If a 2 x tower scheme is pursued (Scenario 2), the Jury recommend that a minimum 18m building separation is achieved between both towers
- Tower heights – The Jury recommend that if a 2 x tower scheme is pursued (Scenario 2), then a minimum 10 storey height differential between both towers be maintained. Through the detailed review of the Stage 2 Competition, the Jury is of the view that the optimal site configuration is for a maximum of 2 towers (not 3), to ensure view loss to adjoining developments are minimised. As a result of having 1 less tower, the precinct must consider increased heights to absorb the allocated floor space. This issue has profoundly changed the Jurys initial view of maximum tower heights. Increased tower heights are considered appropriate if there is the delivery of a larger public open space to service the Wentworth Point community.
- Bridge Link – The Jury are supportive of the proposed publically accessible Bridge Link, linking the mid-levels (level 24-28) of Tower A + B. The height of the bridge link references the predominant height datum established by existing residential towers at Wentworth Point, and is a positive contribution.
- Tower Façade – The revised façade treatments submitted as part of the response to Jury comments is strongly supported by the Jury, and should be retained at DA stage. This includes the provision of 500mm deep horizontal shading at various heights and increased solid spandrels.
- 'Ralph Symonds' Park – The Jury consider the concept landscape design by MSP to be extremely well resolved, given the challenging topography. The sophisticated arrangement of spaces, defined by fluid edges should be retained and developed in close collaboration with Council's public domain team, as the scheme moves towards DA stage.
- Promenade Activation – The proposition of a Marina Club along the foreshore promenade is supported by the Jury as it will provide an excellent opportunity to create a unique destination on the water at Wentworth Point. The proposed retail activation of Burroway Road should also be maintained.
- Podium – The proposed mixed use podiums to Wentworth Place and Burroway Drive are consistent with the objectives of the draft DCP and should be retained. Non-residential uses should be located along public streets and open spaces.

- Scenario 2 - Public Benefit – The Jury understand that the following features will be delivered if the transport enhanced Scenario 2, is endorsed by Council:
 - Community Pavilion,
 - Bridge Link (linking tower a + b), and
 - D’arcy Wentworth Aquatic Park.

If one of the above items cannot be delivered, for whatever reason, the Jury would expect that a replacement item/facility be delivered within the Block H precinct. The Jury wish to emphasise that Design Excellence for both scenarios is contingent on significant public benefit being delivered to the Wentworth Point community.

Whilst the FJMT + MSP scheme is accepted as the winning design, the Jury recommends that the following aspects be further explored as design development occurs prior to DA lodgement with Council:

- Integration with surrounding precincts – All future submissions (pre-DA, DA etc.) should include the proposals for the adjoining Sekisui + RMS sites. This is to ensure that cumulative environmental impacts (overshadowing, views etc) can be assessed.
- Podium Levels – The Jury consider that the podium address to Burroway Road should be strengthened, so that it provides a consistent street wall height that responds to the scale of the street. Street sections should be submitted that show the relationship of the proposal to the approved dry boat storage along the northern side of Burroway Road.
- Shared Way – As part of the preliminary comments, the Jury requested that a new “shared way” be considered that follows the edge of the Village Green. The primary objective of this shared way is to improve street address to Tower B (Scenario 2) and provide a clear delineation between public, communal and private spaces within the street block. It is intended to link Wentworth Place to Footbridge Boulevard. The developed design of “shared way” should involve collaboration with Councils Urban Design team.
- Foreshore Promenade – The foreshore design should be consistent with existing and approved development along the promenade to ensure a consistent linear public space. It is anticipated that design development of the Foreshore Promenade will improve the design and create a benchmark for waterside development in Sydney.
- Wind Impacts – As per the requirements of the Design Competition Brief, provide a wind report prepared by a qualified wind engineer detailing how the design meets the wind engineering objectives, accompanied by a 3D electronic model of the building to support testing of wind effects by Council.
- Environmentally Sustainable Design – With reference to the preliminary Jury comments, it was recommended that resubmitted documentation addresses the items and improvement opportunities provided by Council’s independent ESD advisor, the following items are considered to have been addressed in the documentation provided:
 - Facade related issues have been addressed.
 - Wind is to be resolved and standard DCP controls are adequate in this regard.
 - Use of WRAMS water for toilet flushing agreed and can be conditioned.

The following items have not been addressed at this stage:

- Cross Ventilation of level 1-9 to meet the ADG has not been addressed.
- Ability to resolve natural ventilation chimneys serving podium apartments has not been demonstrated.
- Stormwater reuse is stated to be included now but no additional documentation provided to support.
- Distribution of openings in car park to provide better natural air and light is agreed but not detailed.

The Competition Jury considered that the above matters are required to be resolved in order for the Development Application scheme to exhibit "design excellence" as discussed in Part E.

As set out in Section D.6 below, the Competition Jury will review the developed scheme prior to lodgement of the Development Application to endorse that recommended changes/amendments have been made to the satisfaction of the Jury.

PART E - DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

E1. Jury Recommendations for Design Development

To determine the achievement of Design Excellence in accordance with the recommendations of the Competition Jury for the winning scheme, FMJT was requested by Council to present responses to the matters raised in Section D2, and subsequently after an initial presentation and further Jury feedback as outlined below.

Importantly, prior to the reporting of a DCP and VPA for this site, Council requested that the original Design Excellence Jury be reconvened to assess if Design Excellence has been achieved in the design development for this project subsequent to the competition conclusion.

The Jury acknowledged that there has been a significant “break” in jury consultation with the last Jury presentation being held November, 2018. The Jury requested that more regular consultation occurs in order to review the large amount of information involved in this complex project.

A presentation of the initial response to the Jury’s recommendations in Part D was provided by FJMT to the Jury on 5th September 2019 after which feedback set out in Section E3 was provided. A further jury presentation to the Jury was held on 14th October 2019 to consolidate its feedback into a final design to which the Jury could consider the awarding of design excellence subject to ongoing supervision under Section E6.

E2. Design Response to Jury Recommendations

FJMT provided an initial response to the Jury recommendations in Section D2 for design development of the winning scheme.

In regard to the items particularly valued by the Jury:

- tower placement, orientation a minimum 18m tower separation has been maintained to respect view sharing to adjacent buildings and included a minimum 18m tower separation;
- heights have been marginally increased in consultation with Council’s Land Use team to absorb the allocated floor space to ensure a larger public open space is provided to service the Wentworth Point community while maintaining a 10 storey height differential;
- a publicly accessible bridge linking the mid-levels of Tower A + B is maintained at the predominant height datum established by existing residential towers at Wentworth Point;
- revised façade treatments are retained with horizontal shading at various heights and increased solid spandrels;
- the concept landscape design by MSP and FJMT maintains a sophisticated arrangement of spaces, defined by fluid edges.

In regard to the Jury recommendations of aspects to be further explored as design development occurs prior to DA lodgement:

- cumulative environmental impacts have been assessed in terms of overshadowing, views etc (although this assessment is limited to publically available proposals);
- the strengthening of the podium address to Burroway Road to provide a consistent street wall height that responds to the scale of the street;
- a new “shared way” has been introduced to improve street address to Tower B; provide a clear delineation between public, communal and private spaces; and links Wentworth Place to Footbridge Boulevard.
- The foreshore promenade has been made consistent with existing and approved development to ensure a consistent linear public space with improved design to achieve the anticipated benchmark for waterside development in Sydney.
- Potential wind impacts has informed design development and will be appropriately documented for detailed Council assessment at DA stage;

- Environmentally sustainable design has been further developed and documented in consultation with Council's specialists in finalising DCP controls and project objectives including façade treatment and urban heat effects, use of WRAMS, energy and water use, decarbonisation, ADG compliance.

E3. Jury Feedback to Design Development

Based on a review of the information submitted by FMJT+MSP to update the Jury on design development, the Jury were supportive, in principle, to the following aspects:

- Overall landscape design approach,
- Shared way framework,
- Relocation of Community Pavilion to corner of Wentworth Place and Footbridge Boulevard,
- Aquatic Park Proposal (however understand there are complexities in it being realised and this component is requiring concurrence by other Authorities), and
- Support the approach to bronze/champagne colours and materiality.

Overall, the Jury are of the opinion that the proposition has “fantastic spirit”, and the landscape design is some of the “richest we have ever seen”.

However, the Jury found there were still issues with the design, which are summarised as follows:

Development Scenarios

- Based on a review of the information presented, the Jury are still unable to understand the “baseline” design consistent with Scenario 1.
- The Jury request that all future information presented clearly illustrates what will be delivered (including public domain/park) as part of:
 - Scenario 1 – Base Scheme – 54,356 residential FS
 - Scenario 2 – Uplift Scheme – up to 85,000 residential FS
- The Jury also request that the proponent clearly articulate their preferred building heights for both scenario 1 + 2 in all future presentations. All maximum building heights presented to the Jury should have Council's in principle support to be included in the DCP.

Compliance with Apartment Design Guide

- The Jury are concerned that some key requirements of the ADG are not being achieved – including solar access and natural cross ventilation.
- In order to achieve Design Excellence, the Jury require that full compliance with the ADG is achieved. This requirement is considered acceptable based on the unconstrained size of this site, and the fact the design has been the product of a Design Excellence Master Plan Competition.

Tower + Podium Design

- There has been a significant shift in the design of the towers and podium, with the architectural geometries becoming more “exuberant”.
- The Jury's preference is for the more regular, “calmer” podium, and do not encourage the eroded “terrain” podium, which denies an appropriate urban outcome on Burroway Road.
- The Jury considered the original floorplates to be very elegant, whilst also achieving ADG compliance. The Jury are not convinced that the current “butterfly form” tower floorplates result in improved amenity to residents, including privacy issues at pinch points, and issues achieving solar access. The team should clarify how the ADG requirements will be met whilst ensuring elegant tower forms. .

Environmentally Sustainable Design

- The Jury requested that Council's independent ESD advisor review and comment on the draft submission.
- The key items that require design development are:
 - Natural Cross Ventilation remains unresolved and it is not clear how the ADG requirements will be met,
 - Adequate ventilation of enclosed balconies, and
 - Significantly challenged in achieving solar access compliance, particularly Tower A.

Area Schedules and DCP Diagrams

- To assist the Jury and Council to better assess the proposal, we request that clear area schedules and GFA plans are resubmitted for both Scenarios.
- The Jury also recommend that the draft DCP (to be publically exhibited) includes built form diagrams that clearly illustrate the potential bulk and scale of the proposal.

Deep Soil + Tree Locations

- The design development of the landscaping and shared way have been thoughtfully executed. The Jury are of the view that the landscape design is “heading in the right direction” and will be a positive outcome for the community .
- Council’s City Architect, on behalf of the Jury has requested that Council’s Public Domain team review the latest submission and attend all future Jury Presentations.
- The Jury would also like to better understand, in plan and section, how deep soil zones are achieved and the landscape vision is realised.

Traffic + Circulation

- The Jury would like to better understand how traffic works holistically across the site.
- The Jury question the removal of the “oculus” that provided light into the basement carparks. It is recommended that every effort is made to providing natural light and ventilation into the basement carparks.

Towers – Bridge Link

- The Jury are supportive of the proposed publicly accessible Bridge Link, linking the mid-levels (level 24-28) of Tower A + B. The height of the bridge link references the predominant height datum established by existing residential towers at Wentworth Point, and is a positive contribution.
- The Jury recommend that the appearance of the bridge link is simplified, and are of the view that visually it might be “trying to do too many things”.

At the conclusion of the Jury Presentation, the Jury were of the view that the proposal does not yet exhibit Design Excellence, however it has potential to achieve design excellence once the items are addressed and the Jury have full confidence in the team of award-winning Australian and international architects and landscape architects.

E4. Response to Jury Feedback

In response to the matters raised by the Jury, FJMT provided a comprehensive submission that would form the basis of pre-DA consultation with Council as follows, noting that building heights have in-principle support of Council officers to be included in the DCP.

Development Scenarios


As set out in submitted documentation and extract diagrams below, the Scenario 1 (Base) scheme:

- yields some 54,000 m2 residential floor space in addition to retail, café, restaurants, recreational and entertainment uses;
- includes the fully realised public open space provision, childcare facility and the tower bridge with community access;
- sets Tower A to a height of 40 storeys consistent with planned context of the Sekisui House site and Tower B to 25 storeys consistent with the existing built context; and
- provides a podium height of 8 storeys with Buildings C limited to 4 floors reflective of the lower tower scale to Burroway Road.

Scenario 2 (Uplift) scheme:

- yields some 85,000 m2 residential floor space in addition with the same amount of retail, café, restaurants, recreational and entertainment uses;
- includes all features of the Scenario 1 scheme with the addition of an Aquatic Centre on Homebush Bay (subject to separate DA approvals) and a Public Gallery.
- maintains Tower A to a height of 40 storeys consistent with planned context of the Sekisui House site and increases Tower B to 50 storeys consistent with the design excellence principles for height distribution;


- provides a consistent podium height and Buildings C of 8 storeys reflective of a higher tower scale to Burroway Road and a desire to strengthen the podium addresses to that street.




Diagrams showing Scenario 1 and 2 heights (FJMT)

Tower + Podium Design and Compliance with Apartment Design Guide

- Minimum ADG solar access and natural cross ventilation are achieved in the refined schemes, which are anticipated to achieve full Guide compliance.
- A more regular, “calmer” podium, has been reintroduced for a better urban outcome on Burroway Road and has been broken into three separate buildings to improve ADG environmental and amenity performance.
- A more measured exuberance is reflected in the schemes. The achievement of amenity, privacy, solar access and ADG compliance aspects of the “butterfly form” tower floorplates have been thoroughly considered and demonstrated in the revised schemes.



Diagrams showing Scenario 1 and 2 massing (FJMT)



Draft plan extract showing revised low level floor plates with improved ADG compliance (FJMT)

Environmentally Sustainable Design


- Ongoing consultation is in place with the respective Council officers and independent ESD advisor review in establishing progressive DCP provisions and benchmarks to ensure design excellence in ESD outcomes.

Area Schedules and DCP Diagrams


- Clear area schedules and GFA plans have been submitted for both Scenarios while built form diagrams that clearly illustrate the potential bulk and scale of the proposal have been included in the draft DCP.

Deep Soil + Tree Locations

- Council’s Public Domain team will be closely engaged through to DA submission while the adequacy of the soil depth zones to achieve the landscape vision have been provided in plan and section as extracted below.



Extract showing soil depth provision (FJMT)



B Main Park Section in mounded soil

Cross section example of planting soil depths (FJMT)

Traffic + Circulation

- The “oculus” providing natural light and ventilation into the basement carparks has been re-established.
- Details as to how traffic works holistically across the site has been provided and summarised in the extract below.




Diagram showing traffic movement onto the site (FJMT)

Towers – Bridge Link

- Additional explanation and justification of the strengths of the proposed bridge link design has been provided by FJMT for the Jury’s further consideration.

E5. Jury's Final Design Excellence Recommendations

At the conclusion of the Design Development stage, the Jury unanimously agreed that, subject to the design developments and conditions listed below, that both Scenario 1 and 2 by **FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners** exhibits Design Excellence.

The design development requirements and conditions listed below are considered by the Jury to further improve the design quality of the submitted scheme.

