

**SSD 9043 – 1-2 MURRAY
ROSE AVENUE, SYDNEY
OLYMPIC PARK**

**RESPONSE TO
DEPARTMENTS KEY ISSUES
ASSESSMENT**

URBIS STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS REPORT WERE:

Director	Steve White
Associate Director	Nik Wheeler
Consultant	Katie Weaver
Project Code	SA7305
Report Number	SA7305_RTS_FINAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix I Residential Amenity Response

Appendix J Architectural Drawings and Landscape Response

Appendix K Remediation Action Plan

Appendix L Supplemental Acoustic Assessment

Appendix M Economic Assessment

Appendix N Revised Request for Variation

Appendix O Meeting Minutes – SOPA – 15th May 2018

Appendix P Affordable Housing Contribution

Appendix Q Lift Traffic Analysis Reporting

Appendix R Storage Breakdown

Appendix S Revised Waste Impact Assessment

Appendix T SOPA Letter of Support

TABLES:

Table 1 – Response to Agency Submissions5

1. INTRODUCTION

This Response Report addresses the key issues raised by the Department during public exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the residential development at No 1 and No 2 Murray Rose Avenue, Sydney Olympic Park.

The EIS concluded its public exhibition on 18th December 2018. A separate Response to Submissions Report (RtS) was submitted to the Department in February 2019 following the earlier receipt of submissions from:

- Sydney Olympic Park Authority (SOPA)
- NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA)
- Government Architect NSW (GANSW)
- Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH)
- Roads and Maritime Services (RMS)
- Transport for NSW (TfNSW)
- NSW Police
- Sydney Water

Two public submissions were received during the exhibition of this project. This report incorporates the applicants response to the issues raised in these submissions.

This report addresses the key issues raised by the Department and demonstrates that the proposal balances environmental impact with community benefit and should be approved. This report confirms that there are no significant adverse impacts associated with the Project.

The specialist consultants have assessed the design and recommend mitigation measures to ensure the proposal will not have any unreasonable or significant noise, traffic and environmental impacts on adjoining or surrounding properties or the public domain. The content contained in this report and the previous RtS, demonstrates that the application should be approved.

