

## Appendix K - Consultation Summary

The following table includes a response to Council and the Design Advisory Panel's formal written feedback following submission of the Draft Planning Proposal in August 2020. The relevant text of each request is provided in the left-hand column, accompanied by the Proponent's corresponding response in the right-hand column. The Proponent's responses have been informed by input by the expert consultant team and should be read in conjunction with the revised Planning Proposal and accompanying technical reports.

**Table 1 Pre lodgement Consultation**

Meeting Date	Summary of Key Topics Discussed	Feedback / Changes Provided
<b>Pre draft Planning Proposal lodgement</b>		
20 January 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction to the site and the complex amalgamation that took place to enable this development.</li> </ul>	N/A – refer to the site description at <b>Section 2.0</b> of the Planning Report.
Council staff Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of the concept envelope detailing the applied Schedule 11 methodology with reference to the interpretation of the draft DCP modelling requirements.</li> </ul>	Council advised the schedule 11 criteria has not been correctly applied, and further refinements were to be made prior to commencing Sky View Factor and pedestrian wind modelling.
19 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The heritage significance of Pangas House located at 15-17 Hunter Street was raised, noting site is not identified on a local or Stage heritage list.</li> </ul>	The Proponent engaged Urbis Heritage to conduct a detailed heritage investigation to be reported and presented for Council's consideration prior to lodgement of the Planning Proposal.
Council staff Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A revised Schedule 11 base case envelope was presented, and modelling was shown in accordance with the draft DCP requirements.</li> </ul>	The Schedule 11 envelope and the proposed planning envelope are detailed within the Design Report at <b>Appendix A</b> and <b>Section 7.1</b> of the Planning Report.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed envelope was tested against the Schedule 11 envelope and yielded a positive Sky View Factor result.</li> </ul>	Refer to the Sky View Factor Analysis at <b>Appendix S</b> and <b>Section 7.5</b> of the Planning Report.

Meeting Date	Summary of Key Topics Discussed	Feedback / Changes Provided
4 June 2020  Council staff Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Findings from the heritage investigation of Pangas House at 15-17 Hunter Street presented.</li> </ul>	The Heritage Impact Statement prepared by Urbis Heritage at <b>Appendix F</b> concludes that the site does not warrant a heritage listing. Notwithstanding this, the Proponent is committed to retaining the building through the site's redevelopment. Refer to <b>Appendix F</b> and <b>Section 7.7</b> of the Planning Report for further discussion.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of the wind impact modelling were presented.</li> </ul>	Council staff followed up directly with MEL to discuss the approach to reporting wind test results. The final report prepared by MEL is provided at <b>Appendix G</b> .
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An articulation and sun shading allowance study were presented and it was decided that these aspect would need to be carefully considered in the Planning Proposal submission.</li> </ul>	Refer to the Design Report at <b>Appendix A</b> and the justification detailed under <b>Section 7.1.6</b> of the Planning Report.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setback variations will need to be supported by urban design analysis.</li> </ul>	Refer to the Design Report at <b>Appendix A</b> and the justification detailed under <b>Section 7.1</b> of the Planning Report.
<b>Post draft Planning Proposal Lodgement</b>		
26 October 2020  Design Advisory Panel Meeting (feedback)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reduced setbacks to Hunter Street and Pitt Street require pedestrian view analysis to establish the impacts on this prominent city corner. Analysis should be conducted along Hunter and O'Connell Streets and should consider impacts on the character of the streets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further pedestrian view analysis has been undertaken as illustrated at Appendix A and assessed further at <b>Section 7.4</b> of the Planning Report.</li> <li>This analysis indicates that the reduced setbacks do not preclude a positive outcome for the pedestrian environment.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15-17 Hunter Street should be considered for listing as a local heritage item on Sydney LEP 2012.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As discussed at <b>Appendix F</b> and Sections 5.2.1 and 7.7 of the Planning Report the 15-17 Hunter Street building is proposed to be heritage listed.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The treatment of 15-17 Hunter Street within the proposal requires further careful consideration, including the impacts of any proposed cantilever over the building and its improved integration, and recognition, within the reference design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design has been amended to better integrate 15-17 Hunter Street into the overall design, including the provision of an internal laneway that traverses the site from Hunter Street to Pitt Street adjacent to 15-17 Hunter Street. This will allow for activation on both the Hunter Street and laneway frontages, more actively incorporating the building at 15-17 Hunter Street into the overall design. Further detail is provided at <b>Appendix A</b> and <b>Section 7.1.1</b> of the Planning Report.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retaining and activating the current private 'laneway' that extends into the site from Pitt Street could help improve integration of 15-17 Hunter Street and improve the integration of future development into the surrounding urban fabric.</li> </ul>	As above, the reference design has been revised to include a 'laneway' style through-site link from Hunter Street to Pitt Street, as detailed at Appendix A and discussed at <b>Section 4.3</b> and <b>Section 7.1.1</b> of the Planning Report.

