

Response to Submissions

ISSUES	RESPONSE
City of Sydney	
<i>Architecture, Bulk and Scale</i>	
The quality of the architecture used is questioned and the proposal results in a bulky mass including the new tower. The proposed tower is 76 metres long, whereas City residential towers are not to be more than 40 metres long.	Consideration has been given to reducing bulk and scale and increasing articulation on the western façade of the building. The principles that have been incorporated are described in Section 2.1 of the EAR and in the architectural plans at Volume 2 of the PPR. The bulk and scale of the western façade has been reduced by creating a more articulated building composition and recessing the two stairwells at the north and south ends of the building. Two vertical recesses have been re-distributed across the façade to further reduce the visual façade length to approximately 22 metres between recess slots.
A design competition is required for a development of this scale.	As this proposal was not subject to Part 4 of the EP&A Act, the requirements of Sydney LEP 2005 were not mandatory. Nevertheless, as described in section 6.3.2 of the EAR, the design process undertaken by the proponent to arrive at the proposal was extensive and rigorous. In addition, the proponent further refined the design in response to commentary received from the City of Sydney. This included consultation with the City of Sydney's Director City Planning and Regulatory Services and peer review by Lacoste + Stevenson Architects.
The proposed tower does not sit well in its context, particularly in relation to the ABC building and the heritage building on the corner of Broadway and Harris Street. It does not complement its setting and the tower will read as a mass of repetitive and continuous structure against the more refined ABC building.	As described in Section 3 of the PPR, the proposed amendments to the building design incorporates greater variation in window and precast panel sizes, greater detailed window articulation and the use of neutral tones on the external façade of the building - thus complementing the context, without imitating the neighbouring buildings.
Consultation with Philip Cox is recommended.	Cox Richardson has been notified in relation to moral rights for the project. Cox Richardson was the architect for one of the other two consortia who were competing on this project, so it would not be appropriate to consult with Philip Cox on the design resolution of the winning scheme.
The patterned façade is insensitive to the heritage building on the corner of Broadway and Harris Street.	In response to the change in the western façade composition, the pattern of pre-cast panels has been re-interpreted using three different size panels that are repeated every three floors to break up the visual bulk and scale. The pattern incorporates recessed vertical windows of three different sizes to create a dynamic and varied window treatment. Neutral tones are used to complement adjoining buildings.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
The patterned façade is insensitive to the heritage building on the corner of Broadway and Harris Street.	The revised design of the western façade has resulted in a more textured and articulated building composition, which contributes positively to reducing the visual scale and mass and complements the context of neighbouring buildings and heritage buildings without strictly imitating those buildings.
There is an active consent for a commercial tower on the site.	Noted
If the overall height is retained, the detailing of the architecture and facades should be improved and building mass broken up and lightened with more suitable materials.	The façade has been articulated through the introduction of two vertical slots, colour and additional windows. This reduces the overall mass of the solid areas of the façade and lightens the colour of the façade.
<i>Podium to Ultimo Pedestrian Network (UPN) and Public Domain</i>	
The height of the podium should match the height of the indented podium of the adjoining ABC building.	The datum line generated by the indented podium of the ABC building appears somewhat arbitrary as it is localised to only that small portion of the ABC building and is not reflected on the façade of any of the other adjacent buildings along the UPN streetscape. The fact that the ABC podium element is indented and separated from the UTS site by a strong vertical shadow line form raises the question of the strength of this element as a dominant datum line. It is also noted that the proposed podium and tower on PJB does not materially differ from the bulk of the existing DA which was designed by Cox. Cox also designed the ABC Building. In the design of the ABC Building, Cox chose to not make the height of the ABC indented podium match part of the approved UTS scheme.