Table 1 – Response to Agency Submissions

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
Department of Planning and Environment			
1. Built Form			
Gross Floor Area (GFA)/Floor Space Ratio (FSR)	Provide further justification, including a revised request to vary a development standard, for the proposed FSR non-compliance. In particular, the Department notes the proposed FSR of 4.24: 1 is predicated on subsuming unutilised GFA from the neighbouring developments at 3, 4 & 5 Murray Rose Avenue. While the FSR variation request indicates this will generate a density consistent with what is desired and expected from development in this area.	An updated request to vary development standard has been included at Appendix N.	Appendix J, N.
	The <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (State Significant Precincts) 2005</i> (SSP SEPP) and Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030 (2018 Review) (the Master Plan) controls are predicated on heights and density reducing from west to east with the Parkview Precinct specifically being characterised in the Master Plan by a transition in scale from high rise buildings along Australia Avenue to lower buildings along Bennelong Parkway.	<p>Noted. An updated request to vary development standard has been included at Appendix N.</p> <p>The total height of No's 1 and 2 Murray Rose Avenue are as follows:</p> <p>Site 1: 26m / 33m (SEPP Controls) – Max height 37.5m</p> <p>Site 2: 26m / 50m (SEPP Controls) – Max height 47m</p> <p>Also refer to the View Impact Analysis at Appendix J prepared by PTW Architects. This displays the cumulative impact of the proposal in the context of the maximum heights surrounding the site.</p> <p>This analysis confirms that when viewed from developments to the south-west of the site (particularly 68/100 Bennelong Parkway - a residential development known as 'Botania'), the proposed development creates minimal additional view impact.</p>	Refer Appendix J, N.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	Section 4.5.2 of the Master Plan states the maximum FSR will only be granted when the building depth, building heights, building separation, building setbacks and deep soil zone controls are complied with. The proposed development does not fully comply with these controls and may potentially result in a form of development not envisaged by the SSP SEPP and Master Plan and may provide unsatisfactory amenity to future residents.	<p>Please refer to the updated variation requests at Appendix N for a discussion of the proposals compliance with the built form controls.</p> <p>The proposal provides a high-quality urban development, with a significant level of residential amenity including solar access, natural ventilation, visual and acoustic privacy, and access to communal open space. The design achieves compliance with the ADG as per below:</p> <p>Communal Open Space- 52.93%</p> <p>Deep Soil - 10%</p> <p>Cross Ventilation - 60.5%</p> <p>Solar Access – 70.3%</p> <p>Visual Privacy - 18m</p>	Refer Appendix J and N.
	Review the proposed GFA given the recommended wind mitigation screens to the level 8 communal open spaces and around the upper level north and south facing balconies on both buildings, exceed 1.4 m in height.	<p>In consultation with the applicant's wind consultants, Windtech, the applicant has amended the designs to mitigate against adverse wind environments at height as well as enhancing noise mitigation and privacy by providing densely foliated vegetation screens on levels 08, 10 and 11 of No.1, and levels 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of No.2.</p> <p>The applicant contends that the treatment does not constitute additional GFA under the definition of the Standard Instrument, given the vegetation does not constitute an outer wall (under 1.4m high) and does not create habitable space.</p> <p>The amendments to the balconies are provided as a mitigation measure to ensure acceptable amenity and</p>	Refer Appendix J and L.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
Building height	Provide further justification, including a revised request to vary a development standard, for the proposed building heights. In particular, the Department notes the extent of non-compliance in relation to the western portion of Building 2 and that the majority of the floor plate above level 10 exceeds the 26m height control. This issue needs to be considered in conjunction with issues of FSR and setbacks.	<p>protect residences from the the effects of wind, rather than to create additional livable space.</p> <p>The amendments complement the proposals high standard of residential amenity in the communal areas on both roofs.</p> <p>An updated request to vary development standard has been included at Appendix N.</p> <p>This application has been prepared with regard to the revised controls proposed in the Master Plan (2018 Review) and the accompanying amendment to the State Environmental Planning Policy (State Significant Precincts) 2005 (height plane plan attached). The Height of Buildings Map in the SEPP specifies a maximum building height of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.1 Murray Rose Avenue - 26m fronting Bennelong Parkway and 33m on the western portion of the site; and • No.2 Murray Rose Avenue - 26m fronting Bennelong Parkway and 50m on the western portion of the site. <p>The western portion of building No.2 is subject to the 50m height control. The narrow area of this height control necessitated a tiered design response, with the top element of the tower situated beneath the 50m height control plane.</p> <p>The Design Competition Jury preferred this design response to a design that was compliant with the maximum height controls in the SEPP SSP as it was seen as the best way of managing the transition between the</p>	Refer Appendix N.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
		<p>divergent heights permitted on the site and provided improved amenity to future residents.</p> <p>In addition, the letter of support provided by SOPA (refer Appendix T) outlines that the development complies with the main objective of the height controls within Figure 5.41:</p> <p><i>“SOPA’s primary concern with regard to building heights in excess of the maximum height controls under the SEPP SSP is its potential to increase overshadowing of the Badu Mangroves and wetlands on the eastern side of Bennelong Parkway. In this instance, the overshadowing impacts of the proposed development are no worse than the expected impacts from a fully compliant building envelope.</i></p> <p><i>SOPA’s Ecology team reviewed the shadow studies and ecological assessment provided as appendices to the Environmental Impact Statement and raised no issues with the proposed height of either building or their potential overshadowing impacts”.</i></p> <p>The heights of buildings in the Parkview Precinct are also controlled by Figure 5.41 of the SOPA Master Plan. This outlines the maximum storey heights for the site as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. 2 Murray Rose Avenue: 6 storeys fronting Bennelong Parkway and 15 storeys on the western portion of the site (6 storey block edge and tower above). <p>It is notable that the Master Plan identifies the building heights in storeys, whilst the SEPP expresses the height in metres. The SEPP control is the primary development</p>	

