

5 November 2012

David Gibson  
A/Director Metropolitan and Regional Projects North  
Department of Planning & Infrastructure  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Email: [megan.fu@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:megan.fu@planning.nsw.gov.au)

**RE: Site 60 Building B (3 Murray Rose Avenue), Sydney Olympic Park MP 11\_0082**

Dear David,

I refer to the Environmental Assessment for the above Major Project Application, which was referred to Sydney Olympic Park Authority (the Authority) for comment on 26 October 2012. The following comments are made on the proposed development, based on issues that the Authority requires further involvement from the applicant.

**SOPA Act & Environmental Guidelines**

The application does not include any assessment of consistency with the SOPA Act 2001 or SOPA's Environmental Guidelines. The SOPA Act (s22(2)) requires that *'in determining an application for consent to carry out development on land within Sydney Olympic Park, the Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning must consider the consistency of the proposed development with the Environmental Guidelines'*.

**Stormwater**

The proposed development site is outside the WRAMS catchment area, and stormwater from this site cannot be readily harvested into WRAMS, however no other solution to stormwater collection and recycling (e.g. harvesting for reuse within the development) appears to have been considered in project design. All stormwater is proposed to be discharged to Bennelong Pond, and this is considered to be inconsistent with the Environmental Guidelines (Refer to Point 1 of the Addendum).

Stormwater harvesting and recycling needs to be incorporated into the design of this project. This is particularly important given the likely cumulative impacts upon the ecology of Bennelong Pond (Refer to Point 2 of the Addendum). Construction stormwater will also need to be appropriately managed (Refer to Point 3 of the Addendum).

**Contamination**

Given that the proposed development site is in close proximity to remediated lands, it is pertinent that the waste classification is reviewed by the EPA. The Department of Planning and Infrastructure may also wish to give consideration to requiring the proponent to provide an independent waste classification for any material that is being removed from the site.

**Waste Management Plan**

The proponent will need to prepare a Waste Management Plan that includes (but not limited to) progressive testing and stockpiling of the excavated material at an appropriate frequency in accordance with the EPA's *Waste Classification Guidelines* around the identified "hot spots" to determine the extent of the contamination and ensure that any material that does not meet the human health guidelines is appropriately classified before being removed off-site for disposal.

## **Demolition Staging Plan & Sediment Control Plan**

The Plans show that the existing former 'Samsung' building and adjoining car park will be demolished as part of this Application. It is not clear if some or all of these buildings / structures will be demolished as part of the works for 3 Murray Rose Ave, and the timing. This is critical to the Authority in terms of delivering the public road works (extension of Murray Rose Avenue down to Bennelong Parkway). The impact of the demolition and bulk earthworks on adjoining sites (1 & 2 Murray Rose, and Paddock Park) is also not clear.

Accordingly, the Applicant should prepare a Demolition & Interim Works Staging Plan and Sediment & Erosion Control Plan for the adjoining sites (1 & 2 Murray Rose, and Paddock Park).

## **Recesses**

It is noted that the depth of the recesses, and in particular the eastern façade, has been reduced to a minimum. The proposed floor plates are large and similar to those of 5 Murray Rose Avenue which has larger recesses and is better articulated into 2 defined "wings" that provides better solar access and worker amenity. The proponent should satisfactorily address why the recesses have been reduced for this development.

## **The Cutting & the Chase**

- It is noted that no details have been provided for the awning within "the Cutting". The Proponent should clarify if it is proposed as part of this application. If yes, the detailed design of the awning should be provided, and it should be consistent with advice from the Design Review Panel.
- The EA illustrates an interim and ultimate treatment of the loading dock and through-site pedestrian link that form part of "the Chase". It is not clear when and how these ultimate civil and landscape works would be triggered as this would rely on cooperation and funding from the redevelopment of the adjoining site (1 Murray Rose); which may be under separate ownership in the future. The proponent should address this matter in more detail.
- The pedestrian path within "the Chase" is shown as 1.2m wide and not consistent with the Authority's Access Guidelines which nominate 1.8m as the minimum width for publicly accessible paths. The SOPA Access Guidelines (May 2011) are to be implemented as the minimum standard.
- It is not clear if there is provision for deep soil zones / pockets to support trees proposed over "the Cutting". This is also applicable to trees proposed within "the Chase" as Drawing EA301.G indicates a plant room/service zone under the roadway with no allowance for deep soil zones/pockets to support future tree planting shown on Drawing LA6D. The proponent should prepare a Landscape Plan with cross sections (showing minimum 1m depth tree planting pockets, root-able soil volumes and irrigation system) for SOPA's approval.

## **Traffic**

The Traffic Report from Better Transport Futures is generally satisfactory, however needs to be amended to use more up-to-date data, as it is relying on the traffic surveys measuring volumes at Australia Ave / Parkview Dr (carried out in October 2009) and Australia Ave / Murray Rose Ave (carried out in June 2012).

