



Mr Damian Burke
New Futures Capital Projects Director
University of Newcastle - Infrastructure and Facilities Services
University Drive
Callaghan New South Wales 2308

13/02/2020

Dear Mr Burke

**UON Honeysuckle Campus Stage 1A (SSD-9510)
Response to Submissions**

I am writing to you regarding the Stage 1A application for the University's School of Creative Industries and Innovation Hub. As advised in the Department's letter of 23 September 2019 all submissions received by the Department during the exhibition of the proposal are available on the Department's website at <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/10196>.

The Department has reviewed the submissions and considered the proposal in the context of the Concept Proposal (SSD 9262) for the Honeysuckle Campus which is currently under assessment.

The Department has raised a number of issues that relate to the entire campus precinct, including building envelopes, public domain and transport. The Department is currently reviewing your response to these issues and considers the Concept Proposal should be further resolved before progressing the Stage 1A application.

Notwithstanding, the Department has reviewed the Stage 1A application and provides its:

- concerns and recommendations regarding design excellence at **Schedule 1**
- key issues relating to built form, public domain, amenity, transport and contributions at **Schedule 2**.

Please note, the Department may revise/update its key issues following its detailed review of the Concept Proposal. Once the Concept Proposal is further resolved, the Department invites you to provide a Response to Submissions and response to the Department's key issues.

If you have any questions regarding the advice provided in this letter, please contact Matthew Rosel on 8275 1323 or at matthew.rosel@planning.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anthony Witherdin'.

Anthony Witherdin
Director
Key Sites Assessments

SCHEDULE 1

DESIGN EXCELLENCE

1. The Department notes the proposal was the result of a competitive tender process. However, the design has evolved/changed significantly from the winning scheme. The Department is concerned that the proposal no longer retains the design integrity of the winning scheme.

In addition, your EIS provides only a high-level response, and insufficient evidence, to address the concerns raised by the SDRP, particularly in relation to design/appearance, public domain and the proposal's relationship to wider context.

Noting the SDRP's concerns, the Department recommends that you provide expert design advice to confirm the development achieves design excellence. The Department suggests that:

- a) first, the proposal should be presented to the panel that selected the winning scheme (the Panel) to ensure the proposal exhibits design excellence. The Panel could also be asked to comment on whether, in its view, the proposal has appropriately resolved the concerns raised by the SDRP
- b) second, and after addressing any matters raised by the Panel, the Department suggests that consideration be given to presenting the proposal to the SDRP for final review (unless the Panel has clearly demonstrated that the SDRP's concerns have been resolved).

SCHEDULE 2

PRELIMINARY KEY ISSUES

Built form

1. The proposed stair and plinth arrangement (southern façade) should be reconsidered having regard to the visual impact and functionality of the stairs. In particular, the following issues should be addressed:
 - a) options should be explored to relocate the sprinkler-hydrant pump room (currently shown beneath the stairs) within the building to allow the space to be more holistically redesigned
 - b) the existing design gives the impression that the principal purpose of the stairs is for an entrance or other important arrival feature of the building. However, they instead terminate at a glazed/blank wall with fire exits
 - c) the intended use as an amphitheatre / stage space / connected sitting space appears compromised, noting restrictions of the 'L' shaped footprint/arrangement and the provision of numerous handrails
 - d) improved integration with the architectural design of the building
 - e) the stairs turn their back on, and present a blank (eastern) wall to, the south-eastern open space.
2. The Department notes that the rooftop plant enclosure would be a highly visible feature of the building. Provide justification for its size, height, design and use of handrails and consider options to reduce its visual impact.
3. The Department notes that the proposed awning that wraps around the corner of the building (fronting at Honeysuckle Drive and Worth Place) is of a functional design. Please reconsider the design of the awning in the context of the site's gateway location, the overall appearance of the building and the identification of building entrances.
4. The relationship between the proposed building and the neighbouring Lot A2 building should be more clearly resolved, noting the SDRP's concern about servicing and south-eastern square.

5. Confirm how the provision of electrochromic glazing would be consistent with the Design Report aim of providing a 'highly transparent façade to communicate inner workings of the building'.

Public Domain

6. The landscaping and public domain aspects of the proposal should be revised having regard to the Concept public domain strategy.
7. A landscaping report should be provided outlining the justification and rationale for the landscaping approaches adopted for the development and the broader strategy for the campus. In addition, the following should be considered:
 - a) increase the amount of soft landscaping / planting around the building
 - b) clarify the use and landscaping of the south-eastern square
 - c) clarify the activation of the north-eastern square and the building's relationship to this space
 - d) consistency with the recommended landscape mitigation measures of the Wind Report.

Amenity Impacts

8. Provide a lighting impact assessment, which identifies impacts and mitigation measures to protect the amenity of adjoining residential development.
9. Update the Acoustic Report to include assessment of all residential properties adjoining the site on Hunter Street.
10. Clarify the proposed construction hours, noting the inconsistencies between the submitted Acoustic Report and the Draft Construction Management Plan.
11. The Wind Report should be updated to confirm:
 - a) the predicted wind environment and pedestrian comfort levels (siting, standing, walking etc) at key locations around the site, including the north-east and south-east squares, entrances to the building and key points within the public domain
 - b) that the environment at the key locations / will be appropriate for its intended purpose.

Transport and servicing

12. Confirm how bicycle parking and bin-storage will be provided for on the site once the temporary storage structure is removed.
13. Explore options to provide bicycle parking within the public domain.
14. Provide changing area / locker facilities for cyclists and consider co-locating access to showers (currently off a main internal pedestrian corridor) within a dedicated end of trip facilities space.
15. Noting Council's comments on servicing the Department recommends that options be explored to accommodate all servicing within the building/site or co-located within adjoining building/sites.

Contributions

16. The Department requests that you engage with Council to resolve its concerns regarding development contributions (i.e. section 7.12 levies).