The treatment of the façade should be opened up more to allow passive surveillance and viewing into the UPN and vice versa.	The UPN façade has been designed to achieve a balance between promoting passive surveillance and viewing into the UPN on the one hand, and accommodating UTS's teaching space requirements. Incorporating a screen mesh has lightened the façade while the operable window areas facing the UPN on the first two floors facing the UPN have increased visual surveillance of the UPN. Solid walls are needed at higher levels of the podium to accommodate UTS's interior layout and the functionality of the studio space. Windows will be used to allow light to penetrate into the building and provide interest to the UPN façade.
Remove the overhead bridge and escalators.	General pedestrian access from the UPN was not part of this proposal. The UTS Concept Plan addresses in detail the connectivity of the campus as a whole. Opportunities to further improve access from the UPN to the PJB and main part of the UTS campus, will be explored by UTS in the future.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
<i>Residential Amenity</i>	
Units do not comply with SEPP 65 and have a poor level of internal amenity.	The development is not a residential flat building – but akin to a boarding house or a university college. Despite this, the proposal has sought to adopt the principles of SEPP 65, and the assessment against SEPP 65 in Section 6.2 of the EAR and SEPP 65 Checklist in Appendix E of the EAR indicates a high level of compliance.
Facing windows are less than 2 metres apart an outcome of a poor internal layout which seeks to maximise the number of bedrooms.	The number of bedrooms with facing windows that are less than 2 metres apart represents three pairs on each floor. All bedrooms will comply with BCA light and ventilation requirements. Metal screens have been introduced to improve the issue of privacy for those rooms affected (see Section 2.2 of the PPR).
Proposal should provide a mix of unit sizes and styles not just all one bedroom or studio units and each floor should contain good sized kitchen, eating and recreation areas.	Student bedrooms are to be provided in a mix of accommodation types as follows: 346 beds in studio accommodation 74 beds in 2 bedroom accommodation 300 beds in 6 bedroom accommodation This mix of accommodation types is based on the current market demand and industry experience of Unilodge – a well established operator of student accommodation. Kitchen areas make up 15% of total unit floor areas and are provided to all accommodation types. Common/ study areas are provided on each floor. Significant kitchen, dining, lounge and recreation areas are centralised on Level 8 and roof top to encourage social interaction amongst all students.
Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee	
Bicycle parking facilities are to be provided within the development as well as end trip facilities such as showers, changing rooms, etc, to encourage bicycle use by students and staff.	On site secure bicycle parking facilities are provided for resident students. The UTS Concept Plan ensures that ample bicycle parking and end of trip facilities for the UTS community is provided across the campus.
All vehicles are to enter and leave the site in a forward direction.	All vehicles will enter and leave the car park in a forward direction.
The layout of the car parking areas associated with the subject development ... should be in accordance with AS 2890.1-2004 and AS 2890.2-2002 for heavy vehicles.	The layout of the existing carparking area in the basement of the building complies with AS 2890.1-2004 and AS 2890.2-2002 for heavy vehicles.
Post-development stormwater discharge from the subject site into the RTA's drainage system must not exceed the pre-development discharge.	Post development discharge will not exceed the pre-development discharge.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Detailed design plans and hydraulic calculations of any changes to the stormwater drainage system are to be submitted to the RTA for approval prior to the commencement of any works.	Noted
Road traffic noise from Harris Street and Broadway should be mitigated by durable materials in order to satisfy the requirements for habitable rooms under Clause 102 Subdivision 2 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007.	Noted
Detailed design drawings and geotechnical reports relating to the excavation of the site and support structures are to be submitted to the RTA for assessment.	The proposed development does not require excavation as the development involves construction over an existing building.
