

## Appendix D – Detailed Response to Submissions

This section provides a detailed summary of the Applicant's response to the matters raised in submissions received. For ease of navigation and to reduce repetition, this section also addresses matters upon which DPHI have requested further information or clarification.

### 1.0 Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

**Table 1** *DPHI Request for Information*

Item	Issue Raised	Comment
<b>Department of Planning, Housing, and Infrastructure</b>		
DPHI1	Update the Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) to consider the new Statement of Significance(16 May 2024) as recommended by the Heritage Council.	Refer to the Amended Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report.
DPHI2	Provide a detailed response to issues raised by the Heritage Council and City of Sydney Council (Council) and ensure any resulting changes to the project are clearly articulated and presented to the State Design Review Panel (SDRP) (see Points 5 and 6 below)	Refer to the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report.
DPHI3	Provide details of all interventions to heritage fabric including:	Refer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b>.</li> <li>Amended Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b>.</li> <li>Details the sequencing of works to the Wran Building are included within the Structural Sequencing diagrams contained at <b>Appendix H</b>.</li> </ul>
DPHI4	a) detailed demolition plans clearly illustrating the full extent of demolition and elements to be retained.	
DPHI5	b) a comprehensive materials and finishes schedule cross-referenced to plans	
DPHI6	c) the materiality and construction of the Wran Building including supporting structure, facades and roof, including any changes made in response to concerns raised by the Heritage Council and Council	
DPHI7	d) the design of the Switch House rooftop terrace, including any balustrades.	
<b>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</b>		
DPHI8	Provide a final version of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) with evidence and outcomes of consultation with First Nations stakeholders and the RAPs, indicating how this consultation has informed the design and programming of the revitalised Powerhouse space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The final ACHAR is included at <b>Appendix K</b> of this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
<b>Design Excellence</b>		

DPHI9	Work with the GANSW to establish an SDRP and associated review process for the proposal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A SDRP process has been established. Refer to the Amended Design Excellence Strategy and Design Review Report at <b>Appendix M</b> to this Response Submissions.</li> </ul>
DPHI10	Refine the proposal with input from the SDRP and include a summary of the advice and the Applicant's responses in the RtS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal has been refined and a response to feedback provided by the SDRP prepared. Refer to the Amended Design Excellence Strategy and Design Review Report at <b>Appendix M</b> to this Response Submissions</li> </ul>
<b>Public Domain</b>		
DPHI11	Clarify the function/usability of the Gathering Terrace and provide further detail as to how this space can accommodate different events, including indicative programming.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions Report. This demonstrates how the Gathering Terrace is capable of being used for a range of activations, noting that this DA does not seek consent for the carrying out of any events which would be the subject of separate approval as required.</li> </ul>
DPHI12	Provide further details on any proposed public domain works/landscaping works along the interface between the Gathering Terrace and The Goods Line.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
DPHI13	Clarify how security and access will be managed for the central and Post Office courtyards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access control (gates) will be provided to prevent access into the Macarthur Street courtyard outside of museum operating hours. The design of these gates will be developed during detailed design and will be integrated into the overall design concept. All other areas of public domain would be permeable to the public domain, and implementation of the CPTED.</li> </ul>
<b>Traffic and Access</b>		
DPHI14	Provide details of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed staff and visitor cycle parking and End-of-Trip facilities on plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
DPHI15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicative pedestrian access and connections to Exhibition and Haymarket light rail Stops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Transport Impact Statement at <b>Appendix O</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
DPHI16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The capacity of the proposed coach parking to accommodate simultaneous visiting/school groups and consider provision for weather protection in this location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Transport Impact Statement at <b>Appendix O</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
<b>Visual Impacts</b>		
DPHI17	Update the proposed views and subsequent analysis in the VIA/HIS to accurately reflect the proposed materiality of the Wran Building.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Visual Impact Assessment at <b>Appendix P</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
DPHI18	Consider options to increase the visibility of the double curved roof form when viewed from the corner of Harris Street and Macarthur Steet, as recommended by Heritage Council and City of Sydney Council.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix P</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> <li>As noted by Curio in the HIS at <b>Appendix L</b>, the views to the Wran Building from McArthur Street are an improvement from the existing views attributed to the removal of the large street wall along McArthur Street and the external removal of the external staircase to the west of the Switch House.</li> <li>Reducing the height of the New Building beyond the proposed design would result in a disproportionate relationship with the Switch House which would not be an acceptable outcome for the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> </ul>

Overshadowing		
DPHI19	Update the Shadow Diagrams by overlaying the additional shadows onto the existing shadows to identify any additional impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b> and the Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> <li>Further shadow diagrams reflecting the shadow impacts of the final design are shown within the Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b>.</li> </ul>
DPHI20	Clarify the areas and/or percentage of the Gathering Terrace and central Courtyard that will receive for more than 2 hours between 9 am and 3 pm on 21 June.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> <li>As detailed in the Amended Design Statement, the overshadowing impacts of the revised design demonstrate that 1,003sqm or 34% of more than 2 hours of sunlight between the hours of 9am and 3pm on 21 June. It should be noted that the shadow in the Gathering Terrace is predominately a result of existing buildings within the site that are required to be retained due to their heritage value.</li> <li>323sqm or 31% of the Central Courtyard will receive more than 2 hours of sunlight between the hours of 9am and 3pm on June 21.</li> </ul>
DPHI22	Provide further analysis of the overshadowing impacts to adjoining residential properties, particularly 81 – 85 Macarthur Street, including elevation shadow diagrams, heat maps or similar to demonstrate whether solar access is maintained to these properties in accordance with the ADG minimum requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific shadow diagrams for 81- 85 Macarthur Street are located within the Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b>.</li> </ul>
Operational and Use		
	Provide additional details on the proposed use and operation of the following spaces:	
DPHI23	'The Academy' and whether overnight stays are proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to feedback received as part of the public exhibition, the Academy Space has been reallocated to Learning and Education program space. No approval is sought for overnight stays.</li> <li>Refer to addendum Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> and revised Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b>.</li> </ul>
DPHI24	The rooftop terrace on the Switch House.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design of the Switch House Rooftop Terrace has been further developed and is detailed in the Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b>.</li> <li>The Amended Design Report includes operational details of the Switch House Rooftop. The Switch House Rooftop has been designed to include the following. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The food and beverage bar has been further developed to cater for a range of uses in the day and the evening.</li> <li>The external form has been developed to include a curved roof to reflect the form of the Wran and the Galleria. It is noted that the heritage consultant has recommended further development of the roof form to be minimalist rather than curved and a mitigation measure has been proposed to address this recommendation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Noise Impacts		

DPHI25	Update the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment to include the predicted noise levels at nearby sensitive receivers and demonstrate compliance with relevant noise criteria.	The predicted noise levels at sensitive receivers are included within Sections 3.5 and the Noise and Vibration Assessment submitted with the EIS ( <b>Appendix X</b> ). Additional clarification regarding cumulative noise is contained in <b>Appendix S</b> to the Submissions and Amendments Report. Further, a mitigation measure to develop and Operational Noise Management Plan prior to operation is contained within the Updated Mitigation Measures at <b>Appendix C</b> to this RtS.
<b>Fire Safety</b>		
DPHI26	Provide a comprehensive Fire Safety Upgrade Strategy for the development as required by FRNSW, detailing proposed upgrades and fire safety measures throughout the development and justifying the non-compliance with the Building Code of Australia if still applicable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix AA- Fire Engineering Report to the EIS provides the information that would be contained in a Fire Safety Upgrade Strategy. If necessary, the preparation of a final Fire Safety Update Strategy can be required as a condition of consent to be satisfied prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.</li> </ul>
<b>Plans</b>		
DPHI27	Update the Area Plans to indicate the proposed GFA for each space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
DPHI28	Include demolition elevations and sections to clarify the extent of the proposed demolition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the Amended Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>

## 2.0 Agency Submissions

**Table 2** Agency Submissions

Item	Issue Raised	Comment
<b>City of Sydney (Sydney, NSW)</b>		
CoSI	<b>Heritage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant Listings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Powerhouse Ultimo site contains two state and locally listed heritage buildings, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ultimo Post Office (SLEP I2031 and SHR 00502)</li> <li>Ultimo Powerhouse (Turbine Hall, Engine House, Boiler House, North Annex and Switch House and Pump House) (SLEP I2030 and SHR 02045).</li> </ul> </li> <li>The local listing also includes a section of the forecourt and the northeast courtyard and sections of the Goods Line rail tracks.</li> <li>The City's heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum applies to the whole of Lot 1, DP 631345 and is therefore more extensive than the SHR listing. In addition to the original Buildings (the Turbine Hall, Engine House, Boiler House, North Annex and Switch House) the local listing includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the northeast courtyard and associated Goods Line rail tracks</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule 5 of the Sydney LEP 2012 outlines that the local listing for Powerhouse Ultimo is limited to 'Powerhouse Museum former warehouse buildings, including interiors.' Heritage Map 008 of the LEP clearly defines the extent of the listing as being limited to the described buildings, and this clearly does not include the areas identified in Council's submission. As such it is not correct to characterise the local listing as applying to the entirety of the lot, nor the elements such as Wran Building, Goods Line rail tracks or the Harris Street forecourt.</li> <li>Since the exhibition of the EIS, the State heritage listing of the Ultimo Power House (former) has been amended. The amendment states to the effect that it extends the curtilage of the Ultimo Power House (former) to the entire site (being the 'Powerhouse Museum Complex'). The Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report sets out further detail on the State heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> </ul>

	<p>part of the Harris Street forecourt being the parcel of land extending from Harris Street to the Switch House, and the parcel of land extending to Macarthur Street along the entire length of the Switch House</p> <p>the parcel of land that includes the Pump House to the northwest of the Boiler House extending to Pier Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site area includes the Wran building completed in 1988, and the Harwood Building (former Tram Shed building location) although the Harwood Building is not subject to the application. Nevertheless, the City supports the retention of the Harwood Building and its potential future use for exhibition and cultural spaces.</li> </ul>	
CoS2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gradings of Significance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HIS report includes a section on gradings of significance outlined in Figure 5.1 and Table 5.2 of the report. It is noted that the grading has been undertaken at a building level. It is recommended that a more detailed assessment of the fabric be included to inform the assessment of this application. This should include gradings of elevations, sections, interiors, and individual components of buildings which would ensure a more thorough understanding of significant elements to be retained and conserved.</li> <li>- The HIS report states that the assessment is in accordance with the NSW Heritage Council's October 2023 resolution to consider the significance of the entirety of the Powerhouse Museum site and confirms that the HIS assesses the proposal accordingly (Curio Projects, 21st March 2024, pp 22-23).</li> <li>- On the 15th of May 2023, the Council of the City of Sydney resolved, amongst other matters relating to Supporting the Powerhouse, that the Chief Executive Officer be requested to investigate the entire Powerhouse Museum site for heritage significance.</li> <li>- Since that time, the City has engaged the firm Lovell Chen Architects to carry out a heritage assessment of the site which is still in progress. As a result of this resolution, the City is anticipating making a full assessment of the heritage impact of the proposal once the revised heritage report has been completed and an assessment can be made against the grading of significance identified and any other issues that may arise from that report.</li> <li>- The City may provide a further submission should the heritage assessment indicate heritage impacts not currently identified in the application.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> of this Submissions Report. The amended HIS provides analysis of the relevant heritage impacts of the proposal, including gradings of significance.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
CoS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of Proposed Demolition: Wran Building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HIS states that the proposal is to 'reline' the internal space of the Galleria, excluding daylight generally and most of the internal and external fabric will be removed, making way for the 'next evolution in museum design'.</li> <li>- Overall, the retention of this building form is supported in principle, however, at this stage the extent of intervention and whether this is an appropriate adaptive reuse is uncertain. The requested information above regarding the gradings of significance and the City's own heritage investigations would assist in forming a view.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> of this Submissions Report. The Amended HIS provides analysis of the heritage impacts of the proposal including relining of the Galleria. As set out in the Amended HIS, the fabric proposed to be removed is not of heritage significance and the propose removal will reveal fabric of high significance in the north west part of the Switch House.</li> <li>• The Amended HIS assesses the impact of works proposed for the Wran Building in relation to the relevant statutory heritage listing, including SHR-02045 as gazetted on 12 July 2024. The additional information regarding heritage gardings is provided at <b>Appendix L</b>.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For example, the removal of the southern end may be acceptable as it provides a physical and visual connection from Harris Street to the Goods Yard and beyond but requires further assessment once the nature of any further listing is known.</li> <li>- We are also concerned about proposed changes to the fabric of this originally lightweight building, to a more solid form, despite the grading of significance being upgraded from neutral to moderate. There is also some concern with the apparent use of bricks to cap the ends of the Wran Building, which would be a marked contrast to the existing lightweight mix of materials originally used in this building. More advice can be provided once the City's own heritage assessment has been completed based on the independent consultant's assessment of the significance of the building.</li> <li>- It is noted that Lionel Glendenning, the architect of the Wran Building is quoted (from 1988 and 2022) in the HIS to justify the proposed changes to the building. It is recommended that Mr Glendenning be approached as part of the Commonwealth's Moral Rights obligation to ensure the proposed design changes are consulted with him, given such extensive changes are now proposed to the retained building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As above, the Amended HIS assesses the impact of works proposed for the Wran Building in relation to the relevant statutory heritage listing, including SHR-02045 gazetted on 12 July 2024.</li> <li>• The Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> provides further details on the proposed materials and finishes. In relation to heritage impact, the Amended HIS provides further assessment of these materials.</li> <li>• The Amended HIS sets out the heritage reasons why the existing lightweight fabric of the Wran Building comprising metal and glazing would not be retained or otherwise replaced with like for like fabric. The Amended HIS assesses the proposed brick materiality of the Wran Building as sympathetic to the industrial heritage of the Heritage Core building and provides an important opportunity to incorporate the First Nations co-design of the Powerhouse Museum Complex, including through the proposed representation of stratigraphy in the brickwork whilst retaining the features of the Wran Building recognised of significance comprising the arched roof form and general scale of the Wran Building.</li> <li>• Infrastructure NSW will undertake all necessary consultation and will follow the requirements of the <i>Copyright Act 1968</i> (Cth) in respect of moral rights. This is not a planning matter.</li> </ul>
CoS4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goods Line: Proposed Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The remnant alignment of the Goods Line track traversing through the southeastern courtyard area are proposed to be demolished. These tracks are included in the local listing of the site and should be considered for retention or reinterpretation.</li> <li>- The proposal includes a new building along Harris Street, which will impact on views from Harris Street to the existing buildings.</li> <li>- The City's previous submission highlighted the significance of the views from Harris Street to the historic core that retains the legibility of the heritage items and this retention of views which are an important attribute of the 1980s Powerhouse Museum design. Our submissions have also highlighted the importance of retaining adequate visual curtilage around eastern side of the Wran building.</li> <li>- The 2022 Conservation Management Plan (CMP) identifies the key views as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Views from Darling Harbour</li> <li>Views to the site from Harris Street and William Henry Street</li> <li>Views from William Henry Street Bridge</li> <li>Views from the Goods Line</li> <li>Views and access from Darling Drive, Exhibition Light Rail Station, and Hay Street</li> </ul> </li> <li>- It is noted that the HIS provides justifications for the potential view impacts and should be assessed in detail as part of the application</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule 5 of the Sydney LEP 2012 outlines that the local listing for Powerhouse Ultimo is limited to 'Powerhouse Museum former warehouse buildings, including interiors.' Heritage Map 008 of the LEP clearly defines the extent of the listing as being limited to the described buildings, and this clearly does not include the areas identified in Council's submission. As such it is not correct to characterise the local listing as applying to the entirety of the lot, nor the elements such as Wran Building, Goods Line rail tracks or the Harris Street forecourt.</li> <li>• An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> of the Submissions and Amendments Report. The Amended HIS provides heritage assessment on the impacts of the proposal on heritage views.</li> <li>• An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> of the Submissions and Amendments Report. The Amended HIS provides heritage assessment on the impacts of the proposal on heritage views.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• In summary, under the Amended HIS, the proposed works (including the introduction of the New Building results in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A moderate adverse impact to views of the Switch House when viewed from Harris Street. The Amended HIS considers this impact to be mitigated by the series of glazed permeable openings along the western elevation of the New Building which afford view lines to the Switch House. Furthermore, the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<p>Amended HIS states to the effect that historically there was built form obscuring views to Switch House from Harris Street and at the time of the c1988 adaptive reuse the western courtyard was identified as a location for new built form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A moderate adverse impact to views of the southwest portion of the Wran Building when viewed from the corner of Harris Street and Macarthur Street. The Amended HIS states to the effect that this impact has sought to be minimised through the height of the New Building which is consistent with the height of the Switch House but otherwise subservient to the height of the Wran Building.</li> <li>- A positive impact to views of the Wran Building when viewed from Macarthur Street along the southern elevation of the site as a result of the proposed removal of non-significant structures currently obscuring views to the southern façade of the Wran Building and the western façade of the Switch House.</li> <li>- A positive impact to views from the Goods Line particularly as a result of the removal of non-significant or otherwise intrusive elements and structures to reveal significant heritage fabric of the eastern façade of the Switch House and the southern façade of the Boiler House. It is noted this improved view scape will also be experienced from the junction of Darling Drive, Exhibition Light Rail Station and Hay Street.</li> <li>- Minimal to no change to views of the Powerhouse Museum Complex from the north, in particular from William Henry Street (including the William Henry Street Bridge). This extends to views further northeast from Darling Harbour to the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> <li>- A positive impact to views from the intersection of William Henry Street and Harris Street when the proposed change to brick fabric of the Wran Building results in an improved visual setting for the Ultimo Post Office and North Annex at the northwestern corner of the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> </ul>
CoS5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historical Archaeological Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Separate reports have been prepared by Curio (Appendixes T &amp; V) for the project assessing the historical and Aboriginal archaeology of the site. The proposed bulk excavation for the basement for the new built form fronting Harris Street has the potential to impact the potential archaeological resources of the site (both Aboriginal and historical) and will require archaeological management strategies and mitigation.</li> <li>- The recommendations of the Heritage Archaeology Assessment and the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report should be adopted.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
CoS6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further Recommendations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The final mitigation measures provided at <b>Appendix C</b> to this Submissions and Amendment Report have been updated to include a requirement to</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An archival recording of the existing buildings in their current form should be completed.</li> <li>- A comprehensive Heritage Interpretation Strategy for the site should be implemented in conjunction with the development works, with particular focus on integration with new public domain and landscaping design.</li> </ul>	<p>undertake an archival recording of the existing buildings in their current form prior to the commencement of works and development of a Heritage Interpretation Strategy.</p>
CoS7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Award of Heritage Floor Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The heritage floor space program incentivizes the conservation of heritage listed buildings. The City has advised the Powerhouse of proposed amendments to the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (SLEP) enabling the Powerhouse Ultimo site to be potentially eligible for an award of heritage floor space for conserved heritage listed buildings. To be eligible for an award of HFS in the future, the heritage listed buildings should not be subject to works that would increase the external envelope and floor space of the building other than a minor increase to facilitate the adaptive reuse of the heritage building.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
CoS8	<p><b>Urban Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entry Points and Circulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed focus of the main museum entry to the southeastern courtyard off the Goods Line (in addition to Harris Street), is positive. However, legibility of the main entry may need to rely on the landscaping within the courtyard to direct people to the furthest corner of the square. The pathways within the public domain need to better establish a hierarchy of movement through the entry courtyard to the main entry. Whilst the relocation is supported, a legible and inviting entry should be retained also along Harris Street. The design of the Harris Street entry is supported in principle.</li> <li>- The southern entry courtyard at Macarthur Street connects to the north south axis which connects to the northern courtyard space located on Harris Street between the Post Office and the Powerhouse Museum.</li> <li>- The north south axis is the main circulation spine; however, this space has limited access to natural daylight. It is proposed to be capped at both the north and south ends with brick. Whereas, at present the north and south ends of the narrow vault (galleria) are glazed and this space is top lit from clerestory windows at the junction with the truncated barrel vault to the west and the Turbine Hall to the east.</li> <li>- It is unclear from the demolition and proposed drawings if the narrow vault is still capable of being top lit in the space between the Turbine Hall and the narrow vault. Daylight access to the narrow vault (galleria) should be considered, especially in relation to the use of artificial lighting required to illuminate this major circulation space. These elements all contribute to visitors being able to orient themselves within the development.</li> <li>- The entry points from The Goods Line, Harris Street and Macarthur Street all contribute to the activation of these streets and the permeability of the site. However, it is not clear if the courtyard spaces associated with the Powerhouse Museum are open (permeable to the street) or have lines of defence (fences and gates). This will need to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement is provided at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions Report and provides further detail regarding the arrival experience to the museum, including the role of the public domain and landscaping in this experience, along with signage and other wayfinding cues.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• The entire extent of clerestory glazing on the east side of the galleria is intended to be retained. Light will permeate the space through the porous 'Aluivent' lining panels. In addition a full width opening is located at the north end of the space looking out across a new elevated landscape. Opposite on the southern end another opening allows for light and views to enter the galleria from the new courtyard space that opens onto Macarthur street. A high figured window is also located in the arched gable at the southern end of the galleria.</li> <li>• As above.</li> <li>• Access control (gates) will be provided to prevent access into the Macarthur Street courtyard outside of museum operating hours. The design of these gates will be developed during detailed design and will be integrated into the overall design concept. All other areas would be permeable to the public</li> </ul>



