

Response to Agency Submissions

Issue	Details	Response
City of Sydney		
Affordable Housing Contribution	<p>The applicant has stated Development contributions equivalent to 2% of the development cost will be paid in accordance with the Redfern Waterloo Contributions Plan 2006, which is supported by the City.</p> <p>However, despite the proponent acknowledging that the Redfern-Waterloo Authority Affordable Housing Contributions Plan 2006 applies to the site, they are seeking an exemption as the “proposed development meets the objectives of the Plan.”</p> <p>The City objects to the exemption request and recommends the affordable housing levy be applied for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development is not one of the types of development to which the plan does not apply, and • The Plan does not provide an alternative pathway for exemptions beyond those described in Clause 6 of the Plan. Any exemption would be inconsistent with the Plan. 	<p>The Applicant is no longer seeking an exemption from affordable housing contributions. Refer to Section to 3.20 of RTS report.</p>
SEPP 1 Objection – height and floor space	<p>It is understood that the Department of Planning have stated that the subject site, which is within the Business Zone – Commercial Core, is not an equivalent land use zone to the relevant zones listed under the Affordable Rental Housing State Environmental Planning Policy (ARH SEPP). Consequently, the provisions and floor spaces bonuses of Division 3 of the ARH SEPP are not applicable. The City concurs with this view.</p> <p>It is considered that the applicant’s written request to justify the contravention of the height and floor space development standards are not well founded and not in the public interest as the information submitted with the application indicates that the proposed development results in adverse environmental impacts such as wind impacts, overshadowing impacts to surrounding properties and encroaches on the heritage setting of St Luke’s Presbyterian Church to the south east of the site</p> <p>The Department cannot be satisfied that the applicant’s written request has adequately addressed the matters required to be addressed under SEPP 1 and that the proposed height and floor space exceedances would be in the public interest.</p>	<p>The RTS scheme fully complies with the height controls. Refer to detailed discussion in Section 3.1 of RTS Report and amended SEPP 1 objection at Annexure P in relation to FSR.</p>
Zone Objectives	<p>Under the State Significant Precincts SEPP, the site is zoned ‘Business Zone – Commercial Core’.</p> <p>The objectives of the Business Zone—Commercial Core are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>to facilitate the development of a town centre,</i> <i>to encourage employment generating activities by providing a wide range of retail, business, office, community and entertainment facilities,</i> <i>to permit residential development that is compatible with non-residential development,</i> <i>to maximise public transport patronage and encourage walking and cycling,</i> <i>to ensure the vitality and safety of the community and public domain,</i> <i>to ensure buildings achieve design excellence,</i> <i>to promote landscaped areas with strong visual and aesthetic values to enhance the amenity of the area.</i> 	<p>Compliance with the zone objectives has been previously demonstrated in Section 5.6.1 of the EIS.</p> <p>Key concerns raised by the City appear to be adverse wind and shadowing impacts to the public domain, which in turn affect design excellence. These issues are all raised separately in the sections below and have been addressed in Sections 3.9, 3.8 and 3.2 respectively of the RTS report. The assessment demonstrates that design excellence is achieved, and the proposal would result in no unacceptable overshadowing or wind impacts to the public domain beyond those generated by any building expected under the planning controls of the SSP SEPP.</p>

Issue	Details	Response
	<p>It is considered that the proposal does not achieve the objectives of the SEPP, particularly paragraphs (e) and (f). The wind impacts discussed below result in avoidable negative impacts to the public domain. The proposal is likely to cause overshadowing impacts (it is noted that insufficient information has been provided to properly assess shadow impacts). As discussed below, corrections to the methodology are required to quantify the degree of impact.</p>	
<p>Design Excellence</p>	<p>Clause 22 of Part 5 of Schedule 3 of the SEPP states that consent must not be granted to a new building or to external alterations to an existing building unless the consent authority has considered whether the proposed development exhibits design excellence.</p> <p>In considering whether the proposed development exhibits design excellence, the consent authority must have regard to the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved,</i> <i>whether the form and external appearance of the building will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,</i> <i>whether the building meets sustainable design principles in terms of sunlight, natural ventilation, wind, reflectivity, visual and acoustic privacy, safety and security and resource, energy and water efficiency,</i> <i>if a competition is held as referred to in subclause (3) in relation to the</i> <p>It is considered that the proposal does not achieve the design excellence provisions of the SEPP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the design of the proposed building does not improve the quality and amenity of the public domain; and the design of the proposed building does not satisfactorily mitigate environmental concerns such as wind and overshadowing 	<p>Design excellence is discussed in detail in Section 3.2 of the RTS Report and the Supplementary Design Report at Appendix D.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to significantly improve the quality and amenity of the public domain as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it creates a publicly accessible through site link incorporating landscaping and artworks to provide pedestrian amenity and opportunities for traveling a different route through the area away from busy roadways it incorporates widening of the footpath on Margaret Street and provision of street trees currently not provided on this side of the road improving pedestrian amenity. it incorporates awnings for all weather protection for pedestrians on Gibbons Street currently not provided it incorporates active frontages with very active spaces provided at the ground floor level with large windows to enable high levels of interaction between the public and private domains and very good levels of natural surveillance compared to the existing use of the site which does not include any active frontages <p>The proposal is also considered to be acceptable with regard to wind impacts and overshadowing, as discussed in Sections 3.8 and 3.7 respectively of the RTS report.</p>
<p>Heritage</p>	<p>St Luke's Presbyterian Church is a locally listed heritage item located to the south east of the site. The Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) submitted with the application states that the proposed building has the potential to have an adverse visual impact on the church, which is most evident when the church is viewed from Regent Street. The HIS claims that any adverse visual impacts are mitigated by positive design which includes increased setbacks from the eastern boundary in the form of a through-site link (TSL) that provides a connection with William Lane.</p> <p>While this setback does generate additional views and vista to the church from the TSL, the proposed building is to be constructed even closer to the heritage church on the south-east corner of the site when compared to the existing building footprint. At this corner, the proposed building projects out at the base as well as the tower levels. This contradicts the applicant's earlier argument about the benefits of increased eastern setbacks.</p> <p>Maintaining a meaningful separation between the church and the proposed building is of critical importance. Currently, the distance between the church and the closest corner of the existing building is approximately 11m and this is reduced to 8m by the proposal. The height and scale of the proposed building in addition to the reduced separation has significant adverse visual impacts on the church. At a minimum, it is strongly recommended that the proposed building is contained within the footprint of the existing building at its south-eastern corner</p>	<p>Refer to Section 3.11 of RTS report for discussion of heritage impacts to the Church. See also Section 5.1 of the Architects Supplementary Design Report at Appendix D.</p> <p>The RTS has revised the design of the building to improve setbacks to the church.</p> <p>The arched feature window has been deleted from the design.</p>

