



planning consultants

Architectural Design Excellence Competition

Jury Report

197 Church Street Parramatta

June 2016

Printed: 23 June 2016
File Name: P:\PROJECTS\8769A 197 Church Street Parramatta\Design Excellence Competition\Jury Report.docx
Project Manager: E. Robertshaw
Client: Holdmark
Project Number: 8769A

Document Control

Version	Prepared By	Issued To	Date
Rev_1, Draft	E. Robertshaw	Jury members	9/6/2016
Rev_2, Revised Draft	E. Robertshaw	Jury Members	11/06/2016
Rev_3, Revised Final	E. Robertshaw	Jury Members	14/06/2016
Rev_4, Revised Final	E. Robertshaw	Jury Members	15/06/2016
Rev_5 Revised Final	E. Robertshaw	Jury Members	23/06/2016

11 Dartford Road
Thornleigh NSW 2120

PO Box 230
Pennant Hills NSW 1715

t: 02 9980 6933
f: 02 9980 6217
e: dfp@dfpplanning.com.au

DFP Planning Pty Limited
ACN 002 263 998
www.dfpplanning.com.au

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Purpose of this Report	1
1.3	Competition Details	1
2	Design Brief	2
2.1	Introduction	2
2.2	Objectives	2
2.3	Proponents Non Negotiable Parameters	2
2.4	Council's Resolution and other Non-negotiable Requirements	3
2.5	Other Desirable Aspects to be considered by the Contestants	3
3	Design Competition Key Personnel	4
3.1	Jury Members	4
3.2	Technical Advisors	4
4	Jury Considerations	5
4.1	Introduction	5
4.2	Attendees	5
4.3	Presentations	5
4.4	Jury Determination	5
5	Redesign of Shortlisted Entries	8
5.1	Introduction	8
5.2	Revised schemes	8
5.2.1	Car parking	8
5.2.2	Efficiency and outdoor space	8
5.2.3	Commercial Viability and Buildability	8
5.2.4	Setbacks	8
5.2.5	Summary	9
6	Consideration of short-listed Designs	11
6.1	Introduction	11
6.2	COX /SHATTOTO Revised Scheme.	11
6.3	GSA/DE LA HOZ Revised Scheme.	11
6.4	Decision of the Jury	12
6.5	Jury Caveats	12

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

At a Council meeting held on 7 December 2015, Parramatta City Council (now known as City of Parramatta) resolved to endorse a Planning Proposal lodged by the Proponent, Holdmark Property Group.

Specifically, part (b) of the Council resolution was as follows:

- (b) **That** the applicant work collaboratively with the CEO to draft a brief for an international design competition to design a building on the site, demonstrating compliance with the sun access provisions (Clause 29E of PCCLEP 2007) including the 45 minutes rule for overshadowing of the solar zone of Parramatta Square and SEPP 65. In particular, any future building on the site must demonstrate a built form that appropriately addresses the building separation controls of the ADG to ensure future development on adjacent sites is not compromised (including 20-22 Macquarie Street, Parramatta).

If any design competition entry proposes a height greater than 156AHD it will need to be supported by an Aeronautical Study to address the relevant Section 117 Direction.

The design competition brief must require entrants to retain the HERITAGE façade of the existing building on the site.

The applicant must include, as one of the entries in the design competition, the 'Boomerang' design already submitted to Council in support of its Planning Proposal, modified as required to comply with the design competition brief.

1.2 Purpose of this Report

This report provides a summary of the Architectural Design Excellence Competition undertaken by the Proponent, , in accordance with part (b) of the resolution of Parramatta City Council made at a meeting held on 7 December 2015.

1.3 Competition Details

The competition was conducted as an invitation only competition. The six invited local firms were required to submit their credentials together with details of two international partner firms for each local firm.

Of the six invited firms, only four submitted complying responses to the initial information request. These firms together with their nominated international partner are detailed in **Table 1**.

Local Firm	International Partner
Cox Architects	Shatotto Architects
GroupGSA	Rafael De La Hoz Architects
PTW	Heneghan Peng Architects
Robertson and Marks	Nikken Sekkei*

* R+M originally nominated SOM as their international partner. SOM advised that they were not longer available to continue in the competition after commencement of the competition. In accordance with the Council resolution, it was essential that R+M entry of the Boomerang be considered by the jury and therefore R+M partnered with Nikken Sekkei part way through the competition process.