	<p>be clarified; the CPTD report appears to be relying on CCTV for surveillance. The CPTD report does mention in section 6.16: 'Install a security door or secure electronic access (card / key controlled entries / lifts etc.) to all private entrances of the building to prevent unauthorised individuals from entering restricted areas not intended for public use (such as within the back of house areas, or areas where there is more private staff amenity sensitivity, as well as the loading dock).'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gates may need to be considered to the Macarthur Street entry points. But if so, should be well integrated into the design.</li> </ul>	<p>domain, and implementation of the CPTED Assessment recommendations are included as a Mitigation Measure.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entry Points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More information is required on the wind comfort of the proposed entry forecourt. The wind report accompanying the proposal is a qualitative wind report rather than quantitative report.</li> <li>- It is noted that the quantitative wind report for the student housing towers (SSD 6610) located to the east of the site predicts wind comfort criteria of walking and standing within the proposed courtyard area. Wind mitigation may be required for the eastern entry forecourt to ensure that the wind comfort levels are suitable.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arup has provided an Environmental Wind Assessment Statement at <b>Appendix T</b> to respond.</li> <li>• A qualitative study was conducted to address the SEARs for the project. This approach is suitable for the proposed development. However, the results from CFD (Computational Fluid Dynamics) modelling completed for an earlier design informed this qualitative study. These modelling results remain relevant as the design of the entry forecourt has not changed. The CFD modelling was performed for the existing conditions and covered initial iterations for 16 different wind directions.</li> <li>• The Environmental Wind Assessment Statement concludes that the wind conditions in the forecourt area would be suitable for sitting and standing activities dependant on their distance from the building. Therefore, it would be suitable for the proposed intended usage as a gathering and entry space for the museum.</li> </ul>
CoS9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Built Form <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed building built to the corner of Harris Street and Macarthur Street is also generally supported. The alignment both holds and turns the corner. Continuing the colonnade around the corner to the Macarthur Street entries is also supported as it provides pedestrian amenity.</li> <li>- The adaptive reuse of the Wran Hall is unclear at this stage. The demolition plans show some internal structural columns being removed. L24 demolition plan shows the external wall to Harris Street being retained and the roof appears to be retained on the L5 demolition plan. There are no demolition plans shown in sections to understand if the structural steel frame that forms the barrel vault is retained in part or full. More detailed demolitions plans should be provided in plan, elevation, and section.</li> <li>- The structural advice provided (Appendix CC) states that the proposed development will be compliant with the relevant codes, standards, guides, and structural principles but does not speak to the retention and extension of the super structure of the Wran Hall. Further advice should be provided.</li> <li>- The elevations do not denote the materiality nor construction of the Wran Hall roof. However, the roof vault arch is proposed to be completed. The survey shows that the apex of the curved roof is RL: 31.78 and the elevation when measured is also approximately RL:31.78.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Details of the extent of demolition of internal areas within the Wran Building are included within the Structural Sequencing Diagrams provided at <b>Appendix H</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> <li>• The Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> to Submissions and Amendments Report provides further details on the proposed materials and</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarification is required as to whether the intent is to retain the existing roof form and structure and how this would be extended to complete the arch of the barrel. The materiality of the roof is also to be clarified with the continuing use of a high durable long life; lightweight metal roof preferred. Galvanic reactions between dissimilar metals must avoided or managed.</li> <li>- The demolition of the lower-level colonnade associated with the Wran Hall allows creative industry spaces to be provided along and activate Harris Street. This is supported; however, the spaces would be disconnected from the Powerhouse Museum and servicing and waste removal needs to be further considered.</li> </ul>	<p>finishes. In relation to heritage impact, the amended HIS provides further assessment of these materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to Amended Design Repot at <b>Appendix F</b>.</li> <li>• Servicing of the Creative Industries spaces will need to occur from the Harris Street frontage. The waste servicing requirements for the users of this space will be extremely low and comparable to a typical office use. Emptying of waste would occur on a daily basis by each tenant taking waste to the central waste room within the loading dock. It is expected that each tenancy will be provided with a 10L bin.</li> <li>• Waste reduction initiatives as part of the submitted ESD Report at Appendix BB of the EIS include a commitment to 80% of construction and demolition waste to be recycled by the head contractor.</li> </ul>
CoS10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Materials and Building Expression <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is only a very limited palette of materials shown on the architectural drawing set</li> <li>- The design report also includes garden mesh and aluminium cladding</li> <li>- The design report also references 'The new built form will be comprised of a mix of recycled and new bricks, brick slips, stone, ceramics, glass, metal cladding and class 2 in situ concrete and precast concrete.'</li> <li>- The proposed materials and finishes need to be further clarified and the drawings should be amended to clarify materials and key these to the elevations and sections. This is also requested to assist in assessing the potential heritage impacts of the additions.</li> <li>- The design of the Wran hall and galleria adaption is generally supported; however, more information is required to understand the amount of demolition and retention of structure.</li> <li>- The northern and southern ends of the Wran hall and the galleria are shown in elevations as brick. More information is required regarding the construction and structural delivery of brick ends to the existing steel super structure. The roof skin is also to be clarified, it is unclear from the renders, what this is intended to be.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report provides further details on the proposed materials and finishes. In relation to heritage impact, the Amended HIS (<b>Appendix L</b>) provides further assessment of these materials. Details regarding the extent of demolition of internal areas within the Wran Building are included within the Structural Sequencing diagrams contained at <b>Appendix H</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
CoS11	<p><b>Public Domain</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased public open space for community and visitors is supported as it will provide greater opportunities for connection, particularly with new outdoor café and seating.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
CoS12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Macarthur Street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed conversion of Macarthur Street to a shared zone is generally supported for investigation, however, further consultation with the City's Local Pedestrian Cycling and Traffic Calming Committee would be required. Certain vehicle count thresholds would need to be met for this to occur.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>

CoS13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpath <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed footpath replacement work in Harris Street extends only to the southern extent of the Post Office building as the foot path has previously been upgraded to concrete pavers. It should be considered whether the footpath replacement should continue past the Post Office and around onto William Henry Street and Pier Street to maintain continuity given there is commonly variations between batches and existing wear issues.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant has no objection to the imposition of a condition of development consent requiring that a Public Domain Plan be submitted following consent detailing upgrades to the adjoining pedestrian areas on William Henry Street and Pier Street, noting that this land is outside the ownership of Powerhouse and would need the consent of City of Sydney to undertake these works.</li> </ul>
CoS14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater and Flooding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site is identified as flood affected and flood modelling has been undertaken. The modelling shows significant ponding within the terrace area at the southeast corner of the site and some of the proposed new entries do not meet the requirement for 1% AEP + 0.5m - although a merit-based approach has been requested given the heritage significance of the existing building. No objection is raised given that the basement is protected up to the probable maximal flood level (PMF).</li> <li>- The MUSIC-Link report does not comply with the City's targets. An amended report should be provided.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• A revised Flood Impact Assessment including updated MUSIX modelling is contained at <b>Appendix X</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>
CoS15	<p><b>Landscaping and tree canopy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree Removal – Supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No objection is raised to the removal of the five Platanus x acerifolia (Trees 18-22) located within the southwestern courtyard given the reasons outlined in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
CoS16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree Removal – Unsupported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landscape plans indicate that street trees T3 and T4 Platanus x acerifolia are to be removed and replaced in the same location with Zelkova serrata (Japanese Zelkova) in accordance with the replacement tree species for the area identified in the Sydney Street Tree Master Plan 2022. However, the plans do not indicate that Trees 3 and 4 will be impacted by the proposed design.</li> <li>- The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) report indicates that these trees are in fair health, having a moderate landscape value with a useful life expectancy (ULE) of 15-40yrs and have a retention value of 'consider for retention'. As these trees will not be impacted by the proposed development, are in good condition with a substantial life expectancy, these trees should be reconsidered for retention and protection. Further information from the arborist is required to justify these tree removals should removal continue to be proposed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As shown in the plans referenced in the AIA, Trees 3 and 4 will be subject to major encroachments within their Tree Protection Zones, including works within their Structural Root Zones, from the proposed design. As noted within the AIA, these trees are in fair health as evidenced by a reduced crown density and the presence of small diameter epicormic growth. Therefore, their ability to withstand extensive construction impacts will be significantly reduced. In addition, the removal of these trees provides an opportunity to plant a new row (4x) of Zelkovas in this section of Harris Street.</li> </ul>
CoS17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees Proposed for Retention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A total of 15 trees are proposed for retention, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree 17 Platanus x acerifolia is an inroad planting located within the Macarthur Street alignment.</li> <li>Trees 12, 5-15 (12 trees) Platanus x acerifolia located along Harris Street footpath.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>

	<p>Tree 16 Tristaniopsis laurina located within Macarthur Street footpath.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All trees have been given a value of 'Consider for Retention' except for Tree 16 which has been given 'Consider for Removal' and Tree 17 'Priority for Retention'. The City supports the retention and protection of these trees if possible.</li> </ul>	
CoS18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree 17 Platanus x acerifolia Macarthur Street inroad planting</li> <li>- Tree 17 Platanus x acerifolia located within the Macarthur Street alignment, on the site, will be subject to a major encroachment due to the proposed demolition and pavement installation within its TPZ. Due to the surrounding road surface and compaction within this area, the AIA report indicates there will unlikely be significant roots within this area.</li> <li>- However, the AIA report has given detail of tree protection requirements and mitigation measures within Section 3.2.9 of the report for the garden bed construction and resurfacing of the new road pavement. This includes the modification of the loading dock entrance outside of the SRZ of Tree 17, modification (extension) of the garden bed to the east and installation of bollards for future trunk protections from vehicle impact damages.</li> <li>- The plans should be amended to reflect design modifications as outlined within Section 3.2.9 of the AIA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• A design outlining the measures required to ensure the retention of Tree 17 is provided within the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>
CoS19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harris Street Trees</li> <li>- The AIA report has indicated that pruning will be required for Trees 12 and 5-15. Trees 1 and 2 have been indicated to have significant branch removal with both trees requiring between 100 - 200mm diameter sized branches to be removed for building clearances. The indicated pruning does not include hoarding and scaffold clearances. Although total canopy removal percentages have not been indicated within the AIA report, the amount of pruning is excessive and is recommended to be reduced to lessen the impacts to these trees.</li> <li>- The AIA report also indicates that major encroachments within the TPZ will occur to Trees 2 and 5-14 which will be between 20-30% due to the proposed ground slab for the western building extension. The report recommends that a root investigation is carried out prior to any proposed excavations to determine any potential impacts to tree roots within the TPZ of these trees.</li> <li>- There is insufficient detail to confirm the full extent of impact this will have on the trees and their long-term health. Canopy cover is limited in this area, and therefore, a reduction in the encroachment into the SRZ / TPZ is recommended.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent of pruning is considered within the constraints of AS:4373 Pruning of Amenity Trees (2007), particularly for street trees which are a species very tolerant of pruning impacts. The proposed pruning works should not adversely impact the trees.</li> <li>• The requirement to carry out this root investigation prior to the commencement of the relevant works has been included in the Revised Mitigation Measures at <b>Appendix C</b> within the Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> <li>• The scaffolding design has yet to be developed, however a strategy whereby wider scaffolding decks and stairs will be installed between the trees will be adopted to ensure minimal encroachment into the SRZ/ TPZ. All works will be supervised by the project arborist and a mitigation measure has been added to this effect.</li> </ul>
CoS20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscaping</li> <li>- The landscape plans indicate 24 trees are proposed to be planted within the site and the public domain (road reserve). Four of these trees will be planted within the road reserve along Harris Street (Zelkova serrata) while the remaining will be planted within</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>

	<p>the site (<i>Angophora costata</i>, <i>Zelkova serrata</i> and <i>Eucalyptus racemosa</i>). All species are listed within the City's recommended tree planting list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regarding the four proposed <i>Zelkova serrata</i> along Harris Street, two of these trees are proposed to replace Trees 3 and 4 as stated above. However, it is recommended Trees 3 and 4 should be retained and protected.</li> <li>- The 15 <i>Eucalyptus racemosa</i> proposed to be planted within the garden bed on the northern boundary corner on William Henry Street and Harris Street appear to have planting distances between 2-2.5m. The planting schedule within the landscape plans indicate the mature canopy spread of these trees is 7m, noting the City's species list indicates an indicative 12m spread. To avoid the likelihood of suppressed growth and poor development it is recommended that the planting spacing of these trees is increased (to a minimum of 8m spacing) to support the establishment and maturity for the long term.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to CoS16.</li> <li>• The design of the Post Office Courtyard has been updated to include <i>Angophora costata</i> trees to replace the previous proposal of <i>E.racemosa</i>. The proposed trees will be planted at a 4m spacing. There will be 6 trees. The intention with the more closely spaced trees than normal is to create a stand of sculptural trees at tight spacing as they are often encountered in natural settings.</li> </ul>
CoS21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Museum Entry Courtyard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The primary open space is located on deep soil except for a small portion of basement and exit stairs connected to exhibition space 1. The landscape design includes eight new <i>Angophora costata</i> planted in a continuous structural soil trench, and "islands of paving embedded into the planting beds with diverse native grasses and flowering.." There is not enough detail to assess the proposed levels, tree pit and trench locations and dimensions, garden beds or stone paving design.</li> <li>- As outlined in the heritage and urban design comments above, there is an opportunity to retain the existing alignment of the Goods Line track and provide a more direct entry through the proposed courtyard. The layout of the planters and stone pavers could be adjusted to provide a more legible paved and accessible route through the courtyard. This should be redesigned without impacting on new tree planting.</li> <li>- Refer to Section 5.3 of this submission regarding the proposed semi-trailer access through the courtyard.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further dimensions of the deep soil trench have been provided within the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Plans at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> <li>• Clarification regarding soil volumes for the Post Office and Museum Entry Courtyards is provided within the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Plans at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> <li>• The former Goods Line tracks within the current museum courtyard are not located on an original alignment. It is proposed that these lines will be removed as part of the landscape design. Further detail is included within the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Plans at <b>Appendix N</b> and Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement at <b>Appendix Q</b>.</li> <li>• Access through the courtyard for vehicles is clarified in the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement at <b>Appendix Q</b> and the Transport Statement at <b>Appendix O</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>
CoS22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Courtyard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed courtyard that bridges the entry levels in the new building fronting Harris Street with the retained and adapted Switch building and connection to Macarthur Street is located entirely on built structure. The design of trees and planters on structure must allow for adequate soil depth and soil volume to support the new trees and comply with the City's Landscape Code. The landscape drawings omit a proposed courtyard tree species.</li> <li>- Further clarification is required, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed tree species, levels and details for the tree planters, stairs, and ramps</li> <li>The proposed design of landscaping on structure to ensure adequate soil depth and soil volume to support trees to maturity and understory planting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> to this Submissions Report provides further details on the proposed tree species, soil volume and structure.</li> </ul>
CoS23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post Office Courtyard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the Post Office Courtyard has been updated to include <i>Angophora costata</i> trees (refer to CoS20).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A grove of 15 new Eucalyptus racemosa is proposed to be planted in the post office courtyard within paving. The landscaping concept is supported in principle; however, further clarification is required regarding the design, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether tree grilles or similar are provided</li> <li>whether pavement is proposed to be rigid or permeable</li> <li>the design of the tree pits</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no tree grilles, rather, the concept is for the Angophoras to emerge from a planted fracture in the hardscape</li> <li>• The trees will be provided ample structural soil beneath permeable pavers</li> </ul>
CoS24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Drawings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landscape drawings include a concept paving and planting design only. The package does not demonstrate that the design of landscaping on structure allows for adequate soil depth and soil volume to support trees to maturity and proposed understorey planting.</li> <li>- To provide a full assessment of the landscape and public domain located in outdoor spaces located within the project boundary, the City requires a more complete set of plans.</li> <li>- Landscape Plans should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>levels (RL, SSL, TW)</li> <li>amended resolved plant schedule with tree pot size, understorey species, pot size or rate per m2</li> <li>materials schedule</li> <li>details for softworks at grade, trees in structural soil and planters on structure</li> <li>details for hard works including paving types, stairs, ramps, balustrades, and elements</li> <li>outline maintenance schedule including responsibility for the ongoing of highly used, traffic and visible landscape</li> <li>plant procurement strategy for grassland species.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This comment has been addressed within the Amended Landscape Plans at <b>Appendix N</b> to this Submissions and Amedments Report.</li> </ul>
CoS25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canopy Cover <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landscape plans indicate that the existing canopy for the site is 4.5%. The proposed canopy cover for the site is indicated to increase to 8% with a total proposed green cover within the project boundary of 14%.</li> <li>- Although there is a proposed increase in canopy over the site, the total percentage increases should be in line with the City's Greening Sydney Strategy and Urban Forest Strategy 2023 which aim for a canopy cover target of 28% by 2050 – acknowledging this target does not apply to Central Sydney area zoned B8 land.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal seeks to maximise canopy cover throughout all areas of the public domain. The inclusion of the internal courtyard fronting Harris Street and the rooftop garden proposed for the Switch House will assist in greening the site in addition to areas of deep soil. It is not possible to achieve a canopy cover of 28% on this site without demolition of existing buildings. Noting the heritage constraints of the site this outcome is considered to be appropriate in these site-specific circumstances.</li> </ul>
CoS26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil Volumes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The submitted landscape plans do not indicate any dimensions or volumes which would be required to ensure adequate soil depth and volume is provides to support the proposed plantings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This comment has been addressed within the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement at <b>Appendix Q</b> and the Amended Landscape Plans at <b>Appendix N</b>.</li> </ul>
CoS27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations of AIA</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As per the recommendations of the AIA, outlined in Section 4.1.4, exploratory root investigations are to be conducted to the west of the existing retaining wall within the TPZ of Trees 1,2 and 5-15 prior to constructions of the site.</li> <li>- All protections for the existing trees should be adhered to as per the recommendations within the AIA report outlined in Sections 3.2.4, Appendix 5: Tree Protection Specification and Appendix 6: Typical Tree Protection Details including the appointment of a Project Arborist. This is to include the modifications to the garden bed, loading dock area and installation of bollards within the TPZ and SRZ of Tree 17 Platanus x acerifolia outlined within Section 3.2.9 of the report. Further, the plans should be amended to address the recommended modifications and tree sensitive construction methods within Section 3.2.9 of the report.</li> <li>- Any proposed underground service installation should not be located within the TPZ of any tree. If this is unavoidable, tree sensitive construction methods must be adhered to in as per recommendations within the AIA report outlined in Section 3.3 Underground Services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• As per CoS18.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
CoS28	<p><b>City access and transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loading Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to the loading dock has not been adequately demonstrated and currently may not be feasible based on the swept path analysis provided (Figure 24 of Appendix H). The access conflicts with a tree, identified as T17 Platanus x acerifolia (Appendix 3 of Appendix K).</li> <li>- The Arboricultural Impact Assessment indicates that this tree is required to be retained and makes recommendation requiring the loading dock entrance to be relocated outside of the SRZ of the tree and extension to the existing garden bed to protect the tree. Any extensions to the existing garden bed or installation of bollards are to be contained within the property boundary of the site.</li> <li>- An amended design is to be prepared and is to be supported with a swept path analysis for the largest design vehicles both entering and exiting the site. The analysis must also reflect the existing and proposed kerbs lines along Macarthur Street and required mitigation measures outlined in the AIA.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A design outlining the measures implemented to ensure the retention of Tree 17 is provided within the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> <li>• Additional swept paths for the loading dock are included within the Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> <li>• As above.</li> </ul>
CoS29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loading Dock <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) identifies the use of MRV and SRV to service the site.</li> <li>- The loading dock access ramp provides a 3.5m clearance, however, in accordance with AS 2890.2, MRVs require 4.5m clear height and will have a maximum length of 8.8m. The access ramp will require redesign to accommodate the height clearance for MRVs.</li> <li>- The loading bay second from the left in Figure 4 of the TIA should be marked as a SRV bay only, noting independent access to the middle bay is not possible if a MRV is parked in this space.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Clarification that the loading dock can provide 4.5m clearance is provided in an Amended Transport Impact Statement provided at <b>Appendix O</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> <li>• The loading dock layout has been amended and is provided with Amended Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> <li>• The design complies with the applicable Australian Standard.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SRV loading bays must be a minimum of 3.5m wide by 6.4m long to comply with AS 2890.2.</li> <li>- The loading dock design is to be amended to comply with minimum requirements. The loading dock is proposed to operate with one-way movements only and would be subject to management measures as outlined in Section 4.4.2 of the TIA. Entering vehicles should also be given priority using a traffic light system. However, the proposed one-way operation can only be supported subject to the resolution the following scenario: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A MRV entering the site occupies the entire width of the loading dock entry and then will need to use the vehicle turntable to turn around an access a loading bay. The TIA suggests that an existing vehicle would be located behind the stop line, however, the exiting vehicle would conflict with the entering vehicle and would also be located on, or partly on the turn table.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- The internal queuing arrangements are to be outlined to ensure that entering vehicles are not impeded and queuing does not occur back onto the street.</li> <li>- The preparation of a freight and servicing management plan, as suggested in Table 11 of the TIA is supported. The management plan will also need to include arrangements for waste and general deliveries and should incorporate a scheduling system to ensure that no queuing occurs, particularly having consideration to the constraints provided by the proposed one-way access and vehicle turntable.</li> <li>- The access driveway to the loading dock indicates level changes within the public domain that do not appear to have considered public domain level and gradient requirements. It is also unclear whether the twisting in the levels would cause vehicle scraping (Refer to Figure 3 below).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is acknowledged that a 4.5m clearance height for a Medium Rigid Vehicle (MRV) is noted in Table 2.1 of Australian Standards for off-street commercial vehicle facilities AS2890.2 2018. In relation to this clearance height the following should be noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The reference to a 4.5m clearance height is based on specifications a document from 1995 that has since been withdrawn.</li> <li>- The standard notes that there is provision for a variation in the dimensions when a commercial facility is being designed specifically for a nominated vehicle type. Notwithstanding the above the loading dock has been redesigned to provide for a 4.5m height clearance – resolving Council's concerns.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Refer to the Amended Transport Impact Statement provided at <b>Appendix O</b>.</li> <li>• Noted, this is included as a Mitigation Measure in the Submissions Report.</li> <li>• The left hand turn from Macarthur Street into the loading dock has been designed to facilitate a (near) level approach to the Loading Dock Entry and to limit the vehicle lean into the 90° turn. Minimal achievable crossfall gradients have been provided, only for the shedding of stormwater across this path. The collateral benefit of this near level area is that the footpath now affords a 4m wide, mid-level rest zone for pedestrians and wheelchair users, on an otherwise very steep (1:8) existing footpath. Further detail is provided within the Amended Transport Impact Statement provided at <b>Appendix O</b>.</li> </ul>
CoS30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semitrailer access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Occasional access (one or two instances per year) is anticipated to be required for semitrailers to deliver and remove large museum pieces. Access is proposed via the landscaped courtyard adjacent to the switch house.</li> <li>- There has been no consideration shown in the design of the forecourt terrace area to accommodate such truck movements. The proposed use of what is otherwise intended to be a landscaped courtyard for truck movements would seriously inhibit the potential design of this space and the opportunity to provide landscaping and trees. The likelihood of landscaping being damaged during truck movements also needs to be considered.</li> <li>- A swept-path analysis for a 20m articulated vehicle completing this movement should be submitted for review. The paths should commence and end at Harris Street to understand the potential impacts to on street parking and street trees.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• The Terrace design has been updated to provide MRV access to the Boilerhouse. This provision includes the new paved pathway along the face of the Switch House.</li> <li>• Very occasional access (one instance per 20 years) will be required by semi-trailer across the Terrace for the installation of very large objects.</li> <li>• The strategy for this loading will be to utilise a grid of Durabase panels <a href="https://aisfloors.com.au/product/durabase/">https://aisfloors.com.au/product/durabase/</a></li> <li>• The panel layout and proposed swept path alignment is illustrated in the new in the Amended Impact Transport Assessment at <b>Appendix O</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- From an access perspective, the proposed arrangement is not supported. Should this be approved, it must be conditional that the management strategies outlined in the TIA are implemented.</li> </ul>	
CoS31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bicycle Parking and End-of-trip facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is insufficient information provided to confirm whether the proposed bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities are adequate. The quantum of staff bicycle parking spaces is supported, allowing for a 10% mode share for staff, however, no details have been provided regarding the location or design of the bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities.</li> <li>- The design of the bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities should comply with AS 2890.3 and the relevant section of Sydney Development Control Plan 2013 should be used as a guide. At least 20% of bicycle parking spaces should be provided as horizontal spaces. The bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities should be located so that they are easily accessible, via a 1.8m wide path of travel, ramp accessible, and either on the ground floor or within the basement.</li> <li>- No details have been provided regarding the location of public bicycle parking spaces. Consultation with the City's Public Domain staff is required.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed bicycle parking and end of trip facilities are marked and further detailed on the Revised Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> <li>• Noted. The design for bicycle parking will be further developed during detailed design.</li> <li>• Revised Public Domain Plans provided at <b>Appendix F</b> show the intended locations of bicycle parking within the public domain. Final locations will be determined in consultation with the City of Sydney prior to the issue of the relevant Crown Certificate.</li> </ul>
CoS32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coach Parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coach parking is proposed to be retained on Harris Street rather than being relocated to Macarthur Street (given Macarthur Street is narrow). It is not yet clear what the desired form or vision for Macarthur Street is and whether any footpath widenings are proposed.</li> <li>- The City accepts retaining coach parking along Harris Street in the short term but notes that future plans for Harris Street might mean that an alternative needs to be developed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Macarthur Street is outside of the project boundary. Any works to Macarthur Street would be subject to a separate project and approval.</li> <li>• The Applicant is not aware of any development proposals that would prevent the proposed coach parking remaining on Harris Street. Any future works/project along Harris Street would need to consider the operations of the museum. It is noted that additional coach parking facilities are also located a short distance to the south-east on Darling Drive.</li> </ul>
CoS33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Travel Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The City supports the preparation of a green travel plan. This should be required as a condition of consent. However, the mitigation measures state that "Provision of secure bicycle parking at the Powerhouse Ultimo for staff and parking within the public domain for visitors" and "Provision of good quality pedestrian connections between the Powerhouse Ultimo and the surrounding transport network" will occur following occupation.</li> <li>- The mitigation measures should be amended to ensure that the relevant design requirements are implemented prior to construction to ensure that the facilities and amenities can be accommodated.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted, the applicant does not object to the imposition of a condition of development consent requiring the preparation of a GTP prior to occupation of the building.</li> <li>• The updated Mitigation Measure at <b>Appendix C</b> of this Submissions Report includes the design of staff and visitor bicycle parking.</li> </ul>
CoS34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cleansing and Waste</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The plans submitted do not detail the proposed waste storage area and access arrangements.</li> <li>- The waste management plan includes the use of hook lift bins on site. Whilst this may be supported as an alternative to a bulky waste storage area, the clearance height required to collect hook lift bins is significantly higher than ordinarily required for waste collection. The architectural plans should detail that adequate clearances are provided to maneuver the waste vehicle and collect the hook lift bins.</li> <li>- The architectural plans should detail the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the number of bins required based on the collection frequency correctly scaled, distinguishing between sizes (e.g., 240L, 660L, 1100L)</li> <li>the proposed layout of bins within storage areas</li> <li>indicate door and lift widths adequate for the transfer of bins</li> <li>mark up the bulky and problem waste storage areas (see Guidelines for Waste Management in New Developments 2018 for minimum requirements).</li> <li>identify the location and size of bin handling equipment like, compactors, balers, tugs/trolleys, glass crushers and any other equipment.</li> <li>show the path of access to the waste storage area and collection point for both users and collection vehicles.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- A demolition and construction waste management plan should be prepared.</li> <li>- The proposed independent creative industries spaces fronting Harris Street do not have internal servicing access. Further clarification is required as to whether waste and recycling is proposed to be transferred to the centralised collection area and how this will be done.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The layout of waste storage areas and access arrangements are marked on the Amended Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> <li>• Vehicle swept paths for the loading dock have been provided in the Transport Impact Assessment at <b>Appendix H</b> to the EIS. These paths demonstrate adequate manoeuvrability for waste vehicles. The loading dock has an adequate floor to ceiling height to accommodate for hook lift bin collection. Refer to <b>Appendix E</b> amended Architectural Drawings submitted with this Submissions and Amendments Report and Appendix N- Operational Waste Plan of the EIS regarding clearance dimensions needed for hook bin collection.</li> <li>• The Operational Waste Plan (Appendix N to the EIS) outlines the area required for waste storage, waste travel paths and initial waste storage layout.</li> <li>• A Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan was included within the application as exhibited at Appendix C to the Preliminary Construction Management Plan (Appendix R to the EIS).</li> <li>• Refer to CoS9</li> </ul>
CoS35	<p><b>Public art</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application does not address any public art despite the previous scheme identifying significant opportunities for public art to provide recognition of First Nations people and culture within the public facing areas of the museum, and to draw upon the collection to inform significant and memorable public art to act as wayfinding or a destination marker.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed design has been inspired by and developed in line with the project's Connecting with Country approach, as outlined in the Architectural Design Report (EIS Appendix E) and Public Domain Report (EIS Appendix F) to provide recognition of First Nations people and culture. This approach extends to the Powerhouse's broader approach to its operations and programming of the museum's collection and events.</li> <li>• Powerhouse is committed to implementing Indigenous ways of working across all Powerhouse sites and areas of practice, including collections, curatorial, learning, public programs, design and delivery, communication, administration, operations, strategy and governance.</li> <li>• A specific, static public art commission is not proposed as part of this development and is not considered to be necessary owing to the Powerhouse's overarching commitment towards engagement and partnership with First Nations people through the programming of the museum, including internal exhibitions and events as well as potential activations of the public domain, which will be complemented by the</li> </ul>