Issue	Details	Response
	<p>An arched 'feature window' is proposed on the south east-facing elevation of the development. Its design, scale and location is likely to distract from the nearby church and its fenestration. The proposed feature window height is approximately 6m and the existing church windows are 4m tall. Nowhere else in the proposed building is an arch used. It is recommended that this arched feature window is deleted from the design.</p>	
Urban Design	<p><i>Built form and height</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed building is situated at the end of a strip of similarly bulky (non-slender) towers, creating a wall of development at approximately 65m in height. The site is differentiated from other sites in the Redfern-Waterloo area in that it is at the southern boundary, adjacent to a single storey service station and low scale development to the south (existing 3-5 storey residential development). Given that the proposal results in height and floor space exceedance, setback non-compliances and wind impacts (discussed below), further consideration needs to be given to achieving a more appropriate transition between the proposed 18 storeys and the existing 5 storey development to the south. <p><i>Setbacks</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development results in non-compliant side and rear setbacks at Levels 4-18 creating adverse residential amenity impacts for the future residents of the subject building and neighboring properties to the north at 11 Gibbons Street (mixed use development currently under assessment), to the east at 104-116 Regent Street (existing service station and low scale residential subject to similar redevelopment opportunities as the subject site), and partially to the south affecting existing low scale residential properties). It is noted that even with the setback offered by the proposed through site link to the rear (east) of the site, non-compliant building separation distances still occur. As a result the future development potential of 104-116 Regent Street is compromised with the subject proposal effectively borrowing amenity from that site. Privacy mitigation measures to habitable room windows are not apparent on the drawn information which may attempt to address the adverse impacts created by non-compliant setbacks. Reliance on new street trees and justifying privacy impacts because they are no worse than existing is simply not acceptable for a development of this scale. Further, development to the north at 11 Gibbons Street is still under assessment and relying on habitable room windows of that development being orientated away from proposed habitable room windows of the subject development is not an acceptable response to privacy concerns under this application. The subject building needs to address amenity issues using its own design as the locations of windows on adjoining development is subject to change. 	<p><i>Built Form</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised proposal does not result in any height exceedances and the Applicant contends that the proposed floor space is less than that permitted by the applicable planning controls as discussed in Section 3.1 of the RTS report. Further, the planning controls do not seek a different building form for buildings at the southern end of the centre, but specifically seek an 18 storey building consistent with the scale and character of all other development within the centre. A reduction in building height would not be appropriate and would be inconsistent with the intention of the controls to create a consistent high-density town centre adjacent to a major transport node. <p><i>Setbacks</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer also to Section 3.1.4 of the RTS report for discussion on setbacks and privacy impacts. The revised proposal complies with the 4m setback control to the west and south and includes increased setbacks to the east and north. Strictly speaking, there are no setback controls applicable to a boarding house development on the east and north elevations and setbacks must be assessed on merit. The proposal has setbacks that are similar to or greater than other residential buildings recently built or approved under the same controls. The proposed setback to the eastern boundary (7.8 – 11.2 m), is likely to result in generous building separation to future development at 104-116 Regent Street. The proposal does not compromise or 'borrow' amenity from that site. On the contrary, the provision of the through site link and generous setback is likely to allow development on that site to be built slightly closer to the common boundary than the proposed development, effectively 'borrowing' amenity from the development site and the through site link. As setbacks comply with and exceed the setback controls on the southern elevation the proposal would be consistent with expectations for privacy in this direction. In addition, the modified proposal reduces the number of windows in the southern elevation of the tower and therefore also materially reduces opportunities for overlooking in this direction. Tower windows in the northern elevation are limited to two hallway and one bedroom window on each

Issue	Details	Response
	<p><i>Building expression</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A projecting bay window is proposed at Level 3 at the southwest corner. The Level 3 floor plan shows that this window is not positioned to offer additional amenity to the room to which it is attached and forms an awkward and inaccessible space. More consideration of fenestration to the podium is required. The west and east facing windows do not include satisfactory means of passive sun protection. Vertical blades are provided on one side of the window opening. On the east, these are positioned on the north side of the windows, and may have some shielding effect from low altitude morning sun from the north east. On the west, the blade is positioned on the south side of the window and will have no impact on reducing afternoon heat load. Greater consideration of passive shading should feature in the design of the facades so as to reduce reliance on air conditioning and to improve the amenity of the rooms. The proposed form does not address the visually prominent corner of Margaret and Gibbons Streets. The building should architecturally 'turn the corner' by presenting greater articulation to the south, rather than presenting a blank featureless two-dimensional wall. The homogenous treatment of the facades does not assist in reducing the perception of bulk of the non-slender towers. The proponent is requested to consider a greater variety of surface treatments over facades. Using a similar detail and colour palette would assist. In addition, the bulk of the tower could be further reduced through the expression of the plan in elevation, that is, corridors could be expressed through deep recesses rather than windows within the face of the wall surface. 	<p>level as rooms are primarily oriented away from adjacent development. The windows would be setback 11.4 to 13.8 metres from dwellings on the adjoining site and due to privacy treatments on the proposed windows, in conjunction with the design of windows opposite there would be no opportunity for overlooking between the two sites.</p> <p><i>Building Expression</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The projecting bay window has been removed in the RTS design and fenestration to the podium has been revised with additional windows provided to add visual interest to the southern facade: refer to plans DA3001 and DA3002 at Appendix C. Shading to windows has also been reconsidered and includes sun-shading above and to the side of tower windows as depicted in the Architect's Supplementary Design Report at Appendix D. Importantly, the revised proposal includes a BASIX certificate (Appendix M) which will ensure appropriate levels of thermal comfort will be achieved Additional fenestration and façade detailing has been added, which, in conjunction with the continuation of the awning around the corner, ensures the building architecturally 'turns the corner': refer to plan DA3002 at Appendix C. Tower façade treatments have been substantially amended to improve visual interest. On the northern and southern elevation, building massing is broken down and articulated by stepping the tower in plan form and use of different materials and finishes for the different building elements. The western (Gibbons Street elevation) also includes a wider variety in finishes as well as horizontal breaks in the tower façade to create a scaled relationship with the podium and express the tower as a series of stacked blocks. Refer to Supplementary Design Report at Appendix D.
Active frontages	<p>The north facade is primarily designed to be a blank facade, with small openings at corridors. This does not maximise opportunities to provide passive surveillance and activation to the proposed new 'street' to the south of 11 Gibbons Street. Safety and security would be improved if the north facade could be activated through use and materiality. It is recommended that the fire stair at the north-west end of the subject site is relocated to the south of the retail unit to provide glazing with adequate fire protection to the north wall of the retail unit.</p>	<p>There is no new street on the adjoining land to the north, only a private driveway that is not accessible to the public. It is not considered appropriate or desirable to overlook the adjoining private land. The introduction of windows in the northern façade of the podium would compromise the security and amenity of the neighbours.</p>
Accessibility	<p>At the main Gibbons Street entry, the accessible ramp is poorly integrated into the design of the entry. The ramp is tucked behind a wall which reduces its visibility, and the dog-leg form of the ramp is circuitous. A better design would start and finish the ramp much closer to the non-accessible route, providing a more dignified and equitable means of entry.</p>	<p>The main entry, including the access ramp, has been redesigned to provide an improved and simpler access route for all persons. Accessible access has also been provided to the eastern entrance at the TSL. Refer to plan DA2001.</p>

