

SICEEP PPP - Response to Public Submissions

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
Overall Urban Design and General Architectural Merit		
1	The Chamber supports the current design put forward. The Chamber believes the plans for the new precinct will meet the requirements and provide sufficient access.	Noted.
1	The Infrastructure NSW urban design and public realm guidelines are insufficient	INSW engaged Woods Bagot to prepare Urban Design and Public Realm Guidelines for the site. Woods Bagot is a highly reputable architectural firm, and the suitability of the guidelines is demonstrated by the high quality proposal which is the subject of this application. The guidelines respond to the brief, and balance the financial, sustainability and operational requirements of the development.
6	Existing facilities have limitations but why not consider other options to knock down rebuild. Demolish and rebuild is an out dated strategy given these buildings life span is still considerable. No regard has been given to the potential re-use of the existing buildings and no cost/benefit analysis has been publicly available.	<p>DHL has given significant consideration to the functionality and adequacy of the existing facilities. As part of these investigations, a number of parties provided input in order to determine what parts of the facilities to retain and what parts to demolish. This included event organisers, architects, construction and maintenance contractors.</p> <p>A detailed review of these considerations is provided within the Response to Submissions report. In summary, retention of the existing facilities is not viable, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The existing SCEC cannot meet current levels of market demand, leading to lost business opportunities. ▪ The SCEC lacks the functionality and flexibility found in state of the art facilities. ▪ The SCEC will require significant expenditure to address lifecycle issues in the coming years. ▪ The ageing facilities will progressively not be able to meet the technical and aesthetic standards required by international delegates and will require substantial lifecycle and maintenance investment
4	Design lacks creativity and distinctiveness of existing buildings.	A number of measures have been implemented in order to ensure that the proposed redevelopment achieves design excellence. These include the establishment of a Design Review Panel chaired by the NSW Government Architect and observed by the City of Sydney and the implementation of the Urban Design and Public Realm Guidelines prepared by Woods Bagot on behalf of INSW.
2	Architecture is "ugly" and will damage aesthetics of tourist area.	Refer to response above. The design of the core facilities (as amended) seeks to enhance the visitor experience within the SICEEP site by providing buildings and public spaces which encourage greater permeability and interaction between the core facilities and the public space.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	Design would be able to facilitate the retention of Tumbalong Park, Exhibition Centre and Urban Stream	<p>Refer to above. A detailed discussion of the limitations of the Sydney Exhibition Centre, and why it cannot reasonably be retained, is provided within the Response to Submissions report. In summary, the Sydney Exhibition Centre was constructed in 1988, and now has the following functionality issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Exhibition Hall concourse and foyers are quite narrow by contemporary standards, and are made more difficult by the off-set nature of each Exhibition Hall. • Public catering areas are located in only 4 of the 5 main Halls, and although recently updated, are still limited in size as they require lettable client space to be taken for seating areas. • The original Exhibition Centre loading dock is inefficient due to its size, irregular shape and column obstructions which results in a very limited number of trucks being able to utilise it during events. These issues also impact the safety aspects within the dock surrounds. • Due to the creation of the Convention Centre Parkside, the loading dock waiting area that was previously utilised for trucks and deliveries has been eliminated, which now allows only one truck to be unloaded concurrently in each Hall. <p>DHL has considered whether the existing Exhibition Halls could be extended by means of raising the existing roof structure and extending the structure masts. In respect to the brief requirement, this option proved unviable, with the following issues precluding the adaptive reuse of the Exhibition Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing roof steel could not be warranted for a further 50 years. • The existing steelwork has no flexibility for redesigning steelwork connections, pin joints, and cable stays, and so these would all require substantial reworking to ensure that a warranty could be applied. • Raising the existing roof to accommodate a double stack of exhibition space would incur greater wind loads, which the structure is not expected to be able to accommodate. • The alignment of the existing halls and its saw tooth layout does not allow for the continuous use hall space. • The configuration of the loading dock and existing column set-out would not facilitate the rearrangement of these areas. • Retention of the lower hall level will limit the opportunity for on grade connections to Quarry St and the light rail. <p>The Exhibition Centre has now been in operation for over 23 years, and some significant repairs would be necessary in the next 2-3 years. There are key maintenance issues such as the chillers, lifts, escalators, underground plumbing and leaking roofs in the Exhibition Halls to be addressed. Due to its age, the building has a poor environmental design, and as a result, is energy inefficient in comparison to contemporary design. When considered in conjunction with issues associated with increasing the building's capacity, the estimated cost of undertaking these tasks would be prohibitive.</p> <p>Tumbalong Park is being retained as part of the proposal and the area of usable space being substantially increased as a result of the development.</p> <p>It is unviable to retain the Urban Stream as part of the development, however the Stream will be interpreted within the SICEEP Site through the installation of water features, water-play areas and as part of the Heritage Interpretation Strategy. It is noted that the Darling Harbour Water Feature, which is a heritage item, will be retained as part of the development.</p>

