

21 February 2020

Our Ref: R/2018/32/D
File No: 2020/06036

David Glasgow
Principal Planning Officer
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

By Planning Portal

Dear David

Response to Request for Additional Information – Adaptive Reuse of the Royal Hall of Industries (SSD-9726)

Thank you for your correspondence dated 4 February 2020 requesting for the City of Sydney Council (“the City”) to comment on the applicant’s response to the DPIE’s Request for Information dated 16 December 2020 for the adaptive reuse of the Royal Hall of Industries (RHI).

The Response, prepared by Urbis, as well as the supplementary documentation has been reviewed. The RTS has generally addressed the issues raised in our initial objection letter and the City withdraws our objection to the proposal. The City provides the following comments against the matters raised in the applicant’s Response as follows:

1. Permissibility

The City provided comments on 13 January 2020 regarding the application for the Site Compatibility Certificate (SCC) for the use of the site. The SCC seeks to demonstrate permissibility of the development under the State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007. It is understood that the application is currently under assessment.

Overall, the City did not object to the issue of a SCC and as such, the issue pertaining to the permissibility of the development by virtue of the SCC is subject to the satisfaction of DPIE as the consent authority.

2. Public Benefit and Contributions

The Development Contribution payable for the development, as detailed in the City’s initial Response to Submissions (RTS) letter dated 29 November 2019, has been calculated in accordance with the City of Sydney Contributions Plan 2015. The Development Contributions are for the provision of infrastructure and services that is required to support the net population increase of visitors and workers resulting from the development.

Therefore, a condition of consent is recommended to be imposed for the relevant Development Contributions to be paid prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.

3. Heritage

In the City's initial RTS, it was noted that careful consideration be made to the location and selection of trees near the RHI building to ensure it has a low impact to heritage fabric that would not visually obscure the building.

The proposed new Banksia Integrifolia trees located adjacent to the eastern elevation of the RHI are not supported so close to the building from a heritage perspective for the following reasons:

- Early aerials show that the eastern elevation of the RHI was clear of trees and the building was designed to be seen on the round and be visually prominent, and not be obscured by trees;
- The proximity of the proposed trees to the eastern elevation has the potential to cause damage to the façade brickwork such as through root damage and watering;
- The canopies of the proposed trees is likely to obscure the eastern elevation of the building. Any landscaping should soften the car parking area but not obscure the building.
- The proposed trees are contrary to the intent of the policies of the Draft Conservation Management Plan, prepared by GAO dated June 2007. Under clause 6.2, constraints and opportunities arising out of the Statement of Significance states that *the relationship of the building to the surrounding spaces and the neighbouring Hordern Pavilion shall not be altered other than to address issues of obtrusive elements as seen from principal street vistas*. In addition under 7.3 Site Context, it is stated:

7.3.1 Setting: The Royal Hall of Industries is a landmark that occupies an important site at the southwest corner of the former Sydney Showgrounds site. It has an important relationship to Moore Park and is a key element in the street vistas of Driver Avenue, Lang Road, and Anzac Parade as well as from the Fox Studios site to the east.

Policy 2.1 Any proposals for alterations to the external facades or roof of the building must take into account the impact on the aspect of the building as seen from key viewpoints, principally from Driver Avenue, Lang Road (east and west ends,) Anzac Parade (west) and Moore Park (south and west). Aim to rectify intrusive elements as seen from such viewpoints in any future works.

It is recommended that lower shrubs and groundcovers are more appropriate and these could be planted in smaller tree pits, which would limit potential root and water damage to the heritage fabric.

4. Environmental Sustainability

The applicant's Response has generally addressed concerns outlined in the City's initial RTS. It is recommended that a condition of consent be imposed to ascertain the applicant's commitment to the specified ESD measures for the development.

5. Transport and Access

Whilst the additional number of bicycle parking spaces are supported, the Class of the staff bicycle parking facilities do not meet the Australian Standards or Sydney DCP 2012. The City requires "Class B" (Australian Standard AS

2890.3:2015) and/or Class 2 (Sydney DCP 2012) staff bicycle parking, which has to be secured, weather protected and the bicycle parking devices will have to allow users to lock the bicycle frame and both wheels. The proposed bicycle hoops located on the public domain do not meet the staff bicycle parking requirements. At least 5 shower/change areas and 40 lockers will also have to be provided as part of the development's end of trip facilities. Therefore, a condition of consent is recommend for staff bicycle parking facilities to comply with the relevant Australian Standards.

The Response letter has confirmed that 9 on-site parking spaces, including 1 accessible parking space, will be provided within the site. This is 2 less than the earlier proposal and is supported. It should be noted that the submitted swept path analysis is made on an older architectural plan. The revised swept path does not demonstrate unacceptable parking manoeuvring for the 8.8m MRV size vehicle and provides no indication of where this 8.8m MRV will park for loading and unloading. The revised GTA traffic report has confirmed that the site requires the access and egress arrangements for 8.8m MRV, 6.4m waste vehicle and 7.0m long minibus. Therefore, separate swept path analysis for the three types of service vehicles (8.8 m MRV including vertical clearance of 4.5 m, 6.4m waste and servicing truck and 7.0m minibus) including parking manoeuvring are to be submitted.