Issue	Details	Response
	<p>The entry to the TSL from the east is not accessible. Further consideration of how this can be made accessible is required.</p>	
<p>Wind Impacts</p>	<p>A Wind Impact Assessment prepared by SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd and dated December 2018 has been submitted with the application. The report notes that some relaxation of the wind comfort criteria may be acceptable for small areas under investigation provided the general site satisfies the relevant criteria. This is not supported. The wording of Clause 3.2.6 (2) of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (SDCP 2012) is specific in requiring that wind speeds do not exceed the stated criteria. Therefore, the methodology used to both quantify and justify wind impacts is not acceptable.</p> <p>Taking into account the future wind environment as a result of the proposed development together with currently proposed and approved development on the adjoining sites, the wind report surmises the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground level conditions surrounding the site exceed walking comfort criteria (above 16m/s) and in some cases are very close to the 24m/s safety levels. This includes the southern portion of the through site link, which is designed with outdoor furniture conducive to sitting. • High localised winds occur at the two southern corners of the proposed development and along sections of Margaret Street. • The external common area on the Level 4 podium experiences elevated wind conditions. The two corners in particular exceed the 16 m/s walking comfort criterion. • Some balconies of the upper levels near building corners are exposed to stronger southerly and westerly winds and will experience adverse wind conditions requiring wind treatment beyond standard height (i.e. code-compliant) balustrades. <p>The report suggests various wind mitigation recommendations including an overhead pergola, internal planting and a perimeter wind break to protect the through-site link. It is noted from the documentation that the pergola is proposed to be constructed of fine stainless steel wires with hanging fine panels. This will have no effect in mitigating wind impacts. Additionally, the 'perimeter windbreak' notated is actually shown as an open mesh wire fence. This will have no effect in wind mitigation. Movable balcony screens on Level 4 and above are recommended to ameliorate high corner balcony wind speeds, however, these screens are not shown on the drawn information.</p> <p>The wind analysis is insufficient and requires amendments and further wind tunnel testing. The following significant issues have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) So as to comply with the intent of the Redfern-Waterloo Urban Design Principles (RWUDP), an 'active frontage' criteria is to be adopted for Gibbons Street of maximum 13m/s. This must not be exceeded; b) A maximum of 16m/s is to be adopted for Margaret Street. This must not be exceeded; and c) For sitting areas in the through site link, the more stringent criteria of 10m/s maximum is to be adopted. The analysis must take into account that an awning capable of deflecting wind is currently proposed in this location <p>The above mentioned adverse wind conditions are exacerbated by a lack of upper level setbacks as wind flow accelerates past the facades of the proposed development's high-rise component and is directed downwards as downwash and accelerated shear flow. It is not acceptable that the proposed design creates additional negative wind impacts in an area which is currently significantly wind affected.</p> <p>In addition to addressing the matters above, it is recommended that:</p>	<p>Further testing of the revised building has been carried out and a new Wind Impact Assessment is provided in Appendix I.</p> <p>The revised building envelope, with revised awnings and landscape treatments will result in improved and acceptable outcomes for wind impacts: refer to discussion in Section 3.8 of the RTS Report.</p>

Issue	Details	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Greater setbacks above podium level are to be investigated to ameliorate the exceedance of the criteria at locations 15, 17 and 18 along the southern alignment of the site. b) Further testing is to be undertaken to ameliorate significant wind impacts to the Level 4 terrace, given that this is the major outdoor communal space for students. c) Further testing is to be undertaken to determine any wind impacts to north facing balconies at No.1 Margaret Street, a residential flat building directly facing the subject site. The additional information must include the current and future wind conditions at open balconies building entries 	
Solar Access	<p>The overshadowing analysis confirms that the proposal casts a large shadow over properties to the southwest, south and southeast of the site. The analysis does not consider the specifics of any overshadowing on individual properties. The impact must be quantified, in terms of both the measurable criteria in the SDCP 2012 controls, the RWUDP controls noted above, and any impacts justified</p> <p>Additional information, which quantifies resulting solar access, the overshadowing impact, and adequate justification is required for the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gibbons Street Reserve; • St Luke's Presbyterian Church, 118 Regent Street; • National Centre of Indigenous Excellence playing field, 160-202 George Street; and • 1 Margaret Street RFB 	<p>Updated and detailed consideration of solar access is provided in Section 3.7 of the RTS Report and the Architect's Supplementary Design Report at Appendix D. The analysis demonstrates that compared with development expected under the controls, the proposal would not result in a greater shadowing impact on adjoining properties or nearby open space.</p>
Public Art	<p>Further design development is required to ensure the proposed suspended artwork design is legible from the through site link. The renderings of the proposed artwork vary across the documents submitted for the application and in one case suggest that the suspended panels may cover the window apertures looking onto the through site link behind which are habitable rooms.</p> <p>It is unclear how wind impacts in the through-site link will impact the long term viability of the proposed suspended public art in this location and the safety of pedestrians underneath.</p> <p>The Department are requested to condition any future approval with a requirement to submit a stand-alone detailed public art plan in accordance with the requirements of the City's Guidelines for Public Art in Private Development. It is recommended that public art, heritage and landscape documentation is carefully coordinated as the submitted public art strategy crosses various aspects of the proposal.</p>	<p>The final details of the artwork will be developed by the artists in conjunction with stakeholders following approval of the application. It is agreed that a condition requiring a detailed public art plan prior to construction would ensure the final details and impacts for safety, maintenance and views can be appropriately reviewed prior to installation.</p>
Trees and Landscaping	<p><i>William Lane connection – through-site link</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the connection is supported by the City in principle, the documentation provided indicates that the through-site link is likely to be windy, heavily shaded and an unpleasant space conflicted by service access, recreation and pedestrian movements, and that is unlikely to be used by the residents and broader community. • It is noted that there is limited landscaping with mostly moveable raised planters. The planting is more of a temporary nature and fragmented rather than meaningful tree canopy and greening of the connection. The wire mesh fencing with climbers (unknown height) is defensive and it is questionable that it will function as an intended wind barrier. • Consideration should be given to utilising at least part of the area beneath the public through site link for deep soil to support new tree planting. Several options are available (i.e. suspended slabs, soil cells or structural soils) which support pavements whilst providing a suitable area for tree growth. <p><i>Rain Garden</i></p>	<p><i>William Lane connection – through-site link</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of the through site link has been substantially amended. Moveable raised planters have been removed and the area now includes deep soil planting area to support provision of four trees within the link as well as understory planting. In conjunction with a green wall of climbers (1.8 m high) on the eastern side of the link, the new tress will ensure the link presents a landscaped appearance, whilst balancing the need to maintain vehicular access through the link. <p><i>Rain Garden</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of the Filterra garden are provided in the Stormwater Management Report and Stormwater Concept Plan at Appendix R and S. Sydney Water has raised no concerns with provision of a rain garden.