The competition was managed by DFP Planning.

2 Design Brief

2.1 Introduction

The design brief included a range of non-negotiable and desirable parameters for the contestants to consider as part of their design schemes.

2.2 Objectives

The brief was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Director General's Design Excellence Guidelines and also took into consideration Council's Design Excellence Competition guidelines.

The objectives of the design excellence competition were to:

- Stimulate imaginative and innovative architectural and urban design proposals that achieve design excellence in terms of diversity of architectural response.
- 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 location and the mix of uses for the building.
- Deliver a form and external appearance that will make a positive contribution to the public domain.
- Provide a building which responds to the strategic location of the site and deliver a built form legacy of which the Council, developer and local community can be proud and which will help identify Parramatta.
- Respond to the relationship with adjoining sites and surrounding buildings, including nearby and adjoining heritage items.
- Seek opportunities for Ecologically Sustainable Design ("ESD").
- Consider imaginative ways to respond to the potential for subterranean archaeological relics to be found on site.
- Ensure the outcome is financially feasible and buildable.
- **Provide vibrant activation of all street frontages, building on the Church Street 'strip' activity.**
- Maintain an appropriate scale and form to the podium
- Provide a tall, slender building.
- Maximise amenity for all apartments – prime west / east orientation.
- Maximise views, particularly to the north and east.

2.3 Proponent's Non Negotiable Parameters

- A. The submitted design must provide for:
 - A mixed use development generally comprising retail/commercial floorspace on the ground floor and podium levels with residential floorspace in the tower.
 - A maximum FSR of 17.25:1.
 - A maximum GFA of 74,300m².
 - 14,000m² of the total GFA of the building is to be provided as retail/commercial floorspace, with the balance of the GFA being provided as residential floorspace.
- B. The design must be buildable using recognised traditional building techniques.
- C. The design must be commercially viable.

2 Design Brief

2.4 Council's Resolution and other Non-negotiable Requirements

- A. **Heritage** - Retention and integration of the existing heritage façade of the Murray Bros building.
- B. **Solar Access to Parramatta Square** - Sufficient information to demonstrate that the resultant development will satisfy the requirements of the Council resolution of 7 December 2015 with respect to the sun access provisions of Clause 29E of PCCLEP 2007 including the 45 minutes rule for overshadowing of the solar zone of Parramatta Square. In this regard, Clause 29E of Parramatta LEP 2011 references the provisions of Parramatta Development Control Plan 2011 with respect to the sun access provisions for Parramatta Square. Control C7 of Section 4.3.3.7 City Centre Special Areas – Building Form requires the following:

Overshadowing is to be minimised within the area outlined in red in Figure 4.3.3.7.3 of Parramatta DCP 2011. Individual buildings shall be designed so that no single point of the area outlined in red is in shadow for a period greater than 45 minutes between 12pm-2pm mid-winter.

- C. **ADG Building Separations** - Sufficient information must be provided to demonstrate that the resultant development will not compromise the future development potential of adjacent sites. In this regard, competitors should note that the ADG indicates that for buildings over 9 storeys in height, a separation of 24m should be provided. Any design which includes a residential tower on the site will need to demonstrate that the objectives of the ADG building separation provisions, particularly with respect to the intent that the separation distances are 'shared' between adjoining sites, are appropriately addressed. In this regard, Council has advised that a Planning Proposal for 20-22 Macquarie Street has been lodged and is currently under assessment by Council.
- D. **Flooding** – As per the supplementary brief, each entry will also need to demonstrate:
 - A shelter-in-place strategy for the proposed development.
 - That the basement car parks are capable of being protected from flooding in all events up to and including the PMF.
 - How the ground floor plane responds to the public domain, particularly with respect to access to ground floor levels set at the 1% AEP flood level + 500mm.