The Jury considers that the following items were particularly valued and should be retained throughout the design and delivery phases of the development:

- Tower location and orientation – The Jury are supportive of the approach to tower placement that ensures view sharing to adjacent developments is respected. The proposed approach to tower orientation is also supported.
- Tower separation – The Jury recommend that a minimum 18m building separation is achieved between Tower A and B.
- Tower heights – The Jury recommend that a minimum 10 storey height differential between both towers be maintained. The Jury grant the award of Design Excellence to the following proposed height limits:
 - Scenario 01 - set Tower A to a height of 40 storeys consistent with planned context of the Sekisui House site and Tower B to 25 storeys consistent with the existing built context; and
 - Scenario 02 - maintain Tower A to a height of 40 storeys consistent with planned context of the Sekisui House site and increasing Tower B to 50 storeys consistent with the design excellence principles for height distribution.
- Solar shading – The provision of 500mm deep horizontal solar shading to the tower facades is strongly supported by the Jury, and must be retained at DA stage. Appropriate solar shading must also be provided to the façade of the Community Pavilion.
- New Public Park – The Jury considers the concept landscape design by MSP to be extremely well resolved given the challenging topography. The sophisticated arrangement of spaces, defined by fluid edges should be retained and as the scheme moves towards DA stage, be developed in close collaboration with Council's Public Domain team.
- Community Pavilion – The Jury are supportive of the proposed location of the Community Pavilion on the corner of Wentworth Place and Footbridge Boulevard. The plans submitted include a café, childcare centre and gallery space. The detailed design is subject to further by assessment by the Jury and Council.
- Promenade Activation – The proposition of a Marina Club with an elevated frontage to the foreshore promenade is supported by the Jury, as it will provide an excellent opportunity to create a unique destination on the water at Wentworth Point.
- Podiums – The revised mixed use podiums to Wentworth Place and Burroway Drive are consistent with the objectives of the DCP and should be retained. Non-residential uses should be located on all street and park frontages.
- Compliance with the Apartment Design Guidelines – In order to achieve Design Excellence, full compliance with the ADG requirements for solar access and natural cross ventilation must be achieved. This requirement is considered acceptable based on the unconstrained size of this site, and the fact that the detailed design has been the product of a Design Excellence Master Plan Competition.
- Shared zone – The provision of a new "shared way" was requested by the Jury to ensure an appropriate street address was provided to Tower B, and to provide a clear delineation between public and private space. The design development of the shared way should involve collaboration with Councils Urban Design team.
- Foreshore Promenade – The foreshore design should be consistent with existing and approved development along the promenade to deliver a seamless linear public space.
- Oculus - The proposed concept for an Oculus and sunken courtyard is strongly supported by the Jury, and should be retained.
- Lift access to promenade – The reconfigured lift to provide direct access to the promenade is supported, and should be retained.
- Rooftop Articulation – The current design indicates the potential for high amenity communal open spaces for residents located within the rooftop of both Tower A + B. No additional residential levels above the proposed height limits should be considered in these rooftop articulation zones.

- Public Benefit – The Jury are pleased that the new public park will be delivered in the base development scenario. The Jury understand that the following features will be delivered if the transport enhanced scenario is endorsed by Council:
 - Aquatic Centre, and
 - Gallery (as part of the Community Pavilion)

If one of the above items cannot be delivered, for whatever reason, the Jury would expect that a replacement item/facility be delivered within the Block H precinct. The Jury wish to emphasise that Design Excellence for both scenarios is contingent on significant public benefit being delivered to the Wentworth Point community.

Whilst the FJMT + MSP scheme is accepted as the winning design, the Jury recommends that the following aspects be addressed prior to the lodgement of a Development Application with Council:

- Integration with surrounding precincts – All future submissions (pre-DA, DD etc) should include the existing context, including proposals on adjoining Sekisui + RMS sites. This is to ensure the cumulative environmental (overshadowing, wind, views etc) can be assessed.
- Wind Impacts – As per the requirements of Design Competition Brief, provide a detailed wind assessment (wind tunnel testing) detailing how the design and built form meets the wind engineering objectives.
- Public Domain – The design development of the landscaping and shared way have been thoughtfully executed. The Jury request that the design development of the public domain occurs in close collaboration with Council's public domain team. The Jury emphasise the importance of large contiguous deep soil zones that can accommodate mature large canopy trees.
 - Shoreline treatment – Encourage further investigation of the opportunities to incorporate mangroves / biophilic filtering along the sea wall.
- Environmentally Sustainable Design – The Jury has requested that all submissions are reviewed by Council's Independent ESD advisor (Flux). Based on their review, the following ESD items are required to be addressed at pre-DA stage:
 - Partially enclosed balconies – The proposed wintergarden solution does not allow effective natural ventilation. The proportion of permanent opening should be not less than 25% of the floor or façade area, whichever is greater.
 - Electric Vehicles – Provision of infrastructure for future electrical vehicle charging. This is necessary to address the high reliance on private car usage and the need to provide the opportunity to reduce future transport related emissions.
 - BASIX – Achieve higher BASIX targets than the regulated minimums. Specifically, BASIX Energy of at least 35 and Basix Water of at least 55 are recommended.
 - Photovoltaics – Maximise the provision of photovoltaic cells on roof spaces.
- Bridge Link – The Jury are supportive, in principle, of the proposed publically accessible bridge link. However, the current design requires some fine tuning to ensure that the towers are viewed as the primary element in the skyline. The proposed uses within the link appear to be a restaurant, bar and private pool. The Jury recommend a publically accessible viewing area is provided.
- Landscaping / Planters – The success of the proposal is reliant on the detailed design and maintenance regime of the landscape planters located throughout the towers + podium forms. These planters need to be sufficient size to realise the spirit and intent of the proposal. The landscape strategy needs to be carefully considered and must be centrally managed.
- Vehicular Access - The proposed shared zone and Burroway Road drop off are supported in principle, but note that they need to be developed in consultation with consultation with the relevant public authorities and Councils traffic section.

E6. Supervision of Design Development

To ensure that the quality of the winning design is maintained through all development approval stages and construction, the Design Competition Jury will review the design at the following stages.

1. During the pre-lodgement stage.
2. During the Development Application stage, when the following information will be required:
 - key cross sections, partial plans and partial elevations through external walls, balconies, pergolas and other key external details. Drawings are to be fully annotated at a scale of 1:50, or if necessary 1:20, showing details, materials, finishes and colours, so that the details and materiality of the external facades are clearly documented;
 - revised 3D photomontages.
3. Prior to issue of the Construction Certificate.
4. Prior to the issue of the Occupation certificate.
5. Prior to lodgement of any Section 4.55 request which modifies the design.

The Jury will provide written certification that the design at the above stages is substantially the same and retains the design excellence exhibited in the winning submission, subject to the amendments required as set out in E5 above.

The Architectural Competition winning architects shall be retained during the construction process to ensure the retention of the design intent, regardless of whether the site is on sold.




All members of the jury or a majority of jurors must be reconvened to discuss the findings and/or direction of the jury.

The venue for these reviews is negotiable.

PART F - ENDORSEMENT BY COMPETITION JURY

This Jury Report for the Architectural Design Competition at **Block H, Precinct B, Wentworth Point** has been endorsed by the Competition Jury as set out below.

Table 8 Jury Endorsement

Jury Member	Signature of Jury Member	Date of Endorsement
Kim Crestani, City Architect, City of Parramatta		13/11/2019
Paulo Macchia, Director Design Governance, Government Architect NSW		20/11/2019
Bob Nation AM, Design Advisor, Barangaroo Delivery Authority		21/11/2019

Appendix 1: Preliminary Jury Comments

DESIGN EXCELLENCE / PRELIMINARY JURY COMMENTS

Phase 02 Design Competition - Block H, Wentworth Point (DC/3/2017)

Date of Issue:	5 October 2018
Architects:	Bates Smart and Hargreaves Associates FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners Durbach Block Jaggers and Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture
Design Competition Reference Number:	DC/3/2017
Drawing Reference Number (TRIM):	D06372875 / D06372873 / D06372869
Jury members:	Kim Crestani, City Architect, City of Parramatta Council Paulo Macchia, Director, Design and Housing, Government Architect NSW Bob Nation AM, Design Advisor, Barangaroo Delivery Authority (Proponent's Representative)

Project History

Design Competition Held:	19 September 2018
Design Excellence Awarded	Pending

Jury Comments

- At the conclusion of the Design Competition Jury Presentations, the Jury unanimously agreed that none of the three schemes presented achieved Design Excellence at this time.
- The Jury, however, believe there is a potential for one of the three schemes to achieve Design Excellence. This scheme has been prepared by **FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners** (FJMT+MSP).
- The Jury requests that further information and design development is undertaken by FJMT+MSP to assist them in their assessment of Design Excellence. FJMT+MSP are requested to re-present this additional information to the Jury.
- Material should not exceed 15 x A3 pages (freehand drawings and/or CAD are both acceptable).
- Note - The Architectural Design Competition results may only be made public once agreed to by both City of Parramatta and the proponent. Until this time, all competitors must keep their individual submissions confidential.

Preliminary Jury Comments

2 x Development Scenarios

- The Jury request that 2 x clearly annotated landscape masterplans are submitted that illustrate the features and facilities that will be delivered by:
 - Scenario 1 – Base Scheme – 54,356 residential FS
 - Scenario 2 – Uplift Scheme – upto 85,000 residential FS

Towers – Design Development

- The Jury are supportive of the proposed approach to tower placement that ensures view sharing to adjacent developments is respected. However, the Jury are of the view that the strict parallel alignment and offset of towers may not be the most optimal solution.
- The Jury requests that FJMT further explore the placement, orientation and rotation/alignment of towers to balance the following criteria – maximise solar access to the park, view sharing, privacy impacts, building separation and tower amenity.

Towers – Building Height

- After a detailed review of the submitted schemes against the principles of the Stage 01 Master Plan Competition, the Jury are supportive, in principle, to the tallest tower located with an address to Burroway Road (northern boundary).
- However, the Jury recommend that both the Base and Uplift schemes are resubmitted to ensure that Tower B (north) is no taller than 45-47 storeys and that the podium may be able to accommodate an additional level.
- The Jury consider that the height differential between both towers should be 10-15 storeys.

Towers – Bridge Link

- The Jury are supportive of the proposed publically accessible Bridge Link, linking the mid-levels (level 24-28) of Tower A + B. The height of the bridge link references the predominant height datum established by existing residential towers at Wentworth Point, and is a positive contribution.
- The bridge link should be shown on all resubmitted documentation.

Tower – Lower Setback Levels

- The expression of the lower setback levels requires further resolution. The uses within the lower setback levels are residential apartments, yet the external expression is ambiguous and covered in greenery.
- The Jury recommend that a clearer expression is developed for these setback levels, and consider the wind downdraft impacts on the public domain by the proposed massing.

Village Green Park

- The Jury consider the concept landscape design by MSP to be extremely well resolved, given the challenging topography.
- However, to improve access and legibility to Tower A and foreshore retail uses, the Jury request that MSP consider the introduction of a new “loop shared way” that follows the edge of the Village Green. The loop should link Wentworth Place to Footbridge Boulevard.
- The loop road could be designed as a shared zone that prioritises pedestrian movement, that could be possibly closed off for events, markets and festivals. WSP should undertake benchmarking of best practice examples.

Foreshore Promenade

- Council planning officers have notified the Jury that the submitted design does not match with the design intent of the foreshore promenade.
- The Jury have requested that Council provide the design team with an annotated drawing (see attached) that outlines the planning requirements of the Foreshore Promenade – see attached.
- The design team are requested to recalibrate the design of the promenade so that it responds to Councils requirements, in particular, the control that does not permit built form to encroach beyond the 20m Public Foreshore Line.

Façade / ESD

- The Jury’s independent ESD advisor has provided an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the submission. These comments are provided as an attachment to these comments.
- As part of the Jury’s assessment of Design Excellence, it is recommended that resubmitted documentation addresses the items and improvement opportunities provided by Council’s independent ESD advisor.

For any questions or clarifications regarding the above comment please contact Kim Crestani (City Architect) or Guy Pinkerton (CoPC Design Competition Coordinator).



Kim Crestani
City Architect
City of Parramatta Council



Paulo Macchia
Director – Design and Housing
Government Architect NSW



Bob Nation AM
Design Advisor
Barangaroo Delivery Authority

FJMT

Design

Strengths	Weaknesses
Tower facade base' (lower part of southern tower) provides solar shading	<p>'Tower facade top', which applies to the majority of the apartments, appears to offer no shading (diagram in report), or a secondary glazed element (diagram in the drawing set).</p> <p>It is not clear what is proposed for the majority of the towers but neither diagram provided would provide meaningful protection from the sun.</p>
	Tower facade step-in' detail provides the most successful shading treatment but the resulting benefits are negligible due to the limited application the presence of self-shading from the larger floor plates above.
The childcare centre is located with good sun access	Wind shielding will need to be provided to protect child care from downwash from the facade. This is described and illustrated as a requirement in the wind engineering opinion provide by Arup but is not clear on the architectural elevations.
	General wind environment is stated to pass distress criterion but may require local amelioration for sedentary activities (sitting, rest)
	Cross Ventilation does not meet ADG requirements for level 1-9.
	Single aspect podium apartments are provided with chimneys to assist to improvement ventilation but this are not coordinated above the roof plane. Chimneys for the north east podium apartments would need to terminate within the childcare terrace.
	Deep soil areas are shown above the car park and are said to be available on the podium buildings. However, neither of these can be deep soil as required by the ADG, which requires connection to the ground that is unimpeded by building structures.

ESD reporting

Strengths	Weaknesses
Centralised heating and heat rejection with local packaged unit is best practice.	Rainwater collection is limited to the roof. No stormwater reused proposed, which is unfortunate given extensive open area and each of deep soil planting.
BASIX 40+ stated as being committed to for Energy and Water.	Discussion regarding NABERS, Green Star and WELL is limited to just discussion - there is no commitment or evidence of any consideration of requirements in the design.


Strengths	Weaknesses
Openings in ground plane to bring air and light to the car park is a good initiative. There is an opportunity to better distribute the opening to enhance their benefit.	Reporting is out of step with design. Report discusses shading elements and window areas being thoughtfully considered.
Allowance for cycle storage and EOT facilities appears generous.	The report states that recycled water (through dual pipe and future connection to utility) is not suitable for residential toilets. This is not true and the existing SOPA WRAMS scheme already supplies residential toilet and clothes washing uses. Despite the statement that a connection to reuse water is not being proved to residential uses, the towers are shown 'recycled water ready' in the accompanying illustration and the toilets are shown as the biggest user of grey water in the water balance diagram.
	Discussion on apartments being thermally autonomous is nonsense. The apartments are effectively BAU for high rise apartment design.
	Proposal for heat recovery shower trays is small environmental gains only and appears based on poor assumptions. It will also be a very expensive initiative and should be confirmed to be priced.

FJMT - Other comments

- Calculations and images for solar access to the park do not appear to consider the towers. It can be seen that the modest community building has more impact on overshadowing than the two residential towers. The reporting on this element is therefore considered unreliable.

FJMT - Improvement opportunities.

- Develop a solution for the facade that provides protection sun protection/minimises solar reflection.
- Introduce capture and reuse of stormwater
- If podium residential cannot be relocated, ensure chimneys are able to be coordinated above ground.
- Develop openings in ground plane to maximum benefit of natural air makeup to the car park.
- Cost allowance for Dual piping should be provided.



LEGEND

- 1. AMPHITHEATRE
- 2. WATER-PLAY FOUNTAIN
- 3. COMMUNITY OUTLOOK THEATRE
- 4. PROMENADE
- 5. PONTOON
- 6. LAP POOL
- 7. KIOSK AND CANOE/KAYAK HIRE
- 8. CHILDREN'S POOL/ WINTER ICE RINK
- 9. FLOATING SALT MARSH
- 10. STREET TREE PLANTING
- 11. WATERFRONT TERRACE
- 12. TERRACE ALCOVE STAIRS
- 13. LIFT TO FOOTBRIDGE
- 14. CAFE
- 15. PUBLIC AMENITIES
- 16. RETAIL
- 17. PODIUM RESIDENTIAL TERRACE LOBBY
- 18. LIFT TO MAIN PARK
- 19. CARPARK/LOADING ENTRY
- 20. PORTE COCHERE & VEHICULAR DROP OFF
- 21. CHILDCARE LOBBY
- 22. TOWER LOBBY
- 23. RESTAURANT LOBBY
- 24. MARINA CLUB
- 25. TOWER A WATERFRONT LOBBY
- 26. RESIDENTIAL/CLUB CARPARK
- 27. BLOCK E EXISTING RETAIL CARPARK EXTENSION
- 28. BLOCK E EXISTING RETAIL CARPARK
- 29. MAILROOM
- 30. PLANT/SERVICES

REQUIREMENTS

30m Building Setback Line - Limited building projections are permitted beyond this line at the northern + southern corners (see hatched - 10m x 25m building articulation zone) Activations such as outdoor dining are permitted between the Building Setback and Public Foreshore Lines.