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
		<p>standard given it is contained within an environmental planning instrument.</p> <p>However, it is worth noting that the height control within the Master Plan is calculated in storeys, rather than in metres like the SEPP. It also covers both the residential and commercial zoned land within the Parkview Precinct. Due to the common difference in floor to ceiling heights of commercial buildings as set against residential buildings, it is evident that the Master Plan storey control can be inconsistent, and it is considered more relevant for the neighbouring commercial properties contained within the precinct.</p> <p>This is because to meet the Master Plan storey control on Bennelong Parkway, a 6-storey residential property would only achieve a height of circa 20m, whilst the SEPP height control allows a building of 26m to be erected. This can be contrasted with the commercial building at No.3 Murray Rose Avenue which is 6-storeys and approximately 25.5m in height.</p> <p>This is also evidenced by different ceiling heights permitted for both commercial and residential properties under Table 4.3 (Minimum Ceiling Heights) of the Master Plan.</p>	
Setbacks	<p>Provide specific consideration of the proposed setbacks for each building, including compliance with the Master Plan controls and Apartment Design Guide (ADG) building separation recommendations. In particular, provide further information and justification regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the provision of a zero setback between Building 2 and the western side boundary, including the location of balconies and habitable room windows directly abutting this boundary. 	<p>The proposal is compliant with the SOPA Masterplan Parkview Precinct Building Zones and Setbacks Plan (Figure 5.42) in that it provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A completed through link between No's 1 and 3 Murray Rose Avenue. This was approved at 18m under the No.3 Murray Rose Avenue approval (MP11_0082) with 9m width on both No's 1 and 3 Murray Rose Avenue. The width of this through site link (the 'Chase') was subject to extensive assessment by SOPA/DPE prior to the approval of No.3 Murray Rose Avenue. • The site through link between 2 and 4 Murray Rose Avenue is fully located within the boundary of No.4 	Refer Appendix J.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	<p>– the required minimum 24 m setback between commercial buildings and facing habitable rooms in residential buildings under Section 4.6.6 of the Master Plan, noting an 18 m separation distance is proposed between Building 1 and No.3 Murray Rose Avenue and a 20 m separation distance is proposed between Building 2 and No.4 Murray Rose Avenue.</p>	<p>Murray Rose Avenue. Therefore, No.2 Murray Rose Avenue proposes a zero-side setback to the western boundary, which will still achieve the requisite through site link,</p> <p>The development generally complies with the building separation requirements outlined in section 2F of the ADG (18m), despite falling short of the 24m separation control outlined in section 4.6.6 of the SOPA Master Plan. Setbacks from the western edge of both sites are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 1: 18m (dimensions include through-site link); • No 2: 20m <p>Due to the varied topography across the site, there is a minor non-compliance to the upper level ADG separation distance of 12m (non-habitable rooms) on levels 8-10 of No.1 and levels 9-14 on No. 2. This is considered acceptable as a result of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed design was unanimously supported by the Design Competition jury, who noted: <i>“This proposed design the great ability to grasp the unique site opportunities and constraints and provides key design principles to respond with the desired future characteristics of the Parkview Precinct”.</i> • No amenity of the habitable rooms will be compromised as these units do not rely on this façade as the only source of light and ventilation. • The visual privacy impact resulting from the above is considered negligible as the adjacent commercial buildings have been built to a substantially lower height. <p>Notwithstanding the above, the proposal satisfies the objectives of 2F of the ADG, these being:</p>	

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p><i>ensure that new development is scaled to support the desired future character with appropriate massing and spaces between buildings.</i></p> <p>Response: The Government Architect NSW in chairing the Design Excellence Competition advised that the proposal achieves design excellence and supported the scale of the winning design. The proposal reinforces the street alignment and provides above ground articulation. Further, the design does not include anything outside the building zone, identified within Figure 5.38 of the Master Plan.</p> <p><i>assist in providing residential amenity including visual and acoustic privacy, natural ventilation, sunlight and daylight access and outlook.</i></p> <p>Response: The proposal maintains or exceeds the built form parameters provided in the ADG, complying with the solar, cross-ventilation, deep soil and communal open space requirements.</p> <p><i>provide suitable areas for communal open spaces, deep soil zones and landscaping.</i></p> <p>Response: The proposal provides a total deep soil area of 10% and a total communal open space area of 52.93%.</p> <p>As outlined in SOPA's letter of support (Appendix T), setbacks were not raised as an issue during SOPA's assessment of the EIS package, on the basis that the proposed development satisfied the intent of the controls, which are to maximise amenity and minimise the potential for overlooking.</p> <p>SOPA has confirmed that they have:</p> <p><i>"no objection to the proposed non-compliance with the separation distances in Section 4.6.6 of Master Plan</i></p> 	