The developer shall be responsible for all public utility adjustments/relocation works necessitated by the above work and as required by the various public utility authorities and/or their agents.	Noted
All works/regulatory signposting associated with the proposed development shall be at no cost to the RTA.	Noted
Australian Broadcasting Corporation	
<i>ABC and UTS Deed of Agreement</i>	
Consultation under July 2000 Deed of agreement did not take place	The July 2000 Deed of Agreement between ABC and UTS was made at a time when ABC was planning construction of its building and required access to UTS land to construct the ABC building. The Deed included a reciprocal arrangement which would be effective if UTS, when it came to construct its building, required access to ABC land to construct the UTS building. The current proposal subject of this Project Application does not require access to ABC land therefore the July 2000 Deed is not relevant, however UTS has consulted with ABC to take account of its concerns including those relating to noise and vibration
<i>Design and Built Form</i>	
The setback of the student accommodation tower from the ABC will create a blank wall. The ABC does not intend to amend this façade.	Noted. This façade of the ABC building is not visible from any major streets and will not significantly detract from the proposal. There is no expectation on the part of the proponent that that the ABC retrospectively enhance this façade.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
The ABC currently provides access for UTS students through its foyer. The new access through the PJB is not expected to reduce student traffic through the ABC.	It is expected that the proposal will be neutral in regard to the number of students passing through the ABC. The development is for student housing and people accessing from either Harris Street or UPN would most obviously enter PJB directly. It should be noted that whilst some UTS students may use ABC as a short-cut, it is understood that the vast majority of student traffic would likely be TAFE students accessing the pedestrian crossing at Harris and Thomas intersection and then travelling up Thomas Street. General student access was not part of this proposal and is dealt with through the Concept plan for UTS.
Late night opening hours of the proposed café may cause a security risk for the ABC.	The detailed operating conditions of the proposed café on the ground floor of the Peter Johnson Building are to be the subject of a separate development application to the City of Sydney. The café will seek to maximise safety and security of students and others in the locality. Hours of operation will be appropriate for the locality. Notwithstanding this, activating the UPN at ground level at night is likely to enhance, rather than detract from, safety.
<i>Construction Management Plan</i>	
Site Establishment - the ABC requests the proposed construction site access be repositioned to avoid conflicts with the ABC emergency exit.	Discussions will be held with SHFA which controls all operations on the UPN. Due consideration will be given to designating a new "Marshalling Area" should a conflict be identified.
Noise, Vibration and Disruption Management – the ABC expects direct negotiation between the ABC and UTS regarding construction noise and vibration targets and other site management issues in compliance with the existing legal agreement between the parties.	Consultation will continue between ABC and UTS regarding construction noise and vibration concerns to minimise disruption to ABC activities. Noise and vibration levels will comply with the requirements of the BCA. As previously mentioned, the existing legal agreement between UTS and the ABC is not applicable to this proposal as no access is required to ABC land.
Construction and Work Hours – works to be scheduled to avoid disruption to ABC broadcasts.	Consultation will continue between ABC and UTS regarding construction activities to minimise disruption to ABC activities. Noise and vibration levels will comply with the requirements of the BCA.
Maintenance of ABC user rights over the granted easements over the UPN during the construction phase	Discussions will be held with SHFA which controls all operations on the UPN in relation to any ABC easement over the UPN.
Ministry of Transport	
No additional on site parking is supported.	Noted. No additional parking is proposed.
Provision of cycle storage facilities	On site secure bicycle parking facilities are provided for resident students. The UTS Concept Plan provides ample bicycle parking and end of trip facilities for the UTS community across the campus

ISSUES		RESPONSE
Department of Water and Energy		
Approval and licence requirements of DWE for groundwater and related issues		Noted
Transgrid		
No issues		
RailCorp		
Ensure the tunnel under the Wembley Building is not blocked during construction without RailCorp approval		Full width access to the tunnel will be maintained and site establishment sheds will be elevated above the rail line on gantries, thus ensuring free running of rolling stocks along the rail line.
Consult with RailCorp and provide details on how the proposal will interface with the proposed CBD Rail Link, including drawings and reports		Noted. The proposed new work does not contemplate a change to the existing basement which occupies the entire footprint of the Site. Therefore the new works will have no additional impact on the proposed CBD Rail Link.
- Demonstrate how the following: - Allowance in building design, construction and maintenance for future construction and operation of railway tunnels in the vicinity of the site - Allowance for impacts from rail operations including stray currents, electrolysis, noise, vibration, electromagnetic fields		Noted. Construction is over an existing building – no excavation is proposed. In addition, there are no rail tunnels beneath the building.