20m Public Foreshore Line - No built form is permitted beyond this line. Continuous public foreshore (20m wide) to include 30% deep soil landscaping and provide 24/7 public access. Street furniture, landscaping permitted.

6.3m Foreshore Path Zone - Required 6.3m path width, measured from the back of the seawall (path and seawall is to align to northern and southern approved seawalls). No obstructions, trees, street furniture etc. is permissible within this zone

Appendix 2: SLR Wind Assessment for Jury

14 September 2018

610.14776-L01-v0.1.docx

Billbergia
Suite 101 / 25 Angas Street
Meadowbank NSW 2114

Attention: Donovan Sia

Dear Donovan

Wentworth Point, Block H Environmental Wind Advice - Design Competition

SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd (SLR) has been previously engaged by Billbergia to qualitatively and quantitatively (wind tunnel testing and/or computational fluid dynamics (CFD) numerical modelling) assess the environmental impact of a proposed multi-purpose developments located at Wentworth Point with regard to the wind environment on and around the site.

SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd (SLR) has been recently engaged by Billbergia to provide a comparison report on the environmental wind for Block H by the following teams:

- Bates Smart Architects
- DBJ Architects
- FJMT Architects

Each team provided a distinctive concept design. The concept designs incorporated design features which may help mitigate wind. Additional wind mitigation measures have been recommended and need to be overcome during the development application stage.




Summary assessment of each design in terms of wind is enclosed. Desktop studies are attached for the project team consideration. This analysis has been made on the basis of our best engineering judgment and on the experience gained from scaled model wind tunnel testing or computational fluid dynamics analysis of a range of developments. Wind conditions must be quantified via wind tunnel and/or CFD during the Development Application Stage of the project to refine the recommendations and satisfy Council's conditions.

Please do not hesitate to call me on 0401 416 274 if you have any queries or require further information.

Yours sincerely




DR NEIHAD AL-KHALIDY
Technical Director - CFD, Wind & Energy

Summary Qualitative Wind Assessment - Concept by Bates Smart	Summary Qualitative Wind Assessment - Concept by DBJ	Summary Qualitative Wind Assessment - Concept by FJMT
<p>The design consists two buildings – Building A (56 storeys), Building B (37 storeys). The following list describes the areas which are likely to be affected by strong wind conditions.</p>  <p>Waterfront Promenade: Affected by reduced shielding to some prevailing wind conditions and the potential for downwash from the tower facades.</p> <p>Floating Area: Affected by reduced shielding to some prevailing wind conditions.</p> <p>Club Balcony: Affected by potential downwash winds from Tower A.</p> <p>Building Entries: Affected by potential downwash winds from tower facades,</p> <p>Childcare: Affected by potential downwash winds from Tower A.</p> <p>Open Park: Affected by potential downwash winds from tower facades,</p>	<p>The concept design consists of one building – which has up to 40 storeys and incorporates a curved façade and building form. The following list describes the areas which are likely to be affected by strong wind conditions.</p>  <p>Burroway Road: Affected by channelling winds between buildings.</p> <p>Wentworth Place: Affected by channelling winds between buildings.</p> <p>Footbridge Boulevard: Affected by channelling winds between buildings.</p> <p>Waterfront Promenade: Affected by reduced shielding to some prevailing wind conditions.</p> <p>Restaurant Open Area: Affected by reduced shielding to some prevailing wind conditions.</p> <p>Club Open Area: Affected by reduced shielding to some prevailing wind conditions.</p> <p>Floating Pool and Beach Area: Affected by reduced shielding to some prevailing wind conditions.</p> <p>Retail and Building Entries: Affected by potential for downwash winds from the development façade.</p> <p>Open Park: Affected by potential for downwash winds from the development façade.</p> <p>Courtyard: Affected by channelling of winds between building.</p> <p>Upper Level Balconies: Affected by stronger upper level winds and reduced shielding.</p> <p>Level 40 Communal Terrace: Affected by stronger upper level winds and reduced shielding.</p>	<p>The concept design consists of two buildings – Tower A 'Plate' (approx. 36 storeys) and Tower B (approx. 57 storeys). The following list describes the areas which are likely to be affected by strong wind conditions.</p>  <p>Waterfront Promenade: Affected by reduced shielding to some prevailing wind conditions.</p> <p>Waterfront Terrace: Affected by reduced shielding to some prevailing wind conditions and the potential for downwash from the tower facades.</p> <p>Floating Area: Affected by reduced shielding to some prevailing wind conditions.</p> <p>Club Terrace: Affected by potential downwash winds from tower facades,</p> <p>Tower Entries: Affected by potential downwash winds from tower facades and wind channelling between development buildings,</p> <p>Open Areas: Affected by potential downwash winds from tower facades,</p> <p>Childcare Terrace: Affected by potential downwash winds from tower facades,</p> <p>Upper Level Balconies: Affected by stronger upper level winds and reduced shielding.</p>

Design Mitigations

The design consists of a number of features which help to ameliorate strong wind conditions. The following list describes these ameliorations at the affected locations:



Waterfront Promenade: Landscaping and screens are recommended to protect seating and standing areas.


Floating Area: Screens or practical wind shielding is recommended to the area. A management plan regarding adverse winds and use of the public space is recommended to be applied to the floating area.

Club Balcony: Awning is recommended to be extended to protect seating and standing areas

Building Entries: A 3m canopy is recommended to the surrounds of both towers to be applied at level 3 or below. Alternatives to this could be assessed through quantitative testing during DA stage.


Childcare: Additional landscaping is recommended to the east of the proposed childcare open area.

Open Park: Additional landscaping is recommended around open area.



Design Mitigations

The design consists of a number of features which help to ameliorate strong wind conditions. The following list describes additional features that will further improve the wind environment.



Surrounding Streets: Additional landscaping is recommended along surrounding streets to mitigate against wind channelling between buildings.

Waterfront Promenade: Landscaping and screens are recommended to protect seating and standing areas.

Restaurant and Club Open Areas: Landscaping and screens are recommended to protect seating and standing areas. .

Floating Pool and Beach Area: Screens or practical wind shielding is recommended to the area. A management plan regarding adverse winds and use of the public space is recommended to be applied to the floating area.


Retail and Building Entries: Additional landscaping is recommended. Further awnings or canopies are recommended above building entries.

Open Park: Additional landscaping is recommended.

Courtyard: Additional landscaping is recommended and canopies or pergolas are recommended over seating areas.


Upper Level Balconies: Corner balconies or balconies with dual aspects are recommended to incorporate vertical shielding elements, to ensure they have only one open aspect.

Level 40 Communal Terrace: Vertical shielding surrounding terrace eg balustrade is recommended to be set at 1800mm above floor level.



Design Mitigations

The design consists of a number of features which help to ameliorate strong wind conditions. The following list describes additional features that will further improve the wind environment.



Waterfront Promenade: Landscaping and screens are recommended to protect seating and standing areas.

Waterfront Terrace: Screens or other vertical shielding recommended to the area. Pergolas or canopies recommended over seating areas.

Floating Area: Screens or practical wind shielding is recommended to the area. A management plan regarding adverse winds and use of the public space is recommended to be applied to the floating area.


Club Terrace: Extend awning above or incorporate pergolas/ canopy to protect seating areas.

Tower Entries: A 3m canopy is Recommended to the surrounds of both towers to be applied as low as practically feasible. Alternatives to this could be assessed through quantitative testing during DA stage.

Open Areas: Additional landscaping is recommended.

Childcare Terrace: Canopy or awning recommended above.

Upper Level Balconies: Corner balconies or balconies with dual aspects are recommended to incorporate vertical shielding elements, to ensure they have only one open aspect.



<p>Further Comments</p> <p>The concept displays many design features which could mitigate adverse wind conditions in and around the site. The rooftop terraces situated on L34 and L53 have been provided with generous balustrades set at 3000mm which should provide adequate shielding against stronger upper level winds. It is advised that balconies retain nested feature and be located away from building corners, as currently specified; this will provide excellent protection from stronger upper level winds.</p> <p>Proposed landscaping to the site and public park will greatly aid in providing wind mitigating to the site and surrounding area. Additional landscaping on the park level public space, particularly around the childcare and open public areas will further help improve wind conditions. Building entries should be well shielded if provided with the recommended 3m canopy to each towers façade.</p> <p>The waterfront and floating area are where most attention needs to be placed. The “Forest” landscape area will provide generous shielding from westerly and some downwash winds. However screens or vertical shielding elements are recommended to the floating space and a management plan is recommended for adverse wind conditions. Along the waterfront promenade it is recommended to utilise trees and vertical screens to protect pedestrians along with seating areas to the club and café. Pergolas and canopies over seating area could further improve wind environment.</p>	<p>Further Comments</p> <p>The concept displays many design features which could mitigate adverse wind conditions in and around the site. The rooftop terrace situated on L40 may still experience strong wind conditions due to stronger upper level winds and reduced shielding at this height. It is advised this area incorporate an 1800mm balustrade.</p> <p>Additional landscaping on the ground floor public space, particularly around neighbouring streets and the open public areas will help improve wind conditions. Entry locations are at this point unclear, it is recommended that the incorporate vertical shielding elements above to reduce impact of downwash winds.</p> <p>The façade design of the proposed does incorporate a number of undercroft areas; it is recommended that landscaping be provided around and to both sides of these undercrofts to mitigate against the risk of wind channelling.</p> <p>The waterfront and floating area are where most attention needs to be placed. The slightly elevated public seating for the proposed beach area around the pool should help wind conditions. However screens or vertical shielding elements are recommended to the space and a management plan is recommended for adverse wind conditions. Along the waterfront promenade it is recommended to utilise trees and vertical screens to protect pedestrians along with seating areas to the restaurant and club.</p>	<p>Further Comments</p> <p>The concept displays many design features which could mitigate adverse wind conditions in and around the site. Corner balconies are recommended to incorporate additional shielding or be assessed quantitatively to establish required mitigation.</p> <p>Additional landscaping on the podium public space, particularly around proposed stairs and the play/seating areas will help improve wind conditions. Entry points on the podium level to residential towers are recommended to incorporate vertical and horizontal shielding elements.</p> <p>The façade design has a setback for the allocated restaurant area, if any of the external areas are ever to be made accessible to the public then additional mitigation measures would be required.</p> <p>The waterfront and floating area are where most attention needs to be placed. The shielding from the development for some prevailing winds and the size of the allocated areas should provide some flexibility with regards to adverse winds. However screens or vertical shielding elements are recommended to the floating space and a management plan is recommended for adverse wind conditions. Along the waterfront promenade it is recommended to utilise trees and vertical screens to protect pedestrians along with seating areas to the club and public. Additional pergolas/canopies are also recommended over seating areas.</p>
---	---	---

Appendix 3: Correspondence Schedule

Formal correspondence to competitors during the competition process.

Subject	Date	Information
Issue of brief	5 July 2018	Issuing of competition of brief and general arrangements.
Additional information	18 July 2018	Additional miscellaneous information re levels, mandated views for CGIs, final draft DCP issued by Council and formal brief approval.
View analysis	24 July 2018	Clarification of the brief's requirements regarding existing apartment views requirements and miscellaneous matters.
Contextual details	2 August 2018	Additional information on the level and details of the approved Burroway Road upgrade as well as the retail carpark built within Block H.
Obstacle Limitation Surface	8 August 2018	Advice on effect of Obstacle Limitation Surface on potential building heights for Scenario 2 (35 storeys).
Scenario 1 Height Limit	10 August 2018	Council endorsement of amendment to Brief and draft DCP such that Scenario building height to be consistent with Jury recommendations for 35 storeys.
Additional survey and photos	14 August 2018	Survey levels for Footbridge Boulevard between Wentworth Place and the Bridge and optional photos for mandated CGIs.
Winter Gardens	24 August 2018	Clarification on the use of winter gardens for balconies and information required for compliance check.
Wind Assessments	19 August 2018	Request for information for independent wind assessment.
Presentations	7 September 2018	Notification of presentation details.
Wind Assessments	17 September 2018	Copy of independent wind assessment for architect comment at presentations as warranted.

Appendix 4: Competition Brief

DESIGN EXCELLENCE COMPETITION BRIEF

City of Parramatta



Phase 2 Competition for Architectural Design

Block H , Precinct B, Wentworth Point

9 August, 2018



Acknowledgement

Design Competition Brief template has been prepared by City Plan Strategy and Development for the City of Parramatta Council. This Design Competition Brief has been prepared by Dowling Urban with input from City of Parramatta Council.

Table of Amendments

Revision	Date	Amendments
A	7 June 2018	Dowling Urban
B	29 June 2018	Council Comments
C	04 July 2018	Dowling Urban
D	9 August 2018	Brief Amendment 01 – Maximum building heights

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	ii
Table of Amendments	ii
Competition Summary	5
PART A - Introduction to the Architectural Design Competition	8
A1. Background	8
A2. Competition Objectives	9
A2.1 Competition Format	9
A2.2 Reference Documents	9
A2.3 Brief Endorsement	9
PART B - Site details	11
B1. Site Address	11
B2. Legal Description	11
B3. Site Characteristics	11
B3.1 Site Area and Measurements.....	11
B3.2 Existing Buildings and Structures.....	12
B3.3 Easements or Restrictions	13
B3.4 Topography and Vegetation.....	13
B3.5 Vehicular Access	13
B3.6 Special Site Characteristics	13
B4. Site Analysis	14
B5. Surrounding Area	14
B6. Relevant Existing Development Approvals	15
B6.1 For the Site	15
B6.2 The surrounding Area	15
B7. Planning Proposals	15
B7.1 For the Site	15
B7.2 The surrounding Area	15
B8. Voluntary Planning Agreement	15
PART C - Objectives for the Proposal	17
C1. Overview	17
C2. Design Excellence	17
C3. Design Objectives	17
C3.1 Overview.....	17
C3.2 Phase 1 Competition Jury Recommendations	18
C3.3 Development Scenarios.....	20
C3.4 Building Form.....	20

C3.5 Height and Street Frontage Heights	20
C3.6 Public Domain.....	20
C3.7 Vehicular Access, Loading and Parking.....	21
C3.8 Structural and Geotechnical Objectives	21
C3.9 Wind.....	22
C3.10 Flooding and Rainwater Management Objectives	22
C4. Planning Objectives	22
C4.1 Statutory and Non-Statutory Framework.....	22
C4.2 Non-Compliances	23
C4.3 Ecologically Sustainable Development and Environmental Performance	24
C4.4 Sustainable Transport.....	25
C4.5 Public Art	25
C4.6 Commercial Objectives.....	25
C4.7 Net Lettable Area	26
C4.8 Land Use	26
C4.9 Construction Budget	26
C4.10 Construction Methodology	27
C4.11 ESD Methodology.....	27
PART D - Competition Procedures	29
D1. Proponent	29
D2. Competition Manager.....	29
D3. Competition Entry	29
D4. Competition Details	29
D5. Architectural Design Competition Brief	29
D5.1 Objectives of the Brief.....	29
D5.2 Amendments to the Brief	30
D6. Mid-Point Review	30
D7. Competition Jury and Requirements.....	30
D8. Juror’s Obligations	30
D9. Proponent’s Obligations.....	31
D9.1 General Obligations	31
D9.2 Competition Fee	31
D9.3 Payment of Jury Members	31
D9.4 Payment of Technical Advisors for the Jury and Competition Participants	31
D9.5 Administration Costs	31
D10. Technical Assistance for the Jury	32
D11. Technical Assistance for Competition Participants.....	32
D12. Communications, Questions and Competitor Briefings.....	32
D13. Closing Date for Proposals	32

