



Ecove
Site 2 Pty Limited
ACN 626 211 701

14 September 2022

Renah Givney
Senior Planning Officer – Key Sites Assessments

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Locked Bag 5022
Parramatta, NSW 2124

Level 1
3 Australia Avenue
Sydney Olympic Park
NSW 2127
Locked Bag 1451
Meadowbank NSW 2114

P 02 9763 0444
F 02 9763 0401
E mail@ecove.com.au
W ecove.com.au

Dear Renah,

RE: TfNSW SUBMISSION TO SSD – 21356591 PROPONENT RESPONSE

We write with reference to the referral submission from TfNSW in response to our SSD application relating to Sites 2A and 2B, Sydney Olympic Park (SSD-21356591). Ecove as the applicant has justifiable concerns with some of the proposed changes and conditions proposed by TfNSW's submission. We are also of the view that a number of views and issues raised by TfNSW in their submission result from them either not reviewing the SSD application material in sufficient detail or their misinterpretation of this material.

It is our view, which can be supported, that the proposed conditions relating to the Parramatta Light Rail 2(PLR2) cannot be complied with at this current time given the considerable uncertainty around the future timing for this infrastructure project and may never be able to be complied with. The conditions also place a considerable and unreasonable cost burden for compliance to mitigate risks that do not currently exist.

It is our view that TfNSW's requirements with respect to the Dawn Fraser East extension are inconsistent with the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030 (2018 Review), SOPA's wishes as the landowner and authority for Sydney Olympic Park, and also our development agreement with SOPA.

Parramatta Light Rail 2

At the time that the TfNSW submission was prepared the PLR2 was not a committed infrastructure project and was unfunded. It is our understanding that the PLR2 was not even being considered as part of future strategic planning for Sydney Olympic Park at that time. Added to this the infrastructure has questionable economic benefits and a recent recommendation from Infrastructure NSW that the project to be deferred.

Since this time the PLR2 has received initial funding only for design and enabling works, including the Melrose Park to Wentworth Point bridge, with no certainty around the future timing and funding of the light rail construction.

The submission notes by its own admission that the PLR2 is in the planning phase and that the route has not been finalised. Despite this TfNSW make an emphatic statement that they are of "the view that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the future construction and operation of the PLR2 corridor". Without a confirmed route it is difficult to understand how a statement such as this can be true. Furthermore, the statement is made without detailing any impacts or providing support for these views.

As the PLR2 route is not finalised, the definitive statement that “the proposed development is located within 25m of the future PLR2 corridor” cannot be true either. In any case TfNSW admit that the provisions of the Infrastructure SEPP do not apply in this instance as there is no defined corridor and it is not protected. Accordingly, they determine that no concurrence is required. Despite this TfNSW are effectively seeking conditions as if the provisions of the Infrastructure SEPP did apply on the basis that should the PLR2 proceed to delivery, it might pass along the existing road fronting the site.

The development only has around 30m of basement fronting Australia Avenue running north of Dawn Fraser Ave where the potential PLR2 route may run. Above ground the only structure in this vicinity is a single story café style pavilion with a small roof top dining terrace. The basement when complete is entirely self-supporting and requires no structural support beyond the site boundary. During construction Australia Avenue fronting the site will need to be protected for around 6 months, a very common situation that is safely completed hundreds of times a year in Greater Sydney. Given what is being proposed it is difficult to understand how the development could have impact of any significance on the PLR2 even if it was constructed and operational.

In broad terms the difficulties with the proposed PLR2 conditions are as follows. These comments are made with the benefit of significant prior experience in undertaking development projects in close proximity to major rail infrastructure:

- The conditions require the proponent to comply with policies, rules and procedures that are unavailable publicly and likely do not exist.
- Numerous proposed conditions require approvals from TfNSW and the operator of the PLR2. There is currently no operator and should the PLR2 be deferred in the future there is a risk that there will be nobody in TfNSW able or willing to provide these approvals. This exposes the proponent to the potential for significant delay with corresponding financial loss.
- The proposed conditions require the preparation of engineering and technical reports that cannot be prepared without the PLR2 infrastructure existing.
- The proposed requirements for insurance coverage are wildly disproportionate to the size of any potential loss or damage that could be caused even if the PLR2 existed in front of the site.
- It is unlikely that the proponent can obtain insurance for an asset that does not exist.
- The proposed conditions are onerous compared with the risk and would impose a significant cost burden on the proponent to comply with when they are mitigating against risks that are unlikely there even if the infrastructure existed.
- We are not proposing to alter the Australia Avenue intersections at Parkview Drive and Murray Rose Avenue.