Provide plans to RailCorp showing the location of the CBD Rail Link in relation to the site and proposed development		Noted. Construction is over an existing building – no excavation is proposed. In addition, there are no rail tunnels beneath the building. However, a copy of the plans will be provided to RailCorp prior to construction.
Sydney Water		
Sydney Water will assess the proposal with application for a Section 73 certificate.		Noted
Summary of issues raised by the public		
<i>Bulk and Scale</i>		
The building exceeds the height limit for the area.		A detailed justification for the proposed building height is at section 6.1.3 of the EAR. The height is justified due to engineering constraints of the existing podium limiting the footprint of the new tower, the 40 metre setback from Harris Street, the tower form has sought to protect the visual amenity and solar access of the Taragon Building and the development is consistent with the established pattern of built form along this section of Harris Street.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
The building exceeds the height limit for the area.	In summary, proposal will deliver significant social, environmental and regional benefits associated with providing accommodation for up to 720 students at a major Sydney university.
The FSR is greater than that permitted for residential or commercial development resulting in significant massing.	A detailed justification for the proposed floor space ratio is at section 6.1.3 of the EAR. The proposal delivers an improved environmental, social and economic outcome than a scheme that complied with the FSR for the site. In addition, deep modulations and significant façade articulation reduces the potentially bulky appearance of the building.
Photomontage misleading due to the angle used from Broadway.	The photomontage is an accurate representation of the development from this location. Due to the effects of perspective, the building appears the same height as the Tarragon Building – it is not, but because it is further away it appears smaller.
Higher than other buildings in the area and blocks local vistas and the city skyline from residences in Chippendale.	The visual impact assessment at Appendix E of the EAR concludes the proposed building has a low visual impact within the local context and when viewed from a distance. The visual impact analysis undertaken for the UTS Broadway Precinct Concept Plan by Clouston showed that the visual impact of the proposed building would be either of slight or moderate significance. In relation to views from Chippendale, Clouston has not identified any City views that will be impacted by the new tower for student housing. Clouston notes some receptors to the south of Broadway and in Chippendale will have a slightly adverse visual impact from the construction of the Concept Plan as a whole, but impacts resulting from the student residential tower will be negligible for these receptors.
<i>Increased Pedestrian and Vehicle Traffic</i>	
Increased number of people in the building will significantly increase pedestrian volumes on footpaths.	The number of pedestrians on footpaths is not expected to increase as a result of the proposal, as it will not increase projected overall UTS student numbers. As a rule, greater pedestrian activity has a positive impact on greater safety and local businesses.
Additional students will increase traffic which will also affect safety of pedestrians	The proposal will not increase the number of UTS students. As discussed in Section 6.11 of the EAR, the proposal will not increase vehicular traffic.
<i>Wind Impacts</i>	
Development will result in an unbroken wall along Harris Street which will create unacceptable wind impacts.	The wind assessments carried out by Windtech (at Attachment 2 of the PPR) and by CPP for the Concept Plan note the site is currently well shielded by existing buildings, so local wind conditions will be similar to the current situation following the construction of the proposal (refer section 6.9.6 of the EAR).

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Concerns about the wind report especially as a result of the Fraser's development (which did not consider the proposed building) which will therefore exacerbate impacts in the area.	The wind assessment undertaken by CPP for the Concept Plan considered the impact of the UTS and Frasers developments. CPP found that existing tall buildings surrounding the site will continue to shield Harris Street from strong channelling winds resulting from the Frasers and other UTS Concept Plan developments.
<i>Internal Amenity and Open Space</i>	
Student accommodation is grossly undersized.	The mix and size of accommodation units is based on market research and the industry experience of Unilodge – a well established operator of student accommodation. The area of one bedroom units – at 17.3 m² - is greater than the equivalent provided at recent student accommodation developments at the Australian National University in Canberra. In addition, significant common areas are provided for students on all levels and with external area on Level 8 and the roof top terrace.