D14. Lodgement of Proposals	33
D15. Disqualification	33
D16. Jury Assessment and Decision	33
D16.1 Details of the Jury Meeting	33
D16.2 Jury Assessment and Decision	33
D16.3 Announcement.....	34
D16.4 Request for Review.....	34
D17. Appointment of the Architect of the Winning Scheme	34
D18. Post-Competition Review	34
D19. Care of Material and Insurance	35
D20. Return of Documents.....	35
D21. Copyright	35
D22. Confidentiality	35
D23. Post Competition Processes.....	35
D23.1 Confirmation of Design Excellence	35
D23.2 Integrity of Design Excellence post competition.....	36
PART E - Competition Submission Requirements	38
E1. General Requirements	38
E2. Drawings and Graphics	38
E2.1 Technical Requirements for Documentation	39
E3. Statement of Design Intent	39
E4. Statement of Compliance	39
E5. Detailed Area Schedule.....	39
E6. Quantity Surveyor's Cost Advice.....	39
E7. Physical and Digital Model Requirements	39
E8. Anonymity	40
PART F - Reference Documents	42
Appendix 1: Template Letter for the Appointment of the Juror	44
Appendix 2: Template Invitation Letter to Architects	46
Appendix 3: Draft Homebush Bay West Development Control Plan Amendment No 2.	48
Appendix 4: Site Survey & Analysis	49
Appendix 5: HBW DCP Amendment No.2 Quantitative Planning Compliance Criteria.....	50
Appendix 6: City of Parramatta Council Digital 3D Model Requirements	51

Competition Summary

Site Address	Block H, Precinct B, Wentworth Point
Site Legal Description	Lot 24 and Part Lot 11 DP 270778
Project Name	"Block H"
Competition Type	Invited Architectural Design Competition
Proponent	Billbergia Pty Ltd
Competition Manager	Greg Dowling, Dowling Urban Pty Ltd Ph 02 9516 4377, m 0407 404 898, e greg@dowlingurban.com.au
CoP Competition Co-ordinator	Guy Pinkerton Ph: (02) 9806 5262, Email: gpinkerton@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au In his Absence, Najeeb Kobeissi Ph: (02) 9806 5304, Email: nkobeissi@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au
Architectural Design Competition Competitors	Bates Smart and Hargreaves Associates Durbach Block Jaggars and Jane Irwin Landscape Architecture FJMT and Martha Schwartz Partners
Competition Fee	Phase 2 \$60,000 per competitor which includes \$10,000 allowance for Landscape Architect
Technical Advisors	Town Planner: Greg Dowling, Dowling Urban Quantity Surveying: RLB, Stephen Mee Structural Engineering: WSP Group Mechanical and Electrical Engineering: WSP Group Hydraulic and Fire Services: WSP Group Wind Engineering: WSP Group Façade Engineering: WSP Group Lift Engineering: WSP Group Flood Engineer: WSP Group
Jury Members	City of Parramatta Council - City Architect – Kim Crestani NSW Government Architect – Peter Poulet Proponent - Bob Nation, National Design Director, GHD Woodhead (Proponent's Representative) One registered landscape architect and one urban designer will be engaged by Council to provide expert independent advice to the Jury.
Key Competition Dates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13th July 2018 - Design Competition Brief endorsed by COPC; • 13th July 2018 – Design Competition Commencement (7 weeks) • By Arrangement - Briefing session for each Competitor (proponent only); • 3rd Sept 2018 - Lodgement date for Proposals to Competition Manager; • Fourth week by arrangement - Midpoint check in and costings review • 5th Sept 2018 - Proposals issued to CoPC by Competition Manager • 5th Sept 2018 - Proposals issued to Jury by Competition Manager • 19th Sept 2018 - Presentation by Competitors to Jury; • TBA - Final deliberation by jury and recommendation made to Proponent; • TBA - Jury report issued to CoP for endorsement; and • TBA - Formal appointment of successful Competitor.
Site Area	Approximately 30,800 m ² inclusive of foreshore linear and main parks

Maximum HBW DCP Floor Space	Scenario 1: Maximum residential floor space (FS) 54,356 m2 Minimum FS for non-residential uses 2,900m2 Scenario 2 (Transport enhanced): Scenario 1 but with limit of 85,000m2 FS residential floor space. (Refer to Section C4.2 for definition of 'floor space' (FS))
Minimum Public Open Space	16,800 m2
Maximum Building Heights	Scenario 1: Maximum 35 storeys above the level of Wentworth Place at its highest point (refer to Phase 1 Competition Jury Report recommendations) Scenario 2: Not specified (refer to Phase 1 Competition Jury Report recommendations)
Voluntary Planning Agreement?	Yes, likely to include built items on site as described in brief.
Construction Budget	Variable, allow \$3,250m2 GFA and note potential public benefit allowances in brief.
Estimated Apartments	Approximately 605 to 1,000 for scenario 1 and 2 respectively (based on Council standard of 85m2 GFA average)
Desired Apartment Mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 bedroom - 35% • 2 bedroom - 35% • 1 bedroom - 30%

PART A

INTRODUCTION TO THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION

Grimshaw & BVN
Arthur Phillip High School & Parramatta Primary School
175-177 Macquarie Street, Parramatta

PART A - Introduction to the Architectural Design Competition

A1. Background

This Architectural Design Competition Brief relates to Block H, Precinct B, Wentworth Point, which is owned by Billbergia.

The Homebush Bay West Development Control Plan (HBW DCP) is the primary statutory document in this part of Wentworth Point. It is subject to a draft amendment included in this brief which was informed by Phase 1 of the Competition.

The site is subject to a request by the proponent to amend the DCP to permit additional floor area, altered building heights and increased public open space in consideration of an offer for public benefits under a voluntary planning agreement.

Acceptance of the proposal by Council is subject to the resultant development exhibiting design excellence in architectural, urban and landscape design while the amount of development floor space to be permitted will be based on State government commitments to new public transport infrastructure proposals.

Accordingly, the design of the development will require the inclusion of two compatible scenarios as described in the Brief.

There are two (2) different forms of Architectural Design Competitions that can be undertaken, including:

- (a) an 'open' architectural design competition; or
- (b) an 'invited' architectural design competition.

The subject competitive design process will be undertaken as an invited architectural design competition

Three architects have been selected by the Phase 1 Masterplan Competition Jury to participate in the Phase 2 Architectural Design Competition. Participants must include a Landscape Architect with suitable experience or expertise to undertake foreshore and major public park design.

Due to the importance of this project, a collaborative approach to the Architectural Design Competition is considered to be an effective means of achieving design excellence and architectural variety.

The purpose of this document is to provide a Brief to the architects, urban designers and landscape architects that will participate in the Architectural Design Competition for the abovementioned site.

This Brief provides an outline of the project objectives and competition process, the Proponent's expectations, and information to assist Competitors in preparing their proposal submissions.

A2. Competition Objectives

The key objectives of this Architectural Design Competition are:

- To ensure that the highest standard of architectural, urban and landscape design is delivered to the Parramatta LGA; and
- To ensure that development exhibits design excellence that contributes to the natural, cultural, visual and built character values of Parramatta.

Site and development specific objectives that are required to be addressed in the Architectural Design Competition entries are set out in Part C of this Brief.

A2.1 Competition Format

Details regarding the type, process and requirement of this competitive design process is provided in Part D of this Brief. Set out below, however, is a summary:

- The purpose of this Architectural Design Competition is to select the highest quality architectural and urban design and landscape solution for the development of the site, compatible with the objectives set out in Part C of this Brief;
- This competition will be an invited Architectural Design Competition, with three competitors;
- Each Competitor is required to be led by a registered architect with demonstrated relevant expertise in high quality architecture, urban design and landscape architecture;
- Competitor teams must include a Landscape Architect with suitable experience or expertise to undertake foreshore and major public park design.
- The competition entries will be judged by a Jury panel comprising three (3) members, representing the Proponent, the Department of Planning and Environment (or their nominee) and CoPC; and
- The competitive design process will not fetter the discretion of the Consent Authority since the Consent Authority will not form part of the judging process.

A2.2 Reference Documents

This Brief has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines and Parramatta LEP 2011 (Clause 7.10 – Design Excellence). Its objectives are to ensure:

- Council's design excellence requirements are balanced with the Proponent's objectives; and
- Procedural fairness for Competitors.

This Brief contains details regarding the following information:

- A detailed description of the site;
- A detailed description of relevant information or documentation including any relevant planning history;
- Competition type;
- Competition objectives;
- Full details for the conduct of the competition process; and
- The fees offered to participants in the competition.

A2.2.1 Project Information Package

Each Competitor will be provided with the following information, which is annexed to this Brief:

- Template letter for the appointment of Jurors
- Council resolution and draft DCP Amendment
- Phase 1 Masterplan Competition Jury Report
- Current site survey
- Planning compliance criteria
- Parramatta Council's Digital 3D Model Requirements
- 3D site model DWG
- Site Survey DWG and Strata Easement (showing 20 m public easement for Seawall)
- Flooding Advice, Geotechnical Report and Seawall Detail
- Consultant Contract and Consultant Scope of Works and Services
- Billbergia Residential Principles Project Requirements and Past Projects
- Homebush Bay Development Control Plan incorporating Amendment 1.

A2.3 Brief Endorsement

This Brief has been reviewed and endorsed by City of Parramatta Council (CoPC) on 13th July 2018.

PART B

SITE DETAILS



Tony Caro Architecture, Aleksander Design Group & Order Architects
5-7 Parkes Street, Parramatta

PART B - Site details

B1. Site Address

The site is located at Block H, Precinct B, Burroway Road, Wentworth Point.

B2. Legal Description

The site is legally described as Lot Lot 24 (and Part 11)in Deposited Plan 270778.


B3. Site Characteristics

B3.1 Site Area and Measurements

The site has an area of approximately 30,800 m² and boundary dimensions are irregular but the main parcel is as follows:

Table 1 Boundary Dimensions


Boundary	Distance (m)
North	183 m
South	183 m
East	159m
West	159m




Excerpt from Plan of Subdivision showing subject land.

B3.2 Existing Buildings and Structures

The main parcel within the subject site is known as Block H and is the final stage of development of Precinct B shown in the attached plan and model. The Block H site is vacant other than a three level basement carpark servicing the adjoining shopping centre and which will become below new ground level. It is also encumbered by the Bennelong Bridge landing while the existing seawall to Homebush Bay is required to be rebuilt.



Plan of subject site (source: Site Plan in Appendices)



3D view of subject site (source: 3D View in Appendices)

B3.3 Easements or Restrictions

The subject land is subject to a number of variable easements as shown in the plan of subdivision, including in particular 20m public right of way on the foreshore to Homebush Bay.

B3.4 Topography and Vegetation

The subject site comprises formerly reclaimed land from Homebush Bay created for industrial development. The development approach to date has been to construct a false terrain to limit excavation into the water table. The site does not contain vegetation of significance or capability/suitability for retention.

B3.5 Vehicular Access

Vehicle access is available from Burroway Road, which is a public road, as well as the adjoining Wentworth Place and Footbridge Boulevard, which are Public Accessways within the community title subdivision of Precinct B. Note that Footbridge Boulevard may have restrictions for direct car access given its role in servicing the bus only Bennelong Bridge.

B3.6 Special Site Characteristics

B3.6.1 Contamination

The site has been investigated for contamination given the history of the site and its relationship with land reclamation from the Bay and former industrial activities in the wider area.

Potential contaminants as well as the extent and results of soil and groundwater tests are outlined in the Environmental Report but do not preclude the use of the site for high density mixed use residential development.

B3.6.2 Drainage & Flooding

The site is free of natural hazards except some flooding on Burroway Road and the foreshore in their current conditions but from which habitable floors are able to be placed above potential flood levels with limited adjustment.

Auburn Council has previously advised that on-site detention will not be required for the site. Stormwater from the site will be collected and directed to the east to Homebush Bay through a new pipeline to be laid in Burroway Road.

The street system will be sized to cater for the 20 year ARI flow. Provision for flows in excess of the 20 year ARI and up to the 100 year ARI will be treated as overland flow and contained within the street kerb and gutter.

B3.6.3 Acid Sulfate Soils

Details on acid sulphate soils, soil/groundwater aggressivity and seismicity are provided in the Geotechnical Report.

B3.6.4 Geotechnical

Most of the Wentworth Point peninsula is on reclaimed land and is subject to geotechnical constraints whereby excavation requires special considerations.

The geotechnical issues considered relevant to the proposed development in the Geotechnical Report in the Appendices include site preparation, excavation, excavation support, groundwater and foundations. Details on acid sulphate soils, soil/groundwater aggressivity and seismicity are also provided.

B3.6.5 Views

The site occupies a predominant site within the Hombush Bay catchment while towers will be visible from a wider area surrounding.

Existing apartments in the Block C and E towers enjoy water views which is required to be taken into account in proposed designs.

B3.6.6 Key Elements of Public Domain

The key elements of the existing public domain is the foreshore easement as well as the existing adjoining streets, Burroway Road, Footbridge Boulevard and Wentworth Point.

B4. Site Analysis

Plans of the site's context are provided with the brief.

A context, site and detailed analysis should be undertaken to inform the proposed design. Sufficient plans and sections to scale should document the important elements surrounding the site including (but not necessarily limited to);

- Context to include where publicly available relevant buildings recently approved, under construction or constructed as well as indicative outcomes of land planned for redevelopment,
- Circulation, Movement and Pedestrian desire lines
- Street network
- Street plans
- Levels
- Uses
- Building footprints
- Building heights, building edge and setback conditions,
- Building alignments
- Entry points vehicles and pedestrian
- Public transport routes
- Effect on adjacent sites.
- Easements or restrictions

B5. Surrounding Area

Wentworth Point was formerly known as Homebush Bay West and forms part of a wider area of urban rejuvenation of former industrial and reclaimed land. It is located to the north of Sydney Olympic Park and Newington, and is linked to Rhodes over Homebush Bay by the Bennelong Bridge which is restricted to pedestrian, bicycle and public transport busses.

The Parramatta River separates the Wentworth Point precinct from Meadowbank to the north while the Millennium Parklands are located to the immediate west.

The site immediately to the south of Precinct B contains residential buildings from 4 to 25 storeys with associated connecting streets and public opens spaces.

The land north of the site on Burroway Road comprises

- a 4 to 8 storey mixed use development adjacent to the public ferry wharf;
- a primary school immediately adjacent to the north-west; and

The Wentworth Point Urban Activation Precinct redevelopment site to the north-west across Burroway Road proposed for mixed residential of 5 and 25 storeys and maritime facilities.

B6. Relevant Existing Development Approvals

B6.1 For the Site

The site is subject to a redundant masterplan and a staged development consent which are not to be taken into account for this competition.

B6.2 The surrounding Area

A compilation drawing is included in the appendices providing an overview of current built, approved and planned indicative spatial and building forms.

B7. Planning Proposals

B7.1 For the Site

In considering a report and option recommendations subsequent to the Phase 1 Design Competition, The City of Parramatta Council resolved the following on the 28 May 2018:

- (a) **That** Council receives and notes the report regarding the DCP and draft VPA, and also notes that the Design Jury Expert Report provided recommendations regarding the site's capacity to sustain bulk, scale and density.
- (b) **That** Council proceed with the second half of the Design Excellence competition on the basis of the Jury recommendation to consider additional residential floorspace.
- (c) **That** Council enter into negotiations on the final terms of the Draft VPA regarding increased floorspace to achieve increased public benefits for Council and the community of at least \$70 million on the proviso that the developer continues to fund the existing Baylink Shuttle service at its own expense for the shorter period of: eight years OR when light rail (Stage 2) is delivered. The Public Benefit items to be targeted include:
 - a. Road infrastructure and intersection upgrades
 - b. Baylink Shuttle Service (as above)
 - c. Child care centres
 - d. Library and Community Centre fit out funding
 - e. Public open space and developed parklands
 - f. Waterfront promenade & other as agreed on foreshore
- (d) **That** on completion of the design excellence competition, Council proceed with the exhibition of the Draft DCP to the limit of Option 3 (85,000sqm of residential floorspace).
- (e) **That** the draft DCP wording contain a caveat that until a funding commitment from the State government to Parramatta Light Rail (Stage 2) and Metro West is announced, or other transport improvements to justify the maximum residential floor space, the Applicant be restricted from lodging applications for development approval exceeding 54,356sqm of residential floorspace as recommended under Option 2.
- (f) **Further, that** Ward Councillors form a sub-Committee, if the VPA is approved, to assist in making recommendations to Council regarding the allocation of the funds.