Issue	Details	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is reliant on a raingarden to Margaret Street to capture rainwater from the tower downpipes. No details have been provided to confirm the design or Sydney Water concurrence with this stormwater management solution. <p><i>Common Open Space</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No access doors or windows onto the terrace are shown and ease of access is unknown. The western facade walls of the building project into the decking area making the passing distance less than 1.4m wide which is insufficient for equitable access and is not supported. The landscape plans do not include any communal furniture, BBQ, dining areas or seating. Benches shown against the 1.2m high balustrade do not comply with the building code in order to mitigate falls from height. The northern and southern planters appear to be inaccessible. How will the landscaping be safely accessed and maintained? A large awning is proposed with projections to the north and south to mitigate high winds and down wash from the tower. The awning extent will limit the size, type and longevity of trees that can be planted. Currently 300mm and 75L pot size trees are proposed which are too small. A minimum 100-200L tree is recommended All planting is located on slab. The plans do not show any levels (SSL, RL, TW) and no detail has been provided to confirm the planter designs are sufficient size and soil volume to successfully support trees. Review whether the tree species are appropriate for the proposed environment and microclimate. Some of the currently proposed species are likely to need removal and replacement in the short to medium term. Given that Level 2 and 4 of the landscape proposal is located on slab, the proposal will be heavily reliant on adequate irrigation and drainage systems. The drainage, waterproofing and watering systems associated with the landscape scheme must be clarified. Communal outdoor open space is to receive a minimum 2 hours solar access to at least 50% of the area at mid-winter. However, there is insufficient information to confirm if complaint levels of solar access are achieved to the communal outdoor areas. <p><i>Roof</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quantum of landscaping proposed on the subject site is extremely low compared to the uplift and scale of development. To offset this imbalance and improve biodiversity on the site, the proponent is encouraged to include a non-trafficable green roof to the full perimeter of the plant with hardy local plant species <p><i>Street trees</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is noted that two new street trees are proposed to be planted on Margaret Street. The species must be <i>Tristaniopsis laurina</i> (Water Gum) in order to align with the City of Sydney Street Tree Master Plan. 	<p><i>Common Open Space</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common open space areas have been substantially amended with northern areas on Levels 2 and 3 deleted to remove privacy concerns and replaced by enlarged west facing balconies at these levels. The design of the Level 4 terrace has also been amended. Updated details are shown on plans DA2003 and DA2004 at Appendix C and Landscape Plans at Appendix E and demonstrate equitable access, furniture, BBQs, seating areas, updated pot sizes, species, levels and planting details. Further details can be provided at the detailed design phase, prior to construction certification. Sun eye studies in the Architect's Supplementary Design Report at Appendix D demonstrate that the west facing terrace on Level 4 and communal balconies on Levels 2 and 3 will receive in excess of four hours of solar access at mid-winter. <p><i>Roof</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quantum of landscaping exceeds that expected by the controls which envisage a podium occupying the entire site and do not require any on-site landscaping. However, the revised plans have incorporated significant additional plantings, including within the through site link, the Margaret Street setback and at the Level 4 roof terrace. A total of 21 new trees will be planted on the site, which is a material improvement on the existing 16 trees currently on the site. A green roof is therefore not required or proposed. <p><i>Street trees</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The updated landscape plans show <i>Tristaniopsis laurina</i> (Water Gum) on Margaret Street.
Health	It is recommended that the Department of Planning require that the Contamination Assessment Detailed Site Investigation referenced 86266.04, Revision 1, prepared by Douglas Partners, and dated 2 November 2018 is peer reviewed by a NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor and a Section A Site Audit Statement is to be submitted to the Department certifying that the site is suitable for the proposed use.	The Department has not requested additional information in this regard. There is no reasonable basis on which to require a peer review of the Detailed Site Investigation. Douglas Partners is a reputable and experienced environmental engineering consultant. Its detailed site investigation which did not find

Issue	Details	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that a Loading Service Management Plan is prepared for the development with the final plan approved by the Department prior to any future Occupation Certificate for the site/use being granted. The Loading Management Plan should include a strategy for the management of all servicing of the site including waste collection, delivery vehicles student/resident move-in move out etc. The Plan should include, but is not limited to, management of operable bollards within the through-site link and a schedule of deliveries to prevent disruption to public streets. The plan should detail a form of pre-booking system showing future occupants when they can use the service access in the lane, or by a register managed on site to allow occupiers to reserve a time period for their deliveries. This information should be made available to all occupiers of the building. It is recommended that the plan is provided to all future occupiers and external users. It is recommended that a Transport Access Guide (TAG) is implemented and maintained by management of the premises to be made available via printed document and electronically to staff, clients, customers and visitors at all times Any proposals for alterations to the public road, involving traffic and parking arrangements, must be designed in accordance with the Roads and Maritime Services Technical Directives and must be referred to and agreed to by the City's Local Pedestrian, Cycling and Traffic Calming Committee prior to any work commencing on site. 	<p>evidence of contamination above site assessment criteria levels and concluded the site is suitable for the proposed development in its current state, did not result in any questionable finds which would result in the need for further investigation or a peer review. On this basis the relevant matters for consideration under SEPP 55 have been addressed.</p> <p>These are matters that can be conditioned. No concerns are raised to conditions recommended in this regard.</p>
Public Domain	<p>Should the development be approved in the future, the City require the following public domain related conditions of consent to be imposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment Levels Photographic Record / Dilapidation Report - Public Domain Preservation of Survey Marks Protection Of Survey Infrastructure Paving Materials Public Domain Plan Public Domain Works - Hold Points and Handover Stormwater And Drainage Flood Planning Levels For Buildings and Structures Public Domain Lighting Defects Liability Period – Public Domain Works Public Domain Damage Deposit Tactile Ground Surface Indicators and Handrails 	<p>No concerns are raised with the recommended conditions.</p>
ESD	<p>An ESD Report prepared by SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd, dated December 2018 has been submitted with the application. The report indicates a 'business as usual' approach and fails to deliver any of the intent of the sustainability requirements stated in the SEARs, as modified</p> <p>Specific concerns are raised as follows:</p> <p>a) The SLR report is vague on the issue of air conditioning and thermal comfort. There is no discussion on the degree to which individual units will be comfortable enough through natural ventilation (window opening) versus reliance upon air conditioning. Nor does the report discuss</p>	<p>Refer to response by SLR consulting at Appendix N.</p> <p>In addition, the revised scheme is now accompanied by a BASIX certificate (Appendix M) which will ensure the proposal will meet required targets for water efficiency, energy efficiency and thermal comfort.</p>

Issue	Details	Response
	<p>energy loads required to address winter comfort for units that do not benefit from solar access. There is no cross reference to the wind report which flags that gustiness may affect amenity when windows are open in upper level apartments. The report makes unrealistic claims with respect to natural ventilation in common hallways.</p> <p>b) With respect to water efficiency, out of date standards are referenced. There is no reference to shower ratings despite this being in the top two highest water consuming activities in the building (3 Star minimum shower heads should be committed to, ideally with flow rate 6 to 7.5 litres per minute). Cooling towers are proposed and are a significant source of water consumption requiring efficiency measures, which is not discussed in the report.</p> <p>c) The report states that gas water heating is the preferred hot water solution. However, gas water heating is an increasingly expensive solution resulting in higher than necessary operational costs and always results in carbon emissions. Heat pump or solar thermal (with heat-pump or less ideally electric boosting) are the logical energy efficient domestic hot water solutions if the proponent is to demonstrate a genuine commitment to carbon abatement. The proponent could readily commit to purchase green power under contract as a means to reduce emissions but the SLR report does not even explore that option.</p> <p>d) Despite the subject application being a detailed design proposal, no investigations at this stage have been carried out to allocate roof space to Photo Voltaic (PV) capacity for the site</p> <p>In summary, the ESD report falls far short of any serious intent with absolutely no innovation to deliver even a reasonable to good environmental performance building. The report is considered a seriously substandard response to the intent of the SEARs which seeks some evidence of better than minimum environmental performance.</p>	<p>In summary:</p> <p>a) Thermal comfort is now addressed through BASIX certificate requirements. Further discussion on natural and mechanical ventilation is included in Section 3.16 of the RTS Report</p> <p>b) The Basix assessment demonstrates water efficiency targets will be met and exceeded. Measures include low water use and indigenous species for plantings, 3 star shower heads, 4 star toilets and 5 star taps throughout the development</p> <p>c) The Basix Assessment includes consideration of the hot water heating system and demonstrates that with the proposed central gas hot water system, in conjunction with other measures, the target score for energy saving will be met and exceeded.</p> <p>d) Photo voltaic cells have been added to the proposal as shown on Plan DA 2005 and the BASIX certificate.</p>
Misc.	<p><i>Bedroom sizes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sydney DCP 2012 sets the appropriate amenity guidelines for student accommodation. These require a minimum room size of 12sq.m for a single lodger and 16sq.m in any other case. The EIS states that the proposed bedrooms would vary in size between 10.1m² and 11.1 m² (exclusive of kitchens and bathrooms) and therefore would be marginally smaller than the recommended room size of 12m² under the controls. It is acknowledged that smaller room sizes for similar development have been approved elsewhere previously. However, for a dispensation to be awarded in this regard, above average residential amenity ought to be demonstrated elsewhere in the development which this proposal does not for numerous reasons outlined elsewhere in this letter. <p><i>Private Open Spaces</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDCP 2012 requires that 30% of rooms in boarding houses have access to private open space in the form of a balcony. The proponent's justification that a variety of well-designed communal open space areas well in excess of minimum requirements are provided on the site to meet student needs is overstated and for the reasons outlined under the 'Trees and Landscaping' above, is not satisfactory compensation for non-compliant private open space provision in the development <p><i>Laundries</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At a rate of 1 washing machine/dryer per 49 students, the proposal provides one quarter of the laundry facilities required by Sydney DCP 2012 for the number of students proposed to be accommodated by the development (40 required). This grossly underestimates the basic amenities required by the students. 	<p><i>Bedroom sizes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Section 3.10 of RTS Report. Bedroom sizes have been increased. <p><i>Private Open Spaces</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strictly speaking the DCP controls do not apply to State Significant Development. Student housing is slightly different from other traditional boarding house development, with students tending to prefer to gather in communal spaces and with less need for private open space. It is noted that the other student housing developments approved in the immediate vicinity of the site and under the same planning controls do not include any balconies. As discussed above, the communal open spaces and landscaping have been improved, compared to the original scheme. <p><i>Laundries</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to detailed discussion in Section 3.15 of the RTS report which demonstrates that due to the large capacity of the machines and very fast cycle times, the number of machines is more than sufficient to meet the needs of the students.