No open space is proposed either for residents or the wider community.	A total area of 807 m² of open space is provided on Level 8 and the roof top terrace for the use of resident students. In addition, the proposal provides approximately 1,104.2 m² of internal communal space for students, as well as a café that will be available for use for all members of the community. Resident students and the wider community may also use the 7,000 m² of new open space at Alumni Green on the main UTS campus to be provided as part of the UTS Concept Plan, proposed new parks at the Frasers Broadway site and other substantial indoor and outdoor recreational facilities in and around the University.
<i>Solar Reflectivity</i>	
Concerns about the level of solar reflectivity created by the building.	The Solar Light Reflectivity Analysis at Attachment 3 of the PPR concludes the proposal will not have adverse glare impacts on drivers, pedestrians and occupants of surrounding buildings for the following reasons: - As the proposed development will be obscured by other buildings to the east of the site there will be no adverse glare impacts on drivers or pedestrians travelling south-west along Thomas, Bijou or Pitts Streets (critical sightlines for pedestrians and drivers in the vicinity of the site); and - Façade glazing will have a maximum normal specular reflectivity of 5% - this compares favourably with the maximum recommended level of 20%. Consequently, the proposal will not cause an adverse solar glare impact to the occupants of surrounding buildings.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Coalition Chippendale Community Groups	
■ Cumulative impact of the development on the locality – University of Notre Dame, UTS Concept Plan	The proposal does not increase projected student numbers on the UTS campus. It provides much needed accommodation for UTS students on the City Campus, thus minimising the need for the students to compete for affordable rental accommodation or travel long distances. The new UTS student accommodation is consistent with the NSW Government’s vision for a health and education precinct on the edge of the Sydney CBD. The proposal complements the recent University of Notre Dame proposal to enliven the locality. In addition, the new student housing will provide added safety to the local area through passive surveillance of the Harris Street area and be a boost to local businesses.
■ Excessive student housing in the locality will alter the demographics of the area	The proposal will provide up to 720 beds for existing UTS students that would otherwise compete for scarce affordable rental accommodation – and who may live in the locality anyway. Providing quality, well managed student accommodation minimises the risk of students residing in private, unsafe accommodation in the inner city. The edge of the Sydney CBD is undergoing a transition with additional younger people and families moving into the area, particularly with the foreshadowed Frasers development. The proposal will complement this changing population by increasing demand for shops and community services, and encouraging the use of public transport. The proposal is consistent with the NSW Government’s vision for a health and education precinct in this locality.
■ Project application assessed prior to Concept Plan	The tender and assessment process under Part 3A of the EP&A Act has not been compromised. The Director-General’s Environmental Assessment Requirements (DGRs) for the project were issued well after the DGRs were issued for the Concept Plan for the UTS City Campus. The DGRs for the UTS student housing proposal were issued in the context of the UTS Concept Plan, and the Project Application was prepared and assessed in the context of the Concept Plan.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Proposal substantially breaches the City's height and FSR controls	A detailed justification for the proposed building height is at section 6.1.3 of the EAR. The height is justified due to engineering constraints of the existing podium limiting the footprint of the new tower, the 40 metre setback from Harris Street, the tower form has sought to protect the visual amenity and solar access of the Taragon Building and the development is consistent with the established pattern of built form along this section of Harris Street. In summary, proposal will deliver significant social, environmental and regional benefits associated with providing accommodation for up to 720 students at a major Sydney university. A detailed justification for the proposed floor space ratio is at section 6.1.3 of the EAR. The proposal delivers an improved environmental, social and economic outcome than a scheme that complied with the FSR for the site. In addition, deep modulations and significant façade articulation reduces the potentially bulky appearance of the building.
<i>SEPP 65</i>	
Proposal breaches SEPP 65 objectives including good building design	The development is not a residential flat building – but akin to a boarding house or a university college. Despite this, the proposal has sought to adopt the principles of SEPP 65, and the assessment against SEPP 65 in the Section 6.2 and SEPP 65 Checklist in Appendix E of the EAR indicates a high level of compliance.