Meeting Date	Summary of Key Topics Discussed	Feedback / Changes Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal should strive to protect the prevalent fine grain character of Hunter and Pitt Streets.</li> </ul>	<p>The reference design includes a podium design which is highly articulated and reflects the prevalent fine grain character of both Hunter and Pitt Street. The inclusion of the through site link will also provide fine grain detail characteristic of the area.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reduced allowance for architectural articulation within the proposed envelope has not been sufficiently justified and should be increased.</li> </ul>	<p>A total articulation of 12.5% is proposed in accordance with the Guideline for Site-Specific Planning Proposals.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vehicular access from Hunter Street, instead of Pitt Street, should be explored in the context of improved ground-level activation.</li> </ul>	<p>With the provision of the laneway through-site link, vehicular access to the site is able to be accommodated from Hunter Street.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Best endeavours should be made to ensure the efficient use of land within a tower cluster area.</li> </ul>	<p>As discussed in <b>Section 1.2</b> of the Planning Report, the planning proposal process has been undertaken to deliver a higher yield of commercial floor space than was able to be delivered under the tower cluster provisions of the CSPPS and subsequent LEP amendments. Therefore, this is a very efficient use of land in a tower cluster area.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal needs to articulate the range of strong strategic outcomes consistent with the Strategy that would otherwise not be realised.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal's consistency with the CSPPS is discussed further at <b>Section 6.2</b> of the Planning Report.</p>
<p>2 March 2021 Design Advisory Panel Meeting (feedback)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The panel was broadly supportive of the introduction of ground level laneways with natural light, the retention and integration of 15-17 Hunter Street, the architectural articulation allowance being 15% of the envelope, and the pedestrian viewpoint analysis to support the proposed 4 metre setback to Hunter Street.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, these key features have been retained in the proposal.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A detailed traffic study is needed to determine whether car stacker queuing, deliveries and general traffic circulation is feasible on the site while maintaining pedestrian priority</li> </ul>	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment provided at <b>Appendix E</b> addresses these matters.</p>

Meeting Date	Summary of Key Topics Discussed	Feedback / Changes Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower-level bridges in the laneway network are not supported; they are visually obtrusive and serve to reduce the apparent space and its amenity</li> </ul>	<p>A thin, lightweight bridge has been included at Levels 2-3 of the podium, connecting to the roof terrace. The bottom of that bridge is nearly 9.5m above the laneway below, providing significant clearance height and a feeling of openness and separation. This single lower level bridge, reduced from multiple bridges, is necessary to ensure physical connections at the podium levels of the building, ensuring that the usability of the office space is maximised. It is the intention that any bridge be lightweight and not visually intrusive to the through-site link. Further refinement of the bridge design is expected to be a key part of the future Design Competition.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The laneways should be designed as a shared space with clear pedestrian priority</li> </ul>	<p>The intention for the laneways is that they will be shared spaces, with priority provided to pedestrians.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Curved corners for the tower component are an effective and necessary strategy in mitigating daylight loss and aligning the tower edge with Pitt Street</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, the proposed DCP envelope includes chamfered corners.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further information is required on the amount of below-ground floorspace requested, which at an FSR of 2.9:1 requires strong justification before it can be supported.</li> </ul>	<p>Further explanation and justification of the below ground floor space is provided in the Design Report and <b>Section 7.1.5</b> of the Planning Report. On balance, the below ground floor space is considered to be a tremendous opportunity to provide layered activation and to contribute to the vibrancy of the evolving precinct.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following aspects align with the City's Central Sydney Planning Strategy and should be confirmed and secured as part of any formal request:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No residential or service apartments use</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Noted, no residential or serviced apartment uses are proposed, and it is anticipated a clause will be provided to this effect in the site-specific section of the Sydney LEP 2012.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The laneways within your site, providing vital through-block connections and the basis for further extension of the laneway network on neighbouring sites</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, the laneways are proposed to form part of the site-specific DCP and a component of the public benefit offer, ensuring they are secured as a key benefit of the proposal.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural light and ventilation to the laneways, achieved through an increased height differential between the north and south components of the podium and the 'cut-back' of the tower component at its lower levels</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, the objective for natural light and ventilation into the laneways will be secured in the site-specific DCP. The height and vertical separation to enable the achievement of this objective is outlined in the site-specific DCP.</p>

Meeting Date	Summary of Key Topics Discussed	Feedback / Changes Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The hybrid timber and post-stressed concrete construction of the tower</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, the ESD Report supporting the request for a Planning Proposal outlines the commitment to a hybrid timber and post-stressed concrete construction (refer to <b>Appendix I</b>). Furthermore, the public benefit offer also provides a commitment in this regard.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed 6-star Green Star rating and NABERS 5.5 star energy rating</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, these commitments are to be secured in both the site-specific DCP and within the public benefit offer which provides a commitment to these targets.</p>