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Demonstrate the development does not include any buildings, including balconies, outside the building zone identified in Figure 5.42 of the Master Plan. 	<p><i>2030 and does not consider that it will establish a precedent for future development in the town centre”.</i></p> <p>Above ground articulation in the form of slab projection (refer drawing DA-10-2200 Rev B) slightly exceeds the building zone as in identified in Figure 5.42 of the SOPA Masterplan. However, this complies with subsection 3 of section 4.6.7 of the Masterplan, which states the following:</p> <p><i>Above ground articulation in the form of balconies, sunscreens and bay windows and the like may extend 300mm into the front setback zone.</i></p>	
Residential Amenity	Provide a revised ADG assessment and calculations that considers the proposed buildings individually in relation to solar access, natural cross-ventilation, deep soil and communal open space.	Revised ADG calculations for each site have been provided at Appendix J. The design is generally compliant with the ADG controls for cross ventilation, deep soil, building separation and solar access.	Refer to updated DA –00–0100, 93–0200 and 94–0000.
	The provision of apartment 1.00.01 should be reviewed given it would not be cross-ventilated, would receive very limited solar access and limited privacy, and provides a bedroom within 3 m of the loading dock roller door and service areas, contrary to objective 4H-1 of the ADG.	Apartment 1.00.01 will be converted to visitor bicycle parking. This will replace the 42 bike parking spaces currently proposed at the rear of No 1.	Refer to updated plan DA-10-2000 – C.
	Provide further consideration of the amenity of apartment 2.02.13 and the six identical apartments above, given they would not be cross-ventilated, would receive limited solar access, only satisfy minimum size and balcony size recommendations, and have limited outlook and privacy (due to orientation directly towards No.4 Murray Rose Avenue).	These apartments have not been included in the solar access and cross-ventilation calculations outlined in Appendix A and K of the original application package. Under the ADG controls, 30% of apartments are permitted to receive less than 2 hours direct sunlight between 9 am and 3 pm at mid- winter, whilst 40% do not need to achieve cross-ventilation.	Refer Appendix J.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
		<p>The furnished layout of bedroom apartment will provide essential amenity and ample space to move around the furniture to achieve individual comfort. Additionally a window is added to the living room, improving natural ventilation.</p> <p>Furthermore, given these are single-aspect apartment facing to the west, these 7 apartments are less desirable than most of the others in the development and will be provided at a lower price-point. It is noted the application still achieve's 70% solar & 60% cross ventilation compliance.</p>	
	Demonstrate how privacy and amenity would be achieved to the balcony/living areas of apartments 1.00.01, 1.00.02, 1.00.03, 1.00.10, 1.01 .03, 1.01.13, 1.01.14, 1.08.01, 2.00.01, 2.01 .01, 2.01 .02 and 2.01 .03. Consideration must also be given to the implication of any proposed privacy screens/landscaping on solar access to these apartments.	<p>Apartments 1.00.01, 1.00.02, 1.00.03, 1.00.10, 2.00.01, 2.01.01, 2.01.02 & 2.01.03:</p> <p>A vertical slatted fence is proposed to screen any direct overlooking. Additional planting increases the sense of privacy as well as softening the green edge. This is illustrated further in Appendix J.</p> <p>Apartments 1.01.13 & 1.01.14</p> <p>Where the balconies sit right along the boundary, the 1.8m high fence is proposed with 700mm high solid balustrade, which will prevent any privacy issues.</p> <p>Apartment 1.08.01</p> <p>A 2m high slatted fence is provided for this apartment.</p>	<p>Refer Appendix I & J.</p> <p>Refer to DA-10-2600 (B).</p>
	Provide further information and consideration regarding the proposed privacy mitigation measures and lines of sight between the balconies serving apartments 1.02.11	A vertical louvre is provided on the balcony to ensure additional privacy to 1.02.11 & 1.02.18 (and the identical apartments above).	Refer Appendix I and DA-10-2200 B.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	and 1.02.18 (and the identical apartments above), and the habitable rooms and balconies of units 1.02.10 and 1.02.19 (and the identical apartments above).		
	Confirm why apartments 1.07.13 and 1.07.14 are identified as cross-ventilated in drawing 94- 000.	<p>Apartments 1.07.13 and 1.07.14 are not cross-ventilated.</p> <p>Refer to updated DA-94-0000 (Cross Ventilation Compliance Diagram), showing overall 60% compliance.</p>	DA-94-0000 B.
	Provide plans demonstrating compliance with ADG minimum storage volume recommendations (including provision of a minimum of 50% within the apartment).	Please refer to Appendix R of this report for a breakdown of storage area for sites 1 & 2. This demonstrates compliance with the ADG.	Refer Appendix R.
	Provide revised plans demonstrating deep soil area calculations and clearly identifying areas that satisfy the ADG 6 m minimum dimension recommendation. It also appears the deep soil area illustrated on drawing L0.01 includes the area occupied by balconies on the eastern side of both proposed buildings, as shown on the architectural plans.	<p>Note: The proposal has a total deep soil provision of 10%</p> <p>Site 1: 6.8%</p> <p>Site 2: 15.8%</p> <p>This is generally in compliance with the ADG control of 7%.</p> <p>The deep soil areas of also both achieve the 6m minimum dimension of the ADG.</p>	Refer Appendix J.
	Provide further details of proposed privacy mitigation measures on the western elevation of Building 1 (level 9 and above).	The scheme proposes an innovative design to the western façade of the upper levels of both buildings to be sealed or otherwise enclosed for future façade modification should it be required. The design also ensures that no amenity of the habitable rooms will be compromised by doing so, as the space behind does not rely on this façade as the only source of light and ventilation.	Refer Appendix J.
	Provide a copy of the lift consultant advice referred to in the EIS consideration of 4F-1 of the ADG.	Lift traffic analysis advice was prepared by KONE and is attached at Appendix Q. KONE undertook two studies one	Refer Appendix Q of this document.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
		<p>for each site. These reports confirm that the lift ratio provide for an ‘excellent’ overall performance.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with the recommended maximum apartments to be accessed off a circulation core. Of the 45 levels of accommodation across both sites, some 43 levels serve 8 or less apartments and two levels serve 9 apartments. All levels serve less than 12 apartments in accordance with the ADG.</p> <p>Further a high level of amenity is provided to all circulation space,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daylight and natural ventilation are provided to all corridors and circulation spaces. • Windows are provided in common circulation spaces and lobbies. • 1800mm corridor minimum width <p>Site 2 has two connected common circulation spaces sharing with an open courtyard to maximise solar access and natural ventilation.</p>	
	Confirm the function of the proposed executive garden on level 10 of Building 1 and its relationship to the balcony of apartment 1.10.01.	This is a private ‘bonus’ amenity feature and will be a communal use for that floor. This will be screened from apartment 1.10.01 via vegetation and glass screening.	Refer Appendix J.
	Provide a supplemental acoustic report that considers the potential amenity impact of the location of apartments in both proposed buildings adjacent to service areas.	<p>A supplemental acoustic report has been prepared by Renzo Tonin and Associates. The report provides a total of four recommendations to mitigate potential acoustic impacts from the loading bay including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The roller door shall be of solid construction and fitted with soft liner within the guides to eliminate metal-to-</i> 	Refer Appendix L.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
		<p><i>metal contact, ensuring that the shutters operate smoothly.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The door shall be immediately closed upon a garbage truck entering and remain closed until the truck exits the loading bay.</i> <i>Floor separating the loading bay to the apartment above to shall comply with the NCC 2019 and achieve a weighted sound reduction index of Rw 50.</i> <i>To prevent sleep disturbances to residences with bedrooms facing the service entry driveway, the loading dock operating hours shall be limited to the day and evening time periods (7am to 10pm).</i> 	
Trees and Landscaping	Provide an arborist report that considers the proposed trees to be removed, including whether any significant mature trees could be transplanted.	An updated Aboricultural report has been submitted with this RTS, please refer to Appendix C of the RTS document.	Appendix C of RtS.
	Provide a response to matters raised by the Office of Environment and Heritage and the Sydney Olympic Park Authority (SOPA) in relation to tree removal and proposed landscaping/tree canopy cover.	Refer above (page 14).	Appendix C of RtS.
	Review and provide justification for the proposed removal of trees located outside the site boundary adjacent to Bennelong Parkway.	<p>Due to the topography of the land and set RL of the ground level apartments, some of the existing trees along Bennelong Drive are proposed to be removed. These trees and marked as non-significant. The significant trees have been retained to the north of the site.</p> <p>By lowering this RL level, a greater level of amenity is provided to the ground level apartments that face Bennelong Drive. As the trees to be removed are non-significant, this is considered to be acceptable.</p>	Appendix B of RtS.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
		Please see pages 23 & 24 of the Landscape Report at Appendix B of the RtS for further justification and landscape intent for this area.	
	Provide revised landscape plans confirming the number and location of each proposed tree species.	Refer to page 30 of the Landscape Report, provided at Appendix B of the RtS.	Appendix B of RtS.
Land Contamination	Provide a Remedial Action Plan for 1 Murray Rose Avenue as recommended by the Detailed Site Investigation.	<p>A RAP has been prepared by Ei Australia and is attached at Appendix K.</p> <p>The report confirms that the previous investigation on the site concluded that the site is largely suitable for the proposed use, providing that the remediation measures were carried out. As outlined in section 4 of the RAP, these consist of excavation and offsite disposal. A suggested remedial sequence is also proposed.</p>	Appendix K of this document.
Wind Mitigation	<p>Provide further details of how the wind mitigation measures recommended in the Wind Impact Assessment Report have been incorporated into the proposed design, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – additional densely foliating vegetation along Murray Rose Avenue. – additional vegetation to the north of Building 1. 	<p>The landscape architect has incorporated further landscaping on the roof top garden facing Murray Rose Avenue. The species are of an evergreen variety and densely foliating. Trees are to be planted in clusters with interlocking canopies to help absorb the wind.</p> <p>Further, a 2m high perimeter evergreen densely foliating vegetation has been incorporated into wind screen design consistent with the wind migration strategy.</p> <p>Stage 3 of the new Brick-pit Park has now been completed, providing densely foliating evergreen</p>	Refer Appendix J