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
15	Advocates the retention of the award winning Exhibition Centre.	<p>Refer to above. A discussion of the limitations of the Exhibition Centre, and why it cannot be retained, is provided within the Response to Submissions report. In summary, the Exhibition Centre was constructed in 1988, and now has the following functionality issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Exhibition Hall concourse and foyers are quite narrow by contemporary standards, and are made more difficult by the off-set nature of each Exhibition Hall. • Public catering areas are located in only 4 of the 5 main Halls, and although recently updated, are still limited in size as they require lettable client space to be taken for seating areas. • The original Exhibition Centre loading dock is inefficient due to its size, irregular shape and column obstructions which results in a very limited number of trucks being able to utilise it during events. These issues also impact the safety aspects within the dock surrounds. • Due to the creation of the Convention Centre Parkside, the loading dock waiting area that was previously utilised for trucks and deliveries has been eliminated, which now allows only one truck to be unloaded concurrently in each Hall. <p>DHL has considered whether the existing Exhibition Halls could be extended by means of raising the existing roof structure and extending the structure masts. In respect to the brief requirement, this option proved unviable, with the following issues precluding the adaptive reuse of the Exhibition Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing roof steel could not be warranted for a further 50 years. • The existing steelwork has no flexibility for redesigning steelwork connections, pin joints, and cable stays, and so these would all require substantial reworking to ensure that a warranty could be applied. • Raising the existing roof to accommodate a double stack of exhibition space would incur greater wind loads, which the structure is not expected to be able to accommodate. • The alignment of the existing halls and its saw tooth layout does not allow for the continuous use hall space. • The configuration of the loading dock and existing column set-out would not facilitate the rearrangement of these areas. • Retention of the lower hall level will limit the opportunity for on grade connections to Quarry St and the light rail. <p>The Exhibition Centre has now been in operation for over 23 years, and some significant repairs would be necessary in the next 2-3 years. There are key maintenance issues such as the chillers, lifts, escalators, underground plumbing and leaking roofs in the Exhibition Halls to be addressed. Due to its age, the building has a poor environmental design, and as a result, is energy inefficient in comparison to contemporary design. When considered in conjunction with issues associated with increasing the building's capacity, the estimated cost of undertaking these tasks would be prohibitive.</p>

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	Site should provide better integration with Ultimo/Pymont and Tumbalong Park	SSDA1 provides for significantly improved connectivity between the SICEEP core facilities, Tumbalong Park and Ultimo/Pymont. The proposed public domain works retain Tumbalong Park and increases pedestrian connectivity to this area from the surrounding public spaces. The Boulevard will provide a strong north-south connection through the site connecting Tumbalong Park to Cockle Bay to the north and The Haymarket to the south, allowing connection to existing east-west linkages to the Ultimo/Pymont area. SSDA1 provides for a new direct pedestrian bridge between Quarry Street and the Event Deck, substantially improving the accessibility and quality of pedestrian access between Pymont and Darling Harbour. Also, the Boulevard will connect to the planned Ultimo Pedestrian Network (UPN) within The Haymarket site (subject to SSDA2 and subsequent detailed DAs).
1	Impact of the traffic overpasses are ignored despite their significant intrusion on the public realm	DHL is proposing to provide a design treatment to the underside of Pier Street for the width of The Boulevard only. This will be part of the precincts' Art and Interpretation Strategy.
6	Harbourside shopping centre building should be included as part of the project and would facilitate a better design outcome for the precinct	Harbourside is on a long-term lease, and never formed part of the land in the original brief.
1	The design of Harbourside Place should better integrate with the existing drop-off area for the Harbourside shopping centre to provide more space for taxis and coach parking and create a safer environment.	The proposed road and public domain works to Harbourside Place, along with other taxi and coach parking provided elsewhere in the vicinity, provides sufficient capacity for taxis and coaches to meet the present and future needs of the Darling Harbour precinct. Public domain, traffic calming measures and kerbside treatments will ensure that vehicle and pedestrian movements and interactions occur in a safe environment.
1	The use of Harbourside Place for special outdoor events such as markets is considered highly inappropriate	Any special events involving the whole or partial closure of Harbourside Place are strictly governed under the Project Deed between the State and DHL and would require the implementation of appropriate pedestrian and traffic management procedures.
1	Objection to the treatments of the public domain spaces Recommendation of new paving treatments in a colour that integrates with the existing public domain treatments	There has been strong consideration of the colours, form and future character of the site, concurrent with clear acknowledgement of the materials fabric prescribed by City of Sydney across the city streets, parks and urban plazas. The proposed palette of materials reflects the design intent and is subject to refinement and review following consultation with INSW, SHFA, City of Sydney and other relevant authorities.