B7.2 The surrounding Area

None known.

B8. Voluntary Planning Agreement

A VPA is proposed to be entered into between the proponent and City of Parramatta Council which will include some facilities to be placed on site. It is anticipated that:

- a child care centre for 75 places to be dedicated to Council will be included in a VAP for Scenario 1;
- a water recreation facility and a public park pavilion, potentially including an art gallery, may be included in a VPA for Scenario 2 or become part of the proposed overall public benefit supporting the scheme.



PART C

OBJECTIVES FOR THE PROPOSAL

SJB
14-20 Parkes Street, Parramatta

PART C - Objectives for the Proposal

C1. Overview

The overarching purpose of this competitive design process is to deliver the highest standard of architectural, urban and landscape design in accordance with the objectives set out in the following sections of this Brief.

C2. Design Excellence

The design excellence objectives for this Architectural Design Competition are effectively those set out throughout this section of the Brief. High level design excellence objectives to be considered in the preparation of a competition entry are sourced from the PLEP 2011 and are set out below:

- The design of the development will promote a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location;
- The form and external appearance of the development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain;
- The planning and envelope treatments will provide high quality responses to promote passive design, enhanced occupant amenity, energy efficiency and mitigation of the heat island effect;
- The development will not detrimentally impact on key view corridors;
- The development will not detrimentally impact on public open space land protected by solar access controls proposed in the draft DCP amendment;
- The development will appropriately and positively respond to (draft DCP clause 5.4.10 iv):
 - the suitability of the land for development,
 - the existing and proposed uses and use mix,
 - any heritage and archaeological issues and streetscape constraints or opportunities,
 - the relationship of the development with other development (existing or proposed) on the same site or on neighbouring sites in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form, in particular the Apartment Design Guide for residential buildings;
 - the bulk, massing and modulation of buildings,
 - alignment of buildings with the streets to reinforce the block and street pattern,
 - street frontage heights,
 - environmental impacts, such as sustainable design, overshadowing and solar access, visual and acoustic privacy, noise, wind and reflectivity,
 - excellence of the principles of ecologically sustainable development including improvement on the minimum applicable energy and water target of BASIX,
 - pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access and circulation requirements, including the permeability of any pedestrian network,
 - the impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain,
 - the impact on any special character area,
 - achieving appropriate interfaces at ground level between the building and the public domain, and
 - excellence and integration of landscape design.
- The development will promote design excellence and integration in the urban design and landscape design solution.

C3. Design Objectives

C3.1 Overview

The design objectives for this Architectural Design Competition are to:

- Stimulate imaginative architectural and urban design proposals that achieve design excellence.
- Respond to the site's context and the constraints and opportunities of the site.
- Deliver a high standard of architecture and urban design as well as materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location.
- Deliver a proposed form and external appearance that will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain.
- Allow for the incorporation of public art;
- Maintain a positive relationship with adjoining sites and surrounding buildings.
- Achieve best practice heritage conservation outcomes;
- Achieve best practice flooding and rainwater management outcomes;
- Achieve best practice Ecologically Sustainable Development outcomes; and
- Ensure the outcome is financially feasible and buildable.

C3.2 Phase 1 Competition Jury Recommendations

The recommendations of the Jury for the Phase 1 Masterplan Concept Design Competition is as follows and is required to be addressed. The full Jury Report is provided with in the Information Package.

“Based on the evaluation of all of the submitted schemes in accordance with the Competition Brief, the following firms have been formally announced by the Design Excellence Jury as proceeding to the Stage 2 Architectural Design Competition:

- Bates Smart,
- Durbach Block Jagers, and
- FJMT

Subject to the design development requirements discussed in Section D.3 below, the Competition Jury has determined that these three (3) respective schemes have the potential to exhibit design excellence. The design development recommendations are considered by the Jury to further improve the design quality of the submitted schemes.

This decision by the Jury was unanimous. The technical advisors to Council also ratified these findings.

Note: It was demonstrated by all shortlisted architects that the following maximums could be physically accommodated on site while generally meeting design objectives.

Table 10 Summary of non-conforming concepts □

Statistic	Bates Smart	Durbach Block Jagers	FJMT
Public open space estimates	20,000 m ²	16,800 m ²	32,000 m ² *
Tower Heights	33 / 50 storeys	28 / 50 storeys	39 / 49 storeys
Maximum GFAs	82,000 m ²	85,000 m ²	90,000 m ² (bulkier tower forms)

Notes: All schemes positioned the largest tower on the south-east corner of the site and rotated the park to orientate more to Wentworth Place. * includes recreational areas proposed to be created on Homebush Bay

To assist in informing the proposed DCP amendment for the site, the Jury also provides the following responses regarding the sites capacity to sustain bulk, scale and density.

Density

The three (3) shortlisted competition entries clearly demonstrate that the site has a built form capacity to contain a floorspace of approximately 75,000sqm. The 75,000sqm FS is equivalent to the maximum GFA benchmark contained within the brief (65,000sqm FS) with an additional 15% Design Excellence bonus. It should be noted that the nominated floorspace is based on the proponents proposed improvements to infrastructure (i.e. bus service, community facilities and new public open space).

The Jury do however consider that additional floorspace, up to 85,000sqm FS could be “tested” on the site subject to improved transport and social infrastructure (i.e. light rail, community facilities, increased provision of open space). The Jury are happy to assist Council in assessing the suitability of any increased density on the site should the delivery of improved infrastructure be realised.

Height

The Jury confirm that the maximum building height should be as per the endorsed design competition brief. Building heights are to be maximum 35 storeys above the level of Wentworth Place at its highest point. The Jury are of the view that building heights at Wentworth Point should not exceed the approved height of towers at Rhodes Railway Station (39 storeys – Rhodes Central) and Sydney Olympic Park (38 storeys – The Boomerang).

Future improvements to public transport infrastructure at Wentworth Point would have the juries support for the consideration of building heights that exceed 35 storeys.

Public Open Space

The Jury recommend that a minimum of 16,800sqm public open space be delivered as part of the Stage 2 Architectural Design Competition. However, all three (3) shortlisted schemes highlight the opportunity for the increased delivery of public open space in the order of 16,800sqm to 31,700sqm.

Although the Jury consider increased levels of open space as a key attribute of the master plan, it should not be at the cost of other improvements and infrastructure planned for the site.

Mix of Uses

As per the Design Competition brief, the Jury recommends that a minimum 2,900sqm floorspace is allocated to non-residential uses. However, the Jury would hope that for any increase in floorspace above 65,000sqm, there is an equitable increase in non-residential uses at ground level to activate waterfront and street frontages.

The Jury agree that community facilities such as Council owned child care centres should be excluded from the calculation of floor space (as per the HBW DCP). The exclusion of club facilities from the calculation of floorspace should be considered by Council, but the Jury defer the decision to Council's Land Use planning team.

Urban Design Principles

Based on a detailed review of the three (3) shortlisted schemes the Design Excellence Jury would like to suggest the following urban design principles are incorporated into the future DCP amendment for the site;

1. New Urban Park - with an address to Burroway Road, Wentworth Place and Footbridge Boulevard,
2. Development zone – located adjacent to Waterside Promenade to minimise overshadowing and maximise views between existing and proposed developments,
3. Tallest development – located in south-eastern corner of the site marking the arrival to Wentworth Point via Bennelong Bridge. Development to step down in scale from south (tallest) to north (lowest),
4. New Pedestrian + Cycle connections – Fully accessible (lift access) from Bennelong Bridge to Foreshore Promenade,
5. Street Address – New pedestrian and vehicular links are required to ensure appropriate street address to all residential development,
6. Foreshore Promenade – Ensure the delivery of a high quality, active and unique waterside public space at Wentworth Point,
7. Waterside Activation – Maximise retail and community uses along the Foreshore Promenade,
8. Reinforce Pedestrian Desire Lines – from Bennelong Bridge (south-east) to Ferry Wharf (north-west),
9. Potential development zones – Investigate development with an address to Burroway Road (north) and Footbridge Boulevard (south) to create an active address to streets and the new Urban Park, and
10. Waterside Activation – Explore options for animating and activating the waterfront (eg – public pool, wharfs, jetties etc)

The Jury is happy to provide additional feedback and assistance to Council as part of the preparation of the proposed DCP for Block H, Wentworth Point.

Concept Development

Despite the deliberation above, the Competition Jury has made further observations and recommendations for the proceeding concepts as set out under 'Considerations' in Section C – Review of Competition Entries for the shortlisted firms to participate in the Stage 2 Architectural Design Competition.

The Competition Jury considers that these matters are required to be resolved in order for the development concepts to exhibit "design excellence" in the Stage 2 Architectural Design Competition.

The Competition Jury will review the developed concepts as part of the Stage 2 Architectural Design Competition in which a winner will be announced."

C3.3 Development Scenarios

The draft HBW DCP amendment Np. 2 provides for two potential residential floor space outcomes (5.4.4 (i) and (ii)) whereby the maximum permitted is 54,356sqm if funding for key public transport upgrades is not committed to by the State government, or otherwise to be set to a limit of 85,000sqm.

The design must therefore accommodate the two scenarios such that either floor space option may be realised including the ability to convert the lower floor space outcomes to the higher outcome even after construction has commenced and potentially in a staged arrangement.

However, in providing for both scenarios, the individual scenario designs must be complete and demonstrate design excellence regardless of the floor space outcome.

C3.4 Building Form

The key objectives in terms of building form are as follows (draft DCP 5.4.9) :

The built form is to:

- Maintain the grid pattern east of Hill Road.
- Be organised to:
 - Reinforce the street pattern.
 - Assist in providing continuity of the built form on the east side of the peninsula and Hill Road.
 - Minimise perceived density from the public domain.
 - Minimise impacts of density on the adjacent development.
 - Maximise the views to the water from the public domain.
 - Relate to the levels in the site as formed.
 - Respond in contemporary architecture to climate and sustainability issues.
- Minimise barriers from the transition of levels from the peak of the synthetic terrain at Wentworth Place to the finished seawall levels at the waterfront within the site and to the waterfront.
- Provide clear sight lines within and through the site, and accommodate accessibility needs especially through the main park.
- Clearly distinguish between public and private domains particularly for the main park and waterfront, while allowing for active edges to the foreshore linear park and elsewhere as appropriate.
- Define the main park without excessive indentation or complexity, edges to streets and the waterfront should be activated, and be sufficiently robust to accommodate a range of uses.
- Provide seamless, continuous and animated interfaces to the respective public domains
- Use robust resilient materials that complement the neighbourhood and reflect the location.
- Modulate and articulate buildings to provide depth in the external walls, interest at street level and highlighted entrances.

C3.5 Height and Street Frontage Heights

Departures from HBW DCP and draft Amendment No.2 at Appendix 3 are required to be justified .

The height of the building MUST include to the top of any structure (including plant and equipment) unless plant and equipment can be accommodated within an acceptable architectural roof feature.

C3.6 Public Domain

The key objectives in terms of the public domain are as follows (draft DCP 5.4.6 to 5.4.9):

Public Domain And Open Space Network

The objectives for Block H public domain and open space network are that they:

- Provide:
 - A clear legible public domain.
 - Clear legible communal and private open spaces.
 - Places for people to gather formally and informally.
 - A main community park for a wide range of uses and users.
 - A foreshore promenade
 - Generous soil volumes for trees and vegetation in any landscape area on slab. Provide large, contiguous soil areas (not numerous separated planters) for planting, especially tree planting, on slab. Demonstrate that the design can provide soil volumes (excluding any drainage layers) in accordance with ADG requirements. The planters should not be raised.
 - A 24/7 lift connection between the foreshore and Footbridge Boulevard. Additional 24/7 public connection between the park and the foreshore at ground level is also required,
 - Public street frontages along all park edges.

- Active edges along the river foreshore
- Public conveniences both at the foreshore and the main park.
- Mid-site access for physical and visual permeability and reflect both movement towards the waterfront as well as north-south connections. It should be in the form of streets, lanes and/or public paths as well as view corridors
- A hierarchy of spaces, designed as a suite. which enable a range of uses over a long timeframe.
- Guided by DCP Volume 2 Homebush Bay West December 2005 Public Domain Manual design principles.
- Are consistent with the Homebush Bay West DCP controls in relation to overshadowing and deep soil requirements.
- Achieve Best Practice:
 - Flooding and rainwater management outcomes, including diversion or all stormwater from the Bay and collection for reuse and/or groundwater recharge ; and
 - Ecologically Sustainable Development outcomes
- Incorporate desire lines in the public domain design and through site links.
- Address impact of views on existing towers as a result of increased development.
- Maintain positive spatial relationships between buildings, streets, open spaces and neighbouring buildings.
- Reflect the history of the site.
- Provide on-street car parking.

Main Park (Community)

The Main Park is to:

- Reflect the recommendations of the Local Open Space Review prepared by Leisure Planners (December 2016).
- Be guided by DCP Volume 2 Homebush Bay West December 2005 Public Domain Manual design principles (except with respect to the specific location of the main park).
- Provide:
 - Flexible area for civic activities and community gathering spaces
 - Active areas such as a children's playground / all age play spaces / multi-use court / fitness equipment and bike hub.
 - Areas for contemplation, relaxation, outlook and views.
 - Community gardens and community activity rooms.
 - Cafe/restaurant associated with the park - maximum size of 100m²
 - Connections through the park and linked to the street network.
- Incorporate the timber portals of the existing warehouse into the park design.
- Be delivered as part of the first stage of development.

Foreshore Promenade

To provide:

- A continuous foreshore promenade activated at key locations.
- A well-lit accessible area under the bridge - safe and secure.
- Large canopy tree planting.

C3.7 Vehicular Access, Loading and Parking

The key objectives in terms of vehicular access, loading and parking are as follows:

- Moderate the potential visual, and pedestrian safety and amenity impacts of basement entrances, loading docks and vehicle movements in general
- Ensure that parking is contained within levels below the highest point of Wentworth Place and is well integrated with built forms and the public domain.
- Below finished ground level structures allow sufficient soil for healthy and sustainable landscape trees and vegetation.

C3.8 Structural and Geotechnical Objectives

The key objectives in terms of structural and geotechnical matters are as follows:

- Minimise the impacts of the any excavation works.
- Satisfy structural adequacy and constructability requirements in the design of the development.
- To facilitate the buildability of the project.

C3.9 Wind

Key wind engineering considerations include:

- Provide a built form that limits downdrafts;
- Introduce strategic interventions in the street scape to ameliorate adverse wind effects;
- Create a comfortable walking environment for pedestrians; and
- Maximise the amenity of private open space including balconies and wintergardens.

To address those objectives a Wind report, prepared by a qualified engineer shall be provided in the following circumstances:

- For buildings above 50m in height: Provide a wind report prepared by a qualified engineer detailing how the design meets the wind engineering objectives.
- For buildings above 150m in height: Provide a wind report prepared by a qualified engineer detailing how the design meets the wind engineering objectives, accompanied by an 3D electronic model of the building to support testing of wind effects by Council.

Wind reports are to use historical wind data from Bankstown Airport as the basis for analysis

C3.10 Flooding and Rainwater Management Objectives

Key flooding and rainwater management objectives include:

- appropriate assessment, acceptable to Council, of flood risks, flood hazard and affectation of the site from both mainstream (river) and overland flow (rainfall) events.
- a legitimate design response, acceptable to Council, that minimises risks and hazards to people and property for occupants and those in the building surrounds/public domain from both mainstream (river) and overland flow (rainfall) events.
- successful integration of flooding and rainwater design responses with other urban design and architectural solutions
- achievement of beneficial rainwater and stormwater outcomes, including in regard to rate of stormwater discharge, water quality, landscape design, other environmental factors and resource use

Specific flooding and rainwater management considerations include:

- The Flood Planning Level for the development is to be the higher of the 1% AEP flood levels from mainstream (river) and overland flow (rainfall) events plus 500mm freeboard. (Note this may vary around the site.)
- Habitable floors, all access to basement car parks and other flood-sensitive uses shall be set at a minimum of the applicable Flood Planning Level.
- Buildings surrounded by “high hazard” flood waters in a 1% AEP event cannot be developed unless failsafe, all-weather emergency access to and from adjoining higher land is provided.
- Council requires additional measures for events greater than the Flood Planning Level up to the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF), including the provision of safe shelters/refuges for occupants and the public above the PMF and additional flood protection for basement car parks. The building is not to adversely affect flood behaviour, including flood conveyance and significant loss of flood storage, at least to the Flood Planning Level.
- Rainwater management is to be integrated with other aspects of the architectural and landscape design to optimise rainwater capture, stormwater runoff quantity and quality, flooding protection and other environmental benefits.