2.5 Other Desirable Aspects to be considered by the Contestants

- A. **Sustainability attributes** of the building. Such attributes could include:
 - Consideration of façade treatments to reduce heat absorption (whilst also having regard to light reflection);
 - Installation of dual pipes at time of construction to allow for reticulation of recycled water when this becomes available.
 - Consideration of alternative power sources and/or options to connect the building to alternative power sources when these become available.
 - Consideration of parking provision having regard to Council's desire to minimise private vehicle usage in areas proximate to public transport but also having regard to marketing requirements
- B. **Setbacks to Church Street and Marsden Street** - Along Church Street the DCP requires a minimum setback to a tower from the podium of 18m however Council has advised that a minimum of 12m setback is acceptable. Along Macquarie Street the DCP requires a minimum setback to a tower from the podium of 6m. These controls can be relaxed if it is demonstrated that an alternative solution achieves an equal or better outcome having regard to the objectives of the setback provisions.
- C. **Residential Floorplates** - The residential floorplates are to be efficient and flexible to allow for a variety of apartment layouts to be provided, depending on market demand. A generic floor plate layout is to be provided.

3 Design Competition Key Personnel

3.1 Jury Members

The design jury comprised three members:

- Chris Johnson, Chief Executive Officer Urban Taskforce nominated by the proponent;
- Kim Crestani, City Architect nominated by Parramatta City Council;
- Olivia Hyde, Director of Design Excellence, Office of the Government Architect, nominated by Department of Planning and Environment.

3.2 Technical Advisors

The following consultants provided technical assistance to the contestants and the jury:

Town Planning and Competition Manager:

Ellen Robertshaw, Partner, DFP Planning

Quantity Surveyors to assess the cost of the development:

Altus Page Kirkland

Valuer to consider the financial viability of each design:

AEC Group

Construction Manager to prepare a buildability analysis and a construction programme for the submitted designs:

CPM Consulting

In addition to these consultants, ARUP undertook a review of the wind assessments, ESD assessments and façade engineering assessments provided by each of the contestants in relation to their schemes.

4 Jury Considerations

4.1 Introduction

The jury meeting to consider the entries to the design competition was held on 18 May 2016 in the Charles Byrnes Room, Parramatta Town Hall commencing at 10am.

The competition entrants made presentations to the jury in turn.

Each entrant included an audio visual presentation together with other presentation aids (as described below). Each entrant was given a total of 25 minutes to make their initial presentation with 20 minutes available for the jury to ask further questions. All presentations (with the exception of the R+M presentation) ran over time and the question time session also exceeded the allotted 20 minutes for each entry.

4.2 Attendees

Jury:

Olivia Hyde (Chair) (OH) – Office of the Government Architect

Kim Crestani (KC) – City Architect, City of Parramatta Representative

Chris Johnson (CJ) – CEO Urban Development Taskforce

Observers/Technical Advisors:

Penny Bowen (PB) – City of Parramatta

Che Wall (CW) – Flux Consultants (invited on behalf of City of Parramatta)

Brad Roeleven (BR) – City of Parramatta, Executive Planner, City Significant Development

Kevin Nassif (KN) – Holdmark Property Group

Gavin Carrier (GC) – Holdmark Property Group (via video)

Competition Manager:

Ellen Robertshaw (ER) – DFP Planning

Michelle Niles (MN) – DFP Planning

4.3 Presentations

Each of the four teams presented their designs to the jury and, following these presentations, the jury questioned the contestants in relation to aspects of their designs.

4.4 Jury Determination

Following the completion of the presentations, the jury convened to discuss each of the schemes. There was some discussion regarding the construction costs that had been applied to each of the schemes and the impact that costing may have had on the feasibility of the projects. The jury observed that, based on the viability estimates, none of the schemes presented would be likely to proceed.

Following discussions with the QS, the jury made the following observations:

- The Jury was most impressed with the overall quality of the four schemes and appreciates the enormous amount of work undertaken by each team.
- The Jury believes the approach of having a local architect and an international architect jointly designing the building is positive but in some instances the role of the international architect was not clear and potentially not adding sufficient value.
- A number of issues that arose during the judging raise broader policy positions that the Council for Parramatta or the NSW Government should take up. These included balconies related to wind on very tall buildings and car parking numbers for inner city

4 Jury Considerations

sites, solar access in a city fast becoming high rise, podium heights as the city becomes taller and the need to review retaining the facades of heritage buildings.

- The jury expressed concern that the construction cost per apartment indicated in the QS report may not be viable in Parramatta. This could result in an unacceptable level of value engineering led design change, potentially undermining the design quality of the built outcome.

Further, the jury agreed:

- That the schemes presented by Group GSA/Rafael de la Hoz and Cox Architects/Shattoto were highly commended. However, it was felt that both schemes required some further investigation in order to clarify certain issues and to establish a clear competition winner.
- That the schemes presented by Robertson + Marks and PTW did not display the same degree of design excellence and would not be further considered.