The Australia Ave/Parkview intersection has significantly more traffic going through it in 2012 due to developments such as Australia Towers (Site 3) and Fujitsu (Site 8a) and as such the data is a little out of date. The Australia Ave / Murray Rose Ave data is based on assumptions from the 5 Murray Rose Ave (Lion building) rather than the actual usage from the (now) tenanted building.

The SIDRA analysis for the intersection of Australia Ave / Murray Rose Ave (Table 6-2), shows that traffic entering Australia Ave from Murray Rose East in the PM peak is close to unsatisfactory (LOS D). This has potential to increase accident frequency at this intersection and, as recommended, requires an accident study.

### **Swept Path Analysis**

The Traffic Report mentions that a swept path analysis has been completed for vehicles using the loading dock. SOPA requests a copy of the analysis for both the interim and ultimate (when 1 Murray Rose Av is developed) treatment of the loading dock.

### **Vehicle Parking**

MP 2030's maximum vehicle parking ratio of 1 vehicle per 80sqm should be maintained. Various improvements to public transport such as the 10-min interval train service in AM/PM peaks as well as the additional bus services (450 & 533) have resulted in better public transport services to SOP in recent years.

### **Tree Management Plan**

A Tree Management Plan will need to form part of the supporting documentation to address Points 4-6 in the Addendum.

### **Driveway**

The width of the proposed driveway should be reviewed and narrowed, subject to compliance with relevant standards, to reduce the disruption to the Murray Rose Avenue footpath.

### **Public Domain Plan**

To ensure interface levels and materials are well-integrated with Stage 2 of Brick Pit Park, the proponent will need to submit an amended Public Domain Plan in accordance with the requirements of SOPA's Urban Elements Design Manual (2009).

### **Lighting**

Lighting should be designed and oriented to avoid impacts to wildlife in adjacent habitat areas. Building and outdoor lighting should not be directed to the Brickpit or Badu Mangroves, and should not be directed upwards.

### **Conclusions**

Subject to the above issues being satisfactorily addressed by the proponent, the Authority supports the proposed development and believes that it will contribute to creating a vibrant township outlined in the Sydney Olympic Park *Master Plan (MP) 2030*.

Please contact Dat Tran on 9714 7139 or email [dat.tran@sopa.nsw.gov.au](mailto:dat.tran@sopa.nsw.gov.au), should you require any further assistance or clarifications in relation to this submission.

Yours sincerely



**Andrew Brown**  
**Executive Manager, Urban Planning and Design**

## ADDENDUM

### **Stormwater**

1. Relevant clauses of the Environmental Guidelines are:

*Clause 4.1 (b) - requiring all new developments to maximise opportunities for building and infrastructure design to incorporate water collection and recycling systems*

*Clause 4.1 (c) avoiding adverse impacts on water quality or quantity in local streams, wetlands and groundwater from operations, developments, and major event activities at Sydney Olympic Park*

Clause 4.1(b) applies to all new developments, not only those within the WRAMS catchment areas.

2. The EA (page 56) erroneously states that 'stormwater from the site will drain directly into SOPA's Water Reclamation and Management Scheme (WRAMS)' and 'that the WRAMS system will ensure that adverse impacts from stormwater will not arise'. This is incorrect – the site drains directly into Bennelong Pond in the Badu Mangroves system.

Bennelong Pond contains the endangered plant species *Zannichellia palustris* – the potential impact of the proposal upon this endangered species is not assessed. The Badu Mangroves system is listed on the Commonwealth's Directory of Important Wetlands in Australia. Potential impacts upon this system, including cumulative impacts of future adjacent developments flagged in the assessment document are not considered.

3. Construction stormwater from this site will flow into Bennelong Pond. Should dewatering of any temporary sediment basins be required during construction, any waters discharged to Bennelong Pond must comply with EPA requirements, at a location and flow rate approved by SOPA, be approved on each occasion by SOPA, not exceed 50mg/L suspended solids, and be within the pH range 6.5-8.5.

### **Tree Management Plan**

4. Two Fig Trees – *Ficus obliqua* as listed in the proponent's Arborist report (trees #34 and #35) are also nominated on SOPA's Significant Tree Register (pg. 22 & 23). These 2 trees are shown for retention in MP 2030 (pg.163) and so will need to be transplanted by the Proponent to a location to be agreed with the Authority, at no cost to the Authority.
5. A third Fig Tree – *Ficus rubiginosa* (tree #50) occurs in a proposed publicly accessible pocket park (future Paddock Park, located between 2 & 4 Murray Rose Ave) and will need to be protected in accordance with the Authority's 'Guidelines for the Protection of Trees on Development Sites'.
6. The Arborist report has assessed trees on the adjoining sites (1 & 2 Murray Rose Ave and future Paddock Park) and has recommended the trees are proposed 'for removal' and states that "the term removal does not necessarily destruction". Where the transplanting of healthy trees (such as trees # 36-49) for potential reuse on the site or anywhere else within SOP is not practical, it is recommended that these trees be transplanted to other sites outside SOP.