2	Unsuitable and unsustainable solution to remove mature landscaping from Darling Harbour	Existing vegetation will be replaced with new vegetation which provides a suitable response to the public domain strategy for the SICEEP site. Existing vegetation within the site was planted during the redevelopment of Darling Harbour in the 1980s, and the replacement of this vegetation in the current redevelopment of the site is therefore consistent with the intent and purpose of the new public domain strategy.
2	Current design creates a sense of enclosure and does not facilitate softening	The proposed design incorporates an appropriate mix of hard and soft public domain treatments to balance the functional and recreational requirements of the Darling Harbour precinct, with an increase in the area of soft landscaping within Tumbalong Park as a result of the project.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	Event deck is thoroughly ill-conceived and will have an enormous negative impact on hundreds of residents in the Bullecourt complex	<p>The Event Deck will provide a high-quality space which contributes to the functionality and quality of the SICEEP core facilities.</p> <p>The potential impacts of the location of the Event Deck, including noise and privacy, are further discussed in the Response to Submissions report and in the Event Management Plan prepared by AEG Ogden at Appendix R. The impacts are considered to be acceptable.</p>
1	Design does not deliver the area required in the government brief	The project achieves all spatial requirements of the INSW Brief, including the 40,000m ² of exhibition space across the Precinct.
1	No opportunities for future expansion	The proposal addresses the requirements of the project brief which are based on the current and projected requirements for convention and exhibition facilities for the duration of the design life of the core facilities.
1	Loss of use as a sports venue	The Theatre has been designed to accommodate sporting events.
1	Calculation of FSR is incorrect as calculation of site area is wrong	There is no FSR control applicable to the site under the <i>Darling Harbour Development Plan No.1</i> . The core facilities have been designed to achieve the requirement under the INSW Brief for 40,000m ² of exhibition space across the Precinct, with additional floorspace for administrative and ancillary uses and circulation space.
5	Project attempts to provide too much in limited area resulting in overcrowding	The existing capacity of infrastructure, services, local intersections and roads, pedestrian networks has been assessed and deemed to be adequate to support the proposed development, with amplification of services proposed where required to support the project. The smaller built footprint of the proposed core facilities within the SSDA1 site in comparison to the existing facilities provides opportunities for the provision of additional landscaping and public domain spaces throughout the SICEEP site.
1	Existing Exhibition Centre building should be dismantled and re-erected at Glebe Island.	<p>In order to maintain Sydney's position as an international business tourism destination, temporary exhibition facilities at Glebe Island will be required to be operational as soon as the existing facilities at Darling Harbour are demolished. The need to provide continuity of service precludes the relocation of any existing structural elements from Darling Harbour to Glebe Island.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Exhibition Centre has now been in operation for over 23 years, and some significant repairs would be necessary in the next 2-3 years. There are key maintenance issues such as the chillers, lifts, escalators, underground plumbing and leaking roofs in the Exhibition Halls to be addressed. Due to its age, the building has a poor environmental design, and as a result, is energy inefficient in comparison to contemporary design. As such, the relocation of the existing structure to Glebe Island is not considered to represent either a good interim outcome for Glebe Island or good value for money.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the following issues precluding the adaptive reuse of the Exhibition Centre:</p>

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The existing roof steel could not be warranted for a further 25 years. ▪ The existing steelwork has no flexibility for redesigning steelwork connections, pin joints, and cable stays, and so these would all require substantial reworking to ensure that a warranty could be applied.
Built Form		
2	Significant use of glass and metal is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding development and will ruin the vista of Darling Harbour	The materiality of the proposal is consistent with the Urban Design and Public Realm Guidelines prepared for the site by Woods Bagot on behalf of INSW.
1	The development represents the complete over-building of the area.	The proposed development achieves the facility requirements of the INSW design brief based on the current and projected demand for convention, exhibition and entertainment facilities within Sydney.
1	The building heights should relate to their foreshore context, to enable the next tier of buildings away from the foreshore to enjoy views of the Bay.	Maximum heights for the proposed buildings are consistent with the Urban Design and Public Realm Guidelines prepared for the site by Woods Bagot on behalf of INSW.
1	The 3m level change for the overhead bridge at the Liverpool Street entry has not been addressed. The back-of-house for the performance area is relocated in the proposed scheme with an exposed back of house. Currently, the back of house area uses the level change of the ground plane from Liverpool Street.	The pedestrian bridge from Liverpool Street to the SICEEP site over Harbour Street does not form part of the SICEEP site and will remain in-situ.