In this regard, the two shortlisted contestants were requested to undertake the following further design development in relation to each of their schemes:

Cox/Shattoto is required to provide the following information:

- Provide adequate set back to the west (12m)
- Seek advice on high level landscaping and adjust the scheme as necessary if higher level greenery is not realistically achievable. Or validate how high level greenery can work with wind etc.
- Address high level wind impacts possibly via introduction of winter-gardens noting that fully-enclosed winter-gardens must be included in the GFA and that the GFA must not exceed 17.25:1
- Have a wind engineer review the above work
- Seek to reduce car parking - Parramatta CC to provide standard statement, Holdmark to provide indication of viable minimum
- Provide revised visualizations (maximum of 3) showing the impact of above adjustments
- Confirm materials
- Submit to cost planner for revised cost plan

Group GSA/Rafael De La-Hoz is required to provide the following information:

- Note: Jury prefer presentation plans and visualizations with balconies, but GSA to look at wind effects at upper levels and note that fully-enclosed winter-gardens will count as GFA and GFA must not exceed 17.25:1
- Note that the jury supports the high amenity of apartment design
- Look at options to improve efficient and reduce construction costs
- Whilst the jury supported the reduced parking numbers presented in this scheme, and the approach taken to incorporation of innovative parking solutions such as car share, the jury requests an option with greater car parking provision to enable equivalence across schemes in viability modelling. Parramatta CC to provide standard statement. Holdmark to provide indication of a viable minimum.
- Provide revised visualizations (maximum of 3) showing any impacts resulting from the above adjustments

4 Jury Considerations

- Have a wind engineer review the above revisions
- Submit to cost planner for a revised cost plan.

The shortlisted firms are to provide a maximum of 5 x A3 sheets with the requested information. Further panels are not required.

5 Redesign of Shortlisted Entries

5.1 Introduction

Prior to reconsideration of the two shortlisted proposals by the Jury, each of the shortlisted contestants was required to refine their schemes to respond to the Jury's requirements. These revised schemes were then submitted to the QS and valuer to reassess the construction costs and feasibility of each of the proposals.

5.2 Revised schemes

5.2.1 Car parking

In relation to car parking, in response to the jury's comments the proponent requested that the revised schemes ensure that any car parking provided was less than the LEP provisions which prescribe a maximum car parking provision within the CBD but addressed viability in regards to marketing requirement.

In this regard, each contestant has prepared an underground car parking scheme which it considers complies with the above requirements. Should it become apparent that this quantum of car parking can be further reduced as the design is developed, the only effect would be the construction of fewer basement levels which will not impact on the design to be considered by the jury.

The jury strongly recommends further reductions in parking through the use of other car use models such as car share.

5.2.2 Efficiency and outdoor space

Each of the short listed contestants was also requested to consider ways of increasing the efficiencies of their floorplates and opportunities to provide useable outdoor spaces. In this regard, each contestant was requested to provide endorsement of their design by a qualified wind engineer. It is noted that the GroupGSA design now includes balconies to the apartments.

5.2.3 Commercial Viability and Buildability

Clearly, for this development to proceed it is vital that it is commercially viable. Discussions with each of the shortlisted contestants, the QS and the Valuer were held to examine opportunities to improve the viability. Each contestant has made a number of improvements in this regard whilst being very mindful not to impact in any way upon the design excellence of their proposals.

In respect of buildability, advice has been received that the GSA/Rafael de la Hoz scheme provides greater benefits in respect of buildability compared to the Cox/Shattoto scheme.

5.2.4 Setbacks

One of the observations of the original CoxShattoto scheme was that the Church Street tower did not provide the required ADG 12m setback to the eastern boundary of 20-22 Macquarie Street.

The revised Cox/Shattoto scheme has addressed this by providing a 9m setback to this boundary for the first four storeys of the tower (Levels 4-7) and a 12m setback thereafter.

The revised Cox/Shattoto scheme provides for a 12m setback of the tower to Church Street with the exception of a minor encroachment of the south eastern corner.

The Cox/Shattoto scheme includes a 12 storey tower on the Marsden Street part of the site which extends from boundary to boundary and has a 0m setback to Marsden Street (NOTE: The DCP requires levels 5+ to be setback 6m from this frontage).