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> awnings over the southern entrance to communal open space on the ground level of Building 1. seal the southern entrance to the communal open space of Building 2. a 2 m high impermeable screen around the perimeter of the level 8 communal open spaces 	<p>vegetation in interlocking canopies along the northern edge of Building 1. The raised level of the park, together with height of the interlocking canopies will not only provide protection to the ground level of building 1 but also up to levels 3 and 4 of building 1.</p> <p>Trees have also been incorporated into the landscaping design of the northern edge of the communal open space to further absorb the wind. Evergreen foliating trees are also being included in the site through link landscape design</p> <p>The Windtech report highlighted the No.1 ground floor entry area may experience adverse wind conditions as a result of the wind flows funnelling into the narrow entrance on Murray Rose Avenue. The initial solution was to introduce an awning over the entrance. However, after further consideration a 2m high impermeable wind screen across the Murray Rose Avenue entrance has been incorporated into the building design.</p> <p>The landscape architect has incorporated additional landscaping treatment on all three tiers to the southern entrance of the communal open space of Building 2. The species are of an evergreen variety and densely foliating ensuring effective buffering of the south-east winds.</p> <p>The architect has also has incorporated a 2m high glass screen door to further prevent funnelling wind flows.</p> <p>PTW and RPS worked with Windtech to design an impermeable wind screen around the perimeter of level 8 in building 1 and 2. The wind screens incorporate a mix of</p>	