Insufficient solar access; opaque and grey glass (windows) will “close in” the studio apartments and other accommodation areas	Grey vision glass is required to assist thermal performance of the building and will have minimum impact on the visibility through windows. Every bedroom and living area has grey vision glass and operable windows and will comply with BCA standards in respect to natural light and ventilation. Opaque glass is only proposed to sections of the eastern façade to conceal solid structural elements behind the façade.
Insufficient communal facilities, less than 1.75m² per student.	Communal facilities are distributed on each accommodation level, Level 8 and the roof top. The total communal space (internal and external) is 1,911.2 m². The represents approximately 2.65 m² per student which is comparable with other student accommodation developments.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Insufficient open space and deep soil landscaping opportunities; lack of private open space	The development is in infill development in an inner city location which typically limits the opportunity for deep soil planting. Moreover, the new student housing is located above the podium of an existing education building – thus severely limiting opportunities for deep soil planting. Despite this, the outdoor common areas on Level 8 and the roof of the tower will incorporate landscaped elements, and the landscaping in the existing Level 4 courtyard will be retained. These outdoor areas will be wind protected. Providing landscaping in pots enables drainage to be more readily controlled, and at the same time greater flexibility with the layout of landscaping. The 7,000 m² Alumni Green is to be a landscaped and planted area – providing an area of outdoor open spaces close to the site. The area of total communal space is approximately 2.65 m² per bed/ student.
Solar orientation is not met.	Solar orientation of the proposal is governed by the footprint and structure of the existing podium. The building form is articulated on the northern facade to allow for the increased penetration of light to internal living areas.
Acoustic privacy, especially the insufficient setback from lift wells and communal space is made.	As discussed in Section 6.8.1 and Appendix N of the EAR, the proposal will meet relevant Australian Standards for acoustic privacy.
Inadequate building separation and potential privacy issues that will result from the lack of sufficient setback from the proposed development to the Taragon Building (to the site's immediate south).	As discussed in sections 6.9.2 and 6.9.3 of the EAR, the proposal seeks to maximise separation and minimise overlooking between the new student housing and the existing Taragon Building, given the in-fill nature and inner city/ CBD environment of the proposal. The Level 8 terrace adjacent to the Taragon is proposed to be occupied by the building manager only, and hence no privacy impacts by students on the adjoining property are anticipated. Furthermore, acoustic and privacy screens will be incorporated at the terrace level to further facilitate privacy. Above Level 8, windows facing the Taragon will incorporate permanent privacy screens thus preventing overlooking and privacy invasion from the adjoining properties.
<i>Massing and form including the impact on local vistas and the City's skyline</i>	
Impacts on views from Darlington, the Block, Chippendale, Glebe, Ultimo, Broadway	The visual impact assessment at Appendix E of the EAR concludes the proposed building has a low visual impact within the local context and when viewed from a distance. The visual impact analysis undertaken for the UTS Broadway Precinct Concept Plan by Clouston showed that the visual impact of the proposed building would be either of slight or moderate significance.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Impacts on views from Darlington, the Block, Chippendale, Glebe, Ultimo, Broadway	Specifically, Clouston notes some city views from the sites immediately adjoining the site will be impacted by the new tower for student housing but impacts on views from Harris Street will be negligible. However, Clouston notes some receptors to the south of Broadway and in Chippendale will have a slightly adverse visual impact from the construction of the Concept Plan as a whole, but impacts resulting from the student residential tower will be negligible for these receptors.
Massing will restrict sunlight onto public domain areas including Broadway	Although there will be some over shadowing of Broadway at 9 am on 21st June, the shadow diagrams indicate the overshadowing will be temporary in nature. Further, the area overshadowed on Broadway is a pedestrian footpath that will not be occupied permanently. Footpaths along Broadway are typically overshadowed for part of the day by adjoining buildings.