		Connecting with Country approach brought to the architectural design of the built form and public domain. A static public artwork(s) is the antithesis of the Powerhouse's approach to knowledge and culture, which requires a dynamic and evolving approach to all areas, including in artistic endeavours and partnerships with First Nations people.
CoS36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that public art be reconsidered as a critical aspect of the social and cultural design of the revitalisation of the Powerhouse Museum and that a Public Art Plan be prepared by an experienced public art curator that can harness the opportunities of the development, and the site and the important place in the social, cultural and physical geography of the City.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to response above.</li> <li>The Powerhouse is one of NSW's most renowned cultural institutions, and this project seeks to ensure that Ultimo site is able to function in a dynamic manner that ensures that the Powerhouse can continue to deliver leading and innovative programs of culture and design across the entire facility, including both internal and external areas.</li> <li>The most critical social and cultural aspect of the Powerhouse Ultimo Revitalisation project is ensuring that the Powerhouse is able to be adaptive, dynamic and innovative in its programming, and avoid administrative constraints that would unnecessarily limit the engagement of the institution with the public and visitors. It is not considered appropriate for the planning system to seek to restrict, limit or duplicate the cultural and social responsibilities of the Powerhouse under the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i>.</li> <li>In the context of the Powerhouse's ongoing custodianship and curation of the site as a whole, it is not considered appropriate to impose a specific 'public art' program that is static or operationally separate from the Powerhouse's overarching programming of the site.</li> </ul>
CoS37	<p><b>Design excellence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City raises no objection to the proponent's request for an exemption from the requirement to run a competitive design competition by retaining the same team. This is on the basis that a competitive design process was run based on the previously approved concept application and the winning scheme has been appropriately adapted for the revised scope of the works and has the support of the selection jury.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
CoS38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirement to retain and consult with the DIP is considered fundamental to the continued pursuit of design excellence and should be captured in the development consent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the Applicant has no objection to a condition of consent in this regard. It is noted that further that the DIP is not the SDRP as set out in the Design Review Report at <b>Appendix M</b>.</li> </ul>
CoS39	<p><b>Contamination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Detailed Environmental Site Investigation (DESI) has been carried out. The DESI concludes that a Remediation Action Plan (RAP) is required. This is to be provided before the application is determined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Remediation Action Plan is contained at <b>Appendix R</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
CoS40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RAP/RWP must be reviewed by an NSW EPA Site Auditor and include a Section B Site Audit Statement or Letter of Interim Advise issued by the Auditor certifying that the RAP/RWP is practical, and the site will be suitable after remediation for the proposed use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RAP is not required to be reviewed and/or a Site Audit Statement provided by a Site Auditor at this stage. This is consistent with the Managing Land Contamination Planning Guidelines published by the NSW EPA.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In summary, the City supports in principle the adaptive approach to the Powerhouse Museum Ultimo, however, further information is required to understand the potential impacts to the heritage significance of the site, in particularly the Wran Building. Additional comments have been provided to further assess the application and develop the design further.</li> <li>• The retention of the Powerhouse Ultimo site as a museum space for the community is supported. In doing so, the revitalised Powerhouse should provide the same amount, if not more, of exhibition space. The revitalisation provides the opportunity to the adapt and improve the existing spaces, including the introduction of flexible spaces.</li> <li>• Additional comments have also been provided regarding matters that impact the public domain (both on site and City) including landscaping, traffic, waste and servicing. Additional information and design changes are suggested to ensure these issues can be resolved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>Heritage Council</b>		
HC-1	<p><b>Built Heritage – Design and Interpretation</b></p> <p>The proposed conservation and adaptive reuse of the existing Ultimo Power House and Ultimo Post Office heritage items for museum purposes is supported.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
HC2	<p>Retention of the curved roof form and scale of the Wran Building is supported.</p> <p>The proposed interpretation and celebration of the Wran building's design intent, its architecture and history in the proposed scheme is supported. It is recommended that the 'Powerhouse Museum Design Principles: Lionel Glendenning &amp; Richard Johnson' document prepared by Design 5, as included in the 2022 Conservation Management Plan, should guide aspects of the revitalisation project to enable this. It is further recommended that interpretation should extend to key design elements and façade treatment, not just be limited to the curved roof form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
HC3	<p>The final design of the new museum addition along Harris Street will reduce any remaining views of the historic core from the corner of Harris and Macarthur Streets. The design should ensure that the facades to the new building are made more visually permeable to mitigate visual impacts. An updated Statement of Heritage Impact along with a revised Visual Impact Assessment demonstrating the impact of the final design could resolve and address these design issues.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> and Amended VIA at <b>Appendix P</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
HC4	<p>The final design should have regard to the legibility of the Wran building as perceived from the surrounding context and include appropriate setbacks. The use of common materials (recycled and reconstituted brick, stone and concrete) across both the Wran facades and the new addition along Harris Street is not supported. The Wran building reflects the distinct 1988 adaptive reuse development of the site as the PHM and the design should recognise this in terms of its external treatment/materiality. Further, it is claimed that the way the brickwork on the Harris St façade will be used reflects the geology/stratigraphy of the location of the PHM pre-settlement. How this is to be achieved requires greater explanation and tangible links to Connecting with Country principles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> to this Submissions Report provides further details on the proposed materials and finishes. In relation to heritage impact, the Amended HIS provides further assessment of the legibility of teg Wran Building and the proposed materials.</li> </ul>

HC5	The public domain works including the Post Office courtyard, the Museum Entry Terrace, and the Harris Street public areas are supported.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
HC6	The proposed Aboriginal co-design of the revitalised museum (including contributions to built, public domain and landscape designs) are supported. These collaborations should extend to museum programs and engage local Aboriginal community and traditional owners to further integrate the design process and use of the place with the Connection with Country.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
HC7	Recommendations under Section 8.2 of the Heritage Impact Statement are supported including a comprehensive archival recording of the site comprising a photographic archival recording and 3-d scanning of the site in its current form, prior to its redevelopment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
HC8	<p><b>Moveable Heritage</b></p> <p>While the Power House Museum Collection is not covered by the current SHR listing or the amended SHR listing as recommended by the Heritage Council on 8 May, it remains an integral part of the Power House Museum Complex. The inter-relationship of the purpose-built Museum and its permanent displays is relevant.</p> <p>The application should clearly demonstrate the ability to adequately accommodate the Museum's operations and curatorial display including all the permanent displays.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NSW Heritage Council resolved on 4 October 2023 to: <i>Not proceed with further consideration of the listing of the Powerhouse Museum Collection noting that it is managed by an appropriate statutory body.</i></li> <li>The collection management and display is governed by the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945. The display and management of the collection does not form part of this application, .</li> <li>The Submissions and Amendments Report provides detail on how the proposed works enable flexibility for display of the collection and discusses that the collection will remain notwithstanding being outside the scope of the application.</li> </ul>
HC9	<p><b>Heritage Archaeology</b></p> <p>The final design must be informed by the findings of test excavations. The results of the test excavations should be used to inform decision-making, and identify appropriate conservation outcomes and mitigation measures, commensurate with the assessed significance of the identified archaeological resource. It is advised that the current approach for the management of State significant archaeology is preservation and conservation in situ, as a preferred heritage outcome</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
HC10	<p>The Historical Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology (HARDEM) should be updated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 5.4 (Assessment of Historical Archaeological Potential) – the assessment of potential for Phases 1 and 2 is 'low to moderate'. This appears to be inconsistent with the potential presented in Figure 5-2, where a substantial area of moderate to high potential is indicated. This apparent discrepancy should be rectified.</li> <li>Clearly indicate where it is proposed to undertake Aboriginal archaeological test excavations, and detail how the historical and Aboriginal archaeological testing programs will interact.</li> <li>Include the demolition plan, and detail how potential impacts of demolition, decontamination, etc. on the potential archaeological resource will be avoided.</li> </ul>	<p>An Amended Historical Archaeological Assessment is contained at <b>Appendix J</b> to this Submissions Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to revised section 5.4.</li> <li>The methodology has been updated- refer to section 9.4.5.</li> <li>An artefact discard policy is included in the revised section 9.6.</li> <li>The water-cooling system and manifold is located underneath the Turbine Hall and is therefore outside any areas of proposed excavation.</li> <li>Triggers and hold points are included in the revised methodology at section 9.4.6.</li> <li>The open area salvage excavation methodology has been revised to require an addendum HARDEM to be developed in consultation with Heritage NSW.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the inclusion of an artefact discard policy and procedure.</li> <li>Indicate how it is proposed to avoid subsurface impacts to the water-cooling system and manifold.</li> <li>Include clear triggers and hold points for the identification of substantially intact (and potentially State significant) archaeological deposits/relics. The hold points should require, and allow for, consideration of redesign to avoid impacts. We would appreciate an opportunity to comment on the proposed management approach decided upon by the proponent.</li> <li>If open-area salvage excavation is recommended as mitigation, based on the results of the testing, an Addendum to the HARDEM, which details the proposed salvage excavations and methodology, should be developed in consultation with Heritage NSW.</li> <li>The results of any archaeological investigations undertaken should be incorporated into the Heritage Interpretation Plan, which should be developed in consultation with Heritage NSW.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This requirement has been addressed at section 8.2.</li> </ul>
--	---	---

Transport for NSW (TfNSW)		
TNSWI	<p><b>Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management</b></p> <p>It requested that the applicant be conditioned to prepare a Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP). Prior to the issue of any construction certificate or any preparatory, demolition or excavation works, whichever is the earlier, the applicant shall prepare a Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) in consultation TfNSW.</p> <p>The CPTMP shall include (but not limited) the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A description of the development;</li> <li>Location of any proposed work zone(s)</li> <li>Details of crane arrangements including location of any crane(s);</li> <li>Haulage routes;</li> <li>Construction vehicle access arrangements;</li> <li>Proposed construction hours; - Predicted number of construction vehicle movements and detail of vehicle types, noting that vehicle movements are to be minimised during peak periods;</li> <li>Construction program and construction methodology;</li> <li>Any potential impacts to general traffic, cyclists, pedestrians and light rail and bus services within the vicinity of the site from construction vehicles during the construction of the proposed works;</li> <li>Cumulative construction impacts of projects and Proposed mitigation measures. Should any impacts be identified, the duration of the impacts and measures proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>

	<p>to mitigate any associated general traffic, public transport, pedestrian and cyclist impacts should be clearly identified and included in the CPTMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit a copy of the final plan to TfNSW for endorsement; and</li> <li>• Provide the builder's direct contact number to small businesses adjoining or impacted by the construction work and the Transport Management Centre within TfNSW to resolve issues relating to traffic, public transport, freight, servicing and pedestrian access during construction in real time. The applicant is responsible for ensuring the builder's direct contact number is current during any stage of construction.</li> </ul>	
TNSW2	<p><b>Green Travel Plan</b></p> <p>Prior to the issue of a completion Certificate, the proponent shall prepare a Green Travel Plan to increase the mode share of public transport and active transport for the development and the surrounding precinct. A copy of the Green Travel Plan shall be submitted to Transport for NSW (development.sco@transport.nsw.gov.au) for endorsement prior to the issue of the completion certificate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW3	<p><b>Protection Sydney Light Rail Infrastructure and Operation</b></p> <p>The proposed development is located in close proximity to Sydney Light Rail corridor. It is advised that Sydney Light Rail operation and assets needs to be protected during the construction and operation of the proposed development.</p> <p>It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to protect the Sydney Light infrastructure and operation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW4	<p><b>Proposed Pedestrian Access from Pyrmont Street to Exhibition Light Rail Stop</b></p> <p>It is noted that a pedestrian access from Pyrmont Street to Exhibition Light Rail Stop is proposed as part of the development application.</p> <p>It is requested that: • The applicant be conditioned to consult with TfNSW and the Sydney Light Operator during the detailed design phase as the proposed access arrangement needs undergo Sydney Light Rail Operator and TfNSW review and approval process; and • The applicant undertakes the pedestrian modelling for the proposed access arrangement as part of the applicant's Submissions Report.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application does not seek approval for any works within Pyrmont Street or underneath Pier Street. The area underneath Pier Street is noted as an 'integration zone' that offers the opportunity to improve connectivity of the museum to the north. These works are not required as part of the proposed development, and these works would require separate approval and are outside the scope of the current application.</li> </ul>
TNSW5	<p><b>Proposed Pedestrian Access from Pyrmont Street to Exhibition Light Rail Stop</b></p> <p>Prior to the Issue of the Construction Certificate, the applicant shall consult with TfNSW and the Sydney Light Operator during the detailed design phase and obtain Sydney Light Rail Operator and TfNSW approval for the proposed pedestrian access from Pyrmont Street to Exhibition Light Rail Stop.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application does not seek approval for any works within Pyrmont Street or underneath Pier Street. The area underneath Pier Street is noted as an 'integration zone' that offers the opportunity to improve connectivity of the museum to the north. These works are not required as part of the proposed development, and these works would require separate approval and are outside the scope of the current application.</li> </ul>
TNSW6	<p><b>Protection Sydney Light Rail Infrastructure and Operation</b></p> <p>The applicant must comply with all Altrac Light Rail Partnership (Altrac) or any subsequent operator of Sydney Light Rail (Sydney Light Rail Operator) policies, rules and procedures when working in and about the Sydney Light Rail corridor;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>

