

2 November 2009

Director General
Department of Planning
23-33 Bridge Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Attention: Annette Birchall

Dear Annette,

**Major Project Application MP09_0011
Garvan St Vincent's Cancer Centre
Response to Submissions**

We are writing in response to your email of 20 October 2009 requesting further information in relation to the above application.

Demolition Plan

A Demolition Plan has been included in the architectural drawings as requested.

A1 Drawings

A1 size floor plans, elevations and sections have been separately submitted, as requested.

Shadow Diagrams

Shadow diagrams for June 21 at 9am, 10am, 11am, midday, 1pm, 2pm and 3pm have been included in the previously submitted shadow diagrams.

Key Differences between EAR and PPR

As detailed below, numerous submissions were received by the Department from public authorities and the general public following public exhibition of the originally submitted Environmental Assessment Report (EAR). As a result of the proponent's consideration of these issues, the following key changes were made to the project:

Decoupling of Cancer Centre Project Application from the broader Research Precinct Concept Plan

While the Concept Plan for the Research Precinct details building envelopes for both the Cancer Centre and Virology Centre buildings, the design development of the Cancer Centre is significantly more resolved than the Virology Centre. Furthermore, the Cancer Centre has full funding commitment, with no impediment to the commencement of construction upon receiving project approval.

It has therefore been proposed to 'decouple' the Cancer Centre Project and the Concept Plan, allowing the Cancer Centre project to proceed to detailed approval, independently of the resolution of the key parameters for the Virology site.

Height Reduced

A key concern in relation to the originally submitted Cancer Centre building was its height. While the project partners have important research functions that could occupy the entire building originally proposed, the core functions of the proposed research centre can be accommodated within a building reduced by two storeys. Further design development has also achieved height reductions in the rood plant and associated parapet.

As a consequence, the height of the proposed Cancer Centre has been reduced as follows:

- Concept Plan proposal: RL 93.5 (11 storeys above Victoria St)
- Original Project Application proposal: RL 91.936 (11 storeys above Victoria St)
- Preferred Project Report proposal: RL 80.4 (9 storeys above Victoria St)

The proposed Cancer Centre building has been reduced by 13.1 metres. As Victoria Street is at RL 40.9 (and variable), this reduction equates to 22% of the originally envisaged height of the buiding.

Car Parking Reduced

The originally proposed Cancer Centre building included 217 basement car parking spaces. In addition to providing for the proposed Cancer Centre and the existing Garvan Institute building (as required by a Condition of Consent for the erection of the Garvan Institute), this included the provision of additional car parking to relieve the existing shortfall at St Vincent's Hospital.

In view of significant objection to this additional component of parking, a level of parking has been deleted, reducing the number of spaces from 217 to 150, a reduction of over 30%.

Façade Design Refined

In view of various issues arising throughout the assessment process, the design of the Victoria Street façade has been comprehensively reviewed by BVN Architects. While the attached design statement more thoroughly explains the revised façade, in short:

- The majority of the three storey base element has been revised to establish an aerial garden floating over the Victoria Street footpath from four metres above the footpath to twelve metres in height. The aerial garden is an extension of a ground level garden located in a two metre setback zone between the footpath and the new chemotherapy suites.
- While the external enclosing wall of the western tower façade has not changed, the fine metal screen has been extended across the entire façade, creating a 'diaphanous veil' that will variously screen or expose the building form behind, depending upon the angle and distance of the viewer, and relative natural and artificial lighting conditions.

City of Sydney Submission

With specific regard to the submission to the Minister made by the City of Sydney, below is a tabulated response to each of the issues raised.