Impact of wind downwash on Harris Street	A revised wind analysis report has been prepared by Windtech Pty Ltd to analyse and clarify the wind downwash effects on the Harris Street façade. (see Attachment 2 of the PPR. This report confirms that whilst the downwash effects will mainly impact the UTS courtyards on Level 4, the impacts have been assessed as category 4 and 5 on the Beaufort scale and are acceptable for courtyard uses. There will be no windwash effects to Harris Street pedestrians due to the tower being setback from the podium building line.
Management Plan	
Office hours should be extended to match operating hours for roof top open space	Noted. The one live-in staff member (who will reside in the apartment on level 8) and security personnel will patrol the area. The roof terrace and common outdoor terrace on level 8 are will be carefully managed in accordance with the management plan at Appendix G to the EAR. Additionally, a small number of senior students will act as “Networkers” to assist with the interface between students and management. Accordingly, there is no necessity to extend the operating hours of management staff.
Staff to student ratio is inadequate for pastoral care	Section 3.9 and Appendix G of the EAR outline the student pastoral care provisions, which are tested and proven within existing operating student accommodation facilities around the country.
Oppose use of building as temporary accommodation during semester breaks	As is common practice at Australian universities, the student accommodation may be used by university staff and students during semester breaks.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
<i>Developer contributions</i>	
▪ Sufficient communal and open space be incorporated into proposal	Significant private open space has been provided for the residents on Level 8 and Roof top. A total open area of 807 m² has been provided in addition to internal common areas and the café on Level 2. In addition, 7,000 m² of open space is to be provided at Alumni Green as part of the UTS Concept Plan.
▪ Any agreements between UTS and DoP regarding contributions be released	Noted. As discussed in section 6.4 of the EAR, UTS does not propose to enter into any voluntary planning agreement or separate development contributions framework as part of the Project Application. This is justified given the considerable environmental, social and economic benefits of the proposal, including provision of student accommodation and student services, no significant additional traffic demand and improved pedestrian amenity through the locality.
<i>Design excellence</i>	
▪ Design excellence process does not meet the intent of CoS guidelines	As this proposal was not subject to Part 4 of the EP&A Act, the requirements of Sydney LEP 2005 were not mandatory. Nevertheless, as described in section 6.3.2 of the EAR, the design process undertaken by the proponent to arrive at the proposal was extensive and rigorous. In addition, the proponent further refined the design in response to commentary received from the City of Sydney including its Director City Planning and Regulatory Services and independent peer review from Lacoste + Stevenson Architects.
<i>Parking</i>	
▪ Reduction of on-site parking and lack of any parking to accommodate student housing. Suggest 12 spaces be allocated for car sharing	Consistent with ESD principles, no parking, other than for a mobility impaired resident, is provided for the student accommodation. The proposal provides on site parking for residents' bicycles and one allocated parking space for a mobility-impaired resident. The proposal is located adjacent to a major public transport hub and the main UTS campus, and parking for student residents is not required. The proposal will result in fewer car parking spaces in the existing Peter Johnson Building. The university actively encourages the use of public transport by students and staff. As the proposal does not increase the projected overall number of students on the campus it will not have a direct impact on parking on the local streets
<i>Environmental initiatives</i>	
▪ 5-star Green Star rating will not be achieved	As illustrated in the environmental assessment at Appendix F of the EAR, the development will achieve benefits equivalent to a 5 Green Star rated building although a formal rating is not possible for the building due to its end use.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Insufficient solar access is provided with most of the rooms dependent on light through opaque windows (or grey coloured) windows.	BCA standards will be met in respect to natural light and ventilation. Furthermore as indicated Design Report at Appendix E of the EAR, 100% cross-ventilated accommodation and studios will be provided by the incorporation of operable grilles and ventilation stacks in lieu of dual aspect apartments.