The revised GroupGSA/Rafael de la Hoz scheme maintains the setbacks in relation the Church Street tower as per their submitted scheme. In this regard, their revised scheme

5 Redesign of Shortlisted Entries

provides for a 12m setback to the eastern boundary of 20-22 Macquarie Street and a 13.5m setback to Church Street.

Their revised scheme also provides for a tower on the Marsden Street site. GroupGSA/Rafael de la Hoz have two options with respect to this tower:

- A 20 storey commercial office tower which provides for 3m setbacks from the southern and northern boundaries of this part of the site; or
- A 24 storey serviced apartment tower which provides for a 6m setback to the southern boundary (to 20-22 Macquarie Street) and a 3m setback to the northern boundary.

Both towers are setback 6m (above the podium) from Marsden Street and therefore comply with the DCP. The costings and feasibility have been based on Marsden Street tower comprising serviced apartments.

5.2.5 Summary

Each contestant has included a comparison of their original scheme against the revised scheme as part of their submission.

A summary of each of the revised submissions is provided below:

Summary of Revised Schemes for Design Competition for 197 Church Street, Parramatta		
	GroupGSA/Rafael de la Hoz	COX/Shattoto
GROSS FLOOR AREAS (m²)		
Residential	60,300	60,300
Commercial	10,425	5,850
Retail	3,575	8,150
<i>Total non residential GFA</i>	<i>14,000</i>	<i>14,000</i>
Total development GFA	74,300	74,300
No. of Storeys		
Church Street Tower	82	79
Church Street Podium	3	3
Marsden Street Tower	24	11
CAR PARKING		
Total Car Parking	794	896
LEP Max Parking Number	880 + employees	1,041 + employees
OTHER MATTERS		
Solar Access to Parramatta Square	Satisfies 45 minute DCP 'rule' – animation provided	Satisfies 45 minute DCP 'rule' – animation provided
Buildability	<p>The construction methodology of the Group GSA design proposal is such that the building is able to be delivered in stages, allowing for lower levels to be completed and occupied as the upper levels are completed.</p> <p>The basic support structure is the external framework and the building does not rely on transfer beams, meaning a simpler, faster construction timeframe.</p>	<p>The Cox scheme uses traditional construction methodology including 4 sets of transfer beams within the tower structure.</p> <p>During construction outriggers would be required to be used which may impact on public domain areas around the site.</p> <p>The construction methodology is such that the building must be</p>

5 Redesign of Shortlisted Entries

Summary of Revised Schemes for Design Competition for 197 Church Street, Parramatta

	GroupGSA/Rafael de la Hoz	COX/Shattoto
	<p>Outriggers would not be required for this construction methodology.</p> <p>Vertical transportation is separated into low rise and high rise lifts to allow staged delivery and occupation of the building. Alignment of the façade facilitates simpler, quicker construction techniques.</p> <p>The above results in significant financial benefits with reduced impacts on the public domain.</p>	<p>completed before any part could be occupied.</p>

6 Consideration of short-listed Designs

6.1 Introduction

The jury reconvened at the office of the City of Parramatta on 8 June 2016.

At that meeting, in addition to the jury members the following were also in attendance:

- Ellen Robertshaw, Competition Manager
- Gavin Carrier, observer on behalf of the proponent
- Kevin Nassif, observer on behalf of the proponent
- Penelope Bowen, observer on behalf of the City of Parramatta

The jury noted that the 45 minute overshadowing rule of the solar plane on both schemes was addressed and compliant.

A summary of the Jury's consideration of both shortlisted schemes is provided below.

6.2 COX /SHATTOTO Revised Scheme.

- The scheme addressed the issues very well.
- The ground plane was well considered and is considered a strength of the scheme.
- The expression of the 4 vertical villages was also considered a strength in the scheme.
- The resolution of the greening of the façade for the lower 20 floors was well considered **given Parramatta's climate and the "greebling" effects were calmed down above 20 floors** which was appropriate given the height of the building.
- The architects noted that the design was a kit of parts and would be further resolved and developed which was accepted.
- **The "cuts" in the tower form were also appropriately located to ensure the 45 minute overshadowing rule was addressed.**
- The floor plans were well resolved and the articulation of the plan and the open circulation was neatly resolved.