TNSW7	The applicant must comply with the requirements of ASA standards T HR CI 12090 ST Airspace and External Developments version 1.0 and Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads- Interim Guidelines;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW8	Activities of the applicant must not affect and/or restrict Sydney Light Rail operations without prior written agreement between the applicant, Transport for NSW (TfNSW), Altrac, and the Sydney Light Rail Operator, and it is a condition precedent that such written agreement must be obtained no later than two (2) months prior to the activity. Any requests for agreement are to include as a minimum the proposed duration, location, scope of works, and other information as required by the Sydney Light Rail Operator;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW9	The applicant must apply to Altrac and the Sydney Light Rail Operator for any required network shutdowns four (4) months prior to each individual required network shutdown event. Each request for network shutdown must include as a minimum the proposed shutdown dates, duration, location, scope of works, and other information as required by the Sydney Light Rail Operator. The Sydney Light Rail Operator may grant or refuse a request for network shutdown at its discretion;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW10	The applicant shall provide safe and unimpeded access for Sydney Light Rail patrons traversing to and from the Sydney Light Rail stops at all times;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW11	All buildings and structures (other than pedestrian footpath awnings), together with any improvements integral to the future use of the site are to be wholly within the freehold property (unlimited in height or depth), along the Sydney Light Rail corridor boundary;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SSDA does not seek consent for any works located outside of the land described in Section 2.1.1 of the EIS, being land wholly owned in freehold by the Trustees of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences. No works are proposed within the Sydney Light Rail corridor.</li> </ul>
TNSW12	The relocation of any TfNSW services or infrastructure must only be undertaken with prior consent from TfNSW and to TfNSW Requirements and Standards. The works must be designed and undertaken by Authorised Engineering Organisations (AEO) at the applicant's cost;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW13	All works/regulatory signage associated with the proposed development are to be at no cost to TfNSW;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW14	TfNSW, and persons authorised by it for this purpose, are entitled to inspect the site of the approved development and all structures to enable it to consider whether those structures on that site have been or are being constructed and maintained in accordance with these conditions of consent, on giving reasonable notice to the principal contractor for the approved development or the owner or occupier of the part of the site to which access is sought; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW15	All TfNSW, Altrac and Sydney Light Rail Operator's costs associated with review of plans, designs and legal must be borne by the applicant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SSDA does not seek consent for any works located outside of the land described in Section 2.1.1 of the EIS, being land wholly owned in freehold by the Trustees of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences. No works are proposed within the Sydney Light Rail corridor.</li> <li>The Applicant is not responsible for the costs incurred by TfNSW or any other parties in its fulfilling their ordinary statutory roles, for example as a referral, concurrence or approval authority with respect to planning and development matters. It is unclear on what basis this request is made.</li> </ul>



TNSW16	<p><b>Prior to the Issue of the Construction Certificate</b></p> <p>Review and Endorsement of Documents:</p> <p>Prior to the issue of any construction certificate or any preparatory, demolition or excavation works, whichever occurs first, the following documentation shall be provided for the review and endorsement of TfNSW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of craneage including diagrams; and</li> <li>• Construction methodology and construction program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW17	<p>Pre-construction Work Dilapidation Report:</p> <p>A pre-construction work Dilapidation Report of the Sydney Light Rail and its assets shall be prepared by a qualified structural engineer. The dilapidation survey shall be undertaken via a joint site inspection by the representatives of the Sydney Light Rail Operator, TfNSW and the applicant. These dilapidation surveys will establish the extent of existing damage and enable any deterioration during construction to be observed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW8	<p>Reflectivity Report:</p> <p>Prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate, the applicant shall design lighting, signs and surfaces with reflective materials, whether permanent or temporary, which are (or from which reflected light might be) visible from the rail corridor limiting glare and reflectivity to the satisfaction of Altrac, TfNSW and the Sydney Light Rail Operator.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW19	<p>Insurance Requirements:</p> <p>Prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate, the applicant must hold current public liability insurance cover for a sum acceptable to TfNSW. TfNSW's standard public liability insurance requirement for this type of development adjacent to a rail corridor is minimum of \$250M. This insurance shall not contain any exclusion in relation to works on or near the rail corridor, rail infrastructure. The applicant is to contact TfNSW to obtain the level of insurance required for this particular proposal. Prior to issuing the relevant Construction Certificate the PCA must witness written proof of this insurance in conjunction with TfNSW's written advice to the applicant on the level of insurance required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW20	<p>Works Deed / Agreements:</p> <p>Prior to the issue of any construction certificate or any preparatory, demolition or excavation works, whichever occurs first, if required by TfNSW, Works Deed (s) between the applicant, TfNSW and/or Altrac and the Sydney Light Rail Operator must be agreed and executed by the parties.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW21	<p><b>During Construction</b></p> <p>Construction vehicles shall not be stopped or parked along the light rail corridor at any time without prior approval of TfNSW;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW22	<p>No rock anchors/bolts (temporary or permanent) are to be installed into the light rail corridor without approval from TfNSW;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>

TNSW23	No metal ladders, tapes and plant/machinery, or conductive material are to be used within 6 horizontal metres of any live electrical equipment unless a physical barrier such as a hoarding or structure provides separation;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW24	During all stages of the development extreme care shall be taken to prevent any form of pollution entering the light rail corridor. Any form of pollution that arises as a consequence of the development activities shall remain the full responsibility of the applicant;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW25	Rainwater from the roof must not be projected and/or falling into the rail corridor/assets and must be piped down the face of the building which faces the rail corridor. Given the site's location next to the rail property, drainage from the development must be adequately disposed of/managed and not allowed to be discharged into the corridor unless prior approval has been obtained from TfNSW and the Sydney Light Rail Operator (or the delegated authority); and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW26	No scaffolding is to be used within 6 horizontal metres of the rail corridor unless prior written approval has been obtained from the Sydney Light Rail Operator and TfNSW and a physical barrier such as a hoarding or structure provides separation. To obtain approval the applicant will be required to submit details of the scaffolding, the means of erecting and securing this scaffolding, the material to be used, and the type of screening to be installed to prevent objects falling onto the rail corridor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW27	<p><b>Prior to the Issue of the Occupation Certificate</b></p> <p>Post - construction Dilapidation Report:</p> <p>Prior to the Issue of the Occupation Certificate, a post-construction dilapidation survey shall be undertaken via a joint inspection with representatives from TfNSW, Altrac, the Sydney Light Rail Operator and the applicant. The dilapidation survey will be undertaken on the rail infrastructure and property in the vicinity of the project. These dilapidation surveys will establish the extent of any existing damage and enable any deterioration during construction to be observed. The submission of a detailed dilapidation report to TfNSW and the Sydney Light Rail Operator will be required unless otherwise notified by TfNSW. The applicant needs to undertake rectification of any damage to the satisfaction of TfNSW and the Sydney Light Rail Operator and if applicable the local council.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
TNSW28	<p>Reflectivity Report:</p> <p>Prior to the Issue of the Occupation Certificate, the applicant shall demonstrate that lights, signs and reflective materials, whether permanent or temporary, which are (or from which reflected light might be) visible from the rail corridor were installed limiting glare and reflectivity to the satisfaction of TfNSW, Altrac and the Sydney Light Rail Operator.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted - the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
<b>Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water</b>		
DCCEEW1	Heritage NSW understands that the proposal involves the revitalisation of the Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo, including demolition of some existing buildings, construction and use of new museum spaces, alterations to and adaptive reuse of existing buildings and heritage items and the construction of new public spaces. These works will	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>

	occur generally within the area bounded by Harris Street, William Henry Street, Macarthur Street, and the Light Rail Corridor.	
DCCEEW2	Heritage NSW notes that the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment is in draft format only and has not been subject to review and comment by registered Aboriginal parties. Until such time as consultation requirements have been met and report finalised, Heritage NSW cannot provide advice to the Department on whether the management recommendations provided in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment are adequate or is the ACHAR substantially complies with the SEARs. On the submission of the finalised Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment, Heritage NSW will provide further advice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) is included at <b>Appendix K</b> of this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>
<b>The Biodiversity, Conservation and Science (BCS) Group</b>		
BCS1	<p><b>Flood</b></p> <p>BCS considers that the EIS does not meet the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for flooding. In summary, BCS' key issues are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>flood modelling of potential flood impacts has not been undertaken</li> <li>further information is needed on flood planning levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A revised Flood Impact Assessment which includes details of flood modelling of potential impacts and the applicable flood planning levels is contained at <b>Appendix X</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>
BCS2	The proposal includes demolition of existing buildings and construction of new museum spaces and public open spaces. The potential flood impact caused by these changes remains unclear in the absence of flood modelling. All changes such as topography, building footprints and any other potential obstructions to flooding should be presented on a plan to undertake an initial qualitative assessment of whether flood impact modelling is necessary. BCS raised concerns on the potential for flood impacts for a previous SSD proposal at this site (SSD-32927319). The EIS for SSD32927319 did not provided a Flood Impact and Risk Assessment (FIRA) and the RtS provided an unsatisfactory FIRA. Please refer to previous EHG submissions on the EIS (DOC22/479653) and RtS (DOC22/878399) for this previous SSD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Amended Flood Impact Assessment is contained at <b>Appendix X</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>
BCS3	<p>The Stormwater and Flooding Report has used a stormwater model and other calculations to estimate flood levels and flood planning levels. Given the shallow depth of flow, this approach may not be unreasonable for Harris Street and Macarthur Street. However, further information is required. The cross-sections used should be presented. Using the Manning's equation is not able to take account of areas with varying terrain. Varying flood depths in the flood model results presented indicate that this approach may not be accurate. BCS raises particular concern that flood levels at the Gathering Terrace may not be properly represented in the stormwater model. BCS recommends further information be provided to address these concerns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A plan clearly showing the relevant building entrances together with "flood planning level check locations" shown on Figure 17.</li> <li>A description of each location in Tables 15 and 16.</li> <li>The water surface levels and depths used to determine flood planning levels should be reviewed against flood depths and levels from a flood model including scrutiny of flood levels adjacent to any new basement entries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Amended Flood Impact Assessment is contained at <b>Appendix X</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>

BCS4	<p>The approach to the basement entries needs further clarification. The following should be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan showing basement entry locations and whether these are existing or proposed.</li> <li>• Clarification on which basement entries are above the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) and how much freeboard to the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) can be provided where 500mm cannot be reached. Preferably the existing tables would be amended to provide this information.</li> <li>• Consideration of the flood risk should form part of the justification for a lower level, e.g., depth and duration of flooding. Where protection to the PMF level cannot be reached, calculations can be made to estimate the maximum volume of water likely to enter the basement. The resultant maximum depth can inform a risk assessment.</li> </ul> <p>It may be preferable to revise Tables 15 and 16 or produce an alternate table to focus only on flood planning level compliance for the purpose of clarity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Amended Flood Impact Assessment is contained at <b>Appendix X</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>
BCS5	<p><b>Biodiversity</b></p> <p>Section 7.1 of the EIS notes “as has been demonstrated in Appendix BB and throughout this EIS, the proposed development will not result in any significant effect on the biological and ecological integrity of the study area, subject to the implementation of the Mitigation Measures set out in Appendix D” (page 100). However, neither Appendix BB nor Appendix D appear to have been provided. Please note BCS granted a BDAR waiver for this SSD on 18 April 2024.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Appendix BB</b> and <b>Appendix D</b> both formed part of the exhibited application and are available on the Major Projects Portal at <a href="https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/projects/powerhouse-ultimo-revitalisation">https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/projects/powerhouse-ultimo-revitalisation</a>.</li> </ul>
BCS6	<p><b>Landscaping</b></p> <p>The EIS and accompanying reports include differing information on the proposed number of new trees to be planted, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIS states the removal of the 7 trees “will be offset through the planting of 41 new trees throughout the site, which will be endemic species more suited to the locality” (section 6.5, page 87)</li> <li>• The AIA states “the supplied plans show that twenty-four (24) trees are to be planted to help off-set the loss of canopy cover and amenity resulting from the tree removal” (section 3.5.1)</li> <li>• The Public Domain Report states “Overall, 31 new trees are proposed within the public domain to increase canopy cover and amenity, and to replace the 7 trees proposed to be removed” (section 2.10, page 32).</li> </ul>	<p>A Total of 5 trees are proposed to be removed as per the Amended Landscape Plans at <b>Appendix N</b>. 26 Trees are proposed to be planted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees 2, 5-15, existing London Plane Trees (plantus x acerifolia) to be retained.</li> <li>• Tree 3 and T4, existing London Plane Tree (plantus x acerifolia) to be removed.</li> <li>• T16, existing water gum (tristaniopis laurina) to be retained.</li> <li>• T17 existing London Plane Tree ((plantus x acerifolia) to be retained.</li> <li>• T18 -T22 existing London Plane Tree (plantus x acerifolia) to be removed</li> </ul>
BCS7	<p>The RtS should also clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the location of trees to be retained and offset on site allowing enough space needs to be provided on site to allow the new trees to grow to maturity without the need for pruning</li> <li>• mitigation measures to reduce impacts to the tree protection zones of the trees to be retained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Amended Landscape Plans at <b>Appendix N</b> to this Submissions Report demonstrate sufficient space is provided.</li> <li>• The recommendations of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment are included in the revised Mitigation Measures at <b>Appendix C</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> </ul>

BCS8	In addition to the above recommendations for conditions of approval, BCS recommends the following conditions are included in any approval: Any planting/ landscaping uses a diversity of local provenance native trees, shrubs and groundcover species from the relevant native vegetation community that once occurred in this location.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
BCS9	Tree planting shall use advanced and established local native trees for local native tree species which are commercially available. Other local native tree species which are not commercially available may be sourced as juvenile sized trees or pre-grown from provenance seed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
BCS10	<p>Enough space is available to allow the existing trees which are to be retained and the new replacement trees to grow to maturity</p> <p>A Landscape Plan is to be prepared and implemented by an appropriately qualified bush regenerator and include details on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the native vegetation community (or communities) that once occurred on the site and the plan demonstrates that the proposed plant species are from the relevant vegetation community</li> <li>b. the type, species, size, quantity and location of trees</li> <li>c. the species, quantity and location of shrubs and groundcover plantings</li> <li>d. the pot size of the trees to be planted</li> <li>e. the area/space required to allow the planted trees to grow to maturity</li> <li>f. plant maintenance regime. The planted vegetation must be regularly maintained and watered for 12 months following planting. Replacement plants for those that have failed during this period should be of the same type, size, quality and species as the plant that has failed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>
<b>Ausgrid</b>		
AG1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ausgrid requires that due consideration be given to the compatibility of proposed development with existing Ausgrid infrastructure, particularly in relation to risks of electrocution, fire risks, Electric &amp; Magnetic Fields (EMFs), noise, visual amenity and other matters that may impact on Ausgrid or the development. Ausgrid notes that in "Appendix Q_Utillitiies_Electrical_and_Communications" the proponent has already contacted Ausgrid regarding supply to the development through the connection application process. This is including the decommissioning the existing Ausgrid Substation S5514.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
AG2	<b>Ausgrid underground cables are in the vicinity of the development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, this can be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan to be prepared prior to the commencement of works.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Special care should be taken to ensure that driveways and any other construction activities do not interfere with existing underground cables located in the footpath or adjacent roadways along Harris St, Peir St and Macarthur St.</li> </ul>	
AG3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that the developer locate and record the depth of all known underground services prior to any excavation in the area. Information regarding the position of cables along footpaths and roadways can be obtained by contacting Before You Dig Australia (BYDA).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, this can be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan to be prepared prior to the commencement of works.</li> </ul>
AG4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to BYDA the proponent should refer to the following documents to support safety in design and construction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SafeWork Australia – Excavation Code of Practice.</li> <li>Ausgrid's Network Standard NS156 which outlines the minimum requirements for working around Ausgrid's underground cables. The following points should also be taken into consideration.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, this can be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan to be prepared prior to the commencement of works.</li> </ul>
AG5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ausgrid cannot guarantee the depth of cables due to possible changes in ground levels from previous activities after the cables were installed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
AG6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should ground anchors be required in the vicinity of Ausgrid underground cables, the anchors must not be installed within 300mm of any cable, and the anchors must not pass over the top of any cable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
AG7	<p><b>Ausgrid Chamber Substation in the vicinity of the development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The substation ventilation openings, including substation duct openings and louvered panels, must be separated from building air intake and exhaust openings, natural ventilation openings and boundaries of adjacent allotments, by separation distances which meet the requirements of all relevant authorities, building regulations, BCA and Australian Standards including AS 1668.2: The use of ventilation and air conditioning in buildings - Mechanical ventilation in buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, the project is capable of compliance with the BCA.</li> </ul>
AG8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to above, Ausgrid requires the substation ventilation openings, including duct openings and louvered panels, to be separated from building ventilation system air intake and exhaust openings, including those on buildings on adjacent allotments, by not less than 6 metres.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
AG9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exterior parts of buildings within 3 metres in any direction from substation ventilation openings, including duct openings and louvered panels, must have a fire rating level (FRL) of not less than 180/180/180 where the substation contains oil-filled equipment, or 120/120/120 where there is no oil filled equipment and be constructed of non-combustible material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
AG10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development must comply with both the Reference Levels and the precautionary requirements of the ICNIRP Guidelines for Limiting Exposure to Time-varying Electric and Magnetic Fields (1 HZ – 100 kHz) (ICNIRP 2010). For further details on fire segregation requirements refer to Ausgrid's Network Standard 113.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
AG11	<b>Easements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing Ausgrid easements, leases and/or right of ways must be maintained at all times to ensure 24- hour access. No temporary or permanent alterations to this property tenure can occur without written approval from Ausgrid. For further details refer to Ausgrid's Network Standard 143.</li> </ul>	
AG12	<p><b>New driveways – proximity to existing poles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed driveways shall be located to maintain a minimum clearance of 1.5m from the nearest face of the pole to any part of the driveway, including the layback, this is to allow room for future pole replacements. Ausgrid should be further consulted for any deviation to this distance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
AG13	<p><b>New or modified connection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To apply to connect or modify a connection for a residential or commercial premises. Ausgrid recommends the proponent to engage an Accredited Service Provider and submit a connection application to Ausgrid as soon as practicable. Visit the Ausgrid website for further details; <a href="https://www.ausgrid.com.au/Connections/Get-connected">https://www.ausgrid.com.au/Connections/Get-connected</a>. Additional information can be found in the Ausgrid Quick Reference Guide for Safety Clearances "Working Near Ausgrid Assets - Clearances". This document can be found by visiting the following Ausgrid website: <a href="http://www.ausgrid.com.au/Your-safety/Working-Safe/Clearance-enquiries">www.ausgrid.com.au/Your-safety/Working-Safe/Clearance-enquiries</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>Jemena Gas</b>		
JG1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jemena confirms that it has no objection to the proposed development subject to the following conditions and considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jemena requires that any development, including the planting of street trees or vegetation, be in compliance with the attached Guideline to Designing, Constructing and Operating Around the Existing AS4645 Natural Gas Network (GAS-1999-GL-CN-001, Rev 0 dated 22/07/2022).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>NSW EPA</b>		
EPA1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the information provided, the proposal does not appear to require an environment protection licence under the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997. However, the proposal is being undertaken by a NSW public authority and therefore the EPA is the appropriate regulatory authority for the proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
EPA2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPA notes that a concept application for the Powerhouse revitalisation (SSD-32927319) was approved in February 2023 which has since been surrendered. EPA provided comment on the surrendered application (DOC22/475874-7) which raised matters relating to contamination including requesting a detailed site investigation to be conducted. These comments have been considered by the EPA in this review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, a Detailed Site Investigation was provided at Appendix I of the EIS and a Remediation Action Plan (RAP) is provided at <b>Appendix R</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report</li> </ul>
EPA3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPA has reviewed the EIS and notes that the EIS does provide the information required by the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See EPA2 above. It is considered that a Preliminary Long-term Environmental Management Plan is not required at this stage as set out in the Detailed Site Investigation submitted with the EIS (<b>Appendix I</b>).</li> </ul>

EPA4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPA understands that the Preliminary and Detailed Site Investigations have identified elevated concentrations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, total recoverable hydrocarbons, metals, and organochlorine pesticides in soils and ammonia, copper and zinc in groundwater. The Detailed Site Investigation concluded that the site can be made suitable for the proposed development subject to the management of the identified contamination in soil.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
EPA5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPA recommends that contaminated land management matters are addressed in conditions including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Additional site investigation, testing and analysis to ensure sufficient coverage of the site in addition to the areas investigated during the EIS stage.</li> <li>- The development and implementation of a Remedial Action Plan.</li> <li>- The development and implementation of a Site Management Strategy.</li> <li>- An unexpected finds protocol.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) is provided at <b>Appendix R</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report. The RAP addresses the matters outlined in the comment.</li> </ul>
EPA6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Remedial Action Plan (RAP) must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- be prepared, or reviewed and approved, by consultants certified under either the Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand's Certified Environmental Practitioner (Site Contamination) scheme (CEnvP(SC)) or the Soil Science Australia Certified Professional Soil Scientist Contaminated Site Assessment and Management scheme (CPSS CSAM); and</li> <li>- be prepared in accordance with Consultants Reporting on Contaminated Land: Contaminated Land Guidelines (EPA, 2020) and relevant guidelines made or approved by the EPA under section 105 of the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) is provided at <b>Appendix R</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report. The RAP addresses the matters outlined in the comment.</li> </ul>
EPA7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration should be given to the use of site auditor accredited under the Contaminated Land Management (CLM) Act 1997. The site auditor could be engaged to provide a site audit statement (SAS) and accompanying site audit report (SAR) certifying suitability of the land for the proposed land use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In accordance with the RAP (provided at <b>Appendix R</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report), a site auditor will be engaged prior to commencement of works relating to contamination.</li> </ul>
EPA8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following guidance, as relevant, should be considered, when assessing contamination at the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NSW EPA Sampling Design Guidelines: <a href="https://yoursay.epa.nsw.gov.au/sampling-design-guidelines">https://yoursay.epa.nsw.gov.au/sampling-design-guidelines</a></li> <li>- Guidelines for the NSW Site Auditor Scheme (3rd edition) 2017 <a href="https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/-/media/epa/corporatesite/resources/contaminatedland/17p0269-guidelines-for-the-nsw-site-auditorscheme-third-edition.pdf">https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/-/media/epa/corporatesite/resources/contaminatedland/17p0269-guidelines-for-the-nsw-site-auditorscheme-third-edition.pdf</a></li> <li>- The National Environment Protection (Assessment of Contamination) Measures 2013 as amended.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) is provided at <b>Appendix R</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report. The RAP addresses the matters outlined in the comment.</li> </ul>