The absence of balcony areas suggests that insufficient natural ventilation will be achieved particularly for rooms on the Harris Street frontage where it is likely that the wind downwash will restrict window opening.	100% of units will be cross-ventilated. Providing balconies presents a safety risk for internal occupants and to the external public. The common spaces on each level are intended to encourage a communal student culture. The vertical slots that divide the building will incorporate awning windows at the corridor bridges. While downwash on the southern side of the building is acknowledged, the Pedestrian Wind Report at Attachment 2 indicates that wind will be at a Beaufort level 4 or 5 (moderate to fresh breeze) which is appropriate for the intended use of the communal areas below.
Noise, particularly for adjoining accommodation area to the lifts and lift wells, does not meet Green Star rating.	Internal environmental noise levels will meet Australian standards as indicated in the Noise Assessment Report at Appendix N of the EAR. The acoustic amenity of units is maximised by acoustically isolating lifts and other plant areas from units and acoustically treating auxiliary ventilation system to minimise the transfer of noise between units and common areas.
CFD modelling may need to be reviewed	The submission does not explain why CFD modelling should be reviewed. CFD modelling was undertaken as indicated in the Computational Fluid Dynamics Report at Appendix M of the EAR. The analysis concludes cross ventilation can be achieved if the cross-ventilation principles adopted in the Design report at Appendix E of the EAR are adopted
<i>Noise</i>	
The design and reliance on internal communal facilities on Level 8 to offset open space or private areas will exacerbate any noise impact internally to accommodation areas on this level.	As illustrated in Section 6.8.1 of the EAR, acoustic privacy is maximised by acoustically treating auxiliary ventilation system to minimise the transfer of noise between units and common areas. The facades of the building will also be insulated to further promote acoustic amenity and party walls between units will be treated to maximise acoustic privacy for residents.
Noise will be generated by students residing in the area – need to address impacts on Taragon Building	Access to the common outdoor terrace on Level 8 and roof terrace will be generally limited to 7am to 10 pm daily. The outdoor common areas will be locked outside these hours to ensure no unauthorised use. In addition, windows of units on Level 8 that adjoin the common outdoor terrace will incorporate acoustic glazing to minimise transfer of noise.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Noise will be generated by students residing in the area – need to address impacts on Taragon Building	In addition, acoustic and permanent external privacy screens will be provided on south and east facing windows of the live-in staff member's apartment and on the boundaries of the adjoining outdoor terrace on Level 8. Access to that terrace will be strictly limited to staff only, which is located adjacent to the existing lightwell in the Taragon Building.
<i>Balustrade safety</i>	
Concerns that 1.2 metre balustrade is insufficient to meet safety concerns	BCA requires balustrades to be 1.0 metres above the finished floor level. The proposal allows for a 1.2 metre balustrade that is set back from the building edge to provide further safety which is considered adequate.
<i>Signage</i>	
Recommend rooftop and UPN signage be reduced in size	The sign on the UPN side of the building will be approximately 2.5 metres tall and 7 metres wide and incorporated into the facade by a perforated subtle pattern. One roof top building identification sign will be affixed to the Harris Street façade of a plant room on the roof of the building. The UTS logo on this sign is approximately 2.40 metres tall and 7 metres wide. The signs will be modest in nature and incorporated into the design of the building. The signs will not affect public safety or views, and will not have an adverse impact of the locality. In addition, the location, design and proposed illumination of the signs comply with the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy No 64 and the City of Sydney Advertising and Signage DCP.
<i>Economic impact</i>	
Jobs to be generated during construction were not properly quantified	Noted. The number of jobs to be generated by the proposal is based on experience with similar sites.
<i>Community consultation</i>	
Additional community consultation to be carried out to enable the community to have a greater understanding of the proposal	Exhibition of this proposal and the Concept Plan is considered to have been adequate. As noted in the Coalition's submission, a public exhibition of the UTS Concept Plan was held in February 2009. Community "drop in" sessions were notified in local newspapers, and nearby residents were advised by letterbox drop. Despite this, attendance by the community was low. In addition, information on this proposal and the Concept Plan was available on the UTS website. For 5 weeks during May and June 2009, the student housing proposal was publicly exhibited by the Department of Planning. During this time, detailed architectural plans and reports prepared by expert consultants were available for review.