City of Sydney Submission	Applicant's Response
1. The Environmental Assessment Report prepared by Urbis for SVHMS is inadequate overall and deficient in a number of key areas. It does not satisfactorily address the Director General's Environmental Assessment Requirements, and the City is of the view that any assessment which relies on the unsubstantiated rationales within the report will be open to question and will provide an indefensible outcome. Examples of issues include:	The City's submission does not specify: – where the EA is inadequate or deficient; – which of the Director General's Environmental Assessment Requirements has not been satisfactorily addressed; or – which rationales that have been relied upon are unsubstantiated.
(a) The Concept Plan envelopes have not been justified on planning grounds. The report makes it clear that the size and heights of the proposed buildings are solely determined by the projected 'needs' of each institute, and that the scale of the buildings directly reflects those requirements alone;	The Concept Plan is fundamentally informed by relevant State, subregional and local planning strategies and built form principles. Within this context, building envelopes were determined with reference to: – The adopted strategic planning objectives of government. – The underlying built form principles that informed controls applicable within the area – Established physical benchmarks within the landscape. – The functional structure of the surrounding urban context. Local scale analysis was also undertaken to ensure that immediate impacts (e.g. noise, traffic volumes, visual impact and overshadowing) are contained within normally accepted criteria.
(b) <i>The analysis of alternatives fails to meaningfully consider any alternatives including collocating the UNSW Virology building at nearby locations such as Boundary Street. The desirability of co-locating medical researchers and clinicians on the St Vincent's site does not justify development of the scale proposed;</i>	As detailed at Section 3.0 of the Concept plan, Action A2.1.3 of the Draft Inner Sydney Subregional Strategy specifically recognises the precinct as a world class health services cluster, and Action A2.2 requires the Department of Planning and the Department of State and Regional Development to promote the precinct as a centre of excellence in biomedical research and development. Section 5 of the Concept Plan examines alternatives including: – Council's preferred option (i.e. local contextual approach) – An alternative locality (e.g. within the UNSW campus) – Other nearby sites

As documented at page 23 of the Concept Plan, local heritage constraints and the highly fragmented pattern of surrounding land holdings severely limit options to use other nearby sites, such as land in Boundary Street, which is within the Barcom Avenue Conservation Area. The local contextual approach advocated by Council and the former Master Plan for the precinct simply precludes the type of facilities proposed, and a distant location, such as within the UNSW campus at Kensington (over 4km away) would undermine the significant translational medicine opportunities provided by collocation of clinical and research functions.

The alternative options advocated by Council have been meaningfully considered in the Concept Plan, and found to be inferior in terms of either local amenity/heritage or public health outcomes.

(c) *The overshadowing and overlooking analyses lack credibility. It can be deduced that the overshadowing effects over the residential areas east of West Street will be significant in the afternoon throughout most of the year and more extensive than the one day of the year chosen to be illustrated in the Report (equinox and other time impacts are not considered). Overshadowing impacts to Green Park in the early hours of the day are considered unacceptable;*

The project Architects who produced the shadows diagrams have advised that Shadow drawings were generated using Microstation software, based upon survey information provided by Rygate & Company Limited (Dwg No. 73649 - Showing contours & DTM surrounding the site and EX_71194_RevF - Showing the existing buildings on site)

A 3D net was constructed which accurately represents the information provided by the surveyor relating to the topography of the site.

All modelled information was set to the surveyors True North in the Microstation model and all existing buildings where survey information was available were modelled to survey ridgeline, gutter or parapet line and to survey outline. All buildings, including the proposed scheme were projected from RL 0.0 to the corresponding survey RL or intended RL, as reflected on BVN elevations and sections for the Project Application. Sun angles and sun angle projection were based on sun angle projection software that is built into Microstation.

As the city would be aware, the "one day of the year chosen to be illustrated" is the Winter Solstice, which is the day of the year on which shadows are longest and shadow impacts therefore the most extensive. Throughout the rest of the year, shadow impacts will be less extensive than indicated. Should the Department of Planning see any purpose in considering other dates, diagrams for these dates can be provided.

(d) *The heritage assessment fails to provide adequate information (including no assessment of interiors) in relation to the affected 429 and 431 Liverpool Street terraces and is deficient in its assessment of the impacts*

The heritage assessment of the site includes specific reference to 429-431 Liverpool Street. It provides a history, description, assessment of significance and a Statement of Significance. Interiors were not described but are altered and damaged examples of the period, being representative late Victorian terraced houses. The dwellings are not listed as Heritage Items, are not designated in Council's controls as Contributory Items

on the heritage listed school at 350 Liverpool Street. The heritage assessment does not provide any built form guidance as to how the mass of the West Street envelopes transition to, or relates to, the former Victorian period grocer terrace at 429 Liverpool Street.

and are not in a Conservation Area.

The Heritage Impact Statement for this site was for the Precinct Master Plan and it assessed the envelope controls without specifically referring to the detailed design resolution for a particular design in association with conservation of built heritage.

The report at Section 5.0, deals with 'Heritage Items in the Vicinity' and specifically, at Section 5.3, '350 Liverpool Street Darlinghurst - Darlinghurst Public School Group'. It assessed that there was no detrimental impact on the heritage significance and appreciation of the school group.