EPA9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The processes outlined in State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 – Chapter 4 Remediation of Land be followed and documented, to assess the suitability of the land and any remediation required in relation to the proposed use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Detailed Site Investigation was provided at Appendix I of the EIS in accordance with the processes outlined in State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 – Chapter 4 Remediation of Land. A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) is further provided at <b>Appendix R</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>
EPA10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPA should be notified under Section 60 of the CLM Act for any contamination identified which meets the triggers in the Guidelines for the Duty to Report Contamination Page 3 <a href="https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/-/media/epa/corporate-site/resources/clm/150164-reportlandcontamination-guidelines.pdf">https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/-/media/epa/corporate-site/resources/clm/150164-reportlandcontamination-guidelines.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) is provided at <b>Appendix R</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report. The RAP addresses the matters outlined in the comment.</li> </ul>
EPA11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPA recommends use of “certified consultants.” Please note that the EPA’s Contaminated Land Consultant Certification Policy (<a href="https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/yourenvironment/contaminated-land/managing-contaminatedland/engaging-consultant">https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/yourenvironment/contaminated-land/managing-contaminatedland/engaging-consultant</a>) supports the development and implementation of nationally consistent certifications schemes in Australia, and encourages the use of certified consultants by the community and industry. Note that the EPA requires all reports submitted to the EPA to comply with the requirements of the CLM Act to be prepared, or reviewed and approved, by a certified consultant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) is provided at <b>Appendix R</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report. The RAP addresses the matters outlined in the comment.</li> </ul>
<b>NSW Fire and Rescue</b>		
NSWFR1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is deemed that the proposal has limited scope and application in regard to special hazards or special problems of firefighting. FRNSW notes the design will meet the Performance Requirements of the Building Code of Australia (BCA) through a combination of Deemed-to-Satisfy (DtS) and Performance Solutions. FRNSW submit no comments or recommendations for consideration, nor any requirements beyond that specified by applicable legislation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
NSWFR2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While there is currently no requirement for a Fire Safety Study, FRNSW may recommend one be undertaken at a later stage should information be provided such that the development is deemed to pose special problems of firefighting or special hazards exist that require additional fire safety and management measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>NSW Police Force</b>		
NSWPF1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Police have conducted a review of crime related incidents for the areas surrounding 500 Harris Street, Ultimo. The main crime categories for the area are malicious damage and stealing. As such, police request that all construction/modifications take the following measures into consideration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
NSWPF2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Coverage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCTV cameras to cover internal and external areas of the location.</li> <li>Footage is of a high quality with a minimum resolution of 1280 x 720 pixels.</li> <li>Cameras ideally mounted at a zero-to-thirty-degree angle to capture best facial imagery.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>As highlighted within the CPTED Report appended to the SSDA (EIS Appendix EE) a CCTV network is essential throughout the overall development and its curtilage. At a minimum, the CPTED Report recommends that CCTV coverage should consider capturing the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loading dock and other back of house and service areas.</li> <li>Arrival concierge circulation spaces.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Footage is stored for a minimum of 30 days and to be made available to police in a timely manner upon request.</li> <li>- NSWPF Signage placed in area to indicate that the area is being monitored by CCTV cameras.</li> <li>- All CCTV cameras should adhere to the framework specified in the Surveillance Devices Act 2007.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lobby areas.</li> <li>• Entry points to both ends of the through-site link.</li> <li>• Surrounding publicly accessible areas such as the Creative Courtyard or new entrances at Harris Street.</li> </ul> <p>The CCTV network will be developed by, and installed in consultation with, a suitably qualified security consultant with a Class 2A licence under the <i>Security Industry Act 1997</i>. In doing so, the more specific CCTV design specifications outlined within the <i>Surveillance Devices Act 2007</i>, as well as operational requirements will be developed in further detail prior to installation.</p>
NSWPF3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Security Guard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Police recommend that the location considers employing a security guard to perform regular patrol, engaging with people in the area.</li> <li>- Security guard to complete reports of any issues which arise. Patterns to be identified and measures taken to reduce future issues arising.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Several security guards will be employed at the site and will perform routine regular patrol of the precinct, similar to the existing security arrangement.</p> <p>The CPTED report recommends the preparation of a future Plan of Management (PoM) for the operation of the site which should include detailed security measures performed by security personnel and other day to day operational best practice security tasks (such as lock up / lock down or any emergency evacuation protocols, major event security, and the like).</p>
NSWPF4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lighting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All alcoves, recessed areas and areas with poor line of sight to be well lit and monitored by security guard during patrols</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant has no objection to this lighting provision requirement throughout the proposed development and will ensure that the lighting strategy is prepared in consultation with a suitably qualified and experienced lighting expert. It will account for appropriate illumination measures in alcoves, recessed areas and areas with reduced open vistas, such as in back of house areas or loading docks. The lighting strategy will ensure that the most appropriate illumination levels are achieved so that facial recognition is easily captured by the associated CCTV devices.</p>
NSWPF5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upon completion of this development, police request that they are invited to attend the location to evaluate and complete a security assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant has no objection to a condition of consent in this regard.</li> </ul>
<b>Sydney Water</b>		
SW1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water and Wastewater Servicing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Our preliminary assessment indicates that water servicing should be available for the proposed development.</li> <li>- Amplifications, adjustments, deviations and/or minor extensions may be required.</li> <li>- Detailed requirements will be provided at the S73 application stage.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
SW2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical Asset – Water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sydney Water identifies a critical asset, in the form of a DN300 water main, along Harris St.</li> <li>- The applicant's 'Site Infrastructure Management Strategy SSDA Report' has indicated that connections to the DN300 is of interest.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Our preliminary assessment notes that connection to DN300 is acceptable. However, additional contingency measures such as the installation of additional valves is recommended.</li> <li>- Further information and requirements would be provided at the S73 stage.</li> </ul>	
SW3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sydney Water identifies various stormwater assets along Macarthur St.</li> <li>- The applicant's 'Stormwater and Flooding Report' has noted that connections to the DN600 and DN900 wastewater channels in Macarthur Street is of interest.</li> <li>- No building or permanent structure is to be proposed over the stormwater channel / pipe or within 1m from the outside wall of the channel / pipe or within Sydney Water easement whichever is larger. Permanent structures include (but are not limited to) basement car park, hanging balcony, roof eaves, hanging stairs, stormwater pits, stormwater pipes, elevated driveway, basement access or similar structures. This clearance requirement would apply for unlimited depth and height.</li> <li>- When this development is referred to us at the Building Plan Approval/Section 73 application stage, the applicant is required to submit the elevation drawings with the stormwater channel/ pipe, to ensure that the proposed buildings and permanent structures are 1m away from the outside face of the stormwater channel/pipe and away from the Sydney Water easement.</li> <li>- The proposed stormwater connections to Sydney Water's stormwater system are to be carried out according to Sydney Water's requirements as part of the Section 73 application for this development. More information regarding Sydney Water's stormwater policy is available via the following web page Building over or adjacent to Sydney Water stormwater assets.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
SW6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the Department decide to progress with the subject development application, Sydney Water would require the following conditions be included in the development consent. Further details of the conditions can be found in Attachment 1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 73 Compliance Certificate</li> <li>- Building Plan Approval</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted- the applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.</li> </ul>

### 3.0 Organisation and Public Submissions

**Table 3** Organisation and Public Submissions

Item	Theme	Name	Response
<b>Exhibition spaces</b>			
<b>Concerns around the reduction in exhibition space and loss of functionality</b>			
OP-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned around 75% reduction in exhibition space.</li> <li>Belief that the reconfiguration of exhibition space into three larger open halls is not the best use of space.</li> <li>Concern that the proposal will remove the existing range of scaled spaces to appropriately present the Powerhouse Collection.</li> <li>Belief that the plans reduce the museums ability to support numerous and large exhibitions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (St Leonards, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Croydon, NSW)</li> <li>Ashleigh Berdebes (Forest Lodge, NSW)</li> <li>Ian Nicol (Narraweena, NSW)</li> <li>David Payne (Glenbrook, NSW)</li> <li>Thomas Lockley (Pymont, NSW)</li> <li>Kylie Winkworth (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>Cassandra Sargeant (Glebe, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Hunters Hill, NSW)</li> <li>Annie Wale (Balmain, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Woollahra, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Fairfield Heights, NSW)</li> <li>Katelin Gregg (Exeter, NSW)</li> <li>Kiri Valsamis (Pymont, NSW)</li> <li>Timothy Bidder (Sydney, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Rossmore, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Camperdown, NSW)</li> <li>Savannah Thill-Turke (Watsons Bay, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Woronora, NSW)</li> <li>Linda Lin (Strathfield, NSW)</li> <li>Alec Smart (St Ives Chase, NSW)</li> <li>Jennifer Jungheim (Waverley, NSW)</li> <li>Andrew Grant (Northbridge, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Vaucluse, NSW)</li> <li>Aylee Benham (Burwood Heights, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Wentworth Falls, NSW)</li> <li>Melinda Mockridge (Kyneton, VIC)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Artarmon, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> to this Submissions Report outline the changes in allocation of uses throughout the Proposal to increase exhibition floor space.</li> <li>A quantitative comparison between the existing areas of the museum and the proposed areas does not pay sufficient regard to qualitative considerations of the spaces in terms of clarity of circulation and the ability of spaces to offer contained exhibitions. Flexible, international standard exhibition spaces that can support and adapt to new and dynamic programs that facilitate direct connections with Powerhouse collections are essential for the museum's future.</li> <li>The reconfiguration of the Boiler Hall, Turbine Hall, Wran Building, Switch House and the creation of new spaces will provide a diversity of exhibition space typologies with the capacity and flexibility to enable the museum to create and present high quality, internationally leading museum exhibitions across the applied arts and applied sciences.</li> <li>The revitalisation of Powerhouse Ultimo is occurring within the context of the wider Powerhouse program that includes the recent expansion of Powerhouse Castle Hill) the establishment of Powerhouse Parramatta (under construction) – together these facilities represent a significant expansion of the Powerhouse's museum spaces and overall capacity to deliver programming with</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sarah White (Kings Langley, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Double Bay, NSW)</li> <li>• Joshua Frank (Warrawee, NSW)</li> <li>• Jarvis Pitcher (Chippendale, NSW)</li> <li>• Ryan Miller (Oak Flats, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Earlwood, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Ashfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Tia Sweeney (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>• Holly Tam (Kellyville Ridge, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Glenhaven, NSW)</li> <li>• Hannah Sieveking (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Cromer, NSW)</li> <li>• Christopher Roberts (Lilyfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Gerry Wedd (Port Elliot, SA)</li> <li>• Brad Hyne (Muswellbrook, NSW)</li> <li>• John Wade (Eglington, NSW)</li> <li>• Christopher Abbott (Taree, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Tennyson Point, NSW)</li> <li>• Bryce Peterson (North Epping, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Chatswood, NSW)</li> <li>• Lindsay Sharp (Foxground, NSW)</li> <li>• Ann Cairns (Paddington, NSW)</li> <li>• Jacob Grossbard (Strathfield South, NSW)</li> <li>• Jason Wheatley (Annandale, NSW)</li> <li>• Michael Sanders (Hazelbrook, NSW)</li> <li>• Leigh Howlett (Lewisham, NSW)</li> <li>• Colin Sutton (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Mona Vale, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Ashfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Mary Winkler (Bexley, NSW)</li> <li>• Roger Dunk (Carlingford, NSW)</li> <li>• Neville Pleffer (Rooty Hill, NSW)</li> <li>• Grace Cochrane (Summer Hill, NSW)</li> <li>• Shirley Fitzgerald (Huskinson, NSW)</li> <li>• Jan Westlake (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• Samuel Wilkins (Beacon Hill, NSW)</li> </ul>	<p>increased diversity, reach, and relevance to the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed removal of internal mezzanines, exhibition structures and other internal fit out from within the Heritage Core buildings have been assessed by the heritage consultant as having a positive heritage impact on the heritage significance of those buildings, including on internal fabric graded with high or exceptional heritage significance. This is set out in further detail in the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b>.</li> <li>• Refer to Section 6.4 of Submissions and Amendment Report for further response.</li> </ul>
--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• National Museum Trust Australia (Millers Point)</li> <li>• Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Additional Submission)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 10)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 12)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 15)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> <li>• Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Additional Submission)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 30)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	
OP-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the revitalisation will disrupt the conservation and storage of the collection, preparation, and construction of exhibits and museum management.</li> <li>• Concern that the collection of exhibits requires considerable space which is currently facilitated in the Harwood Building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• National Museum Trust Australia (Millers Point)</li> <li>• Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 11)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revitalisation of Powerhouse Ultimo has considered the requirements of the museum to create and construct exhibitions.</li> <li>• Storage of the collection at Powerhouse Castle Hill is within purpose-built facilities.</li> <li>• The Harwood Building is an office, storage, loading and workshop facility owned by the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences. It will continue to be used to support the operation of the museum.</li> <li>• The proposed design scheme includes a new internal loading dock. The internal facilities, supported by back-of-house spaces, creates significant operational improvements for the security and protection of the Powerhouse Collection. Current loading between the Harwood Building and exhibition spaces creates significant risks due to pedestrian conflicts at Macarthur Street. This is a busy pedestrian thoroughfare.</li> <li>• The conservation and management of the museum's collection is not a planning matter. The Powerhouse will continue to manage the collection in accordance with the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act (1945)</i>.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to Section 6.4 of Submissions and Amendment Report for further response.</li> </ul>
OP-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification on where the new 1,500m<sup>2</sup> international standard exhibition space is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> to this Submissions Report outline the changes in allocation of uses throughout the Proposal to increase exhibition floor space.</li> <li>Exhibition spaces are primarily located on the ground floor and level one of the Powerhouse. Various Exhibition spaces are created throughout the proposal within the Turbine Hall, Engine House, Wran Building and the new building proposed on Harris Street</li> <li>The proposal to combine the existing two auditoria on the ground floor of the Wran Building that will enable creation of an approximately 1,500sqm exhibition space that includes appropriate light and acoustic separation as well as environmental controls to host a range of international exhibitions within the existing Wran vaults.</li> <li>Refer to Section 6.4 of Submissions and Amendment Report for further response.</li> </ul>

#### Concerns around impacts specific to the Hall of Steam

OP-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns around the removal of the Engine House's Steam exhibition and underlying steam infrastructure having an impact on the live steam demonstration enjoyed by generations of visitors.</li> <li>Belief that the Steam Revolution section of the Powerhouse is one of the most significant elements of the Powerhouse.</li> <li>Belief that the removal of the Hall of Steam is destructive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (St Leonards, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Croydon, NSW)</li> <li>Ashleigh Berdebes (Forest Lodge, NSW)</li> <li>Thomas Lockley (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Kylie Winkworth (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>Cassandra Sargeant (Glebe, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Hunters Hill, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Woollahra, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Fairfield Heights, NSW)</li> <li>Katelin Gregg (Exeter, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Blacktown, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Rossmore, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Camperdown, NSW)</li> <li>Savannah Thill-Turke (Watsons Bay, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Woronora, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst the programming of the Powerhouse is not a planning matter, steam-based collection displays have always been a part of Powerhouse Ultimo and will continue in the future. The NSW Government has committed to retaining iconic Collection items at Ultimo as part of the revitalisation, including Boulton and Watt Steam Engine, Catalina, and Locomotive No. 1. This will include all necessary infrastructure required to support these objects on exhibition.</li> <li>Refer to Section 6.4 of Submissions and Amendment Report for further response.</li> </ul>
------	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linda Lin (Strathfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Alec Smart (St Ives Chase, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Fairy Meadow, NSW)</li> <li>• Jennifer Jungheim (Waverley, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Vaucluse, NSW)</li> <li>• Aylee Benham (Burwood Heights, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Wentworth Falls, NSW)</li> <li>• Melinda Mockridge (Kyneton, VIC)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Artarmon, NSW)</li> <li>• Sarah White (Kings Langley, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Double Bay, NSW)</li> <li>• Joshua Frank (Warrawee, NSW)</li> <li>• Jarvis Pitcher (Chippendale, NSW)</li> <li>• Ryan Miller (Oak Flats, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Earlwood, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Ashfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Tia Sweeney (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Glenhaven, NSW)</li> <li>• Hannah Sieveking (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Cromer, NSW)</li> <li>• Peter Wotton (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Ashfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Roger Dunk (Carlingford, NSW)</li> <li>• National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 15)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 30)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	
<b>Concerns around which exhibitions will be kept post-revitalisation</b>			
OP-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns around which exhibitions will be kept post-revitalisation. State that three exhibitions have been confirmed to be retained, however, there is no commitment or information about the other exhibits.</li> <li>• Concerns that the core exhibits give the museums identity and are being removed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name Withheld (St Leonards, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Croydon, NSW)</li> <li>• Ashleigh Berdebes (Forest Lodge, NSW)</li> <li>• Ian Nicol (Narrabeena, NSW)</li> <li>• David Payne (Glenbrook, NSW)</li> <li>• Kylie Winkworth (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to response P-ES2.</li> <li>• Programming of the museum is not a planning matter, with the Powerhouse responsible for the programming and delivery of exhibitions in accordance with its statutory functions under the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act (1945)</i>.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cassandra Sargeant (Glebe, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Hunters Hill, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Eltham North, VIC)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Woollahra, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Fairfield Heights, NSW)</li> <li>• Katelin Gregg (Exeter, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Rossmore, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Camperdown, NSW)</li> <li>• Savannah Thill-Turke (Watsons Bay, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Woronora, NSW)</li> <li>• Alec Smart (St Ives Chase, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Vaucluse, NSW)</li> <li>• Aylee Benham (Burwood Heights, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Wentworth Falls, NSW)</li> <li>• Melinda Mockridge (Kyneton, VIC)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Artarmon, NSW)</li> <li>• Sarah White (Kings Langley, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Pymont, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Double Bay, NSW)</li> <li>• Joshua Frank (Warrawee, NSW)</li> <li>• Jarvis Pitcher (Chippendale, NSW)</li> <li>• Ryan Miller (Oak Flats, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Earlwood, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Ashfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Tia Sweeney (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>• Holly Tam (Kellyville Ridge, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Glenhaven, NSW)</li> <li>• Hannah Sieveking (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Cromer, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (East Ryde, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Chatswood, NSW)</li> <li>• Neville Pleffer (Rooty Hill, NSW)</li> <li>• Australiana Society (Glebe, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Powerhouse will continue to present an exhibition program across the applied arts and applied sciences, that provides new levels of access to the Powerhouse Collection.</li> <li>• This program will feature many other very large objects, which have not been on public display before.</li> </ul>
General impacts on museum collection and exhibits		