1	Consideration should be given to clause 6.16 of SLEP 2012 relating to the erection of tall buildings in central Sydney.	The entire SICEEP site is excluded from land to which SLEP 2012 applies, which reflects that it has its own special planning regime that applies. Notwithstanding the above, clause 6.16 of SLEP 2012 applies to buildings greater than 55 metres in height only, and would not affect SSDA1 in any case.
1	There will be unbearable reflectivity.	Façade reflectivity has been considered in the Solar Reflectivity Assessment prepared by Cermak Peterka Petersen (Appendix S of SSDA1) in accordance with the provisions of the Sydney DCP 2012. This assessment concludes that the PPP buildings will not result in any driver hazards or pedestrian discomfort.
1	A stepped development like the Novotel would be better for the ICC.	The proposed building envelopes are consistent with the Urban Design and Public Realm Guidelines prepared for the site by Woods Bagot on behalf of INSW and is required to accommodate the INSW brief.
25	Metallic cladding of western wall of proposed ICC will be ugly and offense to the east facing apartments. Western face needs to be more aesthetically pleasing given how it will dominate views from residential apartments	Architectural treatments of the western façade of the ICC have been refined to achieve an improved built form outcome as detailed in the Response to Submissions and amended Architectural Drawings.
1	Option for a stepped back building instead of flat wall for ICC is not considered and would be a more appropriate solution	The Response to Submissions incorporates amendments to the façade which break up the building massing and introduce additional articulation to the built form.
2	Wall of ICC that faces Darling Drive should have a hanging garden instead of huge wall to provide greenery as compensation for loss of views	Architectural treatments of the western façade of the ICC have been refined to achieve an improved built form outcome as detailed in the Response to Submissions and amended Architectural Drawings.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	The height of the proposed building ICC and hotel should be reduced so that it does not overshadow the Goldsbrough Building at any time.	Maximum heights for the proposed buildings subject to SSDA1 are consistent with the Urban Design and Public Realm Guidelines prepared for the site by Woods Bagot on behalf of INSW. The proposed ICC Hotel will be subject to a future separate planning assessment and approvals process.
30	Overshadowing from ICC will remove morning winter sunlight and increase heating costs.	Axonometric diagrams have been prepared to enable an assessment of the shadow impacts on residential development to the west of Pyrmont Street. The diagrams demonstrate that at 9am on 21 June, there will be very limited overshadowing to the lower levels of the Goldsbrough and Bullecourt Apartments. There will be no overshadowing of these buildings by midday on 21 June. The proposal will have a negligible impact to the availability of solar access to these apartments, with solar access maintained from 9am onwards in the morning on the Winter Solstice.
8	Unacceptable level of overshadowing on public open space	At the winter solstice on 21 June (i.e. the worst-case scenario for overshadowing), the buildings proposed under SSDA1 will not overshadow Tumbalong Park between 9am and 3pm, and there would be only minimal overshadowing of the Chinese Garden of Friendship forecourt (there would be no overshadowing of the garden itself). At 3pm on 21 June there would only be partial overshadowing of the north-south boulevard during the worst-case scenario of 3pm. In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed PPP Site redevelopment will not result in any adverse impacts upon amenity within the adjoining public domain as a result of the proposed development.
4	Reduced amenity of public open space through removal of water features	As part of the Darling Harbour Live vision the Public Realm is a series of interactive water features for children of a variety of ages which combine to create a connected urban stream from south to north, along the Boulevard and terminating at the Harbour's edge. The removal of the existing water features will improve pedestrian permeability and provide a more interactive experience for visitors to the precinct. The Woodward Fountain, which is going to be listed on the State Heritage Register, will be retained as part of the proposed development, with the revised scheme seeking to increase the curtilage between the ICC and the water feature.
3	The development takes up too much public space, parkland and walking space, diminishing the park and cutting out the fountains.	The proposal results in an increase in the amount of useable open space available to the public. In particular, the size of Tumbalong Park will be increased from 8,000m ² to 11,000m ² and its design simplified and flattened to accommodate activities ranging from family picnics and social grass sports to theatrical and major festival congregations.
6	Height of proposed ICC should not exceed the height of the existing centre.	Maximum heights for the proposed buildings are consistent with the Urban Design and Public Realm Guidelines prepared for the site by Woods Bagot on behalf of INSW.
7	ICC is too large in comparison to surrounding development and the existing buildings on the site	<p>The height of the ICC has been minimised, while ensuring that the scheme meets the INSW Brief and internal services requirements of the building.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the height of the ICC is compatible with the scale of surrounding development and structures including the Sydney CBD along the eastern edge of Cockle Bay, the topography and scale of development to the west within Pyrmont, and the scale of the Western Distributor viaducts.</p>

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
4	Building designs do not reflect their setting the way the existing buildings are nautically themed and create a connection with the historical significance of the area	The nature of the site's context has changed dramatically since the design and development of the existing buildings occurred during the 1980s. It is therefore appropriate that the proposed development reflects the modern context of the site and desired architectural outcomes for significant new buildings within the Darling Harbour precinct.