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	and around the upper level north and south facing balconies on both buildings	<p>2m high glass panels and densely foliating vegetation (refer drawings DA-10-2600 and DA-10-5600).</p> <p>In addressing the private balconies which are exposed to the prevailing winds of the upper floors of building 2, the architect has incorporated screens on both ends of the corner balconies to deflect accelerations and incorporated 2m high glass panels and densely foliating vegetation to deflect the prevailing winds upwards. These screens are incorporated to all southern balconies on upper floors.</p> <p>An additional Wind Impact Statement has been sought from Windtech (Appendix U). This confirms that the replacement of sections of solid screen with equivalent height planter boxes containing densely foliating vegetation is expected to achieve similar wind mitigation results for those areas.</p>	Refer Appendix U.
Carparking	Consider providing accessible visitor car parking within each building in accordance with SOPA's Access Guidelines.	32 accessible visitor car parking spaces will be provided in accordance with the guidelines. These are illustrated on the updated plans.	Refer Appendix J.
Location of Visitor Parking (No 1)	Review the location of visitor bicycle parking for for 1 Murray Rose Avenue. This location raises CPTED issues given this area is shared with resident bicycle storage areas.	<p>This visitor bicycle parking area has now been relocated to the front of the development (refer plan DA-10-2000 - C)</p> <p>Visitors will be also be assisted in navigating to the appropriate bike parking areas via wayfinding signage.</p>	Refer Appendix J.
Other Matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide further view impact analysis/images of the proposed development when viewed from residential towers to the south-west. This should include a comparison of the view impact of the 	Refer response 1, above.	Refer Above.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	<p>proposed development compared to a height compliant development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Provide a response to the Environment Protection Authority's comments regarding odour, noise, water and waste management. – Provide a response to OEH's comments in relation to sustainability. 	<p>Additional view impact analysis from the south west of the proposed development has been provided at Appendix J of this document.</p> <p>A response to the submissions made by EPA and OEH has been provided in the body of the RTS document. The following comments also address the sustainability matters outlined within the OEH submission:</p> <p>The Biodiversity Impact Statement submitted with the original application package highlights that the proposal will have minimal environmental impact on waterways within the Central District and the Sydney Harbour Catchment.</p> <p>Section 2.1 of the report states the following:</p> <p><i>“a small component of Bennelong Pond would be in the building shadow from 2pm. The shade does not affect areas containing mangroves until 3pm and at this time, only a small portion of the western edge of the mangrove area is in shade.</i></p> <p><i>It is noted the western sections of Bennelong Pond are also subject to shade from the native trees along both sides of Bennelong Parkway. At approximately 1:30pm during the site visit (28 September 2018), shade from these trees was observed to approximately 12m east from the western bank of Bennelong Pond, with only small areas of light filtering through.</i></p> <p><i>The mangroves and aquatic habitats (including habitat for Zannichellia palustris) to the east of the Project extend over an area of greater than 30 hectares. The section of Bennelong Pond subject to shading from the development at 3pm during winter is approximately 0.7 hectares, i.e. 2.3%. The remaining area of mangroves and habitat for Zannichellia palustris would remain unaffected.</i></p>	<p>Refer Appendix J.</p> <p>Refer RtS document.</p> <p>Refer Appendix O.</p>