C4. Planning Objectives

C4.1 Statutory and Non-Statutory Framework

The planning objectives for this competition are to ensure that the proposal:

- Complies with the statutory framework of:
 - State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 - Design Quality of Residential Flat Development and the Apartment Design Guide;
 - State Environmental Planning Policy No. 55 - Remediation of Land;
 - State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007;
 - Homebush Bay West Development Control Plan (HBW DCP).
 - Homebush Bay West Public Domain Manual HBW DCP (Volume 2)
 - HBW DCP Draft Amendment No.2

- NSW Floodplain Development Manual 2005.
- Other relevant and applicable State plans and policies; and
- Justifies any instances of non-compliance against the objectives and strategic direction of the applicable control.
- Addresses any relevant Council resolutions in relation to the site.
- Address the recommendations and comments of the Phase 1 Masterplan Concept Design Competition Jury Report.

Annexure 5 to this Brief sets out the key compliance criteria set out in the HBW DCP having regard to Draft Amendment No.2 in Annexure 3.

C4.2 Non-Compliances

All entries must comply with any applicable State Environmental Planning Policy.

All entries must comply with the key controls of HBW DCP, excepting any amendments foreshadowed by the draft Amendment No. 2 to HBW DCP, which has been endorsed by Council.

For the sake of equity, all entries must also comply with the general controls of HBW DCP. However, competitors are permitted to also identify opportunities for a "non-conforming" scheme which varies from HBW DCP, provided it is demonstrated to the Jury how:

- The relevant objectives are achieved, notwithstanding the variation;
- The variation adds value by resulting in a better outcome, in terms of both planning and design excellence; and
- How the objectives in Part C of this Brief are better satisfied by the non-conforming scheme.

In regard to the HBW DCP, it should be noted that:

- The location of the large park and street in the DCP diagrams is indicative / illustrative only.
- The existing height controls are provided in Section 5.3.2 and may be varied for the purposes of this competition.
- The intentions for the public domain including parks, foreshore and streets is set out in clauses 3.2 and 3.3 of the DCP. A street within the site would likely be regarded as a 'secondary east-west street' and may include a 'foreshore street' but in both instances may have a varied typology.

The definition of Floor Space is found in the DCP dictionary as follows.

"Floor Space (FS) the sum of the areas of each floor of a building, measured from the inside face of external enclosing walls and 1400mm above each floor level.

It includes:

- *habitable space below ground (auditoria, cinemas, supermarkets)*
- *retail space (cafés) associated with main entrance and/or lobby.*

It excludes:

- *main building entrances and associated foyers and lobbies*
- *common vertical circulation (stairs and lifts)*
- *non-habitable areas of the building which do not protrude more than 1.2 metres above ground level that are used for the purposes of:*
 - *car, coach and bicycle parking*
 - *space for loading and unloading of goods*
 - *waste management and storage areas*
- *one level of above-ground car parking entirely contained within a perimeter building, as an internal podium or courtyard, where all the uses 'wrapping' the parking are active and have a street address.*
- *plant rooms and vertical mechanical services and ducting*
- *communal recreational areas in residential buildings up to 5% of the total floor area of the building*
- *balconies, including those enclosed by operable screening devices*
- *the void space above double height spaces."*

Note that:

- all Floor Space of the car parking is to be excluded from floor area calculations
- apartment storage provided in accordance 4.4.9 (i) may be excluded from Floor Space
- coveted space for community uses within neighbourhood centres within neighbourhood centres may be offset against residential floor space (3.4.1 ii) and may include the childcare centre to be dedicated to Council.

The definition of Public Open Space and discussion is found in the DCP at page 43 noting that ‘foreshore streets’ are to be excluded for the purposes of this competition.

“Public open space is to include:

- *a point park at Wentworth Point, of approximately 4.8 hectares including foreshore promenade*
- *three parks distributed evenly through the precinct, including one park on the waterfront for active recreation. Parks at the north and south to have minimum area of 2000m² each; park in the middle of the precinct to be minimum 1000m² (areas reflect constraints due to ownership patterns)*
- *a 20-metre wide promenade ~~and foreshore street~~ and a further 10m setback for circulation, spill over dining and activation measured to face of building.*
- *foreshore parks or plazas terminating major east-west streets and linked to the promenade*
- *pocket parks or plazas.”*

DCP rates at sections 5.3.5 and 4.3 may be adopted for the purposes of this competition. (It should be noted that a reduction in residential car parking rates could be supported by Council contingent upon appropriate public transport options being available for future residents.)

“Generally provide a minimum of 1 space per dwelling.

Dwelling type Maximum car spaces per dwelling

<i>studio</i>	<i>none</i>
<i>1 bedroom</i>	<i>1.0</i>
<i>2 bedroom</i>	<i>1.2</i>
<i>3 bedroom</i>	<i>1.5</i>
<i>visitors</i>	<i>1 per 12 dwellings (minimum)</i>
<i>car share</i>	<i>1 per 200 dwellings (minimum)</i>

Visitor parking requirements may be satisfied by provision within basements, on newly created streets and additional parking created on existing streets.

The car parking rates for commercial may be reduced to assist travel demand management objectives subject to agreement of Council.”

C4.3 Ecologically Sustainable Development and Environmental Performance

The ESD objectives for this Architectural Design Competition are stated as Priority Objectives and Secondary Objectives.

Priority Objectives are considered an essential aspect of any Design Excellence submission.

Priority Objectives are:

- Building envelopes and façade articulation that are expressive and achieve high levels of solar protection and minimise reflected heat into public areas.
- Planning and facades that provide high levels of natural light and offer high levels of amenity to occupants.
- Planning and designs that provide optimal natural ventilation and winter sun access that improves upon the minimum guidelines of the Apartment Design Guide.

Secondary Aims are:

- Integration of solar power in area(s) of high sun exposure.
- To accommodate best practice energy and water efficient building services.
- High levels of pedestrian amenity through shade and moderation of wind.
- Use of materials and finishes that minimise environmental impact, human and eco-toxicity in sourcing and manufacture.
- Increase canopy and vegetation cover, using native indigenous and low water use species.
- Reduced reliance to mechanical ventilation to car parking by planning for passive air movement and reduced reliance on mechanical ventilation.
- Promote active transport, provide ample cycle storage and [commercial buildings only] end of trip facilities.
- Provide future proofing in the design to allow future connection capacity to battery storage, vehicle charging, district thermal and recycled water networks.
- Integration of Water Sensitive Urban Design with building architectural and landscape design and functions.

C4.4 Sustainable Transport

To support the reduction of car trips and encourage the use of sustainable transport, all proposals are to consider the inclusion of car share parking spaces consistent with Section 3.6.1 of the Parramatta Development Control Plan 2011.

Note that with any future Development Application, written evidence is to be provided with that DA demonstrating that offers of a car space to car share providers have been made together with the outcome of the offers or a letter of commitment to the service.

C4.5 Public Art

All proposals are to incorporate public art, consistent with the requirements of Parramatta Development Control Plan 2011, to the value of no less than \$750,000 .

An opportunity exist to express and/or re-use the laminated timber beams of the former Ralph Symonds industrial buildings that still remain on site and which might inform the treatment the overall design concept.



C4.6 Commercial Objectives

The commercial objectives for this Architectural Design Competition are set out below:

Billbergia envision Block H as its most prestigious waterfront development, and become the central and urban focal point for Wentworth Point.

The commercial objectives for this Architectural Design Competition are set out below:

- View opportunities both to the immediate water, and to the distant city centres should be maximised in tower configurations.
- Urban design and architecture will be an integrated approach, linking to the existing stages, including the Library and Community Centre and the Marina Square retail development.
- Towers are to respond to the water views available from the existing Block C and E 25 storey towers.
- Additional retail should be complementary to the existing commercial facilities being developed on site.
- An activated waterfront and a seamless transition from the main park to the waterfront.
- Modernist, distinct design, with glass technology, winter gardens and environmental considerations are the key focus points for design ideals.
- Communal amenity, rooftop gardens and landscape design integrated into built form.

- Simple, functional unit designs, maximising living and bedroom spaces, whilst minimising internal circulation. ADG compliance for unit layouts sizes should be adhered to.

The design (including the public domain) is to be highly durable and functionally efficient to operate and maintain so as to keep running and maintenance costs at a minimum.

The building design is to be functionally efficient, and should maximise access to natural lighting and the view potential from each level.

C4.7 Net Lettable Area

The total Net Lettable Area (including all saleable retail and commercial spaces) is to be maximised within the allowable FS and the total is to be calculated using the Property Council of Australia definition.

C4.8 Land Use

The Proponent desires the following uses to be incorporated into the development:

Scenario 1

- Residential apartments to the maximum permitted under draft clause 5.4.4 (ii) of 54,356sqm.
- A minimum of 2,900sqm non-residential floor space chiefly to activate street and other appropriate public domain edges.
- A 75 place child care centre provided in addition to be dedicated to Council.
- A proposed Marina Square Waterfront Club provided in addition and designed to provide world class facility with an exceptional waterfront environment. The club features should include:
 - 4000sqm of floor space on a single level and a 500sqm separate waterfront food and beverage/function venue.
 - Preferred 85m of uninterrupted frontage to Homebush Bay foreshore promenade with a further 40m for the separate food and beverage/function venue.
 - Preferred 35m frontage to Burroway Rd of with arrival point
 - Capacity for large alfresco dining facilities towards the waterfrontage with a double height fully glazed environment.
 - Opportunity for alfresco gaming facilities.
 - Direct access to an 800 space public undercover carpark. (including existing retail carpark)

Scenario 2 (public transport enabled)

- Scenario 1 except residential apartments to the potential limit under draft clause 5.4.4 (i) of 85,000sqm.
- An additional 75 place child care centre to be privately owned and operated.
- Water recreation facility to be located within the Homebush Bay.
- A community pavilion or building within the public park to potentially house a community art gallery and other facilities.

Additional public open space if possible and desirable from a design perspective.

C4.9 Construction Budget

All participants must undertake their design with regard to the construction allowance of \$3,250 per sqm of GFA . This is based upon a construct only building contract (allowing for full trade, preliminaries and profit but excluding design fees).

Designs should make the following allowances:

- Water Recreation Facility of \$12 -20 million;
- Community pavilion or building of \$7 million;
- Public open space embellishment of \$1,300 per sqm;
- Public art allowance of \$750,000.

The proponent will provide technical assistance to participants, including the services of a Quantity Surveyor.

Participants are advised that each design proposal will then be reviewed by an independent Quantity Surveyor. Draft concept plans for the purpose of undertaking costings will be provided by Competitors by no later than a week before the competition closes or a specific date nominated by the Proponent. This information will be made available to the Jury.

C4.10 Construction Methodology

Buildability will be a key factor in the assessment of design proposals.

Each submission will be reviewed by a Structural Engineer and the Proponent's in-house team of construction experts. This information will be made available to the Jury.

C4.11 ESD Methodology

Each submission will be reviewed by the Proponent's in-house experts. This information will be made available to the Jury.

A photograph of a modern building facade. The building features large, light-colored concrete columns and panels. Interspersed among these are vertical wooden slats that create a textured, rhythmic pattern. Large glass windows are visible, reflecting the sky and surrounding environment. The overall aesthetic is clean, industrial, and natural.

PART D

COMPETITION PROCEDURES

Woods Bagot
88 Church Street, Paramatta

PART D - Competition Procedures

D1. Proponent

The Proponent of the Design Competition is Mr Saul Moran, Development Manager, on behalf of John Kinsella, Managing Director, Billbergia.

Billbergia Pty Ltd
Suite 101, 25 Angas Street
Meadowbank NSW 2114
02 8878 6900 | m 0411 431 203

D2. Competition Manager

The Competition Manager is the Proponent's Representative and is:

Greg Dowling BAS (Env PI) M Urb Des (Syd) MPIA
Dowling Urban Pty Ltd
Suite 302 4-14 Buckingham Street | Surry Hills NSW 2010
p 02 9516 4377 | m 0407 404 898 | e greg@dowlingurban.com.au

All specific queries and communication must only be directed to the Competition Manager by email through greg@dowlingurban.com.au. Absolutely no contact shall be made with the Jury. However, the CoPC Competition co-ordinator may, on behalf of the Jury, contact a competitor to request further particulars after the presentations, in order to assist the jury in its deliberations.

D3. Competition Entry

This competition is an invitation-only competition.

Each Competitor must be a person, corporation or firm registered as an architect in accordance with the NSW Architects Act 2003 or, in the case of interstate or overseas Competitors, eligible for registration.

Where a team participating in competition includes overseas firms, that team must be led by an Australian firm. If that team is the successful entrant, then both the Australian firm and international firm must be commissioned for the duration of the project.

To ensure the highest quality of design integrity throughout the design excellence process, all Competitors must have demonstrated experience in projects of a similar nature, scale and capital investment value. A range of architects are to be invited into competitions and at least one (1) Competitor in each competition must have previously won an industry award or been recognised for a building of similar scale and program.

D4. Competition Details

The competition will involve a minimum of three (3) Competitors who each will present their urban design / scheme, including plans, renders and photomontages.

Smaller architectural and landscape firms are encouraged to partner with larger firms to create "consortium" teams, particularly for larger sites, masterplan sites and proposals that will comprise multiple buildings.

Consideration of any relevant concept approval, and planning, structural, cost and environmental concerns as well as the objectives set out in Part C of this Brief will be taken into account in the consideration of each submitted entry.

Each competitor will present their architectural, urban design and landscape schemes.

D5. Architectural Design Competition Brief

D5.1 Objectives of the Brief

This Brief sets out:

- The basis for participation; and
- The responsibilities of the Proponent and the duties of the Jury, in accordance with the Design Excellence provisions of the draft HBW DCP Amendment No.2, the Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines and Council's Design Excellence Competition Guidelines. Note that Addendums may be issued by the Proponent.

D5.2 Amendments to the Brief

Any amendments to this Brief must be endorsed by CoPC and issued to all Competitors with an explanation of the amendments made.

D6. Mid-Point Review

A mid-point review is not mandatory but is recommended to ensure that the progress of each Competitor's scheme can be monitored and feedback provided accordingly to ensure that all requirements of this Brief and particularly, the proposal objectives, are adequately satisfied in the final submission.

The Proponent's technical advisors may be present to provide feedback to the Proponent on the schemes.

The Jury is not to attend the mid-point review.

D7. Competition Jury and Requirements

The competition Jury comprises three (3) members. One (1) Juror each will be nominated by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (delegated to the Office of the Government Architect), CoPC and the Proponent.

Jury members are to be registered architects with substantial knowledge and skill in reviewing large scale city buildings and quality architectural projects.

Competitors or their intermediaries must not communicate with Jury members in relation to this competition. All communication must be through the Competition Co-ordinator (refer Part D.2).

Jury members will have no pecuniary interests in the development proposal or involvement in the approval processes.

Jury members are not to comprise any staff members or councillors with an approval role in Council's development assessment process.

The competition Jury Chair will be nominated by the Jury members.

The competition Jury members are as follows:

Table 3 Competition Jury members

Organisation	Representative
City of Parramatta Council	City Architect – Kim Crestani
NSW Department of Planning and Environment, delegated to the Office of the Government Architect, or their nominee	NSW Government Architect – Peter Poulet
Proponent's Nominee	Bob Nation, National Design Director, GHD Woodhead

If one of the above Jurors has to withdraw prior to the completion of the competition process, another Juror of equivalent credentials will be appointed by whoever originally appointed that Juror.