Issue	Details	Response
	<p><i>Amenities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No amenities are provided to communal spaces and common areas. For example, it is unreasonable to expect a resident of the uppermost levels to have to return to their room to use the amenities when utilising the communal outdoor spaces or dining areas on Levels 2-4, which are likely to be occupied by residents for prolonged periods. <p><i>Signage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed illuminated projecting wall sign, which is located between Levels 2 and 4 of the podium fronting Gibbons Street, will be higher than 5m above ground level (existing) and have an area greater than 0.5 sq. m and is therefore contrary to the relevant signage provisions of SDCP 2012. The sign is excessive in size and design and is not appropriate in that location on the building. The projecting wall sign is to be deleted from any future approved signage strategy for the building. The Department are requested to satisfy themselves that the two proposed 'top of building' signage zones at roof level of the building fronting Margaret Street and the through-site link will be allocated to a significant tenant of the building or to the building's owner, if the owner occupies a significant amount of floor space within the building relative to other tenants, in accordance with the requirements of Section 3.16.5.2 of SDCP 2012. <p><i>SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is noted that the application has not addressed this SEPP. The Department's attention is drawn to the Land and Environment Court judgement (SHMH Properties Australia Pty Ltd v City of Sydney) in relation to boarding houses and BASIX. <p><i>End of trip facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A separate end of trip facility, including shower and change facilities, should be provided to for the retail tenancy <p><i>Waste Storage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional space should be provided for bulky waste storage, storage of food waste for recycling, and space for storage of reusable commercial items (eg. crates, strip out waste etc). 	<p><i>Amenities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although most students will prefer to use their own bathrooms in most circumstances, the revised scheme includes amenities accessible from the main ground floor communal space. <p><i>Signage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No illuminated projecting wall signs are proposed. A non-illuminated wall sign is proposed to enable the building to be identified and assist with way finding. In the context of the entire building the sign is modest in scale and as it is designed to be integrated with the design of the façade, the sign will not result in visual clutter or any adverse impacts to the character of the area. As the development is proposed to operate as one single student housing development, there will be only one significant tenant in the building and the top of building signs will reflect the name of the student housing provider. <p><i>SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A BASIX certificate is provided (Appendix M) <p><i>End of trip facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> End of trip facilities including shower and change facilities, are included for the use of the retail tenancy <p><i>Waste Storage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The size of the waste storage has increased and additional space has been provided for bulky waste storage.
NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA)		
Noise	A Noise Management Plan should be prepared covering the construction phase of the proposal, in accordance with the EPA's Interim Construction Noise Guideline (2009)	A Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) was prepared in accordance with the EPA Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG, 2009) and submitted with the EIS (Appendix U2). No additional detail is required at this stage. Standard conditions of approval may also be included in the consent requiring additional detail in the CNVMP.
Water	<p>In general development should maintain or restore the community's uses and values of waterways, including human and environmental health, through the achievement of relevant NSW Water Quality Objectives (WQO). The proponent should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline opportunities for the use of integrated water cycle management practices and principles to optimise opportunities for sustainable water supply, wastewater and stormwater management across the development. 	The revised proposal includes a Basix assessment (Appendix M) which demonstrates that water efficiency targets will be met and exceeded. Details of WSUD measures are provided in the Stormwater Management Report and Stormwater Concept Plan at Appendix R and S .

Issue	Details	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detail how the proponent will ensure that any seepage waters from basement or underground car parking areas is undertaken in a manner that will prevent pollution of waters. Consideration should be given to waterproofing or "Tanking" all basement levels likely to interfere with an aquifer, to prevent the need for treatment and discharge of groundwater. <p>Sewage overflows have been identified as one of the major contributors to diffuse source water pollution in urban environments. The proponent should detail whether the existing sewage reticulation system can cater for any new additional load. Information should be provided on whether any additional load will impact the system's environmental performance, especially in relation to sewage overflows from any existing sewage pumping stations and discharges from any associated Sewage Treatment Plant. The EPA considers that that for new systems there should be no pollution of waters as a result of overflows during dry weather, and that overflows during wet weather should be minimised.</p>	<p>The geotechnical report submitted with the EIS (Appendix P) found that the basement will be above the groundwater table and therefore there will be no impact to ground water levels or quality as well as no impact in terms of the NSW Aquifer Interference Policy.</p> <p>Sydney Water (refer to below) has advised that the existing sewer in Margaret Street has the capacity to service the development. Sydney Water has raised no concerns with regard to the impact of the development on the sewage system's environmental performance.</p>
Waste Management:	<p>The proponent should provide details of how waste will be managed during construction and operation, with reference to relevant EPA guidelines. This includes identifying, characterising and classifying all waste that will be generated during the construction and operational phases, and detailing the measures proposed to manage, reuse, recycle and/or safely dispose of waste.</p> <p>The Waste Not Development Control Plan (DCP) Guideline (EPA 2008) should be referenced by the proponent. This guideline provides suggested planning approaches and conditions for planning authorities to consider at the development application phase in relation to waste minimisation and resource recovery. This includes consideration of demolition and construction waste and the provision of facilities and services to allow the ongoing separation, storage and removal of waste and recyclables</p> <p>The EPA's Multi-Unit Development Guidelines provide waste and recycling requirements for multi-unit residential developments. The guidelines can be accessed at: http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/warrlocal/multi-unit-dwell.htm</p>	<p>A Construction Waste Management Plan and Operational Waste Management plan were provided with the original application to address these matters (Appendix U and X of the EIS).</p> <p>The EPA has not raised any particular concerns with the waste management arrangements as outlined in these plans, and appears to be providing general advice.</p> <p>Further, standard conditions of consent would require updated waste management plans prior to the issue of a construction certificate.</p>
Former Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH)		
Aboriginal Cultural Heritage	<p>OEH has reviewed the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) dated December 2018 prepared by Artefact Heritage.</p> <p><i>[Based on the assessments]...OEH recommends that no further archaeological investigation be undertaken</i></p> <p>Discussion on a preliminary concept design relating to the proposed Aboriginal artwork indicated that Gadigal language should be incorporated into the design and that the changing and continued connection to Redfern for Aboriginal people were considered important messages for any proposed interpretive elements.</p> <p>OEH Agrees with the report recommendations and the following should be included as conditions of the consent:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant to investigate methods to incorporate Aboriginal cultural heritage values into the proposed design and develop and implement a heritage interpretation strategy for the project including native plantings and the incorporation of appropriate local Aboriginal names into the development. This is to be done in consultation with Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council. 	<p>No additional information is requested or required. OEH's support for the ACHAR is noted and the Applicant agrees with the conditions of consent recommended by OEH to ensure Aboriginal cultural heritage values continue to be incorporated into the design and ensure appropriate safeguards in the case of unexpected finds.</p>