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Provide a response to the Government Architect NSW comments regarding the achievement of a 6-star Green Star rating and heat loadings/sun shading. – Provide further details of the proposed Project Delivery Agreement with the Sydney Olympic Park Authority. 	<p><i>Given the effects of shade from the Project will only occur over a small area from 3pm (in the winter months), in an area which is already partly subject to shading from trees, the shadow from the Project is not considered likely to adversely affect aquatic species in Bennelong Pond”.</i></p> <p>The report also confirms that light spill onto Bennelong Pond is likely to be minimal given the existing vegetation and proposed setbacks.</p> <p>In line with the actions 60-63 of the Central City Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not impede access to the district waterways. • The proposal does not seek to undertake works to existing waterways. <p>As outlined above, the proposal will have a minimal environmental impact on waterways in the locality, principally Bennelong Pond.</p> <p>A response to the submissions made by GANSW has been provided in the body of the RTS document. Meeting Minutes (dated 15th May 2018) have also been attached at Appendix O, as evidence that Austino continues to work with SOPA on 6 star green star issues.</p> <p>Given that the requested PDA is a confidential legal document, SOPA has been approached regarding this request and have refused access. They have provided the following response:</p> <p><i>“The PDA provides that the Developer must achieve an acceptable development approval from a Consent Authority and that the proposed development must be in</i></p>	Refer Appendix O.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm how the proposed through-site link responds to the issue of equitable disabled access. Provide an economic assessment that details the quantity of affordable housing that is achievable within the proposed development, as required by Section 4.6.17 of the Master Plan. Confirm the proposed distribution of affordable housing within the proposed development. Provide swept path diagrams for the longest vehicle entering and exiting the site and provide confirmation that this satisfies Council's waste collection vehicle requirements. Provide an updated BASIX Certificate if required. 	<p><i>accordance with SOPA's Master Plan 2030 (2018 Review)".</i></p> <p>The through site link at The Chase was never intended to be DDA compliant, and this was accepted by the SOPA Design Review Panel. Accessible paths of travel to Brick Pit Park are provided in close proximity at The Ledge and The Cutting.</p> <p>However, work has been undertaken at the link to ensure the paths of travel are clearly demarcated to avoid pedestrian/ vehicle conflict.</p> <p>An Economic Study has been undertaken by JLL at Appendix M. JLL have concluded that under the current market conditions the proposed development would need to achieve a gross realisation uplift of 7% in order to provide 5% Affordable housing. Currently, the study further concluded that in the current market conditions no affordable housing is feasible.</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix M and P for further details of the affordable housing contribution.</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix J of the original application package for the relevant swept path diagrams.</p> <p>As noted in the original Rts, if Paramatta Council do not have MRVs for waste collection, the waste servicing will be provided by a private contractor to accommodate the MRV service space.</p> <p>An updated BASIX certificate has been provided at Appendix D of the RTS document.</p>	<p>Refer Appendix M & P.</p> <p>Refer Appendix D of RTS.</p>

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
Plans and Images	<p>The Department requests the following plans and images are provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – provide an architectural site plan illustrating the proposed development, including setback dimensions. – provide a plan that overlays the proposed site plan with the SSP SEPP and Master Plan building height controls – provide long sections through the eastern and western wings of Building 1 – provide long sections through the northern and southern portions of Building 2 – provide elevations/sections illustrating the relationship of Building 1 and Building 2 to the eastern elevations of 3 and 4 Murray Rose Avenue respectively. – revise the elevation drawings to include maximum building height control lines – provide RLs for the land adjacent to the northern boundary of Building 1 on drawing 10-2100 and adjacent to the western elevation of Building 2 on drawings 10-5100 and 10-5200. – Provide the proposed landscape plans at A3 – Waste management: The EIS states there is a waste collection area within each building to be serviced by council's waste truck. However, we note the WMP states the bins from Building 2 will need to be transferred to Building 1 for collection. If so, this is an unusual arrangement given the buildings are not within the same block but separated by a public roadway and raises a 	<p>Refer to plan DA-00-0500.</p> <p>Refer to updated DA-31-0000.</p> <p>Refer to plan DA-30-0010.</p> <p>Refer to DA-30-0100 of the RTS document.</p> <p>Refer to DA-30-0010 & updated DA-30-0200.</p> <p>Refer to DA-20-0000 - DA-20-0600.</p> <p>Refer to DA-10-2100, DA-10-2200, DA-10-5100 & DA-10-5200.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix J. Also refer to Appendix B of the first RTS document.</p> <p>An updated Waste Report has been prepared by Elephants Foot (refer Appendix S). The report confirms that there is a waste collection area within each building to be serviced by a waste truck. Waste collection vehicles will access No 1 from Murray Rose Avenue and No 2 from Parkview Drive, entering into dedicated loading bays.</p>	<p>Refer to new sheet DA-00-0500, DA-31-0000, DA-30-0010, DA-30-0100, DA-30-0010, DA-30-0200, DA-20-0000 - DA-20-0600</p> <p>Appendix J</p> <p>Refer Appendix S.</p>

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	<p>potential amenity issue. Can you please justify in the RTS why a waste collection area is not provided within Building 2, and provide more details of the bin transfer operation i.e. what vehicle is to be used, how many trips will be required etc. Can you please also demonstrate the bin storage and collection areas satisfy the recommendations of the WMP. I also can't see where the required bulky goods storage room is within Building 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Universal design: The ADG recommends a minimum of 20% of apartments incorporate the Livable Housing Guideline's silver level universal design rating. The ADG assessment however states only 10% of the total apartments will achieve this rating. Could you please review (alternatively we can condition to comply). 	<p>The allocated areas for bulky goods are detailed below:</p> <p>No 1: Ground Floor</p> <p>No 2: 01 Basement.</p> <p>SEPP 65 states 20% of the residential dwellings to be livable 'silver' type complying with the LHA Livable Housing Design Guideline. SOPA's Access Guideline requires 10% of the residential dwellings to be adaptable 'Class B' type complying with AS4299-1995.</p> <p>Adaptable (10%) dwellings are generally counted towards the livable housing requirement, as the adaptable dwellings can also cater for livable. Hence we only require 10% livable, whilst added together they equal the 20%.</p> <p>Please refer to the Access Report at Appendix W of the application package for further information.</p>	<p>Refer to Appendix W of the original application package.</p>
Public Submissions			
Lack of Facilities in Sydney Olympic Park	<p><i>The development fails to create orderly development of the residential suburb of Sydney Olympic Park. Construction of residential apartments has proceeded the construction of the following resident facilities; Primary and a High School, Community Halls and Venues for the arts, vegetable gardens, library, churches, facilities for teenagers to play musical instruments, men's shed, facilities for under 16's sport-netball, basketball, cricket</i></p>	<p>The applicant has no control over the provision of community facilities for the entirety of Sydney Olympic Park.</p> <p>As part of the proposal the applicant has provided several communal open spaces. These are spread across the development in a series of central courtyards and/or landscaped podium rooftops.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment provided at Appendix J of the EIS has confirmed that any traffic increase associated</p>	<p>Refer to Appendix A, K and J of the original application package.</p>