D8. Juror's Obligations

In accepting a position on the Jury, Jurors agree to:

- Have no contact with any of the Competitors in relation to the site and the Architectural Design Competition from their time of appointment until the completion of the process other than during presentations of the proposals, or where it is deemed necessary to request further work and/or additional presentations;
- Evaluate entries promptly in accordance with the timetable;
- Abide by the requirements of the Architectural Design Competition Brief;
- Consider advice provided by the Consent Authority and technical advisors;
- Inspect the site as required;
- Refrain from introducing irrelevant considerations in addition to, or contrary to those described in the Architectural Design Competition Brief, or contrary to the statutory framework;

- Make every effort to arrive at a consensus in the selection of a winner and within four (4) weeks of the competition presentations. This may include caveats on design amendments to be made before design excellence is declared by the Jury;
- If a consensus cannot be met, the decision is to be made by majority vote;
- Submit a report explaining their decisions no more than four (4) weeks after the competition presentations. This report may be prepared by another party, such as the Proponent's Representative. In such a case, the report must be signed by each Juror validating the findings of the report and endorsed by CoPC;
- Provide written certification that the design for any subsequent DA lodged for the development is substantially the same as the winning design and exhibits design excellence at the following hold points;
 - During the pre-lodgement stage
 - During the Development Application stage
 - Prior to issue of the Construction Certificate
 - Prior to issue of the Occupation Certificate
 - Prior to lodgement of any Section 96 which modifies the design
- Sign a statement confirming they have read and understood the Juror's obligations and agree to respect those obligations for the duration of the Architectural Design Competition (refer Appendix 1).
-

D9. Proponent's Obligations

D9.1 General Obligations

The Proponent agrees to have no contact with the Jury members or Consent Authority members outside of the process described in this Brief in relation to the site and the Architectural Design Competition from the time of Brief endorsement until the completion of the final Jury Report.

D9.2 Competition Fee

The Proponent shall pay a competition fee to each of the (minimum) three (3) Competitors described at section 5.4 above.

The fee for each competition participant will be Phase 2 \$60,000 which includes \$10,000 allowance for participating Landscape Architects.

The Proponent shall ensure that all Competitors are paid before the schemes are submitted.

The Competition Manager is to confirm, in writing to the City of Parramatta Council, within 2 weeks of the allocated date of the design competition presentation date, that the architects' submissions have been received and the Architects have been paid in full.

COP reserves the right to postpone the date for the Design Competition Presentations if the proponent has not provided evidence, to the satisfaction of the Manager, that the participating Architectural firms have been paid

In addition to the above fee, the Proponent will pay the fees, before the schemes are submitted, of the nominated quantity surveyor who will prepare the commercial analyses of each Competitor's design and any other nominated technical advisors listed in Part D.9.

D9.3 Payment of Jury Members

The Jury Members nominated by the Proponent and CoPC shall be reimbursed by the Proponent. The Proponent, or Proponent's Representative will contact these members directly, agree an appropriate remuneration rate and engaged on a time basis.

The Office of the Government Architect will be responsible for reimbursing its nominated Jury member.

D9.4 Payment of Technical Advisors for the Jury and Competition Participants

As noted below, technical advisers may be appointed to provide assistance to either or both the Jury and Competitors. The Proponent, or Proponent's Representative will contact these advisors/consultants directly, agree an appropriate remuneration rate and engage on a time basis.

D9.5 Administration Costs

The Proponent is required to pay all out of pocket design competition fees to CoPC.

The Proponent is also required to pay a fee of \$7,500 (excl GST) per submission to CoPC for administrative costs associated with running the competition for individual buildings. For example, a competition with three (3) submissions will require the Proponent to pay CoPC \$22,500 (excl GST). Proposals that include multiple

buildings for larger sites may attract a higher administration fee. The Proponent is to make his/her own enquiries with Council as to the exact fee payable to CoPC.

CoPC will invoice the Proponent for this fee at the time of endorsement of the brief.

D10. Technical Assistance for the Jury

Technical advisers will be appointed to provide technical assistance / advice to the Jury as may be requested by it. The provision of such assistance will in no way reduce the responsibility of the Jury to the Proponent.

The technical advisers will be bound to secrecy and shall not be empowered to exclude any submission, and shall be limited to providing advice to the Jury.

The following Technical Advisors may be called upon by the Jury for further consultation:

Table 4 Technical Advisors

Discipline	Technical Advisors
Town Planning	Dowling Urban
Structural Engineering	WSP Group
Mechanical and Electrical Engineering	WSP Group
Quantity Surveying	RLB, Stephen Mee
Hydraulic and Fire Services	WSP Group
Wind Engineering	WSP Group
Facade Engineering	WSP Group
Lift Engineering	WSP Group
Flood Engineering	WSP Group

D11. Technical Assistance for Competition Participants

The Proponent will also make available the consultants noted in Part D.9 above to each Competitor and will pay for these consultancy services directly, to a maximum of 3 hours of advice, per discipline, per Competitor.

All requests for technical advice shall be made to the Competition Manager.

D12. Communications, Questions and Competitor Briefings

Competitors should submit any questions in writing to the Competition Manager in accordance with the Competition procedures. Answers will not be given orally.

Questions may be sent to the Competition Manager up to the competition close date.

Answers to these questions will be compiled and sent to all Competitors without revealing the source of the questions.

Competitors may request up to three (3) meetings with the Proponent limited to an initial briefing at the start of the competition, halfway and three quarters through the competition.

Competitors must not contact each other, or the media.

D13. Closing Date for Proposals

The competition shall commence upon the issuance of the Architectural Design Competition Brief to Competitors.

Proposals for this Architectural Design Competition must be lodged with the Competition Manager not later than 7 weeks after commencement. The Competition Manager must issue the proposals to COPC no less than two (2) weeks before the presentations.

It is the sole responsibility of the Competitor to ensure actual delivery to the Proponent by the deadline.

D14. Lodgement of Proposals

Competitors shall lodge their proposals in a sealed package labelled "[Block H Wentworth Point, Architectural Design Competition]", to the Competition Manager, at an address to be notified.

Additional materials received which exceed the submission requirements (as set out in Part E of this Brief) will not be considered by the Jury.

D15. Disqualification

At the discretion of the Jury, proposals that breach competition procedures may be disqualified, in particular where:

- The submission is received after the lodgement time and date identified in the Brief; or
- The submission is not submitted in accordance with the submission requirements, as stated in this Brief; or
- A Competitor is found to be ineligible; or
- A Competitor may reasonably be expected to have an unfair advantage through access to privileged information; or
- In an Architectural Design Competition, a Competitor attempts to influence the decision of the Jury. The Competition Manager may confer with the Jury relating to disqualification, but this decision shall be final and no correspondence shall be entered into.

In an Architectural Design Competition, the Jury will determine any disqualifications.

D16. Jury Assessment and Decision

D16.1 Details of the Jury Meeting

The Competitors must present their entry to the Jury in person. The presentation must be no longer than 45 minutes followed by questions from the Jury for a period of 15 minutes. The presentation may include basic plans, renders and photomontages.

In scheduling the time of the presentations, the Competition Manager is to ensure that there is to be a minimum 15-minute break in between presentations.

Design Competition Presentations are held once a month at CoPC (third Wednesday of the month).

The Competition Manager is to contact CoPC's Competition Co-ordinator to co-ordinate a presentation date and time (contact details can be found in the "Competition Summary" at the commencement of this Brief).

The date of the Competition presentation will be within 14 days after the competition closes.

The venue for the Competition presentation will be held at City of Parramatta Council premises.

CoPC will have a town planner representative in attendance at all Competition presentations.

The Competition Manager is to ensure that an attendance sheet is to be filled out by all attendees at the presentation.

D16.2 Jury Assessment and Decision

A minimum of three (3) competitive proposals are to be considered in the Architectural Design Competition.

A copy of the proposals will be distributed to the Jury members at least two (2) weeks prior to the convened Jury meeting, a site inspection will be carried out for them, and the Competition Manager will provide a summary of planning compliance.

Observers of the Proponent and CoPC will be permitted to attend the presentations and/or mid-point review. As noted above, the Jury is not to attend the mid-point review.

The Proponent or their representative may choose to make a submission to the Jury; however, any such proposals will not fetter the discretion of Jury members or diminish their responsibilities as described in Part D.7.

The Jury is expected to reach a decision within 14 days and will submit a Jury report (referred to as the Architectural Design Competition Report) to the Proponent.

The Jury's decision will be via a majority vote. Unanimous agreement is not required but consensus is encouraged.

The Jury's decision will be communicated to the proponent via the *Design Excellence Competition Jury Report*. This will be prepared by the Proponents Competition Manager.

The Jury's decision will not fetter the discretion of the Consent Authority in the determination of any subsequent development application.

The Jury may:

- Nominate a winning scheme on the basis that 'design excellence' has been achieved - with or without the requirement for further design development and hold points;
- Recommend that none of the schemes achieve design excellence but with further work, recommended by the Jury, there is the potential for a scheme to achieve design excellence; or
- Recommend that none of the entries exhibit design excellence and thus end the competition.
- Request further information from two or more competitors to assist them in their deliberations

D16.3 Announcement

There is no guarantee that the winner will be announced on the day of the presentations.

The winner of the Architectural Design Competition will be announced as soon as possible, but within 4 weeks of the presentations.

The Proponent will advise all Competitors of the decision verbally, and then in writing.

The Architectural Design Competition results will be made public within 21 days of the Jury's decision.

D16.4 Request for Review

In the event that;

- the Jury does not reach a decision;
- the Proponent is not satisfied with the nomination;
- the Proponent wishes to make a substantive modification;
- CoPC considers the project submitted for approval (or as subsequently modified) to be substantially different, or
- CoPC indicates it will not grant consent to the design nominated, either the proponent or CoPC may request that the Jury reconvene and make a recommendation as to what further competitive processes or requirements would be necessary to permit an alternative or revised design to satisfy the design excellence provisions of the draft HBW DCP Amendment No. 2.

The Jury shall make such recommendation as it sees fit within 28 days of such a request.

The cost of such review shall be born by the Proponent.

D17. Appointment of the Architect of the Winning Scheme

The appointment of the winning entrant is likely to be on the basis of the Proponent's standard contract for engagement of consultants.

The Proponent shall appoint the architect/or team of the winning proposal as selected by the Jury. Full design and documentation of the winning proposal should then occur. It is assumed that all competitor's fees for the entire architectural commission as set out above will have been pre-agreed by the Proponent.

The architectural commission is to include:

- Preparation of a DA;
- Preparation of the drawings for the Construction Certificate;
- Preparation of the drawings for the contract documentation; and
- Continuity during the construction phases through to the Occupation Certificate.

The Proponent is required to proceed with the winning proposal nominated by the Jury and is not to limit the architectural commission outlined above. If in exceptional circumstances the winning Competitor/Architect cannot proceed with the commission, the Proponent will generally be required to restart the Architectural Design Competition unless CoPC agrees to a replacement Competitor/Architect. In such circumstances, which are entirely within the discretion of CoPC, CoPC in association with the Office of the Government Architect will reconvene the competition Jury to obtain sign-off on any amended design by the replacement Competitor/Architect.

D18. Post-Competition Review

The Jury, or their nominee, is to monitor design excellence and integrity at key project milestones including the following:

- During the pre-lodgement stage
- During the Development Application stage
- Prior to issue of the Construction Certificate

- Prior to issue of the Occupation Certificate
- Prior to lodgement of any Section 96 which modifies the design

The main role of the Jury during this post-competition phase will be to provide certification that the design at different stages through the subsequent approval and construction process is substantially the same and retains the design excellence exhibited in the winning submission.

In the event that the Jury is not able to be reconvened during the post-competition review phase, a Panel is to be established to monitor design excellence at the milestones identified above. The Panel is to be provided with a copy of the signed Jury Report and is to comprise three (3) members including one (1) CoPC representative, one OGA representative or their nominee and one (1) representative of the Proponent. The Panel is to be endorsed by CoPC prior to commencing the post-competition review.

If the Panel is not established, this certification must be provided by the Jury.

D19. Care of Material and Insurance

It is each Competitor's responsibility to wrap, ship, mail or deliver by other means, their submission, ensuring timely and intact arrival. The Proponent disclaims any responsibility for any loss or damage during transit.

No liability shall be attached to the Proponent regarding the proposals, whilst in the possession of the Proponent. All reasonable care shall be taken to maintain the proposals in good condition, but a limited amount of 'wear and tear' is inevitable. Competitors are advised to make copies of their proposals, so as to retain a copy of their work.

Responsibility for insuring proposals rests solely with Competitors.

Competitors must sign the Declaration Form to respect conditions and procedures governing this competition.

The Declaration Form is the invitation letter sent to each architect. Once completed, it should be placed in a plain envelope and forwarded with the Competitor's submission.

Proponent may retain all material submitted by the Competitors and use it at its discretion after payment of the competition fee.

D20. Return of Documents

The Proponent retains the right to hold all proposals for a period of up to six (6) months from the closing date of the Architectural Design Competition. The Proponent shall retain the winning submission(s). Other proposals shall be returned to the owner(s).

Competitors shall be notified of the date on which proposals will become available for collection.

D21. Copyright

Copyright for each submission shall remain in the ownership of the original authors.

The Proponent and the Consent Authority shall have the right to display, photograph or otherwise duplicate or record all proposals for publication, publicity or other such purposes. Any such reproductions shall acknowledge the copyright owner and further use of such designs shall be negotiated between the parties to the agreement on such terms.

Execution of the Declaration Form shall be deemed as legal permission for the Proponent to publish the Competitors' designs. The Proponent will seek to involve Competitors in any such media releases. Generally, no compensation shall be made for such reproduction or publication.

D22. Confidentiality

The Proponent, observer(s) and competition Jurors shall observe complete confidentiality in relation to all proposals received, prior to a decision in relation to the competition that is made public.

D23. Post Competition Processes

D23.1 Confirmation of Design Excellence

The Proponent is to ensure that once all competitors are notified that the jury is also simultaneously notified.

Where practical and feasible, the following processes shall be completed within four weeks of the presentations:

- The Jury will provide comments, and any caveats.
- A Jury report (see Jury Report Template) is completed by the proponent or their representative.
- The Jury report is reviewed by the Jury and signed by all members of the Jury
- The Jury report is sent to City of Parramatta Council for review

- Upon finalisation of the Jury report, the Office of the Government Architect will acknowledge design excellence by sending a letter to City of Parramatta Council.
- Council will subsequently formally notify the proponent of the awarding of design excellence and any associated development bonuses. This notification will include the final Jury report.
- No media releases shall be issued by the proponent until it has received the final Jury report.

D23.2 Integrity of Design Excellence post competition

To ensure that the quality of winning design is maintained through all development approval stages and construction the Jury will review the design at the following stages:

- During the pre-lodgement stage
- During the Development Application stage, when the following information will be required:
 - Key cross sections, partial plans and partial elevations through external walls, balconies and other key external details. These drawings are to be fully annotated at a scale of 1:50, or if necessary 1:20, showing details, materials, finishes and colours, so that the details and materiality of the external facades are clearly documented.
 - Revised 3D photomontages.
- Prior to issue of the Construction Certificate
- Prior to issue of the Occupation Certificate
- Prior to lodgement of any Section 96 which modifies the design


The Architectural Competition winning architects shall be retained during the construction process to ensure the retention of the design intent, regardless of whether the site is on sold.

All members of the jury or a majority of jurors must be reconvened to discuss the findings and/or direction of the jury.

The venue for these reviews is negotiable.

PART E

COMPETITION SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS



Manuelle Gautrand Architecture, DesignInc & Lacoste + Stevenson
5 Parramatta Square, Parramatta

PART E - Competition Submission Requirements

E1. General Requirements

The proposal submission must be clear and concise, with comprehensive design information to complement and explain the graphic presentation.

A proposal must not nominate works of any kind which are beyond the boundaries of the site.

Proposals are to comply with the following requirements. Competitors are advised to carefully study these requirements and strictly adhere to them. Failure to meet these requirements may, at the discretion of the Competition Manager, result in the disqualification of the submission.