6.3 GSA/DE LA HOZ Revised Scheme.

- This design developed proposal does demonstrate a building of the future.
- The jury was very pleased that the two practices of the International architect and Local Architect was a robust collaboration. The presentation clearly demonstrated that the designers were working very closely and the concepts tested throughout the process.
- The proposed exoskeleton form was ably resolved.
- The principle of decanting floor space in the form of a small tower with Serviced apartments/hotel on the Marsden St frontage was a liberating design development to address issues of commercial and residential interfaces.
- The floor plans were very poetic and the layout of the three lozenge shaped forms, with their interstitial circulation spaces [corridors] – which were open at both ends to light and ventilation – were considered highly resolved. The layout produced many corner apartments which provided for optimal access to natural light and solar access.
- The layouts of the re-entrant balconies was a sophisticated resolution of solving the exterior balcony space whilst resolving the wind effects. The wind engineer's solution was considered well resolved. The inclusion of useable balconies was felt to have improved the overall quality of the scheme and apartment layouts.
- Structure was highly resolved and did not require a transfer slab.

6 Consideration of short-listed Designs

6.4 Decision of the Jury

The Jury unanimously agreed that the GroupGSA/De La Hoz scheme was the better in terms of displaying design excellence for the following reasons:

- The GroupGSA/De La Hoz building is streamlined and fluid and represents a futuristic, almost space age, character. The jury believes this character is well suited for the emerging confidence of the City of Parramatta. The winning design firmly positions Parramatta as championing the future.
- The plan for the tower is a very elegant streamlined cluster of three shapes with curved profiles. This form breaks down the mass of the building into three elements which reinforces the vertical reading of the building.
- The curved ends and tops to the building give it a dynamic appearance.
- The eco-skeleton that frames the building gives a city scale simplicity to the tower while adding interest as it appears to climb up the building. The pattern of the structural frame is derived from an abstraction of the pattern of eucalyptus bark. Within this framework the pattern of sun shields gives a more human scale to the tower.
- At the roof level is a series of dramatic shared spaces and the ground level has active uses and public spaces that reinforce the clarity of the tower while addressing the street edge through the heritage façade.
- The jury believes that the partnership between De La-Hoz and Group GSA was the most successful of the four competition proposals. Rafael de La-Hoz from Spain clearly drove much of the fluid form of the building and the continuation of this collaboration will enrich the final solution.
- The jury also acknowledged the simplicity of the architectural competition process in Parramatta that encourages innovation by private sector developers through the ideas of quality architects.
- As part of the design development of this scheme the following should be considered:
 - Corridors to the serviced apartments should be open to light and ventilation.
 - Car parking should be re considered with a view to achieving further reductions in **parking provision, given the site's location in relation to** existing and future public transport options. The potential for utilising the go-get car share schemes should also be examined.
- The jury noted that it is imperative that the materiality of the scheme is maintained- especially the solutions for the glazing of the curved façade and sun shading fins.
- The jury noted that the Cox/Shattoto scheme had also addressed the issues well and was a very close second.

6.5 Jury Caveats

The awarding of this design competition to GroupGSA/De La Hoz, by the Jury has been made subject to the following caveats:

- The jury notes that the final scheme may not achieve the maximum proposed FSR of 17.25:1 as formal approvals by DPE and Council/JRPP are still required.
- The materiality and other distinctive design features including the glazing of the curved façade treatments must be maintained as part of design development.
- Inclusion of generous shared use spaces, such as the roof space were considered a strong element of the design and should be retained.

6 Consideration of short-listed Designs

- To ensure that the quality of the winning design by GroupGSA Architects and Rafael de la Hoz Architects is maintained through all development approval stages and construction, the Design Competition Jury will monitor design excellence and integrity at key project milestones including the following:
 - Prior to the lodgement of the Development Application: Must include key cross sections, partial plans and partial elevations through external walls, balconies and other key external details. Drawings are to be fully annotated showing details, materials, finishes and colours, so that the details and materiality of the external facades are clearly documented; and
 - Prior to issue of Construction Certificate; and
 - Prior to the completion of construction and prior to Occupation Certificate.

Signed by:

 _____ Date: 23.06.16

Olivia Hyde - Chair, Director of Design Excellence, Office of the Government Architect, nominated by NSW Department of Planning and Environment

 _____ Date: 23/06/16

Chris Johnson - Chief Executive Officer Urban Taskforce nominated by the proponent;

_____ Date: _____

Kim Crestani - City Architect nominated by Parramatta City Council;