(e) Unacceptable justifications made in the Report include:

The following quotes are selectively taken out of context. In context they are entirely reasonable and accurate statements:

"...when viewed from the east, the Concept Plan will be merely infilling a gap in the existing high rise wall along eastern side of Darlinghurst."
(Part 8.5.3)

This statement is explicitly made with reference to district, rather than immediate views. In full it states:

"The eastern boundary of the Precinct sits along a distinct urban boundary between low rise Paddington and high rise Darlinghurst. As seen in Figures 12, 13 and 32 when viewed from the east, the Concept Plan will be merely infilling a gap in the existing high rise wall along the eastern side of southern Darlinghurst".

The figures referred to, which are clearly analysing district scale visual impacts, are included below.



Figure 12 - District Context



*“...the proposed building will appear relatively small in context of taller buildings further to the east and the high rise backdrop of the Sydney CBD”
(Part 8.5.3)*

This statement is explicitly made with reference to distant views from the east. In full it states:

“When viewed from more distant locations to the east, the proposed building will appear relatively small in the context of taller building further to the east and the high rise backdrop of the Sydney CBD (see Figure 34)”.



“...the likely additional shadow impacts do not add major additional shadows when compared to the current shadowing on the surrounding area.”

This quote from the Pre-Lodgement Consultation Report (not the Concept Plan) is providing summary reference to the following accurate analysis at Section 8.5.4 of the Concept Plan:

Summary

In summary, Green Park will maintain full sun access shortly after 10.00am and West Avenue residences will lose an hour of sunlight between 2.00pm and 3.00pm on the shortest day of the

(Appendix B Part 3.2)	<i>year. In the context of a densely developed urban area, this is not an unreasonable impact. West Avenue residences will exceed the sunlight access requirements of the RFDC and impacts throughout most of the year will be considerably less"</i>
<i>"the size and heights of the proposed new buildings are determined by the needs of each research institute and the scale of the buildings reflect those requirements"</i> (Appendix B Part 3.1)	This quote from the Pre-Lodgement Consultation Report (not the Concept Plan) is explaining why buildings of the sizes proposed are sought. It is not an analysis or justification of the effects of the size of these buildings. The full quote states: <i>"The size and heights of the proposed new buildings are determined by the needs of each research institution. To undertake the planned research, each group requires a certain number of researchers, laboratories and other associated facilities."</i>
(f) No documentation has been provided with the GSVCCC application showing the design, location or specifications of the additional truck access/egress proposed to West Street. The City has been unable to assess how this will impact on traffic flows in adjoining residential streets.	No additional truck access/egress is proposed to West Street in association with the GSVCC project.
2. The City is of the view that the two building envelopes in the Concept Plan are unacceptable in their current outline form. They are inconsistent with the 2005 Master Plan and analysis for the precinct (referred to in Paragraph one of Part 3 of the Heritage Impact Statement), being a Master Plan previously prepared by the applicant (refer Appendix 1). In particular, the City is of the view that the envelope of the Victoria Street Building (GSVCCC), requires at a minimum, the amendments set out in (a) and (b) on Page 4 below and in the attached drawings (Appendix 2), in order to reach a level of acceptability within the context of the setting:	As discussed in relation to public submissions below, the 2005 Master Plan is not a matter for statutory consideration in the determination of the current application Reference by the City to Paragraph 1 of Part 3 of the submitted HIS is disingenuous. The reference in the HIS is merely a citation of historical investigations prepared in association with the 2005 Masterplan, not an endorsement of otherwise of that Masterplan. The full reference in the submitted HIS is: <i>"A comprehensive history of the site was prepared in 2005 by Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners, Architects, as part of the development of an earlier Master Plan for the Precinct. This section draws heavily on that work"</i>

1 Envelopes Proposed by City of Sydney

The envelopes proposed by the City are based upon a simplistic approach, considering only the immediately adjoining properties to the east and west

(a) Victoria Street Envelope (GSVCCC)

- i. Reduction in the maximum height of the roof to RL 72.00 equivalent to the roof parapet of the Victor Chang building in Liverpool Street (reason: this is considered to be the maximum height that a building envelope of this large size floor area can achieve without dominating the streetscape and negatively altering the character of the area);

No rationale is provided as to why the Victor Chang (Lowy Packer) building should inform the height of buildings on Victoria Street. As demonstrated below, there are numerous other buildings with comparable footprints and height in the immediate vicinity of the site that more directly inform the scale of buildings perceived primarily from within Victoria Street.