OP-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on museum collection including removal, lack of surety around if they will be reimplemented, storage including location and level of care, and whether some exhibitions will be destroyed or never retained.</li> <li>• Concern that the removal of cultural industrial evolution of the area will be a result of the revitalisation. Concern regarding the requirement for the population to travel to Western Sydney to learn about the Powerhouse's history.</li> <li>• Concern that part of the Ultimo Collection will be moved to Castle Hill which is not as accessible at the Ultimo location.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jonathan Sanders (Cowan, NSW)</li> <li>• David Payne (Glenbrook, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Yarrawarrah, NSW)</li> <li>• Thomas Lockley (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Kylie Winkworth (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Annie Wale (Balmain, NSW)</li> <li>• Annette Keenan (Charnwood, ACT)</li> <li>• Kiri Valsamis (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Timothy Bidder (Sydney, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Fairy Meadow, NSW)</li> <li>• Jennifer Jungheim (Waverley, NSW)</li> <li>• Toner Stevenson (Camperdown, NSW)</li> <li>• Andrew Grant (Northbridge, NSW)</li> <li>• Robert Iacopetta (Fairfield Heights, NSW)</li> <li>• Adrienne Tunnicliffe (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Judith White (Tweed Heads, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Ashfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Sarah Thomson (Annandale, NSW)</li> <li>• Holly Tam (Kellyville Ridge, NSW)</li> <li>• Wilhelmina Krieger (Uralla, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Kensington, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Sydney, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (The Entrance, NSW)</li> <li>• Brad Hayne (Muswellbrook, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Kingsford, NSW)</li> <li>• Peter Murray (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Peter Wotton (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Balmain, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Wollongong, NSW)</li> <li>• Bryce Peterson (North Epping, NSW)</li> <li>• Glenn Harper (Greenwich, NSW)</li> <li>• Leigh Howlett (Lewisham, NSW)</li> <li>• Garry Horvai (Pennant Hills, NSW)</li> <li>• Roger Dunk (Carlingford, NSW)</li> <li>• Grace Cochrane (Summer Hill, NSW)</li> <li>• Jan Westlake (Ultimo, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programming of the museum is not a planning matter, with the Powerhouse responsible for the programming and delivery of exhibitions in accordance with its statutory functions under the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i>. This includes responsibilities to control, manage, protect and maintain items and property vested in the Powerhouse.</li> <li>• Whilst the programming of the Powerhouse is not a planning matter, the NSW Government has committed to retaining iconic Collection items at Ultimo as part of the revitalisation, including Boulton and Watt Steam Engine, Catalina, and Locomotive No. 1. This will include all necessary infrastructure required to support these items.</li> <li>• Powerhouse will continue to present an exhibition program across the applied arts and applied sciences, that provides new levels of access to the Powerhouse Collection. This program will feature many other very large objects, which have not been on public display before. The Powerhouse Curatorial team are developing new exhibition concepts for Ultimo and will commence detailed development once planning approval is in place.</li> <li>• The NSW Government has made a significant investment in the expansion and enhancement of its storage facility at Castle Hill, which will facilitate the safe and appropriate storage of collections both temporarily through the Powerhouse Ultimo Revitalisation, but also on an ongoing basis.</li> <li>• The Castle Hill facility is open to the public on weekends and is accessible by both public and private transport modes.</li> </ul>
------	---	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jacksons Landing Community Association (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	
<b>Impacts on education spaces and loss of educational value</b>			
OP-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some concerns around the lack of education spaces available for schools etc.</li> <li>• Belief that the removal of some exhibits will impact the educational value of the museum.</li> <li>• Lack of education spaces for children, particularly science.</li> <li>• Concern regarding accessibility of museum facilities for school children, particularly for regional school visits.</li> <li>• Loss of educational opportunities to learn about Powerhouse history at Ultimo and impacts on future school children.</li> <li>• Concern on reduction in students not being able to engage in STEM.</li> <li>• Reduction in education spaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thomas Lockley (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Toner Stevenson (Camperdown, NSW)</li> <li>• Adrienne Tunnicliffe (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Christina Sumner (Naremburn, NSW)</li> <li>• Holly Tam (Kellyville Ridge, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Kingsford, NSW)</li> <li>• Peter Wotton (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Ann Cairns (Paddington, NSW)</li> <li>• Jason Wheatley (Annandale, NSW)</li> <li>• Kath Elliot (Mosman, NSW)</li> <li>• Neville Pleffer (Rooty Hill, NSW)</li> <li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Additional Submission)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revitalised Powerhouse Ultimo will include a range of educational spaces for schools and life-long learners, including dedicated learning and program spaces in the Switch House.</li> <li>• The Powerhouse has an extensive learning program that is delivered across its sites and in schools. This program will significantly expand when Powerhouse Parramatta is operational and Powerhouse Ultimo is revitalised.</li> <li>• The revitalisation will ensure universal access to the site for all visitors.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request for clarification of the use of the education space on level 3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The learning spaces will be used by the Museum's Learning team to present programs connected to the exhibitions, Powerhouse Collection, STEM curriculum and the history of the site.</li> </ul>
<b>Removal of important historical objects</b>			
OP-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding the display of donated objects and the possibility of these items no longer being available for viewing at a museum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jacksons Landing Community Association (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programming of the museum is not a planning matter. The Powerhouse's collection is managed in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i>.</li> <li>• Powerhouse will continue to present an exhibition program across the applied arts and applied sciences, that provides new levels of access to the Powerhouse Collection.</li> </ul>

OP-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about the fate of the documentary archive and the library.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 25)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing library and archive space within Powerhouse Ultimo will remain in the Harwood Building.</li> </ul>
<b>Heritage and Cultural Impacts</b>			
<b>Impacts to the heritage and cultural values of the museum</b>			
OP-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns around the impacts on heritage values of the museum, including exhibits and the buildings on-site.</li> <li>Belief that the revitalisation will not successfully retain the heritage value of the existing museum.</li> <li>Concerns around impacts on the museum's cultural values, particularly through the removal of exhibits.</li> <li>Does not recognise the original design of the 1980s.</li> <li>Concern regarding the potential erasure of the original Powerhouse Museum legacy, its qualities, attributes, and functionality, as well as its innate, intrinsic and significant relationship to its collection and exhibits.</li> <li>Concern regarding the impact on the original power station structures, and the significance of the site as the home of the MAAS collection.</li> <li>Impact of the proposed works on the heritage value of the 1980's extension.</li> <li>Concern regarding the internal demolition of the original 1890s power station, with only selected retention of significant and internal elements, such as the gantries and cranes over the original Engine House.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (St Leonards, NSW)</li> <li>Jonathan Sanders (Cowan, NSW)</li> <li>Ashleigh Berdebes (Forest Lodge, NSW)</li> <li>Jennifer Sanders (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>David Payne (Glenbrook, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Yarrawarra, NSW)</li> <li>Thomas Lockley (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Kylie Winkworth (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>Cassandra Sargeant (Glebe, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Hunters Hill, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Woollahra, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Fairfield Heights, NSW)</li> <li>Katelin Gregg (Exeter, NSW)</li> <li>Lionel Glendenning (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>Kiri Valsamis (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Timothy Bidder (Sydney, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Rossmore, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Camperdown, NSW)</li> <li>Savannah Thill-Turke (Watsons Bay, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Woronora, NSW)</li> <li>Linda Lin (Strathfield, NSW)</li> <li>David Miller (Maroubra, NSW)</li> <li>Alec Smart (St Ives Chase, NSW)</li> <li>Jennifer Jungheim (Waverley, NSW)</li> <li>Toner Stevenson (Camperdown, NSW)</li> <li>Andrew Grant (Northbridge, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Vaucluse, NSW)</li> <li>Aylee Benham (Burwood Heights, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Wentworth Falls, NSW)</li> <li>Marianne Polkinghorne (Chippendale, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended Heritage Impact Statement at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report assesses the heritage impacts of the proposal, including the recent update of the State heritage listing off the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> <li>All heritage items are retained, including internal heritage features of the Heritage Core Buildings.</li> <li>Further to OP-1, the Amended HIS acknowledges the design intent of the c1980 internal mezzanines, exhibition structures and fit out whilst also identifying the heritage impacts of those structures on the heritage significance of the Heritage Core buildings. The heritage consultant assesses the proposed removal of those non-significant structures as a positive impact on the heritage significance of the Heritage Core buildings.</li> <li>The proposed works retain the distinctive arched roof form over Vault 1 of the Wran Building and interpret the arch over Vault 2 of the Wran Building into a full arch. The proposed works also retain the general scale of the Wran Building. As set out in the Amended HIS, it is the distinctive arched roof form (comprising of two arches) and the general scale which is expressly recognised in the Statement of Significance for the State heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex (Statement of Significance). The fabric of the Wran Building proposed to be removed is not identified in the Statement of Significance, nor is it assessed as having significance in the Amended HIS.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Melinda Mockridge (Kyneton, VIC)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Artarmon, NSW)</li> <li>• Sarah White (Kings Langley, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Robert Iacopetta (Fairfield Heights, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Double Bay, NSW)</li> <li>• Joshua Frank (Warrawee, NSW)</li> <li>• Jarvis Pitcher (Chippendale, NSW)</li> <li>• Ryan Miller (Oak Flats, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Earlwood, NSW)</li> <li>• Adrienne Tunnicliffe (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Judith White (Tweed Heads, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (St James, WA)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Ashfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Sarah Thomson (Annandale, NSW)</li> <li>• Christina Sumner (Naremburn, NSW)</li> <li>• Ewart John Fildes (Belrose, NSW)</li> <li>• Tia Sweeney (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>• Christopher Abbott (Taree, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Chatswood, NSW)</li> <li>• Lindsay Sharp (Foxground, NSW)</li> <li>• Glenn Harper (Greenwich, NSW)</li> <li>• Jacob Grossbard (Strathfield South, NSW)</li> <li>• Jason Wheatley (Annandale, NSW)</li> <li>• Michael Sanders (Hazelbrook, NSW)</li> <li>• Leigh Howlett (Lewisham, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Mona Vale, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Glebe, NSW)</li> <li>• Roger Dunk (Carlingford, NSW)</li> <li>• Catherine Black (Denistone, NSW)</li> <li>• Neville Pleffer (Rooty Hill, NSW)</li> <li>• Peter Bainbridge (Sydney, NSW)</li> <li>• Shirley Fitzgerald (Huskisson, NSW)</li> <li>• Jan Westlake (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• Alexander Swift (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Samuel Wilkins (Beacon Hill, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Glenhaven, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Powerhouse is responsible for the programming and delivery of exhibitions in accordance with its statutory functions under the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i>. This includes responsibilities to control, manage, protect and maintain items and property vested in the Powerhouse. No items within the collection are being destroyed or impacted as a result of the project.</li> <li>• Historically only around 3-5% of the Powerhouse's Collection has been on exhibition at any one time. The Powerhouse Program, including works at Castle Hill (completed), Parramatta (under construction) and Ultimo (this proposal) will significantly enhance the ability of the Powerhouse to display its Collection.</li> <li>• New and improved, flexible exhibition spaces supported by separated back of house and front of house operations will enable the Museum to present a dynamic program across the applied arts and applied sciences and change exhibitions regularly.</li> <li>• The works proposed within the existing power station buildings will not remove any items of heritage significance and as above, primarily involve the demolition and removal of non-significant 1980s fabric and interventions.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Donna Palmer (Lindfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Hannah Sieveking (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Cromer, NSW)</li> <li>• Christopher Roberts (Lilyfield, NSW)</li> <li>• Janice Evans (Jannali, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Sydney, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (The Entrance, NSW)</li> <li>• Brad Hayne (Muswellbrook, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Kingsford, NSW)</li> <li>• John Wade (Eglington, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Balmain, NSW)</li> <li>• Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li> <li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 3)</li> <li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Additional Submission)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 10)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 25)</li> </ul>	
OP-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that significant changes to the Boiler Hall, Turbine Hall and adjacent spaces remove connectivity and that this results in event spaces rather than exhibition displays.</li> <li>• Concern that the proposed layout to address fire safety can be resolved with a better outcome without compromising the existing connectivity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confusion caused by the lack of separation between visitor circulation and back-of-house operations coupled with the legibility of spaces throughout the museum was a daily source of negative feedback from Powerhouse visitors and audiences. The scheme prioritises the visitor experience by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Reorientating the museum entrance to The Goods Line.</li> <li>– Establishing one central, intuitive, and accessible visitor circulation system to access exhibition, program, and education spaces to support the visitor experience.</li> <li>– Separating front-of-house and back-of-house operations from exhibition and circulation spaces.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The design will also deliver upgrades required to safeguard the Powerhouse Collection, meet Building Code of Australia (BCA) and Disability</li> </ul>

			Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth) (DDA) requirements and improve operations.
OP-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the proposed internal layout removes the Powerhouse's function as a museum and the proposed layout is seeking to operate as a function centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal creates new and improved flexible international standard exhibition spaces that can support and adapt to new and dynamic programs that facilitate direct connections with Powerhouse Collections are essential for the museum's future. The proposal will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Increase international curatorial partnership opportunities for the museum.</li> <li>– Improve environmental conditioning for Collection exhibition.</li> <li>– Enable the Powerhouse to create and present high quality, internationally leading museum exhibitions across the applied arts and applied sciences.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
OP-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the external west wall of the Turbine Hall will be hidden behind the proposed elements, and this will conceal the 1980s steel framing of the Galleria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report assesses the columns of the 1980s steel framing of the Galleria as non-significant internal fabric and supports the opening of views to original fabric of the Heritage Core buildings of heritage significance.</li> </ul>
OP-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Powerhouse was purpose-built to house artefacts the history of Ultimo.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst it is recognised that the original development of Powerhouse Ultimo was purpose-designed for the display of the Powerhouse collection, there has been extensive modifications to this original design since opening. A number of the design changes have been made to amend, alter or enhance the functionality of the museum.</li> <li>The Statement of Significance for the Powerhouse Museum Complex also notes that after the fire destroyed the Garden Palace within the Botanic Gardens in 1882, most of the collection was lost but the Technology Museum was reestablished in the Agricultural Hall near the State Library. The museum then moved to the Sydney Technological Museum</li> </ul>

			<p>in Ultimo, followed by the Powerhouse when it was opened as a 'gift to the people of NSW'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed design seeks to continue the evolution of Powerhouse Ultimo to ensure the collection can continued to be displayed for contemporary audience whilst providing inherent flexibility to allow a larger proportion of the collection to be displayed.</li> <li>• As set out in the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b>, the State of Significance for the Powerhouse Museum Complex expressly recognises the need for the museum '<i>...to continually evolve in response to contemporary museum standards</i>'.</li> </ul>
<b>The Heritage Impact Statement is insufficient</b>			
OP-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that there was a lack of expert architectural input into the assessment of the Hardwood Building and tram depot buildings' heritage significance.</li> <li>• Concern that the HIS was not completed by an expert.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 15)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Harwood Building is located outside of the SSDA site and is not the subject of this application.</li> <li>• The NSW Government has committed to the Harwood Building remaining under the ownership of Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences.</li> <li>• The Heritage Impact Statement and Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> of this Submissions and Amendments Report has been authored by appropriately qualified experts and in accordance with Heritage NSW guidelines.</li> <li>• The Amended HIS assesses the impacts of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the Harwood Building as a result of the listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> </ul>
OP-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expression that the Heritage Impact Statement does not provide adequate detail on the extent of proposed changes.</li> <li>• Expression that the architectural plans do not provide adequate detail and that they are confusing.</li> <li>• Expression that the design intent cannot be fully understood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 15)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report provides a detailed assessment of the heritage impacts of the proposal.</li> <li>• All architectural drawings have been prepared in accordance with planning requirements. Detailed construction drawings would be</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Expression that the EIS does not describe the proposal adequately.</li></ul>		<p>prepared prior to the issue of the relevant Crown Certificate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Detailed information regarding the design intent and approach is set out in the Design Report (<b>Appendix E</b> to EIS).</li></ul>
OP-17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concern that the revitalisation is based on the premise that the 1988 buildings and alterations have not been accurately evaluated from a heritage significance perspective.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li><li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Additional Submission)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The built form of Powerhouse Ultimo has been significantly modified since its opening in 1988. Key changes to the museum since its opening are outlined in the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report</li><li>• The Amended HIS provided at <b>Appendix L</b> assesses the heritage impacts of the proposed development having regard to the revised State heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li></ul>
OP-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concern that the removal of glazing at the ends of the vaults and the construction of the lifts at the southern end of the buildings will adversely impact the building's architectural quality.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> which assesses the heritage impacts of the proposed development having regard to the revised State heritage listing and in particular the Statement of Significance in respect of the Wran Building.</li><li>• The entire extent of clerestory glazing on the east side of the galleria is intended to be retained. Light will permeate the space through the porous 'Aluivent' lining panels.</li><li>• Opposite on the northern end another opening allows for light and views to enter the galleria from the new courtyard space that opens onto Harris Street. A high-figured window is also located in the arched gable at the southern end of the Galleria.</li></ul>
OP-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concern that the existing light-filled void of the Galleria will be lost through proposed glazing and proposed new levels.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li></ul>	
Conservation guidance is required			
OP-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A Conservation Management Plan was not exhibited in the development documents.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li><li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 4)</li><li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li><li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A Conservation Management Plan was prepared in 2022 (the CMP) in accordance with the NSW Heritage Council's <i>Statement of best practice for conservation management plans</i> (2021), <i>Guidance on developing a heritage conservation management plan</i> (2021) and the</li></ul>

OP-21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the Heritage Impact Statement is dismissive of the previous Conservation Management Plan (CMP) prepared in 2003.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	<p>Burra Charter, and the CMP remains relevant to the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Statement of Heritage Impact provided at Appendix U of the EIS, and the Amended HIS provided at <b>Appendix L</b> of the Submissions and Amendments Report, were informed by the preparation of the CMP, consider the relevant recommendations of the CMP and include the gradings of significance in respect of the Heritage Core buildings.</li> <li>In the context of Article 4.1 of the Burra Charter, the Amended HIS acknowledges the extensive history of heritage studies undertaken in respect of the site.</li> <li>Gradings of significance in respect of the Wran Building have been prepared in response to the revised State heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex and included in the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> of the Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> <li>The changes that have occurred to the Wran Building since 1988 are also included in the Amended HIS.</li> <li>The CMP is publicly available on the Planning Portal in respect of the surrendered Concept Plan approval for the Powerhouse Ultimo.</li> </ul>
OP-22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the revised CMP finalised in 2022 as part of the Stage 1 Concept SSD did not provide significant gradings for the Wran.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	
OP-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the draft CMP prepared by Curio did not include adequate research on the heritage fabric of the Powerhouse and did not clearly explain the changes that have occurred since 1988.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	
OP-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expression that the draft CMP prepared by Curio did not acknowledge the original design intent and principles of Glendenning, Johnson and Sharp.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	
OP-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the updated draft CMP as noted in the Heritage Impact Statement, has not been made publicly available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	
OP-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that a CMP is required for the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	
OP-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expression that clarity should be provided in the HIS of what are extracts from the draft CMP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	
OP-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the HIS should detail CMP policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	
OP-29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the draft CMP has resulted in an outcome that is not reflective of the importance of the Powerhouse Museum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	

#### Heritage Significance of Powerhouse

OP-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expression that the heritage significance of the Powerhouse Museum is not clearly communicated.</li> <li>Belief that the State heritage listing should be applied to the entire site.</li> <li>Belief that the proposal removes the Powerhouses heritage values.</li> <li>Dissatisfaction with the Cracknell and Lonergan firm reporting on the heritage listing of the Powerhouse.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> <li>Australiana Society (Glebe, NSW)</li> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li> <li>Name Withheld (August Public Submission 1)</li> <li>Name Withheld (August Public Submission 2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NSW Heritage Minister listed the Powerhouse Ultimo Complex on the State heritage register on 12 July 2024.</li> <li>An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> which assesses the heritage impacts of the proposed development having regard to the revised State-Heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> <li>The Amended HIS sets out reasons as to why the proposal increases the heritage values of</li> </ul>
-------	---	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dissatisfaction with the exemptions to the 12 July Heritage Listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex (SHR No. 02045).</li> </ul>		<p>the Powerhouse including by reference to how the proposed works take into consideration all of the layers the Powerhouse's multifaceted history from First Nations cultural and spiritual connection to the site; early 19<sup>th</sup> century development and the industrial heritage of the site as NSW's first large scale power station including for the powering of the tram system; the 1988 adaptive reuse of the museum and the impact of the Bicentenary on First Nations people; as well the need for ongoing change to the museum to ensure it meets the needs of visitors across NSW, interstate and internationally as well as for future generations.</p>
OP-31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that the changes since the 1980s have gradually diminished the aesthetics and functionality of the museum. However, concern is expressed regarding the process of the guidelines and policies in the drafted CMP and belief that adequate policies would have resulted in an overall improved outcome.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 15)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The built form of Powerhouse Ultimo has been significantly modified since its opening in 1988. Key changes to the museum since its opening are outlined in the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report.</li> <li>The Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> assesses the heritage impacts of the proposed development having regard to the revised State Heritage listing and sets out the reasons why the proposed development will result in an improved heritage outcome for the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> </ul>

#### Harwood Building

OP-32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the Harwood Building is of heritage significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Australiana Society (Glebe, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Harwood Building is located outside of the SSDA site and is not the subject of this application.</li> </ul>
OP-33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the Harwood Building is being sold.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Harwood Building is an office, storage, loading and workshop facility owned by the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences. As above, it also includes the library for the museum. It will continue to be used to support the operation of the museum.</li> </ul>
OP-34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the Harwood Building should have been included in the project due to its heritage significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	
OP-35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the Harwood Building is being divested from the Powerhouse precinct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	

OP-36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the proposed loading dock at the Switch House is reflective of the Harwood Building being decoupled from the Powerhouse Museum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	
OP-37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the Harwood Building should continue to be used as the engine room.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 1)</li> </ul>	The Harwood Building is an office, storage, loading and workshop facility owned by the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences. It will continue to be used to support the operation of the museum.
<b>Positive Heritage Outcomes</b>			
OP-38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The continuing use of the Ultimo site as the Powerhouse Museum</li> <li>The exposing of the original elevations to the Switch House and Boiler House through the removal of later additions</li> <li>The engagement with the Goods Line and connection to Darling Harbour as a new public entry to the site that was not feasible at the time of the original construction</li> <li>The removal of the later pitched roof to the Switch House to reveal its original form</li> <li>Conservation of original structural elements associated with the former power station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>The Wran Building</b>			
OP-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the Wran Building and Galleria sections of the museum should be assessed and are likely of "State Significance".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NSW Heritage Minister listed the Powerhouse Ultimo Complex on the state heritage register on 12 July 2024.</li> <li>As set out above at OP-10, the proposed works retain the distinctive arched roof form over Vault 1 of the Wran Building and interpret the arch over Vault 2 of the Wran Building into a full arch. The proposed works also retain the general scale of the Wran Building. As set out in the Amended HIS, it is the distinctive arched roof form (comprising of two arches) and the general scale which is expressly recognised in the Statement of Significance for the Powerhouse Museum Complex. The fabric of the Wran Building proposed to be removed is not identified in the Statement of Significance,</li> </ul>

			nor is it assessed as having significance in the Amended HIS.
OP-40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear what elements of Wran are being retained.</li> <li>Wran appears to be concealed by new elements of the proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> which assesses the heritage impacts of the proposed development having regard to the revised State Heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> <li>Structural sequencing diagrams are included at <b>Appendix H</b> to this Submissions Report that outline the proposed elements of the Wran to be demolished and the sequencing of the proposed works.</li> <li>The view impacts of the proposed development are summarised at CoS4 above. As set out above, the proposed works reveal new views to the Wran Building from Macarthur Street that are currently largely obscured by the street wall forming part of the Harris Street courtyard.</li> </ul>
OP-41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the Wran is unnecessarily truncated to the south and the replacement with masonry diminishes the identity of the Sulman Award-winning title.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> which assesses the heritage impacts of the proposed development having regard to the revised State Heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> <li>As set out above in OP-39, it is the distinctive arched roof form and general scale of the Wran Building which is expressly identified in the revised State heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex. The proposed change in materiality of the Wran Building to brick seeks to acknowledge these elements of the building recognised of heritage significance but also to balance the impact of the Wran Building on the heritage significance of the Heritage Core buildings through the use of brick as a sympathetic materiality. The proposed change in materiality also seeks to incorporate First Nations co-design particularly through the incorporation of the stratigraphy of the land in pattern of the brickwork. As set out in the Amended HIS, the acknowledgement of Bicentenary landmarks</li> </ul>