Issue	Details	Response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> If suspected human remains are located during any stage of the proposed works, work must stop immediately, and the NSW Police notified. An Archaeologist or Physical Anthropologist should be contacted in the first instances where there is uncertainty whether the remains are human. Any unexpected finds procedure be developed for use during the construction and include notification of a heritage consultant and RAPs where unexpected finds are identified. 	

Former Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), Heritage Division

Heritage	The Heritage Division has no issues or concerns in relation to State Heritage matters	Noted. No response required
-----------------	---	-----------------------------

Roads and Maritime Services (RMS)

Roads	<p>Roads and Maritime has reviewed the submitted application and raises no objection to the development application subject to the following conditions being included in any consent issued by the department:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Roads and Maritime is currently undertaking a program to implement "Clearways" on State roads within Sydney. If not already in place, "Clearway" restrictions will be implemented along the full Gibbons Street frontage of the development site. Detailed design plans and hydraulic calculations of any changes to the stormwater drainage system are to be submitted to Roads and Maritime for approval, prior to the commencement of any works. A plan checking fee will be payable and a performance bond may be required before Roads and Maritime approval is issued. The developer is to submit design drawings and documents relating to the excavation of the site and support structures to Roads and Maritime for assessment, in accordance with Technical Direction GTD2012/001. <p>The developer is to submit all documentation at least six (6) weeks prior to commencement of construction and is to meet the full cost of the assessment by Roads and Maritime.</p> <p>If it is necessary to excavate below the level of the base of the footings of the adjoining roadways, the person acting on the consent shall ensure that the owner/s of the roadway is/are given at least seven (7) day notice of the intention to excavate below the base of the footings. The notice is to include complete details of the work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will generate additional pedestrian movements in the area. Pedestrian safety is to be considered in the vicinity. The developer shall be responsible for all public utility adjustment/relocation works, necessitated by the above work and as required by the various public utility authorities and/or their agents. A Construction Pedestrian Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) shall be submitted in consultation with the TfNSW Sydney Coordination Office (SCO), Roads and Maritime, and Sydney City Council, prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. The CPTMP needs to include, but not be limited to, the following: construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control. A construction zone will not be permitted on Gibbons Street. A Road Occupancy Licence (ROL) should be obtained from Transport Management Centre for any works that may impact on traffic flows on Gibbons Street during construction activities. 	No additional information is requested or required. The Applicant agrees with the conditions of consent recommended by RMS.
--------------	--	---

Transport for NSW (TFNSW)

Issue	Details	Response
Sydney Metro City and Southwest	The Minister for Planning approved the Chatswood to Sydenham section of the Sydney Metro City and Southwest on 9 January 2017. It is advised that construction is underway and will be carried out in accordance with the existing approvals and any modifications subsequently approved	Noted. No action required. The EIS assessment notes the development of the Metro.
Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management	<p>The Construction Pedestrian Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) prepared to support the development application states that a temporary works zone may be required on Gibbons Street to ensure the safe and efficient operation of construction activities. It is advised that Gibbons Street would not be a suitable location for a work zone during the peak periods due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gibbons Street is a key northbound bus corridor in Redfern with a clearway restriction in place during the morning and afternoon peak periods between Marian Street and Margaret Street on the eastern side of the Gibbons Street; and The operation of a construction work zone on Gibbons Street during the peak periods would have the potential to impact on general traffic and bus operations. <p>Further, several construction projects, including the Sydney Metro City and Southwest and surrounding developments, are likely to occur at the same time as this development within the vicinity of the site. The cumulative increase in construction vehicle movements from these projects could have the potential to impact on general traffic and bus operations within the vicinity of the site, as well as the safety of pedestrians and cyclists particularly during commuter peak periods</p> <p>Recommendation: It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to update the Construction Pedestrian and Traffic management Plan (CPTMP) in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW and Roads & Maritime Services. A detailed recommended condition is provided.</p>	The Applicant agrees with the recommended condition to update the CPTMP prior to construction to ensure works zones do not conflict with pedestrian and public transport movements and to take into account all other relevant factors affecting the local road network at that time.
Existing Bus Services	<p>It is noted that the recent changes to STA bus network in December 2018 are not captured in the Traffic Impact Assessment prepared to support the development application. It is advised that Routes 310, L09, X09 and X10 have been withdrawn and Routes 309X and 310X have been introduced in this area. In addition, Routes 301, 302 and 303 now operate on Gibbons Street</p> <p>Recommendation: It is advised that the recent changes to STA bus network in December 2018 be included in the Traffic Impact Assessment.</p>	The Applicant notes the revised bus routes now operating on Gibbons Street. However, the revised routes have no implication for the assessment of the application and the site continues to be very well serviced by public transport.
Bicycle Parking	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment states that bicycle parking area will be provided in the basement level and the bicycle parking/repair areas will be on the ground floor level</p> <p>Recommendation: It is advised that the location of bicycle facilities be provided in secure, convenient, accessible areas close to the main entries incorporating adequate lighting and passive surveillance and in accordance with Austroads guidelines</p>	The majority of bicycle parking will be located in the basement in order to maximise communal living space at the ground floor which assists with activation and natural surveillance of the surrounding public domain. Access to the basement bicycle storage is via a secure lift conveniently located close to the building entry. Both the basement and ground level bicycle storage areas will be well lit and will incorporate CCTV cameras to enable surveillance by staff and ensure security.
Former Urban Growth NSW Development Corporation		
Redfern Waterloo Authority Affordable Housing Contributions Plan	<p>In accordance with Clause 8 of the Redfern-Waterloo Authority Affordable Housing Contributions Plan 2006 (AH Plan), the current rate for affordable housing contributions (as at 1 July 2018) is \$86.66/m². The contribution is levied on the additional floor space of the development, less any affordable rental housing floor space that is proposed.</p> <p>The application provides the proposed gross floor area to be 11,470m² and the area of existing floor space on the development site is 2,805m². The additional floor space is therefore 8,665m². The affordable housing contribution is \$752,815. Before payment the contributions will need to be indexed</p>	<p>The Applicant is no longer seeking affordable housing contributions to be waived.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees to a condition requiring payment of contributions under the Affordable Housing Contributions Plan but notes that floor space is now less than originally sought and contributions should be based on additional floor space of 7908 m² (10,713 m² proposed – 2,805m² existing).</p>