Notwithstanding this, the Preferred Project reduces the height of the GSVCC by 2 stories (11.5 metres). The revised building will have a topmost point at RL 80.4, which is well below both the Testra (RL 83) and Cahill (RL88) buildings, notwithstanding being taller than the Lowy Packer Building (RL 72).

- ii. Continuous setback from the Victoria Street boundary of 3.2 metres for the width of the building façade above RL 54 (reason: this maintains the street wall line established by the previous Garvin Institute Building on the corner of Victoria and Burton Streets which in turn recognises the streetscape character of the buildings opposite and those to be demolished);

The following response is an extract from the attached Design Statement prepared by BVN Architects.

"Much discussion has been had regarding a potential three metre setback from Victoria Street above the "podium" level. The apparent form of the building is described by the limit of the diaphanous veil; however the actual built form of the building – the solid form – is actually setback two metres from Victoria Street and two metres from the northern plane of the veil. On Victoria Street the laboratory pod of the façade reduces the two metre dimension to 600 millimetres for part of the façade.

The visual depth created by the interplay of light between the veil and the true façade of the building contributes to the ambiguity of the architecture. From afar – from the intersection of Surrey and Victoria Streets, the northern façade becomes quite transparent as the angle of the viewer becomes flatter and the small scale of the veil blurs exposing the glazed form of the atrium. This view is one of two distant vistas to the building; the second being the view north from Oxford Street and Victoria. The former view exposes another "hidden" or "revealed" aspect of the façade – i.e. the "true" west façade is setback two metres from Victoria Street and is viewed at different angles, in different light and at different distances.

These changing viewing experiences expose the real architectural character of the building – a subtle, complex and considered layering of surface and volume which changes its character in deference to the passing day".

(b) West Street Envelope (UNSWVC) i. Reduction in the street wall height to the boundary with West Street to RL 43 with a setback above RL 43 which can be interpreted in one of two ways: a. 5.0 metre stepped setback above RL 43 to a maximum height of RL 54.00; or b. Angled setback above RL 43 to 48 degrees above RL 43 for the width of the building;	While we reject the parochial contextualism advocated by the City in this regard, the Virology Centre (West St) building envelope is the subject of the Concept Plan, which has been decoupled from the Cancer Centre Project Application.
ii. Revised corner setback treatment to Liverpool Street and West Street depending on whether both terraces are retained (being Option A), or both terraces are demolished (being Option B). The City does not support the retention of the remnant single terrace against the sheer façade of the proposed envelope – either two terraces or no terraces are the alternatives acceptable to the City. In this regard, the proposal in its unaltered form is similar to some of the worst urban outcomes of the 1960s.	429 and 431 Liverpool Street are located on the Virology Centre site, which is the subject of the Concept Plan, which has been decoupled from the Cancer Centre Project Application.
These reductions would result in a decrease in the GFA from approximately 13,900sqm to 9,500sqm in the Victoria Street Envelope and from 8,500sqm to 5,800sqm in the West Street Envelope. The floor space required by the GSVCCC could be accommodated across both redesigned buildings.	While the City has grossly overestimates the floor space that could be obtained within the Virology Centre site controls it proposes, this site has been decoupled from the Cancer Centre. The proposed reduction of the Cancer Centre site results in the GFA being reduced to slightly less than 11,500m² (11,486m²).

-
3. The proposed ground floor outpatient treatment room proposed to the Victoria Street (GSVCCC) frontage should be relocated and this part of the building redesigned to allow the relatively inactive frontage to be replaced with a series of ancillary shop units or similar to ensure appropriate street level activation.

The GSVCCC is a special purpose building specifically designed to accommodate cancer research and treatment. A prominent street presence is appropriate for such a use.

Additional commercial space would further displace cancer research functions, which are already being constrained by the other submissions of the City and others.

Furthermore, the following response is an extract from the attached Design Statement prepared by BVN Architects.

“The streetscape at the southern end of Victoria Street is currently in a state of relative disarray compared with that of the northern end – to the north, footpaths are populated with coffee drinking citizens enjoying a critical urban experience. The new Garvan & St Vincent’s Cancer Centre (GSVCC) does not attempt to replicate this dense urban character but rather to humanize the pedestrian experience and transition the urban corridor to the verdant realm of Green Park and the St Vincent’s Hospital campus.