1	Exhibition Centre should be designed across a single ground floor over the existing car park site	<p>The development of the ICC Exhibition over two levels provides an opportunity to provide a more functional facility with a consolidated footprint. This design provides opportunities to increase site permeability and the integration of the facility into the existing urban framework.</p> <p>This is consistent with other international facilities, such as those in Singapore and Hong Kong.</p>
1	The position of the hotel complex should not impact so severely on nearby residents.	The ICC Hotel does not form part of SSDA1 and will be subject to a separate future application and assessment process.
2	Entertainment Centre should provide increased not decreased capacity	The fan shaped format of The Theatre in the new development provides a high quality entertainment and viewing experience for all 8,000 attendees from every seat. This is an improvement to the existing horseshoe format of the Sydney Entertainment Centre which gives compromised amenity and viewing experience for the current patrons at the Sydney Entertainment Centre. The 8,000 seat centre has been sized based on recent maximum audience levels at the centre. Notwithstanding this, (options to increase internal seated capacity to 9,000 patrons will be investigated during design development).
1	Rear side of theatre also requires a more sympathetic finish to minimise impacts on surrounding residents	Architectural treatments of the western façade of The Theatre have been refined to achieve an improved built form outcome as detailed in the Response to Submissions and amended Architectural Drawings.
3	Impact of wind tunnelling from new built form on public spaces has not been adequately assessed.	Potential wind impacts were considered in the Wind Report prepared by Cermak Peterka Petersen (CPP) submitted with the original EIS. CPP has prepared a Wind Statement to accompany the revised scheme (refer to Appendix Z). The statement confirms that the changes will not alter the conclusions of the original Wind Report and that the street level wind environment at most locations would be similar to, or calmer than, typical street level wind conditions in the surrounding areas. At the windiest locations identified, mitigation strategies such as awnings, fins, or landscaping will be developed during detailed design to improve comfort ratings.
1	Large roof areas should accommodate rooftop gardens and green space	The structural requirements of the core facilities, and in particular the need to provide large column-free internal spaces to meet functional specifications, precludes the inclusion of rooftop gardens within the core facilities. The Event Deck will be publicly accessible outside of 'event-mode' periods and will incorporate appropriate embellishment to allow this area to act as a high quality public space.
Loss of Views		
2	Scale of development blocks the view of the city from William Street and Quarry Street	A Visual and View Impact Assessment has been prepared. An updated Assessment responding to the design changes that have been made following public exhibition has been prepared and is included as part of the Response to Submissions (refer to Appendix L).

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	The development will result in a substantial loss of views to the east and north east for residents of the Bullecourt Apartment complex.	A Visual and View Impact Assessment has been prepared. An updated Assessment responding to the design changes that have been made following public exhibition has been prepared and is included as part of the Response to Submissions (refer to Appendix L).
1	Views looking east and north-east from the Goldsbrough Apartments will be diminished by the proposed Convention Centre, and significantly diminished by the proposed ICC Hotel. Views from Levels 5-7 will be removed, and views from Levels 8-12 will be reduced.	A Visual and View Impact Assessment has been prepared. An updated Assessment responding to the design changes that have been made following public exhibition has been prepared and is included as part of the Response to Submissions (refer to Appendix L).
1	Currently, from Level 5 upwards, there are panoramic views of the western CBD skyline, despite the view being partially obscured by the existing Convention Centre.	A Visual and View Impact Assessment has been prepared. An updated Assessment responding to the design changes that have been made following public exhibition has been prepared and is included as part of the Response to Submissions (refer to Appendix L).
37	ICC proposal will significantly block residential views to Darling Harbour. Rather than 'view sharing' ICC will block views from all east facing apartments.	A Visual and View Impact Assessment has been prepared. An updated Assessment responding to the design changes that have been made following public exhibition has been prepared and is included as part of the Response to Submissions (refer to Appendix L).
6	Mitigation of loss of views by the inclusion of an event deck is directly contravened by the erection of a marquee on this area for a quarter of the year. This marquee structure should be restricted to the eastern portion of the deck to protect views.	The marquee structure will only be erected on a temporary basis and will sit below the upper roof height of the ICC Exhibition and will continue to allow for views to the east.
2	Compensation is sought for residents with complete loss of view.	A Visual and View Impact Assessment has been prepared. An updated Assessment responding to the design changes that have been made following public exhibition has been prepared and is included as an appendix to the Response to Submissions (refer to Appendix L).