Issue	Details	Response
	<p>annually by Building Price Index – Sydney, in accordance with the affordable housing contributions plan.</p> <p>The EIS submitted with the application contained a request for consideration to waive the affordable housing contribution on the premise that student accommodation should be considered a form of affordable housing. Clause 6 of the contributions plan provides that contributions will not be levied only for part of the development that is for affordable housing dwellings and where the developer is a registered community housing organization. The proponent is required to provide appropriate evidence to satisfy both requirements.</p>	
Redfern Waterloo Authority Affordable Housing Contributions Plan	<p>The contribution under this plan is calculated as a rate of 2% of the proposed cost of carrying out the development including GSR. The application provides the proposed cost of development as \$68,530,000 (including GST). The contribution is \$1,370,600. Before payment, the contributions will need to be indexed quarterly by the CPI, in accordance with the contributions plan.</p> <p>There may be opportunities to provide public domain and / or roadworks in lieu of contributions. The applicant should investigate this option with UGDC and Sydney City Council. Accordingly, a condition of consent is recommended requiring payment of contributions, with an option for a credit where public domain and road works are provided by the Applicant.</p>	The Applicant agrees to the recommended condition requiring payment of contributions and / or public domain and roadworks under the Contributions Plan but notes that as the size of the development has reduced, so has the cost of the development. An updated QS report at Appendix Q demonstrates, that for the purpose of calculating contributions, the cost of the development is \$64,955,000 resulting in a requirement for a contribution or public domain works to the value of \$1,299,100 .
Sydney Airport		
Building Height	Request an elevation showing overall maximum height of the building	The Applicant has subsequently contacted Sydney Airport, who has issued approval for construction of the building to a maximum height to 87.93 AHD (Refer to Appendix L). As shown in the elevation and section drawings (Appendix C), the proposal will have a maximum height of RL 87.19 AHD.
Sydney Water		
Water Servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 150mm watermain in Gibbons Street fronting the development site will service the development. Any upsizing requirements of this existing main or a new main will be advised in the Feasibility/Section 73 stage. The proposed development is under the Centennial Park Water Supply Zone. 	Noted. No response required.
Wastewater Servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing 225mm sewer in Margaret Street at the south boundary of the development site has the capacity to service this development. The invert level of all property service connection sewer to existing 225mm sewer must be above the 23m level. This development is under the South Sydney SCAMP (Sewer Catchment Asset Management Plan). 	Noted. No response required.
General	This advice is not a formal approval of our servicing requirements. Detailed requirements, including any potential extensions or amplifications, will be provided once the development is referred to Sydney Water for a Section 73 application. More information about the Section 73 application process is available on our web page in the Land Development Manual.	Noted.
Sydney Water Servicing	A Section 73 Compliance Certificate under the Sydney Water Act 1994 must be obtained from Sydney Water.	Noted. It will be addressed by standard condition

Issue	Details	Response
	<p>The proponent is advised to make an early application for the certificate, as there may be water and wastewater pipes to be built that can take some time. This can also impact on other services and buildings, driveways or landscape designs.</p> <p>Applications must be made through an authorised Water Servicing Coordinator. For help either visit www.sydneywater.com.au > Plumbing, building and developing > Developing > Land development or telephone 13 20 92.</p>	
Building Plan Approval	<p>The approved plans must be submitted to the Sydney Water Tap in™ online service to determine whether the development will affect any Sydney Water sewer or water main, stormwater drains and/or easement, and if further requirements need to be met.</p> <p>The Sydney Water Tap in™ online self-service replaces our Quick Check Agents as of 30 November 2015.</p> <p>The Tap in™ service provides 24/7 access to a range of services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building plan approvals • connection and disconnection approvals • diagrams • trade waste approvals • pressure information • water meter installations • pressure boosting and pump approvals • changes to an existing service or asset, e.g. relocating or moving an asset. <p>Sydney Water's Tap in™ online service is available at:</p> <p>https://www.sydneywater.com.au/SW/plumbing-building-developing/building/sydney-water-tap-in/index.htm</p>	Noted. It can be conditioned
Trade Wastewater Requirements	<p>If this development is going to generate trade wastewater, the property owner must submit an application requesting permission to discharge trade wastewater to Sydney Water's sewerage system. You must obtain Sydney Water approval for this permit before any business activities can commence. It is illegal to discharge Trade Wastewater into the Sydney Water sewerage system without permission.</p> <p>The permit application should be emailed to Sydney Water's Business Customer Services at businesscustomers@sydneywater.com.au</p> <p>A Boundary Trap is required for all developments that discharge trade wastewater where arrestors and special units are installed for trade wastewater pre-treatment.</p> <p>If the property development is for Industrial operations, the wastewater may discharge into a sewerage area that is subject to wastewater reuse. Find out from Business Customer Services if this is applicable to your development.</p>	Noted. It can be conditioned
Backflow Prevention Requirements	<p>Backflow is when there is unintentional flow of water in the wrong direction from a potentially polluted source into the drinking water supply.</p> <p>All properties connected to Sydney Water's supply must install a testable Backflow Prevention Containment Device appropriate to the property's hazard rating. Property with a high or medium</p>	Noted. It can be conditioned

Issue	Details	Response
	<p>hazard rating must have the backflow prevention containment device tested annually. Properties identified as having a low hazard rating must install a non-testable device, as a minimum.</p> <p>Separate hydrant and sprinkler fire services on non-residential properties, require the installation of a testable double check detector assembly. The device is to be located at the boundary of the property.</p> <p>Before you install a backflow prevention device:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Get your hydraulic consultant or plumber to check the available water pressure versus the property's required pressure and flow requirements. 2) Conduct a site assessment to confirm the hazard rating of the property and its services. Contact PIAS at NSW Fair Trading on 1300 889 099. <p>For installation you will need to engage a licensed plumber with backflow accreditation who can be found on the Sydney Water website: http://www.sydneywater.com.au/Plumbing/BackflowPrevention/</p>	
Water Efficiency Recommendations	<p>Water is our most precious resource and every customer can play a role in its conservation. By working together with Sydney Water, business customers are able to reduce their water consumption. This will help your business save money, improve productivity and protect the environment.</p> <p>Some water efficiency measures that can be easily implemented in your business are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install water efficiency fixtures to help increase your water efficiency, refer to WELS (Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards (WELS) Scheme, http://www.waterrating.gov.au/ • Consider installing rainwater tanks to capture rainwater runoff, and reusing it, where cost effective. Refer to http://www.sydneywater.com.au/Water4Life/InYourBusiness/RWTCalculator.cfm • Install water-monitoring devices on your meter to identify water usage patterns and leaks. • Develop a water efficiency plan for your business. • It is cheaper to install water efficiency appliances while you are developing than retrofitting them later. 	<p>Noted. This is general advice. A BASIX certificate has now been prepared for the proposed development (Appendix M) which demonstrates water efficiency targets will be met and exceeded. Proposed measures include low water use and indigenous species for plantings, 3 star shower heads, 4 star toilets and 5 star taps throughout the development.</p>
Contingency Plan Recommendations	<p>Under Sydney Water's customer contract Sydney Water aims to provide Business Customers with a continuous supply of clean water at a minimum pressure of 15meters head at the main tap. This is equivalent to 146.8kpa or 21.29psi to meet reasonable business usage needs.</p> <p>Sometimes Sydney Water may need to interrupt, postpone or limit the supply of water services to your property for maintenance or other reasons. These interruptions can be planned or unplanned.</p> <p>Water supply is critical to some businesses and Sydney Water will treat vulnerable customers, such as hospitals, as a high priority.</p> <p>Have you thought about a contingency plan for your business? Your Business Customer Representative will help you to develop a plan that is tailored to your business and minimises productivity losses in the event of a water service disruption.</p> <p>For further information please visit the Sydney Water website at: http://www.sydneywater.com.au/OurSystemsandOperations/TradeWaste/ or contact Business Customer Services on 1300 985 227 or businesscustomers@sydneywater.com.au.</p>	<p>Noted. No response required.</p>