The street level façade of the GSVCC proposition establishes an aerial garden floating over the Victoria Street footpath from four metres above the footpath to twelve metres in height. The aerial garden is an extension of the ground level garden located in the two metre setback zone between the footpath and the new chemotherapy suite. Most chemotherapy suites in Sydney are dire internal grey spaces – this proposed GSVCC suite creates an internal environment reflecting the compassionate values of the centre by surrounding the facility with lush and fragrant gardens”.

Car parking and excavation should be reduced to be commensurate with the reduction in floor area associated with the amendments in 2(a) and (b) above and in any case to be complying with the maximum car parking controls which apply to the site. Providing additional parking on the site to address the shortfall elsewhere in the St Vincent’s Campus is not supported given the excellent proximity to alternative forms of public transport.

See “Traffic/Parking” response to public submissions below.

4. Any new vehicular entry points from West Street are unsupported. Driveway access to the site should be from Liverpool Street via Chaplin Lane with egress via the existing car park ramp onto West Street. The potential for queuing to occur over the Victoria and Liverpool Street junction as a result of eastbound vehicles waiting to enter the site could be overcome by imposing a right-turn ban at peak times or by imposing a physical treatment. It is noted that the suggested decrease in floor area would result in reduced traffic flows.	See "Number of Driveways" and "West Street Vehicular Access" responses below.
--	--

Clearly there is no urban design rationale for the current Concept Plan envelopes

An extensive urban design rationale considering local, district and State level considerations, in addition to topography, urban form, linear connections and edges has been provided. The parochial approach advocated by the City simply averages the height of selectively chosen adjoining properties, with no consideration of the broader physical or strategic planning context.

However, a two storey reduction of the height is nevertheless now proposed, as detailed above.

Public Submissions

As requested, the following provides a summary of the issues raised in, and the applicant's response to submissions made in relation to public exhibition of the originally submitted Environmental Assessment Report for the above project.

Attached is a matrix summarising the key issues raised in public submissions. Each issue raised is collectively addressed below.

Height / bulk

As detailed above, the originally submitted Project Application proposed a height of 11 storeys and a topmost height of RL 91.936 on the Cancer Centre site. The Preferred Project Report reduced the proposed height to 9 storeys and a topmost height of RL 80.4, a reduction of 2 storey, or 11.5 metres (23%)

Design / Character

A Design Statement prepared by BVN Architects is attached.

Traffic / No. of Car Parking

In response to objections in relation to car parking, the proposed number of spaces has been reduced from 217 to 150- (over 30%). The 150 spaces now proposed is well within the maximum allowed for the Cancer Centre and Garvan Institute pursuant to DCP 11 and the Garvan Institute consent conditions.

West St Vehicle Access

Access via the existing West Street driveways is proposed because:

- ☐ RTA guidelines (2002) recommend that vehicle access be provided by the lowest order street frontage of any site, which in this case is clearly West Street.
- ☐ RTA guidelines (2002) specify a 'desired environmental capacity' of 200-300 veh/h for local streets, such as West Street. Existing peak traffic flows in West Street are approximately 40-50 veh/h. While the project will more than double these volumes to approximately 100-110 veh/h this volume is still well within the environmental capacity of this local urban street.

A key issue raised in the great majority of submissions relates to the 'Special Condition' to the project Approval for the erection of the Lowy Packer building. This condition effectively requires measures to preclude vehicles entering the existing West Street driveways via West Avenue. Whilst we acknowledge that the installed traffic islands do not physically prevent vehicles making this movement, the movement is unlawful. Furthermore, whilst the movement does occur, it is in very limited numbers. Traffic counts carried out by TEF Consulting in the course of preparation of the traffic impacts assessment revealed only two (2) vehicles performing this movement in order to enter the loading dock during the 3-hour morning survey period. Only one (1) such illegal movement was recorded during the 4-hour afternoon survey period. A review of security camera footage over a three-day period in September-October 2009 revealed only 15 vehicles performing this manoeuvre. While a vehicle entering the driveway illegally may be a noticable event, in terms of impact upon overall traffic performance, volumes of this order are well within the environmental capacity of local streets, even given the constrained physical conditions of West Avenue, and the additional traffic that will be generated by the Cancer Centre car park.