3	Visual and View Impact Analysis does not include the two-tower hotel	The proposed ICC Hotel will be subject to a separate future planning assessment and approvals process.
Pedestrian Access		
2	Pedestrian access from Tumbalong Park to public concourse and event deck is insufficient	Pedestrian access to the public concourse is significantly improved from the current Exhibition Centre through the inclusion of clear and well-connected pedestrian access points. In particular, the Quarry Street pedestrian bridge connects directly to the Event Deck and through to the public concourse and Tumbalong Park, and will act as the primary pedestrian linkage between Pymont and Darling Harbour. The interface between the ICC Exhibition public concourse and The Boulevard includes a number of stepped and ramped pedestrian accessways allowing for direct connectivity between these two spaces.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	Disabled access between the Boulevard and the exhibition terrace is compromised, with a very long, narrow ramp.	<p>Disabled access between The Boulevard and the public concourse is not compromised and the Access Review prepared by Morris Goding Accessibility Consulting (Appendix X of the original EIS) concluded that all elements of the proposal are capable of satisfying the accessibility requirements of the AS1428 series, Building Code of Australia, DDA (Access to Premises – Buildings) Standards 2010 and ultimately the Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act 1992 subject to detailed design.</p> <p>Morris Goding Accessibility Consulting has reviewed the revised scheme from an accessibility perspective. The addendum Access Statement at Appendix BB confirms that conclusion of the original report remain unchanged, however provides additional mitigation measures.</p>
1	Entertainment Centre pedestrian queuing area insufficient	Pedestrian queuing areas for The Theatre have been designed in accordance with the facility requirements specified by INSW and the relevant standards.
40	Removal of raised pedestrian walkway adjacent to the existing Convention Centre monorail station removes pedestrian access from building to the western fringe on Darling Harbour	<p>Following the proposed removal of the pedestrian overbridge over Darling Drive to the north of the ICC Convention, pedestrians will continue to be able to traverse from Darling Harbour to Pyrmont via a number of existing pedestrian routes in close proximity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Harbourside/Novotel Car Park pedestrian bridge – 130m to the north; ▪ Pyrmont Bridge – 300m to the north; and ▪ ICC Exhibition/Western Distributor/ Fig Street pedestrian overbridge – 180m to the south. <p>In addition, SSDA1 includes the construction of a new pedestrian overbridge between Quarry Street and the Event Deck, providing additional pedestrian connectivity to and from the SICEEP site. In light of the proximity of existing pedestrian connections, and the provision of a new pedestrian connection to the south, it is considered that pedestrian connectivity will not be significantly impacted by the removal of the Convention Monorail Station pedestrian overbridge.</p>
1	Pedestrian connectivity of the site with the CBD is not shown in graphical form	HASSELL has prepared a series of diagrams addressing the pedestrian accessibility issues raised by the Department. A full set of diagrams is provided at Appendix K . Section 2.5 of the Response to Submissions report shows the various pedestrian connections across the site and to surrounding areas, demonstrating an appropriate level of accessibility and connectivity with surrounding pedestrian networks. The proposal greatly improves the east-west connectivity from the precinct and into / out of the CBD.
2	Pedestrian access from Ada Place should be preserved	Darling Harbour will continue to be accessible from Ada Place via the Western Distributor pedestrian viaduct.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	Increased pedestrian pressure on Town Hall due to relocation of entertainment centre	Whilst The Theatre will be located marginally closer to Town Hall Station, north-south connectivity provided via The Boulevard is expected to result in a large portion of pedestrian movements to be directed towards Central Station, which provides greater accessibility to Suburban and Intercity rail services compared to Town Hall. In addition, the proximity of the site to light rail stations provide greater opportunity for passenger interchange for rail services at Central Station.
1	The impact on Harbourside parking and pedestrian access has not been considered	The SICEEP development provides adequate parking to meet the demand generated by the core facilities and other residential/commercial uses. The Response to Submissions report includes additional parking within The Theatre to achieve this objective (refer Section 2.4 and 3.0).
1	The existing design of Harbourside Place will create a pedestrian-vehicle conflict and added traffic on loop road	In order to meet the INSW Brief DHL are required to provide an 'all-weather' drop off adjacent to the entry of the ICC (i.e. on Harbourside Place). The design intent is for this space to read as a continuous pedestrian zone, similar to a Hotel porte-cochere. To strengthen the pedestrian nature of the zone, kerb and gutter is not proposed to be adopted in this area.
Traffic Generation		
1	Functionality of Darling Drive has not been improved	The proposed design reduces Darling Drive to one lane per direction (with a storage lane/turn bay on the northbound lane at the access entrance to the ICC Exhibition Centre north carpark) but transfers truck parking, loading and queuing within the loading dock facilities, thereby improving the overall functionality of Darling Drive as a carriageway. The Transport and Traffic Impact Assessment Addendum Report prepared by Hyder Consulting (Appendix M of the Response to Submissions) finds that intersections on Darling Drive would not be adversely affected by the proposed reconfigurations.