The City's concerns regarding the Green Travel Plan (GTP) remain outstanding. It is noted in the applicant's Response that TfNSW recommend a condition of consent for a detailed GTP to be prepared and submitted post-approval. As such, this matter is subject to the satisfaction of the DPIE as the consent authority.

6. Public Domain

The applicant's Response refers to the requirements of the Moore Park 2040 Master Plan, which proposes to increase events and entertainment at the Entertainment Quarter, including the RHI.

The same Master Plan also provides an Access Plan, which does not adequately address pedestrian and bicycle traffic around the RHI site. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that the applicant approach the Centennial Parklands Trust to push for improvements to access in and around the site and the EQ precinct to increase public safety.

The driveway on Errol Flynn Boulevard should aim to improve existing conditions and public safety. The retention of the existing driveway alignment does not do so. A driveway perpendicular to the road is desirable, but would require the reconfiguration of the entrance to accommodate vehicle movements. It is acknowledged that the vehicle movements to the site would be low volume, and that the risk to pedestrians is minimal. It is suggested that a low speed limit sign be included at the entrance to improve public safety.

7. Landscape and Tree Management

The submitted Arborist Response letter, prepared by Allied Tree Consultancy, responds to the City's previous comments in our initial RTS letter.

The encroachment within the TPZ of trees numbered 8 and 9 has not been included, however a minimum of 20% canopy loss for tree 8 and 13% for tree 9 is proposed. Section 3.1 of the Australian Standard AS 4970-2009 'Protection of Trees on Development Sites' states that *'the tree protection zone (TPZ) is the*

principle means of protecting trees on development sites. The TPZ is a combination of the root area and crown area requiring protection. It is an area isolated from construction disturbance, so that the tree remains viable.'

The 6 trees located within the plaza have not been assessed or included for tree protection measures. The plaza must not be used as site access to RHI or for the use of storing materials and equipment so as to protect the trees from construction disturbance. Additionally, the encroachments to Trees 22, 36, 56 and 61 were omitted from the submitted documentation. The existing canopy size of these trees as well as the specific tree protection measures or modifications required must be identified.

Overall, the City recommends that only minor pruning of less than 10% of street Trees 8 and 9 is to be undertaken in accordance with AS 4373 2007 Pruning of Amenity Trees by an AQF Level 3 Arborist. All trees impacted by the development including the 6 trees located within the plaza must be protected from the development as per AS 4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites. Sub-surface utilities must avoid Tree Protection Zones. All trees surrounding the site on Council owned land must be retained and protected

The City recommends that a scaled plan be submitted that clearly illustrates all of the trees impacted by the development, including the TPZ, SRZ and canopy spread of each tree including the encroachment area.

a. Tree Removal

Whilst the majority of the tree removal is necessary, it is disappointing that no greater attempt was made to retain Trees 58, 59 and 60. The City maintains the view that the trees should be retained. It is reiterated that the proposed north-eastern driveway crossover be amended to utilise the existing driveway crossovers, or be relocated to remove a section of trees with a lesser value, size and health such as between trees numbered 42 to 46, and only removing trees numbered 43-45. Notwithstanding the above, the issue of tree removal is subject to the satisfaction of the DPIE as the consent authority.

The Arborist Addendum dated 18 October 2019 has updated the pruning information of the 2 street trees (trees 8 and 9) on Lang Road. Tree 8 is a *Jacaranda mimosifolia* (Jacaranda) and will require a minimum of 20% canopy removal. Tree 9 is a *Liquidamber styraciflua* (Liquidamber) and will require a minimum of 13% canopy removal. Both street trees may require further pruning for 'crown lifting'. However, this is likely for the future building and the Addendum does not specify why crown lifting may be required. The proposed pruning is excessive and unnecessary as the existing heritage wall is to be retained and the elevation of the Netball Court and Lap Pool is set back from the boundary line. The photos of excavation test pits within the TPZ of Trees 56-61 have been provided in the Arborist Letter Response but many of the pictures are unclear.

b. Tree Planting

As detailed above, it is recommended that low shrubs and ground covers be planted along the eastern elevation. It is also recommended that a minimum of 9 new medium to large trees be relocated in the planted zone between the driveway/share way and the site boundary to ensure tree

locations take into consideration the existing trees and canopy on Errol Flynn Boulevard.

A medium size tree should be planted in the southern landscape area between the existing palm trees and NSB building. The chosen tree species must have a height of 15 metres with a canopy spread of 6 metres at maturity.

Newly planted trees must meet Australian Standard 2303: Tree Stock for Landscape Use (2015). Young trees should be self-supporting without ties attached to their trunk. Stakes are to be used as protection not as supports. Pruning of young trees should be done by an AQF Level 5 Arborist only.

In summary, the RTS has generally addressed the issues raised in our objection letter and the City withdraws our objection to the proposal. Should an approval be granted for the development, it is requested that the City be given the opportunity to provide input on any conditions that should be imposed to any consent.

Should you wish to speak with a Council officer about the above, please contact Reinah Urqueza, Specialist Planner, on 9265 9333 or at rurqueza@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G Jahn', with a large, stylized loop at the end of the name.

Graham Jahn AM
Director
City Planning | Development | Transport