Chaplin Street is unacceptable as a vehicular access point because:

- ☐ Right hand turns into Chaplin Lane would create significant conflicts with the operation of the proximate signalised intersection of Liverpool and Victoria Streets. However, the width, geometry and proximity of Chaplin Lane and Victoria Street effectively prevent the provision of a physical barrier to prevent such movements.
- ☐ Assuming that right hand turns into Chaplin Street could be prevented, the majority of vehicles that will be arriving from the north, south or west will have to circle the block to arrive via West Street in any event.
- ☐ Any queuing out of the driveway would cause significant traffic congestion, whereas West Street has capacity to accommodate occasional queuing without significant incident.
- ☐ Chaplin lane is private land (i.e. it is not currently a public road) and it is proposed to be pedestrianised to form an important linkage between research activity within the Lowy Packer building and the proposed GSVCC. Noting the need to traverse a subterranean substation required at the northern end of Chaplin Street, vehicle access via Chaplin Street would require a significant ramp structure that would effectively preclude any meaningful pedestrian interface across Chaplin Street.

- Given the proximity of Chaplin Street to the signalised intersection of Victoria and Liverpool Streets, queuing back from this intersection should easily obstruct egress from the site in peak periods.

Number of Driveways

No new vehicular entry points from West Street are proposed in association with the Cancer Centre, which relies entirely upon the existing West Street driveways.

Overshadowing (Res to east)

The attached shadow diagrams have been prepared by BVN for each hour between 9.00am and 3.00pm on the Winter Solstice, the worst day of the year for overshadowing.

As shown in these diagrams, at no time will shadows cast by the proposed building ever extend east beyond the Lowy Packer or Garvan Institute buildings to the residential properties in West Street, WEST Avenue, Cow Lane or Barcom Avenue. While some morning shadows will be cast upon buildings on the opposite side of Victoria Street, these shadows will only effect the southern end of the street block, and only between 9.30 and 11.00am.

Previous Masterplan

The 2005 Master Plan is not a matter for statutory consideration in the determination of the current applications. It was prepared in 2004, when St Vincent's did not have any firm proposal for the two remaining sites. While the Statement of Commitments for the Lowey Packer (Victor Chang) building included (commitment 1.7) a statement that St Vincent's Hospital Limited intended to implement the future development of the overall site in accordance with the Master Plan document, the commitment is explicit that this would be subject to the future demands on medical and health requirements by the community and future changes in technology.

In the subsequent 5 years there have indeed been dramatic changes in gene based therapeutic practice, generating the need for translational approaches to medicine, where clinicians and researchers work together on a daily basis, rather than work from isolated facilities in different parts of the city.

Consultation (Lack of)

Extensive community consultation in excess of statutory requirements has been undertaken, as detailed in the Preferred project and other reports.

Heritage (Demolition of Pomona)

A Heritage Impact Statement dealing with the proposed demolition of Pomona was submitted with the Concept Plan. The HIS concluded that while the dwelling is a good example of its kind, it is not significant enough to warrant its individual listing. Furthermore, it is not practicable to develop the proposed Cancer Centre site and maintain a meaningful context to Pomona. Given the broader medical and strategic planning significance of the Cancer Centre, demolition of Pomona is proposed.

Heritage (Surrounding Context)

A Heritage Impact Statement dealing with the impact of the proposed building upon the heritage values of surrounding heritage Items and Areas was submitted with the project Application.

Impact on Lowy Packer

Noting that the Lowy Packer building is owned by the proponent, it has always been understood that the views and sunlight enjoyed by the recently constructed Lowy Packer building would be significantly impacted upon by development of the rest of the Research precinct. Indeed the proximity, and linkages between the Cancer Centre and the Lowy Packer building are key to the concept of an integrated research precinct.

Loss of Landscaping

The submission raising this issue is referring to loss of the garden next to the West Street driveway. However, this will not be effected by the Cancer Centre project, and will be dealt with separately though the decouples Concept Plan process for the West Street (Virology) site.

Wind

A Wind Effects report was prepared by Heggies Engineers and submitted with the Project Application. This report demonstrates that the project will not result in any unreasonable wind conditions in the vicinity of the site.

Dilapidation Report

Dilapidation reports of immediately surrounding properties will be prepared prior to the commencement of works.

Noise (Plant & Construction)

Noise Management Reports were submitted with the Project Application.

Facade changes:

The façade changes are described and explained in detail in the attached Design Statement prepared by BVN Architects.

Yours sincerely,



Ian Cady
Associate Director

Enc.

- Submissions Matrix
- Design Statement prepared by BVN Architects