Issue	Details	Response
Sydney Metro		
General	A small section of the 13-23 Gibbons Street, Redfern site is within the Sydney Metro City and Southwest corridor. The proposed works do not involve greater than 2 meters as part of an SSD application and Sydney Metro considers that the State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (ISEPP) does not apply. Accordingly, Sydney metro has no comments on the proposed works.	The Applicant wishes to correct a statement in the EIS. Although only very limited basement excavation is required (less than 1 metre), the proposal will require the provision of piles to depths of 8 – 12 metres. Sydney Metro may wish to consider if additional conditions are required accordingly.
State Design Review Panel		
General / FSR	<p>The proposal was first presented to the SDRP on 12 September 2018 with advice provided. A second SDRP session was held on 3 October 2018 with supplementary advice provided. In the SDRP session 2 letter, we recognised the work produced, but reinforced our concerns, strongly urging the Proponent to incorporate advice so as to demonstrate design excellence and quality outcomes. It was also noted that the proponent should not return to the SDRP until an FSR compliant model was proposed.</p> <p>We acknowledge the work undertaken to incorporate some of the issues raised in SDRP sessions, such as the podium modulation; articulation of the street corner along Gibbons Street; and the ground plane reconsiderations. However, many aspects have not been significantly developed and advice not fully considered, notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • William Lane laneway accessibility and use; • entry locations and articulation; • noise mitigation though façade treatment and articulation; • plant / service location and retail provision at grade; • room dimensions and cross ventilation; • demonstration of design excellence; and • the incorporation or inclusion of Aboriginal culture and heritage into the design proposal. <p>While a small number of changes have been made to the proposal in response to our advice these are not considered to alleviate our main concerns relating to FSR exceedance, scale, bulk, and size and laneway activation. We reiterate our summary recommendations in the attached advice and request that these be responded to as part of the RtS.</p>	<p>All previous advice was fully considered in the EIS. However, previous advice in relation to the listed issues has now been re-considered in light of the amended RTS scheme: refer to responses in relevant sections below.</p> <p>See also Architects Supplementary Design Report at Appendix D.</p> <p>On the issue of FSR, scale and size, refer to Section 3.1 of the RTS report.</p>
Previous advice: William Lane	<p>The Panel recommends that the laneway should have a civic quality, be publicly accessible and include opportunities for active and shared use programs, such as bike share and retail.</p> <p>The Panel also recommends the design team respond proactively to improving the public domain. Ensure the laneway contributes to the public domain by making it publicly accessible and used for shared purposes.</p> <p>The William Lane façade should be made permeable at ground level to include the community and activate the laneway.</p> <p>Enterprise opportunities could be considered for ownership or operation of activities along William Lane – this could activate the place and further engage the community</p>	Refer to Section 3.4 of the RTS report and Landscape Plans and report at Appendix E . The design of the through site link has been significantly improved, incorporating improved landscaping, reduction in hard paving in favour of soft landscaping and deep soil tree plantings, reduction in service space and an increase in the extent of 'active' facades overlooking the link.
Previous Advice: Entries	Entry location and articulation should be further developed.	Both entries have been redesigned to provide improved and simpler access route for all persons. The revised design also creates a wider entryway, larger recess in the façade and distinctive awning at the main entry, improving delineation of the entry point and the site's address.
Previous Advice: Noise	Noise mitigation along the Gibbons St elevation, evidence of a detailed understanding is required. Gibbons St noise attenuation, ventilation remain concerns.	To address this issue a detailed noise report was provided with the EIS. The report recommends mechanical ventilation and acoustic glazing to ensure compliance with required internal amenity levels. Refer to Section 3.16 of the RTS report and

Issue	Details	Response
Previous Advice: Plant and Retail	<p>The Panel suggested relocating plant/service zones from the north eastern corner on Marian St to Gibbons St.</p> <p>Provision of retail or commercial outlets at grade. More retail could be introduced, especially along William Lane to encourage the broader public to activate the laneway. Retail must better reflect the neighbourhood and tailored to local needs</p>	<p>Appendix O for details of the proposed mechanical ventilation system. The Acoustic Engineer has considered the mechanical ventilation and certified that the design will meet the relevant noise requirements (Appendix J).</p> <p>Refer to detailed discussion in Section 3.4 of the RTS Report. As Gibbons Street is a public street, where activation is of greater importance and where the controls discourage location of services, the Applicant disagrees with the recommendation to relocate plant to Gibbons Street. It is considered that services have been appropriately located and the extent of service space has been reduced in the amended scheme and designed so that it is not a dominant visual element within the through site link. The controls do not require and it is not proposed to provide additional retail. It is noted that no other developments approved under the same planning controls have included any retail elements fronting William Lane. However the extent of the active façade facing the through site link has been significantly increased and includes double height communal lounge area and entry, communal kitchen and balcony and communal study room. These common and social areas of the building will provide a sense of activity and a direct visual relationship between the public and private domains. Of greater benefit than a retail area, it is expected these areas would be used by students well into the evening, and these areas will provide clear sightlines into the link and surrounding streets. The extent of active façade on this elevation is much greater than any other recently approved development fronting William Lane.</p>
Previous Advice: Room size & ventilation	<p>The Panel remains concerned at the internal planning and the room type dimensions – noting that the difference between studio and dorm is only in length. The level of amenity for occupants remains a concern</p> <p>The building's internal planning precludes cross ventilation and access to adequate natural light.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 3.10 of the RTS Report. All room sizes have been increased.</p> <p>Internal planning does not preclude cross ventilation and access to adequate natural light but rather ensures good levels of both light and ventilation can be achieved in all areas. Refer to Section 4.6 of the Supplementary Design report at Appendix D.</p>
Previous Advice: Design Excellence	<p>Consideration o how the plan responds to site conditions and provides for design excellence</p> <p>The Panel requests further information on the proposed methodology for ensuring design excellence across the lifetime of the project, given a design competition is not proposed.</p> <p>Demonstrate the methodology for ensuring design excellence, outside of a design competition</p>	<p>This was previously addressed in the EIS and accompanying Architects Design Excellence Report and Design Excellence Strategy. Refer also to Section 3.2 of the RTS Report and Supplementary Design Report at Appendix D.</p>
Previous Advice: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage	<p>Stronger, more cultural response is needed with further information on culture and heritage provided, especially given the area's demographics and diversity.</p> <p>Demonstrate how Aboriginal culture and heritage is practically considered.</p> <p>The culture and heritage response must be further investigated and incorporated into the proposal</p>	<p>The EIS was accompanied by an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Report, Heritage Interpretation Strategy and Report on Integration of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Values into the Development Design. This has resulted in collaboration with a local artist to incorporate Aboriginal cultural narratives and imagery into the design, with a proposed public artwork prominently located, as well as other interpretive measures including an interpretive panel on recent Aboriginal History, local Aboriginal language words for naming elements and planting of native species. OEH advised it agrees with the reports.</p>

