

Site 3 Development Co. Pty Limited | SOP Stage 2 & 3 Railcorp Meeting



AUSTRALIA TOWERS
AT SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK

DATE: Fri 4 March 2011 Railcorp Offices L9, 477 Pitt Street 9:40 AM

Name:	Company	Abbreviation	Attendees
Chris Bailey	Railcorp	CB	☒
Jim Tsirimiagos	Railcorp	JT	☒
Allen Paton	Railcorp	AP	☒
Marko Damic	Bates Smart	MD	☒
Michael Azar	Site 3 Development Co	MA	☒
Eddie Lucas	Billbergia Group	EL	☒
Tim Hoare	Bonacci Group	TH	☒
Bill Gunther	Bonacci Group	BG	☒
Rob Angus	Aurecon	RA	☒
Apologies:			
Murray Donaldson	Architectus	MU	☒

Item	Description	Action	Date
1.	MEETING AGENDA		
1.1.	Discuss Railcorp related issues in regard to Stage 2 & 3 of the works at Sydney Olympic Park.	Details below	
2.	DISCUSSION ITEMS		
2.1.	MD provided brief introduction on the SOPA design competition winning scheme by Bates Smart	Note	
2.2.	MD advised the intention of the current architectural design is to comply with Railcorp requirements.	Note	
2.3.	CB advised that in principal criteria as set in the Development Consent will largely be mirrored. There are minor changes to some wording and removal of items already covered as part of the stage 1 works.	Document referenced is DA No. 246-10-2004	
2.4.	MD advised the current design is set back 10m from the track centre lines. There is a minimum of 5m and maximum of 6m between the train corridor boundary and the subject building.	Note	
2.5.	The buildings are a minimum of 20 metre from the Rail corridor. MD to review advise issues of compliance and resolve through compliant design. This includes assessment of balconies facing the corridor.	Bates Smart	
2.6.	The Railcorp conditions A25 to A40 prescribed in DA No. 246-10-2004 were discussed as the base criteria. Not all items are relevant to the DA and can be addressed post Development Application being made.	Note	
2.7.	For the purpose of the DA rail risk assessment associated with the derailment will be assessed. Thus removing the requirement of impact walls or structural redundancy within the design of the basement. The balance of issues will be addressed in the prescribed conditions of the development consent when released.	Note	
2.8.	The rail risk assessment (RRA) is to consider higher train speeds and track curvature.	Note	
2.9.	TH note the RRA is quite urgent to finalise design and specials for structure with in the car park. MD and TH to provide Aurecon with sections and sketches to facilitate the requirements of the RRA.	Bates Smart and Bonacci	

2.10.	CB commented on ensuring the podium is setback a minimum of 10m from the track centreline. Anything within the 10m to 20m zone must be appropriately treated in the design.	Note	
2.11.	EL discussed possible re-diversion of the stormwater lines possibly to be located between the building line and the rail corridor boundary. No concerns were raised.	Note	
2.12.	Upon query from EL, AP advised there was no requirement for access between the building line and the rail corridor boundary behind stage 2 and 3 for Railcorp purposes.	Note	
2.13.	AP note planting along the corridor needs to ensure train driver signals and view is unobstructed through the corridor.	Note	
2.14.	CB noted ant graffiti coating to be applied along the corridor	Note	
2.15.	Reflectivity statements must address building materials and any impact on train drivers along the corridor. MD advised that the tower line of site will obstruct vision to the towers them selves. In either case, this factor should be considered.	Note	
2.16.	CB noted that the Railcorp application and fee can be made now.	Note	
2.17.	A rail risk assessment to be arrange as soon as practical. This is to be held at a confirmed location in Homebush.	Site 3 Development Co	
2.18.	CB noted, due to the proximity of the podium fence (between 10m-20m) this is to be treated appropriately as was in stage 1 to comply with Railcorp requirements.	Note	
2.19.	Meeting End 10:20AM		
3.	NEXT MEETING		
3.1.	To be scheduled and confirmed.		