All Competitors shall submit at least one (1) conforming design which is in accordance with the requirements of the relevant statutory and non-statutory planning controls.

If a Competitor considers that a scheme that is not generally in accordance with the relevant general provisions of development control plan (HBW DCP) better meets the urban design, planning, architectural design and development objectives for the site, then the Competitor may still submit this scheme in addition to a conforming scheme. **Compliance must be achieved with the Land Use Density and Height provisions under 5.4.4 of draft Amendment No.2 HBW DCP.** All schemes will be fully considered by the Jury providing they are accompanied by all reasonable information justifying any relevant non-compliance.

Eight (8) copies of all submission documents shall be provided, except where otherwise noted as below.

E2. Drawings and Graphics

Each Competitor's submission shall consist of the following:

- Site and location plan – 1:1000.
- Contextual analysis – at a suitable scale.
- A series of sketches that explain the design evolution process.
- Plans, elevations sections and typical levels for the scheme (typically scaled 1:200 on A3, elevations and sections can be provided at 1:400 on A3 – scale bar to be included).
- Ground floor street sections (scaled at 1:50)
- Details on façade treatment including a detailed analysis of materials and finishes (scaled at 1:50).
- Mid-winter shadow analysis between the hours of 9am and 3pm (hourly intervals). The shadow analysis should include sun-eye view perspectives.
- A full extent of the ground floor plan including the landscape elements in scale 1:1000 on A3 plus minimum 4 areas of special interest in scale 1:100 (on A3) demonstrating interface with street frontages and any potential non-residential component(s) including the relationship to the public domain.
- Landscape / Public Domain Plan demonstrating the treatment to the setback areas, communal open space and publicly accessible open space areas (1:100)
- Staging Plan – A clear and legible plan identifying the staged development of individual buildings, open space, roads and infrastructure.
- Open space Diagram – Plan identifying size and location of public, private and communal open spaces
- Deep Soil Zone – Plan identifying size and location of deep soil zones.
- 3-D computer model (please note that Competitors may also provide a physical model, however, this is not compulsory). Attached to this Brief is Council's format requirements for the model. Models are required at a scale of 1:1000.
- 1-2 computer generated photomontage(s), the location of which must be taken from the following viewpoints:
- Viewpoint 01 – TBC
- Viewpoint 02 - TBC

Each submission shall include the following (floor by floor) area schedules:

- Floor Space ("FS") using the definition in the HBW DCP;
- Net Lettable Area ("NLA") using Property Council of Australia's definition; and
- Number of Residential Apartments.
- A concise report articulating:
 - how the proposal responds to this Brief;
 - how the proposal responds to the principles and objectives of the masterplan;

- the design approach taken for each tower and the public domain, and key elements in the master planning for the site;
 - discuss the mix of uses and their integration;
 - address the structural nature of the proposal in light any potential structural issues;
 - commentary on how the design is an economically feasible option and an analysis of the scheme's buildability and cost effectiveness;
 - how the proposal satisfies the planning controls (SEPP65, ADG, Parramatta LEP, site specific DCP);
 - demonstrate how the priority ESD objectives have been incorporated and which of the secondary ESD objectives are provided; and
 - the manner in which design excellence is achieved, having regard to the key matters for consideration under Clause 5.4.9 of draft HBW DCP Amendment No.2.
- A separate fee proposal from each Competitor is to be provided with the submission to the Proponent but is not to be included in the competition package.
 - Architects must not provide more information than requested above. An A3 booklet of a minimum 40 pages and maximum 90 pages (either landscape or portrait) is acceptable and consecutively numbered.

E2.1 Technical Requirements for Documentation

- Material for submission to the Proponent shall be provided. Council require 4 x A3 bound copies and 1 x USB containing ALL submission documentation.
- Presentation material must be of a quality suitable for public exhibition.
- Names of Competitors are to be clearly visible on entries.
- Each plan, elevation and section is to show the relevant adjacent context.
- All presentations will be held at the offices of either CoPC or the Office of the Government Architect.

E3. Statement of Design Intent

Each entry should include a design statement addressing the following:

- The proposal's approach;
- The response to the objectives set out in this Brief;
- The manner in which design excellence is achieved;
- A schedule showing the uses, percentage and numbers of each use the indicative FSR, gross floor area and construction methodology; and
- If relevant, a response to the ten (10) design quality principles in SEPP 65.

E4. Statement of Compliance

Each submission must also include a statement prepared by a suitably qualified person indicating the proposal's compliance with the objectives of the controls and guidelines embodied within the planning framework, primarily, the HBW DCP, and relevant State planning policies, including (but not limited to), State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 - Design Quality of Residential Flat Development and the Residential Apartment Design Guide.

E5. Detailed Area Schedule

Each submission shall include the following (floor by floor) area schedules:

- Floor Space ("FS") using the definition from the HBW DCP; and
- Nett Lettable Area ("NLA") using Property Council of Australia's definition.
- A schedule is also required to be submitted showing the uses, percentage and numbers of each use the indicative floor space and construction methodology / buildability.



E6. Quantity Surveyor's Cost Advice

Each submission must include the estimated construction cost. The entries will all be costed by the Proponent's chosen quantity surveyor.

E7. Physical and Digital Model Requirements

A 3-D computer model is required to be submitted. The model is to be prepared in accordance with Council's requirements which are set out in Appendix 6.

Competitors must also provide a physical 1:400 model insert, and an updated 1:2000 Phase 1 model insert, to the specifications in the following diagrams



Phase 1 1:4000 model insert and phase 2 1:400 model insert dimensions.

E8. Anonymity

Names of Competitors are to be clearly visible on entries.



PART F

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Bates Smart
8 Parramatta Square, Parramatta

PART F - Reference Documents

Homebush Bay West Development Control Plan

Refer to information package.

Department of Planning Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines

<http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/~media/Files/DPE/Guidelines/director-generals-design-excellence-guidelines-2011.ashx>

City of Parramatta Council Design Excellence Competition Guidelines

City of Parramatta Council Public Domain Guidelines

<https://www.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/business-development/public-domain-guidelines>

City of Parramatta Council City Centre Laneways Policy

https://www.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/sites/council/files/2017-01/City_Centre_Lanes_Policy.pdf

Proponents Technical Package

1. Context plans as well as site conditions and characteristics including:

- a) 3D site model DWG
- b) Site Survey Plan
- c) Strata Easement (showing 20 m public easement for Seawall)
- d) Flooding Advice
- e) Geotech Report
- f) Sewall Detail

2. Billbergia Standard Consultant Contract

3. Billbergia Standard Consultant Scope of Works and Services

4. Billbergia Standard Residential Principals Project Requirements

5. Billbergia Past Projects

6. Miscellaneous Information

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/6u6wktl5bbak1u3/AACIMTN0wDKCLxaBjmTqaawGa?dl=0>

ANNEXURES

APPENDIX 1
TEMPLATE LETTER FOR THE
APPOINTMENT OF JURORS

APPENDIX 2
TEMPLATE INVITATION LETTER TO
ARCHITECTS

APPENDIX 3
PLANNING PROPOSAL PROJECT
DOCUMENTATION INCLUDING DRAFT VPA

APPENDIX 4
SITE SURVEY & ANALYSIS

APPENDIX 5
PLANNING COMPLIANCE CRITERIA

APPENDIX 6
PARRAMATTA COUNCIL'S DIGITAL 3D
MODEL REQUIREMENTS

Appendix 1: Template Letter for the Appointment of the Juror

[Date] Our Ref: [insert] File No: [insert] PID No: [insert]

[Name and address of invited juror]

Phase 2 Architectural Design Competition for Block H Wentworth Point.

Dear Sir/Madam,

City of Parramatta Council in conjunction with Billbergia (the Developer and Proponent of this project) would like to cordially invite you to sit on the Jury for an Architectural Design Competition of the above mentioned site.

A Juror's obligations throughout the competition process are as follows. In accepting a position on the Jury, Jurors agree to:

- Have no contact with any of the Competitors in relation to the site and the Architectural Design Competition from their time of appointment until the completion of the process other than during presentations of the submissions;
- Evaluate entries promptly in accordance with the timetable;
- Abide by the requirements of the Architectural Design Competition Brief (attached);
- Consider advice provided by the Consent Authority and technical advisors;
- Refrain from introducing irrelevant considerations in addition to, or contrary to those described in the Architectural Design Competition Brief, or contrary to the statutory framework;
- Make every effort to arrive at a consensus in the selection of a winner and within two (2) weeks of the competition presentations. This may include caveats on design amendments to be made before design excellence is declared by the Jury;
- Submit a signed report explaining their decisions no more than four (4) weeks after the competition presentations. This report may be prepared by another party, such as the Proponent's Representative. In such a case, the report must be signed by each Juror validating the findings of the report and endorsed by CoPC;
- Sign a statement confirming they have read and understood the Juror's obligations and agree to respect those obligations for the duration of the Architectural Design Competition; and
- Provide written certification that the design for any subsequent DA lodged for the development is substantially the same as the winning design and exhibits design excellence.

If you would like to be appointed to the Jury, please fill out the following pro-forma and return to (name and address of contact to be advised). If you have any questions regarding the process, contact (name and contact details of Council contact) to discuss.

Yours Sincerely,

.....

I, have read and understood the Juror's obligations (listed above) and agree to respect those obligations for the duration of the Architectural Design Competition.

Signed:..... Date:.....



Appendix 2: Template Invitation Letter to Architects

[Name and address of invited Architect]

Phase 2 Architectural Design Competition for Block H Wentworth Point .

Dear Sir/Madam,

Billbergia is pleased to advise that your practice has been selected to take part in the Architectural Design Competition for Block H Wentworth Point.


The Architectural Design Competition is scheduled to commence on 16th July and concluded at 3rd September 2018. Dates and times for the formal presentation of your design submission will be confirmed at a later date by the Competition Manager.

The Architectural Design Competition Brief, endorsed by CoPC is attached to this letter.

We would ask that you review this Brief and confirm your acceptance of the terms and conditions contained therein and confirm your practice's participation in the competition, by way of signing and returning the base of this letter to the undersigned.

Billbergia appreciates the interest shown by your practice in this competition and we look forward to receiving your acceptance to participate.

Yours Sincerely,



Greg Dowling
BAS (Env Pl) M Urb Des (Syd) MPIA
Competition Manager
p 02 9516 4377 | m 0407 404 898 | greg@dowlingurban.com.au
Dowling Urban, Suite 302 4-14 Buckingham Street, Surry Hills NSW 2010

Declaration Form

I/We hereby confirm that we have read the Architectural Design Competition Brief , and agree to be bound by the terms and conditions contained therein. Further, by signing below, we confirm our practices participation in the Architectural Design Competition for Block H Wentworth Point.

Name of Practice: _____

Signature of authorised representative: _____

Name of authorised representative: _____

Date: _____



Appendix 3: Draft Homebush Bay West Development Control Plan Amendment No 2.

The Council of the City of Parramatta Council adopted the attached draft development control plan for the purposes of the architectural design competition and public exhibition.

Refer to information package.

Appendix 4: Site Survey & Analysis

Refer to information package.

Appendix 5: HBW DCP Amendment No.2 Quantitative Planning Compliance Criteria

Please note that the following tables provide the key quantitative provisions from the PLEP 2011.

Draft HBW DCP Amendment No. 2	Corresponding Development Standard														
Height of buildings (clause 5.4.9)	Scenario 1, 35 storeys above Wentworth Place above its highest point. Scenario 2: unspecified, refer to Phase 1 Jury recommendations.														
Floor space (clause 5.4.4)	Scenario 1: maximum residential floor space 54,356sqm Scenario 2: maximum residential floor space 85,000sqm Minimum non-residential floor space 2,900sqm														
Public Open Space (clause 5.4.4)	16,800 sqm which is to include a main park of 10,500 sqm														
Car parking (clause 5.3.5 and 4.3)	<p><i>Generally provide a minimum of 1 space per dwelling.</i></p> <table> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Dwelling type</i></th> <th><i>Maximum car spaces per dwelling</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>studio</i></td> <td><i>none</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>1 bedroom</i></td> <td><i>1.0</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>2 bedroom</i></td> <td><i>1.2</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>3 bedroom</i></td> <td><i>1.5</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>visitors</i></td> <td><i>1 per 12 dwellings (minimum)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>car share</i></td> <td><i>1 per 200 dwellings (minimum)</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Visitor parking requirements may be satisfied by provision within basements, on newly created streets and additional parking created on existing streets.</i></p> <p><i>The car parking rates for commercial may be reduced to assist travel demand management objectives subject to agreement of Council.</i></p>	<i>Dwelling type</i>	<i>Maximum car spaces per dwelling</i>	<i>studio</i>	<i>none</i>	<i>1 bedroom</i>	<i>1.0</i>	<i>2 bedroom</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>3 bedroom</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>visitors</i>	<i>1 per 12 dwellings (minimum)</i>	<i>car share</i>	<i>1 per 200 dwellings (minimum)</i>
<i>Dwelling type</i>	<i>Maximum car spaces per dwelling</i>														
<i>studio</i>	<i>none</i>														
<i>1 bedroom</i>	<i>1.0</i>														
<i>2 bedroom</i>	<i>1.2</i>														
<i>3 bedroom</i>	<i>1.5</i>														
<i>visitors</i>	<i>1 per 12 dwellings (minimum)</i>														
<i>car share</i>	<i>1 per 200 dwellings (minimum)</i>														
Sun access main public park (clause 5.4.7)	<p>Solar access to the main park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30% solar access to the main park (minimum 10,500sqm) between 9am-3pm at any time of the year, as well as 40% solar access to the main park (minimum 10,500sqm) between 11am-2pm during mldwnter Solar access to be assessed with cumulative overshadowing of adjacent developments and DCP building envelopes of those yet to be approved. Solar access on main park to be contiguous as far as possible. Solar access to the foreshore and new street is not be included in calculating solar access on public main park. 														
Tower footprint controls (cl5.4.9)	<p>Scenario 1 : maximum floorplate* 1100sqm (35 storeys)</p> <p><i>*includes all areas to external face of building including external walls, internal voids and balconies</i></p>														

Appendix 6: City of Parramatta Council Digital 3D Model Requirements

Design Competition 3D Model Acquisition

Model Format

The format of the model to be supplied to City of Parramatta Council should be a basic (.3DS). The size of the file should not exceed 5MB. A SketchUp File must be provided as well to check for consistency of data and detect possible corruption of the 3ds file.

1. Trimble Sketch Up (.skp)
2. General 3D format (.3ds)

Model Coordinates

The model must be orientated to north and centred to (0,0,0) coordinates.

- X – Axis: 0
- Y – Axis: 0
- Z – Axis: 0
- Model orientated to North Facing

Model Unit of Measure

Modelling units must be set in Meters (m), within 2 decimal places 00.00m

- Meters (m)

Model Details

Elements that are to be shown in the model should be, massing / shrink wrap of the building, with floor plates and all faces in the model normalised.

- Defining Features of Building
- Cadastre Outline
- Floor Plates
- No Window Mullins
- No Sun Shading Devices
- Ground Plane Extends to Site Boundary
- All faces in the model to be **Normalised**

Elements in the model that should be **EXCLUDED**:

- All internal elements or modelling
- Duplicated line work
- Gaps or missing elements
- Camera positions deleted



(Faces in Blue = Not Normalised)

(Faces in White = **Normalised**)

Model Textures

Textures in the model must be sizes of powers of two, the format of the textures is to be (.jpg) (.png) (.tiff) and (.tga). All textures used in the model must be provided with the exception of colours.

- 512 x 512 pixels (preferred texture size)
- 1024 x 1024 pixels
- 2048 x 2048 pixels
- 4096 x 4096 pixels

Design Competition 3D Model Acquisition Checklist

- SketchUp File (.skp)
- General .3ds File (.3ds)
- Model North facing
- Model centred to 0,0,0
- Model Unit (Meters) & 2 Decimal Places 00.00m
- Model with Defining Features of the Building Shown
- Cadastre Outline
- No Window Mullions
- No Sun Shading Devices
- Floor Plates
- Faces in model all normalised
- Model texture supplied (if applicable)