			<p>also needs to be considered in the context of the impact of the Bicentenary on First Nations people. The proposed First Nations Connecting with Country design narrative seeks to incorporate First Nations perspectives and inclusiveness into the design of the Powerhouse Museum Complex, including in respect to the Wran Building, whilst taking into consideration all of the layers of the history of the site as set out in OP-30.</p>
OP-42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wran Legacy would be destroyed.</li> <li>• Concern that the proposal will diminish the legacy of the Wran.</li> <li>• Belief that the proposal will diminish the 1988 building's architectural value.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li> <li>• Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 10)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> which assesses the heritage impacts of the proposed development having regard to the revised State Heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex.</li> <li>• The built form of Powerhouse Ultimo, including the Wran Building, has been significantly modified since its opening in 1988. Key changes to the museum since its opening are outlined in the Amended Design Report <b>Appendix F</b> and the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> <li>• The Amended HIS sets out in detail how the associative significance of the Wran Building with former NSW Premier Neville Wran, Minister of Works and Deputy Premier Jack Ferguson, Principal design architect Lionel Glendenning, exhibitions design and director Richard Johnson, Powerhouse Museum Director Dr Lindsay Sharp, the NSW Public Works Department and Government Architect's officer Norman Harwood will be maintained.</li> <li>• As set out above at OP-39 and OP-41, the elements of the Wran Building with recognised aesthetic and technical significance, comprising the distinctive arched roof form and general scale are retained under the proposal.</li> <li>• Furthermore, the use of the Wran Building for the purposes of the museum will continue under the proposed development and is</li> </ul>

			<p>proposed to be enhanced through the removal of the internal office fit out within the 'central spine' and other non-significant internal fit out. The proposed works will reveal the vaulted roof forms internally, including the interpretation of the arch over Vault 2, as a combined open exhibition space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended HIS sets out further that the recognised associative significance of the Wran Building with the above leading design figures can continue to be interpreted and celebrated as part of the interpretation of the site's history and evolution through future museum programs and in particular through a book and a permanent exhibition within the museum itself.</li> </ul>
OP-43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the new design of the Galleria removes the focus on natural light and that the new design is too closed off.</li> <li>Suggestion for the Galleria space to retain windows at each end to maintain natural light access.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended Design Report at <b>Appendix F</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report provides clarification regarding the provision of natural light to the Galleria.</li> <li>As set out in the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b>, the current glazed façade of the Wran Building was tinted black to facilitate the conversion of the building for exhibition space (which had originally been designed as the entry point to the museum). As set out in the Amended Design Report, the proposed change in materiality and design has sought to address the deterioration of that glazed fabric and meet the ongoing needs of the museum for a continuation of exhibition space within the Wran Building.</li> </ul>
OP-44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the vaulted roofs will be brick and not retained as metal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li> </ul>	<p>The vaulted roofs to the Wran Building will be retained as metal including the proposed interpretation of the arched roof form over Vault 2 to a full arch in metal.</p>
OP-45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern the overall revitalisation should be undertaken by architects who have better suited experience to the site.</li> <li>Expression that better notice should be taken of the Burra Charter.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is being undertaken with the input from a range of experts all with appropriate qualifications.</li> <li>The Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> assessed the proposed development as a result of the State</li> </ul>

			heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex and includes an assessment under the Burra Charter.
OP-46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the Heritage Impact Statement HIS does not provide a detailed assessment of the impacts on the Wran, particularly built fabric.</li> <li>• Concern about the visual connection to the Galleria outside.</li> <li>• Belief that a better fit-out can be achieved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Amended HIS is provided at <b>Appendix L</b> which assesses the heritage impacts of the proposed development having regard to the revised State heritage listing of the Powerhouse Museum Complex and in particular the built fabric of the Wran Building.</li> </ul>
<b>Conservation Management Plan (CMP)</b>			
OP-47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion that a new Conservation Management Plan should be prepared in collaboration with the Powerhouse Museum Architect (Lionel Glendenning).</li> <li>• Suggestion that Alan Croker of Design 5 is re-engaged to complete the CMP to ensure conservation of the Powerhouse Museum.</li> <li>• The CMP should include conservation policies to give effect to the Powerhouse Museum Design Principles developed with Lionel Glendenning and Richard Johnson.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> relies on the CMP.</li> <li>• A CMP is not required to be lodged with the application.</li> </ul>
<b>Tourism</b>			
OP-48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns around tourism impacts during revitalisation, particularly once completed. Belief that tourists will be turned away due to the changes in exhibition spaces and the exhibits themselves.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thomas Lockley (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Adrienne Tunnicliffe (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Bryce Peterson (North Epping, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 11)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal will deliver new international standard exhibition space and increase international curatorial partnership opportunities for the museum to present programs across the applied arts and applied sciences. This will provide a world class museum that can contribute to the NSW visitor economy.</li> </ul>
<b>Biodiversity Impacts and Sustainability</b>			
<b>Loss of trees impacting the homes of birds</b>			
OP-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns around the removal of trees leading to a loss of habitat for native birds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Biodiversity Development Assessment Report Waiver has been issued due to the lack of impact on biodiversity.</li> <li>• The trees proposed to be removed are not native species.</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal includes the planting of 41 new trees, native species that will be more tolerant to Sydney climate and/or endemic to the area. This will improve biodiversity on site.</li> </ul>
<b>Belief that reconstruction of some exhibitions is not sustainable</b>			
OP-50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that it doesn't make sense to rebuild some of the exhibits as it is not sustainable, particularly the steam infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (St Leonards, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Croydon, NSW)</li> <li>Ashleigh Berdebes (Forest Lodge, NSW)</li> <li>Cassandra Sargeant (Glebe, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Hunters Hill, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Woollahra, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Rossmore, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Camperdown, NSW)</li> <li>Savannah Thill-Turke (Watsons Bay, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Woronora, NSW)</li> <li>Linda Lin (Strathfield, NSW)</li> <li>Alec Smart (St Ives Chase, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Vaucluse, NSW)</li> <li>Aylee Benham (Burwood Heights, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Wentworth Falls, NSW)</li> <li>Melinda Mockridge (Kyneton, VIC)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Artarmon, NSW)</li> <li>Sarah White (Kings Langley, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Double Bay, NSW)</li> <li>Joshua Frank (Warrawee, NSW)</li> <li>Jarvis Pitcher (Chippendale, NSW)</li> <li>Ryan Miller (Oak Flats, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Earlwood, NSW)</li> <li>Tia Sweeney (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Glenhaven, NSW)</li> <li>Hannah Sieveking (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Cromer, NSW)</li> <li>Docomomo Australia (Fairfield, VIC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historically only around 3-5% of the Powerhouse's collection has been available for display at any one time. The Powerhouse Program, including works at Castle Hill (completed), Parramatta (under construction) and Ultimo (this proposal) will significantly enhance the ability of the Powerhouse to display its collection. A critical component of the Powerhouse Program is ensuring that physical infrastructure can be programmed in a manner to allow dynamism and change in exhibits, in order to better share with the community its collection in a relevant and engaging manner. Without this critical functionality, the community would have less access to the collection, and the displayed collection would remain static and less engaging to visitors.</li> <li>As outlined in the ESD Report at Appendix BB to the EIS, the project will achieve a 5-star Green Star rating with an aspiration to achieve 6 stars.</li> <li>The functionality for steam-based Collection items to be exhibited at Powerhouse Ultimo will remain.</li> </ul>
<b>Transparency and Impacts to Adjacent Residents</b>			

## Distrust of Government approach to Powerhouse Revitalisation

OP-51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the Government has reneged on its promise to save the museum, believing that this revitalisation demolishes the architecture and legacy of the Powerhouse.</li> <li>• Opinion that representatives at the engagement session failed to give clear indications that the same floor space if not more would be available for the permanent exhibitions.</li> <li>• Unsatisfaction expressed by the plan announced by the CEO to retain some the existing exhibitions.</li> <li>• Belief that the government is trying to mislead the public by saying the exhibition spaces will be larger or of increased quality and flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Payne (Glenbrook, NSW)</li> <li>• Kylie Winkworth (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Annie Wale (Balmain, NSW)</li> <li>• Lionel Glendenning (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>• Annette Keenan (Charnwood, ACT)</li> <li>• Kiri Valsamis (Pymont, NSW)</li> <li>• Jennifer Jungheim (Waverley, NSW)</li> <li>• Donald Denoon (Pymont, NSW)</li> <li>• Adrienne Tunnicliffe (Pymont, NSW)</li> <li>• Judith White (Tweed Heads, NSW)</li> <li>• Janice Evans (Jannali, NSW)</li> <li>• Brad Hayne (Muswellbrook, NSW)</li> <li>• John Wade (Eglington, NSW)</li> <li>• Andrew Gee (Neutral Bay, NSW)</li> <li>• Christopher Abbott (Taree, NSW)</li> <li>• Jacob Grossbard (Strathfield South, NSW)</li> <li>• John Peterson (Sassafras, VIC)</li> <li>• Leigh Howlett (Lewisham, NSW)</li> <li>• Ian Bull (Stanmore, NSW)</li> <li>• Garry Horvai (Pennant Hills, NSW)</li> <li>• Shirley Fitzgerald (Huskisson, NSW)</li> <li>• Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• Pymont Action Inc (Pymont, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> <li>• Pymont Action Inc (Additional Submission)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 12)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 17)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 23)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NSW Government announced in September 2023 a revised project budget of \$250 million for a heritage revitalisation of Powerhouse Ultimo. Infrastructure NSW has been tasked with delivery of this project in accordance with the revised scope and budget.</li> <li>• A quantitative comparison between the existing areas of the museum and the proposed areas ignores qualitative considerations of the spaces in terms of clarity of circulation and the ability of spaces to offer contained exhibitions. The positive heritage impacts of removing non-significant or otherwise intrusive structures within the Heritage Core buildings as set out in OP-1 is also not factored in a quantitative comparison.</li> <li>• The Powerhouse Ultimo Revitalisation will significantly enhance the capacity of the site to present dynamic, engaging, and relevant exhibitions across the applied arts and applied sciences. The proposal seeks to provide spaces that are suitable to accommodate the diversity of the Powerhouse Collection.</li> <li>• The revitalisation of Powerhouse Ultimo Revitalisation is occurring within the context of the wider Powerhouse program that includes the recent expansion of Powerhouse Castle Hill and the establishment of Powerhouse Parramatta (under construction) – together these facilities represent a significant expansion of the Powerhouse's museum spaces and overall capacity to deliver programming with increased diversity, reach, and relevance to the community.</li> <li>• See OP-41 and OP-42 above regarding how the proposed development takes into consideration all aspects of the heritage significance of the Powerhouse Museum Complex, including maintaining the associative significance of leading design figures with the c1988 adaptive reuse of the site as a museum.</li> </ul>
-------	---	---	---

OP-52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dissatisfaction that engagement wasn't followed up when Australiana Society gave feedback.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Australiana Society (Glebe, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All feedback received by the Project Team during preparation of the EIS has been considered in the preparation of the EIS, as documented within the EIS and accompanying technical studies as exhibited.</li> </ul>
OP-53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that the key documents including the plans for Ultimo and Parramatta are publicly released including business cases, the competition design brief as well as the facilities brief for Powerhouse.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All relevant documents relating to the revitalisation of Powerhouse Ultimo were made available as part of the public exhibition of the SSDA in May 2024.</li> <li>The Business Case is Cabinet in Confidence. A summary of the Business Case is publicly available at <a href="https://www.infrastructure.nsw.gov.au/investor-assurance/business-case-summaries/">https://www.infrastructure.nsw.gov.au/investor-assurance/business-case-summaries/</a></li> <li>The Competition Design brief was prepared for the now surrendered Concept Plan and does not form part of this SSDA.</li> </ul>
OP-54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the key stakeholders meeting on 27 May 2024 did not result in accurate meeting minutes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Additional Submission)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actions rather than minutes of this meeting were provided to participants for review following this session.</li> </ul>
OP-55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the government should restart the project with a more transparent approach and lead with more professionalism as well as more engagement undertaken with communities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Additional Submission)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SSDA has been developed in accordance with all relevant legislation.</li> <li>The consultation process has been undertaken in accordance with the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's <i>Undertaking Engagement Guidelines for State Significant Projects</i>.</li> </ul>
OP-56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagreement that the draft findings on the significance of the Powerhouse buildings and their relationship to the MAAS collection, Design 5 Architects commission was terminated in March 2022. Disagreements that the draft report was not publicly exhibited despite the authors of the to-be-completed CMP at community and stakeholder consultations.</li> <li>The draft report was forwarded to Create NSW and is titled Draft April 2022, prepared by Design 5 – Architects, of which I am the founding director and principal author of the report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report details the heritage impacts of the proposals.</li> <li>The CMP does not form part of the documents that comprise the SSDA.</li> </ul>

OP-57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the process and the result are completely against all principles articulated in the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Submissions Report details the heritage impacts of the proposals.</li> </ul>
<b>Unnecessary spending of taxpayer money (too costly)</b>			
OP-58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the cost of the revitalisation is too much and is better spent elsewhere.</li> <li>Belief that the cost is not justified by the proposed benefits of the project.</li> <li>Belief that the outcome of this renewal must simply be a better museum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jonathan Sanders (Cowan, NSW)</li> <li>Jennifer Sanders (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>Ian Nicol (Narrabeena, NSW)</li> <li>David Payne (Glenbrook, NSW)</li> <li>Thomas Lockley (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Kylie Winkworth (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>Annie Wale (Balmain, NSW)</li> <li>Kiri Valsamis (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Timothy Bidder (Sydney, NSW)</li> <li>Jennifer Jungheim (Waverley, NSW)</li> <li>Toner Stevenson (Camperdown, NSW)</li> <li>Andrew Grant (Northbridge, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (St James, WA)</li> <li>Ewart John Fildes (Belrose, NSW)</li> <li>Donna Palmer (Lindfield, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Sydney, NSW)</li> <li>John Wade (Eglington, NSW)</li> <li>Andrew Gee (Neutral Bay, NSW)</li> <li>Christopher Abbott (Taree, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Tennyson Point, NSW)</li> <li>Nigel Pearson (Revesby, NSW)</li> <li>Bryce Peterson (North Epping, NSW)</li> <li>Lindsay Sharp (Foxground, NSW)</li> <li>Jacob Grossbard (Strathfield South, NSW)</li> <li>Ian Bull (Stanmore, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Mona Vale, NSW)</li> <li>Mary Winkler (Bexley, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Glebe, NSW)</li> <li>Shirley Fitzgerald (Huskisson, NSW)</li> <li>Bronwyn Hanna (Canterbury, NSW)</li> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>Pyrmont Action Inc (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project expenditure is a matter for the NSW Government and is not relevant to the planning assessment process.</li> <li>The scope for the proposal has been determined as the most suitable way of meeting the project-specific and site-specific objectives as outlined in the EIS.</li> <li>The EIS and the Response to Submissions set out in detail how the proposed development will result in a better museum particularly in terms of removal of current operational constraints, large and flexible exhibition spaces, improved heritage outcomes as set out in the Amended HIS and improved landscaped public domain and reactivation of Harris Street, Macarthur Street and the Goods Line.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jacksons Landing Community Association (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 1)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> <li>• Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Additional Submission)</li> <li>• Pyrmont Action Inc (Additional Submission)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 17)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 18)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 28)</li> </ul>	
<b>Suitability and Cost</b>			
OP-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the Powerhouse Museum requires catch-up maintenance, a refresh, a re-orientation to the Goods Line, and an upgrade, but to remain as a functioning world-class Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, it is not cost-effective to transform the Powerhouse precinct as it is proposed.</li> <li>• Belief that the Powerhouse should be able to remain open to the public during the revitalisation process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design 5-Architects Pty Ltd (Enmore, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project expenditure is a matter for the NSW Government and is not relevant to the planning assessment process.</li> <li>• The scope for the proposal has been determined as the most suitable way of meeting the project-specific and site-specific objectives as outlined in the EIS</li> </ul>
OP-60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request to identify where the CIV is in the SSDA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Executive Summary of the Estimated Development Cost was published with the exhibition of the SSDA and remains on the Major Projects Portal.</li> </ul>
<b>Concerns about the merit of the development application</b>			
OP-61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the EIS does not fully represent the impacts of the revitalisation and does not completely reference the strong level of opposition to the proposal.</li> <li>• Some concern around the qualifications of the authors in museum EIS experience.</li> <li>• Belief that the EIS is incomplete, inaccurate, and misleading.</li> <li>• The recent, very successful, “Ramses and the Gold of the Pharaohs” exhibition at the Australia Museum was</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jonathan Sanders (Cowan, NSW)</li> <li>• Thomas Lockley (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>• Kylie Winkworth (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Lionel Glendenning (Russell Lea, NSW)</li> <li>• John Peterson (Sassafras, VIC)</li> <li>• Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>• National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIS has been prepared in line with relevant legislation and guidelines.</li> <li>• The consultation process has been undertaken in accordance with the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's <i>Undertaking Engagement Guidelines for State Significant Projects</i>.</li> <li>• The Ramses exhibition was at the Australian Museum, not at the Powerhouse, and is only one of many different touring exhibits each</li> </ul>

	<p>arranged in a number of medium size spaces located on 2 different levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The details of the proposal are unclear. Request that exhibition and display areas be outlined as to what will be there.</li> <li>Clarity requested on the function of the Museum.</li> <li>More detail is requested on the current collection beyond the retention of key items.</li> <li>Request for internal illustrations and descriptions of the proposed flexible exhibition spaces.</li> <li>Information is outdated and has inaccuracies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 23)</li> </ul>	<p>with their own spatial requirements. Providing large, flexible spaces allows for the temporary creation of smaller spaces, whilst retaining flexibility to also accommodate exhibits requiring larger spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIS includes detailed plans and descriptions of the proposed outcome</li> <li>Details of the museum function are set out in the EIS and Submissions Report, to the extent that they relate to the land use and planning assessment.</li> <li>Final Architectural Plans are provided at <b>Appendix E</b>.</li> </ul>
OP-62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESD Report is misleading, incomplete and suboptimal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li> </ul>	<p>The ESD Report (as submitted with the EIS), has been prepared in line with the requirements of the Issued Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs), the State Environmental Planning Policy (Sustainable Buildings) 202 and clauses 35BA and 35C of the <i>Environmental Planning &amp; Assessment Regulation 2021</i> and addresses the relevant controls for sustainability. Refer to the Submissions and Amendments Report which includes an update on sustainability measures.</p>
OP-64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of information regarding a design brief, business case for architects facilities brief, master plan, design brief, operational plan or exhibition plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> <li>Pyrmont Action Inc (Additional Submission)</li> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Additional Submission)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Business Case is Cabinet in Confidence. A summary of the Business Case is publicly available at <a href="https://www.infrastructure.nsw.gov.au/investor-assurance/business-case-summaries/">https://www.infrastructure.nsw.gov.au/investor-assurance/business-case-summaries/</a></li> <li>The brief for consultants engaged on the project is not a planning related matter.</li> <li>The SSDA meets all relevant legislation and guidelines for the development proposed.</li> <li>Operations and exhibitions plans will be developed by Powerhouse prior to operation and are not required to be submitted for approval as part of this SSDA.</li> </ul>
OP-65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for GFA of the creative industry spaces.</li> <li>Belief that the GFA plans are inaccurate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Additional Submission)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Architectural Plans are provided at <b>Appendix E</b> to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GFA calculations have been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Sydney LEP 2012.</li> </ul>
OP-66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion for GFA schedules in the architectural plans.</li> <li>Belief there is no accurate GFA Schedule.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per OP-65</li> </ul>
OP-67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the architectural plans are not to scale and are not 'actual' plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All plans exhibited as part of the SSDA include a scale and meet the requirements of the SEARs and legislation.</li> </ul>
OP-68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification on the floor space in the Wran building (exhibition space three).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Final Architectural Plans are provided at <b>Appendix E</b> to this Submissions Report provide areas for all exhibition spaces.</li> </ul>
OP-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the plans do not comply with the WCAG 2.0 accessibility standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 23)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plans submitted with the SSDA comply with all relevant Department of Planning, Housing and Industry requirements.</li> </ul>
OP-70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the site plan is inaccurate (page 22). Belief that the plan does not acknowledge 95 unit powerhouse apartments at 82 Mary Ann Street. Concern that these apartments will be directly impacted by the proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 23)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to all neighbouring properties are accurately described and assessed within the EIS.</li> </ul>
OP-71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the EIS does not recognise Omnibus Lane as the car park exit for 82 Mary Street. Concern that this omission as the proposed entry on Macarthur Street will significantly impact residents' ability to exit their homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 23)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal will not impact upon access to or from the car park for 82 Mary Ann Street via Omnibus Lane.</li> <li>As detailed in the Amended Transport Impact Statement at <b>Appendix O</b>, the southern end of the Harwood Building (nearest to Mary Ann Street) does not include any changes to loading dock access or Macarthur Street/Omnibus Lane. Loading dock access is proposed via Macarthur Street at the northern end of the Harwood Building. See <b>Appendix O</b> for further details and a swept path analysis.</li> </ul>
OP-72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the viewpoint and shadow analysis (pages 73-79) of the EIS diminishes the impacts on residents at 82 Mary Ann Street. This Street is not mentioned.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 23)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Amended Visual Impact Assessment (<b>Appendix P</b>) and Amended Design Report (<b>Appendix F</b>) detailing shadow impacts are appended to this Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All impacts from the proposal are accurately represented within these documents and assessed as part of the EIS and Submissions and Amendments Report.</li> </ul>
<b>Lack of and distrust in the consultation process</b>			
OP-73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the concerns of those opposed have not been adequately addressed and therefore ignored.</li> <li>Some distrust in what was presented at consultation events compared to the submitted EIS.</li> <li>Some believe that there was a lack of public consultation and active participation.</li> <li>Inaccurate stakeholder meeting minutes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thomas Lockley (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Kylie Winkworth (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>Kiri Valsamis (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Timothy Bidder (Sydney, NSW)</li> <li>Andrew Grant (Northbridge, NSW)</li> <li>Brad Hayne (Muswellbrook, NSW)</li> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign Ms Patricia Johnson, Mr Jean-Pierre Alexandre (Additional Submission)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 14)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultation process has been undertaken in accordance with the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's <i>Undertaking Engagement Guidelines for State Significant Projects</i>.</li> </ul>
OP-75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential view impacts to surrounding neighbours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Chatswood, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Visual Impact Assessment has been prepared that clearly responds to the visual impact of the development, following all relevant statutory guidance and caselaw regarding to visual impact. This VIA concludes that there is limited visual impact to surrounding neighbours given the urban environment.</li> <li>A revised VIA has been provided at <b>Appendix P</b>.</li> </ul>
OP-76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The belief that the proposal breaches The Museums own Museum of Applied Arts and Science Act, the Burra Charta and the recent decision of the NSW Heritage Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance Newtown.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliance with the requirements of the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i> is required by that act and is not a relevant planning matter. Notwithstanding this, the lodgement of an SSDA in accordance with the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1970</i> (NSW) is not a breach of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945 (NSW).</li> <li>The Amended HIS in <b>Appendix L</b> sets out how the proposed development addresses the requirements of the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> and relevant guidelines, including the Burra</li> </ul>