2	Increased traffic congestion as a result of Darling Drive being reduced to two lanes.	Road network and intersection modelling undertaken by Hyder Consulting (Appendix M of the Response to Submissions) confirms that the existing network will continue to operate at a satisfactory level of service subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures.
1	Impact on traffic flow from Darling Drive and Loop Road have not been adequately assessed	The functionality of the existing Harbourside Place for traffic movements is retained under the proposed amendments to this road, notwithstanding the proposed reconfiguration of this road for one-way traffic flow.
1	Traffic movement from the site to Broadway has not been considered	The integration of the SICEEP redevelopment within the local road network has been considered in the Transport and Traffic Impact Assessment Addendum Report prepared by Hyder Consulting with regard to trip distribution and influences on the local road network.
2	Traffic study does not include intersection of Ultimo Road and Darling Drive	Refer above.
3	Traffic congestion will be affected by increased frequency of light rail service	The Transport and Traffic Impact Assessment Addendum Report prepared by Hyder Consulting (Appendix M of Response to Submissions) considers the potential impacts of the light rail network on traffic movements, including the potential impacts of the proposed George Street Light Rail Corridor.
1	Intersection upgrades recommended in the Transport and Traffic Assessment must be conditioned to occur prior to the issuing of an occupation certificate	Intersection upgrades will be undertaken as they are required and prior to the issuing of a final occupation certificate.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	Should convene a working group of RMS, City of Sydney, DHL and community groups to assess the cumulative impact of Barangaroo, Darling Harbour, Harold Park, Central Park, White Bay. Need to assess these combined impacts on local street networks	DHL is involved in ongoing consultation with the RMS and the City of Sydney regarding the management of traffic generated by the SICEEP proposal. These agencies are aware of, and engaged with, the assessment and management of traffic generated by other key development sites within the region.
Parking		
5	Parking provided for proposed facilities is very inadequate and does not take into consideration the impact of the hotel development and its need for parking	<p>The analysis undertaken by Hyder (Appendix M of the Response to Submissions) reveals that the proposed parking solution to serve the core facilities of the PPP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provides adequate parking for daytime weekday demand; ▪ excess peak weekend day and evening demand can be serviced by the surrounding supply of carparks in the locality as there will be excess capacity outside of standard working hours (e.g. without commuter use for business and tertiary institutions); ▪ the carparking approach provides the greatest value for money option for the NSW Government by not requiring the construction of additional peak demand infrastructure that is likely to be used less frequently; and ▪ in comparison with the existing situation, the overall proposed parking provision for the SICEEP Site (Whole of Precinct) will be reduced by approximately 500 spaces - reducing the dependency of private vehicles and supporting an increase in mode share for sustainable means of transport. <p>Parking requirements of the proposed ICC Hotel will be subject to separate future assessment at the time an SSDA is lodged for this element of the SICEEP redevelopment. The Transport and Traffic Assessment Report prepared by Hyder notes that the hotel development is expected to require minimal parking. The majority of guests would arrive at the hotel via taxi, coach, mini bus or light rail.</p>
1	Parking removed as a result of this proposal is currently utilised by Harbourside patrons and this impact has not been adequately addressed.	Existing demand for parking has been taken into account in the TMAP prepared by Hyder Consulting (Appendix M of the Response to Submissions).
4	Impact of reduced parking on surrounding local streets has not adequately been assessed	The proposed parking provision has been determined to be adequate to meet the needs of the SICEEP core facilities. In special circumstances where there is overflow demand for parking (e.g. special events), additional public car parking is available at a number of car parks in close proximity to the SICEEP site as identified at Appendix M of the Response to Submissions.
1	Loading facilities will not be able to be accommodated underground in entirety in practice	Loading facilities are not proposed to be provided underground and would be located above-ground with suitable enclosure.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
Public Transport		
2	Currently inadequate public transport servicing the site. New ferry service and additional bus services should be investigated	The SICEEP site is one of the most accessible locations by public transport within Sydney, with two major train stations (Town Hall and Central) within walking distance, a number of bus services and major bus interchange points within walking distance (with strong pedestrian connectivity) and two light rail stations adjacent to the PPP site. INSW will continue to liaise with TfNSW to ensure that the required public transport services are available and communicated to visitors to the site.
1	Site does not provide a link to Sydney Airport which will reduce attractiveness for conferences	Sydney Airport is directly accessible from the site via existing road and rail connections.
1	The development will provide better access to public transport including light rail, Town Hall and Central Stations.	Noted.