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
	<p><i>etc. Developers have provided well for the under 6's but other age groups are neglected.</i></p> <p><i>This development adds significantly to the stress on current facilities including congested roads without adding to the liveability of this suburb. This application should be deferred until the Sydney Olympic Park Authority can demonstrate their commitment to providing space within the suburb for the above facilities rather than draining the resources of the local government area.</i></p>	<p>with the development is unlikely to have any detrimental impact on the overall performance of the surrounding road network.</p>	
Height	<p><i>1. 12 storey and 15 storey apartments too high. It should be restricted to maximum 8 storeys each. It will decrease the time for construction and disturbance from construction.</i></p> <p><i>It will also block the views for apartments in Australia Ave and Brushbox street and Betty Cuthbert Avenue. It should be same level as buildings around it which seems to be 4~6 levels high.</i></p> <p><i>2. Too much construction going on in Sydney Olympic park makes it noisy. have to close roads sometimes. Digging and construction creates dirt that will fly into apartments around it.</i></p> <p><i>To conclude, the apartments should be compressed to a smaller developments like buildings around it (4~6 levels) so it does not disturb and affect the neighborhood too much.</i></p>	<p>This application has been prepared with regard to the revised controls proposed in the Master Plan (2018 Review) and the accompanying amendment to the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (State Significant Precincts) 2005</i>.</p> <p>The Height of Buildings Map in the SEPP specifies a maximum building height of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.1 Murray Rose Avenue - 26m fronting Bennelong Parkway and 33m on the western portion of the site; and • No.2 Murray Rose Avenue - 26m fronting Bennelong Parkway and 50m on the western portion of the site. <p>As stated above, there are some non-compliances with these height controls, however these have been appropriately justified within this Response to Submission package.</p> <p>The cumulative impacts of the heights of buildings in the vicinity are illustrated in the view impact analysis prepared by PTW Architects (refer Appendix J).</p>	Refer Appendix J.

Issue	Comment	Response	Refer to
		<p>This confirms that when viewed from the residential and other developments to the south-west of the site (particularly 68/100 Bennelong Parkway - a residential development known as 'Botania'), the proposed development creates minimal additional view impact beyond what would be a complying building envelope.</p> <p>The Masterplan identifies that significant development will occur at Sydney Olympic Park over the next decade, which means there is likely to be some disruption experienced as part of his process. However, many of the impacts of the construction can be managed through an effective construction management plan.</p>	

DISCLAIMER

This report is dated 11th April 2019 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd's (**Urbis**) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of Austino Pty Ltd (**Instructing Party**) for the purpose of Response to Submissions (**Purpose**) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose, and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report, and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.

APPENDIX I RESIDENTIAL AMENITY RESPONSE

APPENDIX J ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS AND LANDSCAPE RESPONSE

APPENDIX K REMEDIATION ACTION PLAN

APPENDIX L SUPPLEMENTAL ACOUSTIC ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX M ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX N REVISED REQUEST FOR VARIATION

APPENDIX 0 MEETING MINUTES – SOPA – 15TH MAY 2018

APPENDIX P AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION

APPENDIX Q LIFT TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REPORTING

APPENDIX R STORAGE BREAKDOWN

APPENDIX S REVISED WASTE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX T SOPA LETTER OF SUPPORT



BRISBANE

Level 7, 123 Albert Street
Brisbane QLD 4000
Australia
T +61 7 3007 3800

GOLD COAST

45 Nerang Street,
Southport QLD 4215
Australia
T +61 7 5600 4900

MELBOURNE

Level 12, 120 Collins Street
Melbourne VIC 3000
Australia
T +61 3 8663 4888

PERTH

Level 14, The Quadrant
1 William Street
Perth WA 6000
Australia
T +61 8 9346 0500

SYDNEY

Tower 2, Level 23, Darling Park
201 Sussex Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia
T +61 2 8233 9900

CISTRI – SINGAPORE

An Urbis Australia company
#12 Marina View
21 Asia Square, Tower 2
Singapore 018961
T +65 6653 3424
W cistri.com