Accordingly, we do not believe that these conditions should be fairly or reasonably included in any determination should DPIE determine to grant approval for the SSD application.

Dawn Fraser East Extension

The TfNSW submission does not support vehicular access at Dawn Fraser Extension and Australia Avenue intersection despite there being vehicular access in both directions currently from the existing Dawn Fraser Avenue on the other side of Australia Avenue. The Dawn Fraser East extension is required by the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030 (2018 Review), SOPA as both landowner (including all roads) and Authority for Sydney Olympic Park require this extension to be constructed for eventual through traffic to the east in future. The development agreement between Ecove and SOPA requires the extension to be built as a vehicular roadway as proposed.

The Dawn Fraser East extension has always been proposed as a left in left out configuration as indicated in the SSD application supporting documents. The Dawn Fraser Extension has initially been designed as a light traffic flow shared zone at this stage with the capacity to be utilised as a through road in future when the properties to the east of the site are redeveloped.

The service lane along the eastern boundary of the site is proposed as a single carriage way running in a northerly direction from Parkview Drive to Murray Rose Ave only. With the bulk of service vehicles to the site likely to be utilising the 2A building loading dock, a good portion of the service vehicles attending the site are likely to bypass Australia Avenue between Parkview Drive and Murray Rose Avenue entirely.

Parkview Drive Intersection and Car Park Access

The TfNSW submission incorrectly identifies the Parkview Drive and Australia Avenue intersection as unsignalised accordingly the impacts associated with the proposed car park entry may be incorrectly assumed. There is significantly more storage capacity proposed within the car park ramps than is provided by many of the large public car parks within Sydney Olympic Park.

Car Parking

We appreciate the comments of TfNSW with respect to parking numbers and the proximity of the site to public transport and note that Sydney Olympic Park generally still suffers from a lack of user friendly and efficient public transport outside of peak event times. This situation is unlikely to be rectified until the Metro West station is completed, which is currently due to occur some years after the bulk of this development is completed.

Notwithstanding this the overall car parking numbers associated with the proposed development's land uses has been reduced by 9 spaces to 575 spaces in total. In addition to this the 150 space public car park that is to replace the existing public car parking spaces on site remains the same. The public car park will be owned and operated by SOPA and forms part of Ecove's obligations under the development agreement with SOPA.

Total allowable car parking under the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030 (2018 Review) for the proposed development is 768, with the proposed car parking representing a 193 reduction in car parking compared to the allowable number. This equates to a 25% reduction in car parking compared to the allowable total.

The development also proposes an additional 67 bike parking spaces in total over and above the minimum allowable bike parking spaces of 186. It is also proposed to provide end of trip facilities that exceed the minimum numbers required under the controls.

The type of land uses proposed does not lend itself to prioritising parking for car pooling as proposed by TfNSW and this will be difficult to implement in most cases and impossible to police.

Traffic Modelling

Some of the additional traffic modelling requested in the TfNSW in their submission is unusually onerous given that this SSD application is for a compliant use and density under the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030. Requiring modelling of regional road intersections such as the Homebush Drive and Australia Avenue roundabout and for modelling of intervals of 5 and 10 years post development would ordinarily only be required for rezoning applications proposing land use changes and density increases.

Despite our view that this level of detail should not be required for an essentially compliant development application we have had our traffic engineers undertake this additional modelling with the exception of

modelling the Homebush Bay Drive Roundabout. This intersection was excluded by agreement with TfNSW on the basis that is subject to a separate \$300m upgrade plan.

We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss these issues further with DPIE prior to any finalisation of your determination of the SSD application. Should you wish to discuss or clarify any of the above please do not hesitate to contact the under signed on 0400 080 811.

Yours Faithfully,
Ecove Site 2 Pty Limited



Greg Hynd