			<p>Charter and feedback of the NSW Heritage Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See also HC-1 to HC-10 inclusive above.</li> </ul>
OP-77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the UTS Submission is a conflict of interest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 22)</li> </ul>	<p>There is no conflict preventing UTS from making a submission on this application.</p>
<b>Requested Extension of the public exhibition process</b>			
OP-78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public submissions requesting a public exhibition period extension, some attributed the request to due to costing errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 2)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 4)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 9)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 13)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 17)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 26)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 28)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 29)</li> </ul>	<p>Public exhibition periods are a matter for DPHI, noting that a number of submissions were received after the exhibition period which are nonetheless considered in this Submissions Report.</p>
OP-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the exhibition was too short, being from the 3 May 2024 to 30 May 2024.</li> <li>Not enough time to review reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Additional Submission)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 13)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exhibition period is set by Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure, not the Applicant, in accordance with the requirements of the EP&amp;A Act and Regulation.</li> </ul>
<b>Building Design and Amenity</b>			
OP-80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion for inclusion of continual shelter along Harris Street façade.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The detailed design is inclusive of a shelter along Harris Street. Refer to the Amended Design Report (<b>Appendix F</b>) and the Amended Architectural Drawings at <b>Appendix E</b>.</li> </ul>
OP-81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for the use of the former power station and Harwood building for museum space in the revitalisation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
OP-82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that all spaces are accessible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ian Nicol (Narraweena, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All spaces will be fully accessible, in accordance with the requirements of BCA.</li> </ul>
OP-83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern around the conversion of public space outside the museum into student accommodation.</li> <li>Belief that there isn't a need for student-specific accommodation as the area is supported by multiple hotels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Fairy Meadow, NSW)</li> <li>Australiana Society (Glebe, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no plans for any student accommodation as part of the proposal, nor any development in the public domain.</li> </ul>

OP-84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for inclusion of Connecting with Country principles in design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
OP-85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion that the museum entrance must be moved to the eastern façade.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Ultimo, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main entrance will be at the south-eastern end of the building via the Goods Line. There is no opportunity for an entrance along the Eastern Boundary due to the location of the Sydney Light Rail.</li> <li>The Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> highlights that the new proposed entry enables the ability to experience the height of the Boiler House as a key aspect of the new entry.</li> </ul>
OP-86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for front door at the Goods Line.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
OP-87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The complete lack of any dedicated, permanent, fit-for-purpose exhibition display.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal includes new and improved flexible international standard exhibition spaces that can support and adapt to new and dynamic programs that facilitate direct connections with Powerhouse collections are essential for the museum's future.</li> <li>The proposed design seeks to continue the evolution of Powerhouse Ultimo to ensure the collection can continued to be displayed for contemporary audience whilst providing inherent flexibility to allow a larger proportion of the collection to be displayed.</li> <li>The Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> sets out the positive heritage benefits of lightweight and flexible exhibition displays particularly because it does not require intervention with the original fabric of the Heritage Core buildings of high and exceptional heritage significance.</li> </ul>
OP-88	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that Harris Street is more likely to get higher foot traffic compared to the new entrance location.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adrienne Tunnicliffe (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Brad Hayne (Muswellbrook, NSW)</li> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is still access available from Harris Street via stairs and a lift that travel down to the main entrance. There is also proposed new activation of the streetscape from Harris Street through Macarthur Street to the Goods Line.</li> </ul>
OP-89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion that the SSD must be rejected as the design is believed to be destructive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed design seeks to continue the evolution of Powerhouse Ultimo to ensure the</li> </ul>

OP-90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the design destroys the Powerhouse landmark profile.</li> <li>The design does not resonate with the original design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>collection can continued to be displayed for contemporary audience whilst providing inherent flexibility to allow a larger proportion of the collection to be displayed.</li> </ul>
OP-91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall design reduce the museums potential to support exhibitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal enables new and improved exhibitions spaces for the Powerhouse to present exhibitions.</li> </ul>
OP-92	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal design removes character.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 31)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Responses to Submissions sets out the heritage impacts of the proposed development, see in particular OP-41 and OP-42 above.</li> </ul>
<b>General support for the proposal</b>			
OP-93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that there is a need for revitalisation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Pyrmont, NSW)</li> <li>Bernadette Warbrick (Carlingford, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
OP-94	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for new green spaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neville Pleffer (Rooty Hill, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
OP-95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UTS provides its full support to the Powerhouse and Infrastructure NSW for its revitalisation proposals for Powerhouse Ultimo. It is believed that the renewal will aid in creating the truly vibrant, diverse and inclusive hive of creativity, invention, commerce and community required for our precinct to truly be the collision of creativity and technology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UTS (Ultimo NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>Museum Uses</b>			
OP-96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the museum use of the 25m high Boiler Hall if not the exhibition of the museum's transport, flight and space collections which are central to the Objects of the MAAS Act? When there is an SSD for a bridge, the function of the bridge does not need much explanation. The plans detail the purpose, traffic impacts and benefits of the infrastructure. This means the function, purpose and effectiveness of the bridge plans can be understood and contested.</li> <li>Having de-cluttered the museum of its collections and exhibition spaces what is the intended use of the Turbine and Boiler Halls that is consistent with the objects of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed design seeks to continue the evolution of Powerhouse Ultimo to ensure the collection can continued to be displayed for contemporary audience whilst providing inherent flexibility to allow a larger proportion of the collection to be displayed.</li> <li>Programming of the museum is not a planning matter. The Powerhouse's collection is managed in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i>.</li> </ul>

	Act and what is generally understood to be museum exhibitions and activities?		
OP-97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the re-development of the former Powerhouse Museum as a creative industries facility with creative industry shops, creative spaces and programs to support the creative industries is not consistent with the Objects of the MAAS Act.</li> <li>Belief that the MASS Act needs to be renewed before the revitalisation as it does not currently align.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The museum's collection is managed under the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i>, noting that the management of the collection is not a relevant planning matter.</li> </ul>
<b>Naming of Museum</b>			
OP-98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submissions raise that the reference to the site as a museum has been removed from the title of the precinct/facility.</li> <li>Parramatta Powerhouse should be named after something relevant to the western Sydney area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design 5 Architecture</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 11)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Naming of the museum (or other museum's within the MAAS portfolio) is not a relevant planning matter.</li> </ul>
<b>Harris Street Frontage</b>			
OP-99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the proposed Harris Street frontage would diminish the exterior of the Wran and Galleria.</li> <li>Disapproval of the creative commercial spaces (shopfronts) along Harris Street as they are costly and take away the museum function.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pymont Action Inc (Pymont, NSW)</li> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> <li>Pymont Action Inc (Additional Submission)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impacts to heritage are assessed within the Amended HIS at <b>Appendix L</b> to this Responses to Submissions. The Amended HIS supports the proposed works to the Harris Street frontage of the Wran Building and its reactivation of this streetscape</li> <li>Creative industry spaces provided along Harris Street do not remove any floor space potential for exhibition uses and will assist in activating the façade to Harris Street.</li> </ul>
OP-100	<b>Support for Harris Street Frontage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of the Strategic Vision for Pymont Ultimo.</li> <li>The strategic priorities for Ultimo clearly state that Harris Street should be rejuvenated as the historic urban spine of the Peninsula (p.57) identifying multiple initiatives to transform Harris Street into a pleasant pedestrian environment.</li> <li>The revitalisation of Powerhouse Ultimo presents Infrastructure NSW with the unique opportunity to widen the eastern pedestrian footpath on Harris Street, between William Henry Street and Macarther</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UTS (Ultimo, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>

	Street, consistent with the NSW Government's vision for a rejuvenated Harris Street.		
<b>Landscaping and Public Domain</b>			
OP-101	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overly elaborate landscaping treatment of the Museum Entry Terrace.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement is included at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions Report and provides further information regarding the rationale for the landscape design.</li> </ul>
OP-102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the landscape plans were designed without any understanding of museum audiences and are not meaningful.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement is included at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions Report and provides further information regarding the rationale for the landscape design.</li> </ul>
OP-103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Belief that the public domain will increase noise and safety concerns as it is already prone to late-night rowdy behaviour.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 23)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise from the museum has been assessed as part of the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. No approval is being sought for events within the public domain.</li> </ul>
OP-104	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The landscape plan for the main Museum Entry Terrace provides no space for public gatherings.</li> <li>Suggestion for open courtyard space at the main entrance to gather and for events.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust of Australia (Millers Point, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The terrace is of a significant size and can accommodate public gathering.</li> </ul>
OP-105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UTS supports the NSW Government's strategic vision for Pyrmont-Ultimo but believes that the state-significant revitalisation of Powerhouse Ultimo is of such cultural importance to the city that it warrants better public domain and place improvements than currently proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UTS (Ultimo, NSW)</li> </ul>	Noted.
OP-106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The public domain and place benefits of widening this footpath include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improved pedestrian movement and safety,</li> <li>improved pedestrian amenity,</li> <li>an improved sense of arrival experience for visitors and</li> <li>an enhanced setting for the Powerhouse Ultimo Museum.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The proposed activation and success of the Harris Street frontage of the revitalised Wran Building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UTS (Ultimo, NSW)</li> </ul>	Noted.

	with 'shopfront style creative industry spaces' will also benefit from a widened eastern footpath.		
OP-107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In supporting the NSW Government's rejuvenation strategy for Harris Street, UTS recommends that the widening of and improvements to pedestrian footpaths should continue south beyond Macarther Street to Ultimo Road and Broadway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UTS (Ultimo, NSW)</li> </ul>	Noted. This is beyond the scope of the SSDA. Any widening of the footpath would be undertaken as a separate project by the relevant authority.
<b>Support for the proposed Gathering Terrace</b>			
OP-108	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open space designed as a place for both visitors to dwell and for events. As the new main entry point to the museum, its easterly orientation will improve access and better connect the museum to the local and city communities via the Goods Line, Hay Street and the Light Rail.</li> <li>As a former high-density industrial area, Ultimo has limited local public open space and the spaces that do exist are highly valued by the community. In these circumstances, the creation and design of new public spaces such as the 'Gathering Terrace' is especially important for the Powerhouse and the broader community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UTS (Ultimo, NSW)</li> </ul>	Noted.
OP-109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst fully supporting the concept of the 'Gathering Terrace' as a new public entry space, UTS recommends that the design of this important public space be reviewed. UTS believes that for the 'Gathering Terrace' to realise its full potential as an activity and events space, it needs to consider the ratio of hardscape to plantings to enable programming and events to provide more useable and functional event space(s).</li> <li>UTS believes that as a large public forecourt, the 'Gathering Terrace' has the potential for a mix of passive landscape including lawns, gravel and wild grasses, combined with more active landscape areas characterised by a more robustly designed hardscape suitable for active uses and events. The proposed increase in tree canopy cover would benefit the amenity of the terrace's passive and active landscape areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UTS (Ultimo, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Amended Public Domain and Landscape Statement is included at <b>Appendix Q</b> to this Submissions Report and provides further information regarding the rationale for the landscape design.</li> <li>No approval is being sought for events within the public domain.</li> </ul>

Theatre Space			
OP-110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion to include a theatre/performance space that includes adjustable seating and a digital internet interface to project arts programming onto to detachable screen.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Australian Theatre Live (Roselle, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exhibition Space 3 will retain the function as both flat floor exhibition space and an auditorium through provision of a retractable seating bank.</li> </ul>
OP-111	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion to support the arts and performance arts including theatre opera, dance and concerts to make a more financially sustainable and establish an arts hub.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Australian Theatre Live (Roselle, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no intention to provide a live entertainment precinct as part of the Powerhouse revitalisation. The Powerhouse Museum is an exhibition space primarily and the revitalisation has been led by the demand for more flexible exhibition space.</li> </ul>
Closure of the Museum			
OP-112	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The museum will be closed for a very long time. The three-year planning is unrealistic.</li> <li>Premature closure of the Powerhouse.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Save the Powerhouse Campaign (Ultimo, NSW)</li> <li>Pymont Action Inc (Pymont, NSW)</li> <li>Pymont Action Inc (Additional Submission)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIS is not required to nominate timeframes for completion of construction or reopening of the museum.</li> <li>The NSW Government is committed to completing the museum's revitalisation in a timely way to minimise disruption to neighbours and allow the museum to reopen for visitors. Construction timeframes will be confirmed once planning consent is received, and a contract is awarded, with the project expected to take up to three years.</li> <li>During the temporary closure of Powerhouse Museum Ultimo, the community can still view the Powerhouse Collection of over 500,000 objects in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some of the 500,000 objects at Powerhouse Castle Hill are accessible to the public on weekends or by booking a group visit.</li> <li>- More than 380,000 items from the Powerhouse Collection have been digitised. You can access the Online Collection online <a href="https://collection.powerhouse.com.au/">https://collection.powerhouse.com.au/</a></li> <li>- Viewing of some objects in storage at Powerhouse Castle Hill can be arranged directly with the museum.</li> <li>- The new Powerhouse Parramatta is forecast to complete construction in 2025.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Construction Management			
OP-113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Department of Education accepts that there will be an increase in heavy vehicle movements on the State Classified Roads adjacent to and near Ultimo Public School. Notwithstanding this, Wattle Street and Harris Street are one of the main walking routes to/from Ultimo Public School, which are currently proposed as part of the construction vehicle routes to/from the Ultimo Powerhouse Revitalisation site.</li> <li>Recommended that a condition be imposed to ensure the movement of construction vehicles, including delivery vehicles, entering, and exiting the development site, should be avoided one hour before morning bell and one hour after afternoon bell times. This is to ensure the safety and accessibility of students and staff at Ultimo Public School who utilise the surrounding streets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NSW Department of Education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Transport Impact Assessment demonstrates that the impact of construction traffic within the existing network will be negligible.</li> <li>It is noted that during operation of Powerhouse Ultimo truck movements would occur for the bump in and bump out of exhibitions. During construction of the proposal, the operational traffic would be replaced by construction traffic.</li> <li>Given the previous operations and traffic movements for Powerhouse Ultimo, a restriction on construction traffic hours is not considered warranted.</li> </ul>
OP-114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise Construction guide and noise management are outdated, 2009. No mention of 82 Mary Ann Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 23)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Noise and Vibration Assessment (NVIA) has been prepared in accordance with the SEARs and the relevant guidelines.</li> <li>The impacts of noise to 82 Mary Ann Street has been assessed within the NVIA for both construction and operational impacts.</li> </ul>
MAAS Act			
OP-115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Statutory Context section of the EIS omits mention of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945, as required by SEARS in 1: address all relevant legislation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i> does not contain any relevant statutory requirements in respect of the assessment determination of the SSDA under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>.</li> <li>As set out in the EIS, the Trustee of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences is the owner of the land. The consent of the owner of the land is not required for a development application made by a public authority given the required notice to the owner occurred before the application was made.</li> <li>The objects and functions of the Trustee of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences under the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act</i></li> </ul>



			<p>1945 (NSW) is therefore not relevant to the determination of the SSDA. Even if this were not the case, the proposed SSDA is consistent with the objects and functions of the Trustees, being:</p> <p>'...(a) the control and management of the Museum,</p> <p>(b) the maintenance and administration of the museum in such a manner as will effectively minister to the needs and demands of the community in any or all branches of applied science and art and the development of industry by –</p> <p>(i) the display of selected objects arranged to illustrate the industrial advance of civilisation and the development of inventions and manufactures,</p> <p>(ii) the promotion of craftsmanship and artistic taste by illustrating the history and development of the applied arts,</p> <p>(iii) lectures, broadcasts, films, publications and other educational means,</p> <p>(iv) scientific research, or</p> <p>(v) any other means necessary or desirable for the development of the natural resources and manufacturing industries of New South Wales.'</p> <p>The proposed development will facilitate these objects and functions by revitalising the Heritage Core buildings and the Wran Building, and introducing the New Building to the Powerhouse Museum Complex, for the purposes of the ongoing museum use under the control and management of the Trustees.</p>
OP-116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development outlined in the SSD for Powerhouse Ultimo – not an actual museum by title or program - is not compliant with the objects of the MAAS Act. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 14 Objects and functions of trustees</li> <li>- (1) The trustees shall have the following objects and may exercise any or all of the</li> <li>- following functions—</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to OP-115</li> </ul>

	<p>(a) the control and management of the Museum,</p> <p>(b) the maintenance and administration of the Museum in such manner as will effectively minister to the needs and demands of the community in any or all branches of applied science and art and the development of industry by—</p> <p>(i) the display of selected objects arranged to illustrate the industrial advance of civilisation and the development of inventions and manufactures,</p> <p>(ii) the promotion of craftsmanship and artistic taste by illustrating the history and development of the applied arts,</p> <p>(iii) lectures, broadcasts, films, publications and other educational means,</p> <p>(iv) scientific research, or</p> <p>(v) any other means necessary or desirable for the development of the natural resources and manufacturing industries of New South Wales</p>		
OP-117	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the Powerhouse Museum should be reopened.</li> <li>• Belief that the government should prioritise the repairs and maintenance neglected by the management of MAAS, the renewal of exhibitions and open the museum again.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 10)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project expenditure is a matter for the NSW Government and is not relevant to the planning assessment process.</li> <li>• The scope for the proposal has been determined as the most suitable way of meeting the project-specific and site-specific objectives as outlined in the EIS.</li> </ul>
OP-118	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disappointment and distrust in the management of MAAS.</li> <li>• Belief that the intent is to reindustrialise Powerhouse Ultimo through the removal of the collection to the Castle Hill Powerhouse site.</li> <li>• Belief that the intent of the renewal is for the Powerhouse to become a contemporary arts organisation.</li> <li>• Disappointment in the management and the shift towards creative industries rather than contemporary museum as envisioned by MAAS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 3)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 11)</li> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Ultimo will continue to deliver an applied arts and sciences program, exhibiting the renowned Powerhouse Collection, international exhibitions and programs that support the creative industries.</li> <li>• Programming of the museum is not a planning matter. The Powerhouse's collection is managed in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i>.</li> </ul>

OP-119	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the concept of a contemporary museum patronising multi-art form creative industries may be appropriate for the arts and performance facility planned for the 'Parramatta Powerhouse'. But this has little to do with the legislated remit of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences. Creative industries are not applied arts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programming of the museum is not a planning matter. The Powerhouse's collection is managed in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Act 1945</i>.</li> </ul>
OP-120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion that Western Sydney has its own cultural institution based at Parramatta with a remit to work across Western Sydney supporting the creative talent and cultural life of the region's diverse communities, with the capacity to draw on all the state's collections for exhibition at Parramatta or other venues. The Parramatta Powerhouse development must be separated from MAAS and established with a unique name, identity, funding and governance arrangements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Powerhouse Parramatta is not the subject of this application.</li> </ul>
OP-121	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is untenable for the management to be operating outside the objects of the MAAS Act as is clearly the case with the Powerhouse Ultimo EIS. The SSD EIS is inconsistent with the Objects of the MAAS Act and is therefore invalid.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Powerhouse Museum Alliance (Newtown, NSW)</li> </ul>	Refer to OP-115
OP-122	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the plans are inconsistent with the MAAS act.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name Withheld (Additional Public Submission 19)</li> </ul>	Refer to OP-115.