1	No assessment of the demand for coaches or taxi hire has been supplied to complement the design and need for Harbourside Place.	The location and capacity of Harbourside Place is not dissimilar to that currently provided and has been designed to service the requirements of the SICEEP core facilities.
1	The institute supports the removal of the monorail as truly past its used by date and poorly functioning infrastructure.	The removal of the monorail is not related to the SICEEP development and is being progressed separately by TfNSW.
Noise, Light and Odour Impacts		
9	Existing projected noise levels are an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residents	The operational noise impacts of the proposal generally comply with the relevant site noise criteria during the operational phase at nearby residential and commercial receivers. Whilst there will be some noise impacts throughout the construction period, these will be temporary in nature and will be mitigated through the implementation of the Demolition, Evacuation and Construction Noise Management Plan prepared by Acoustic Logic at Appendix Q .
5	Current level of sound proofing is insufficient.	The Environmental Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment prepared by AECOM and submitted with the EIS, and the supplementary Acoustic Report prepared by Acoustic Logic (Appendix P of Response to Submissions) recommends minimum insertion losses for acoustic treatments to operational plant equipment and internal areas. These acoustic treatments will ensure that the SICEEP core facilities achieve the required noise criterion during operations.
8	Closure hours are not in line with existing 10pm controls and noise levels, extending past midnight from patrons leaving events will exceed recommended levels. These are within 60-70 metres of balconies and bedrooms. The reported levels are then expected to be breached 1 in 4 nights of operation. Events must end at 10pm with bump out occurring straight after with access restricted to event deck after this hour.	The hours of operation of the Event Deck have been reduced. In order to minimise any amenity impacts, events and functions will be held between 7am and 10pm (including bump-in and bump-out) except for large celebratory events such as Australia Day and New Years Eve. Notwithstanding this, low noise events or functions where there is no risk of exceeding the recommended noise level at the nearest residence at night time (i.e. after 10pm) as recommended in the ENVIA prepared by Aecom, will be finished by 11pm. This will ensure that there are no adverse impacts at midnight, as raised by residents of the Bullecourt Apartments.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
5	Noise from generators used to power heating or of marquee is unacceptable. Power requirements must be sourced from within the building and not create noise for surrounding residents.	A detailed Noise Management Plan will be developed with SHFA and submitted to the EPA for all outdoor entertainment areas in Darling Harbour. This plan will address preventative and reactive noise management measures to minimise potential impacts on sensitive residential receivers, including appropriate control on the use of any ancillary generators or heating equipment.
4	Seeking clarification of what an unrestricted event means. What is the need for 6-7 events a year with no noise and duration restrictions – this results in unacceptable loss of sleep for surrounding residents	SSDA1 proposes the use of the Event Deck and Oxygen Bar beyond 10pm for large-scale celebratory events up to 6 times per year. Noise criteria would be exceeded by up to 4dB at Bullecourt Apartments during these events, which is considered to be acceptable due to the infrequent nature of the exceedances and in the context of Darling Harbour's role as major events precinct. During these special events (e.g. New Years Eve or Australia Day) it is likely that a number of other similar events would be occurring throughout the locality which would affect noise background levels.
2	Event deck hours should be restricted to 7pm	The evening use of the Event Deck complies with the relevant noise criteria at all residential and commercial receivers during the evening period (until 11pm) in all scenarios except 'large-scale celebratory events' (refer response above). As such the use of this space after 7pm is considered acceptable as it will not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.
4	Event deck should be located away from residential properties	Refer response above. The potential noise impacts of the Event Deck are considered to be acceptable and therefore the relocation of the Event Deck to mitigate potential impacts on residential receivers is not required. Notwithstanding this, an Event Management Plan has been prepared by AEG Ogden (refer to Appendix R). The Plan provides details on public access, frequency of use, hours of operation, noise impacts and noise monitoring which will be further developed in preparing the final Event and Operations Management Plans.
7	Sound system for outdoor music should be orientated away from residential properties to limit noise effects	A detailed Noise Management Plan will be developed with SHFA and submitted to the EPA for all outdoor entertainment areas in Darling Harbour which will address preventative and reactive noise management measures to minimise potential impacts on sensitive residential receivers.
2	Information on sound proofing and assessment is too complex for residents to ascertain the impact the development will have	The Environmental Noise and Vibration Assessment has been prepared by AECOM in accordance with the relevant guidelines prepared and enforced by NSW Government agencies. The results of this noise assessment are technical by nature, and will be reviewed and assessed by appropriately qualified government personnel. The assessment concludes that the noise impacts on residential receivers is acceptable, subject to the mitigation measures proposed.
5	Lighting assessment has not been provided for the entire development, let alone the event deck. No indication of light pollution impact and how this is mitigated.	The detailed design of external lighting will be developed in consultation with SHFA and will generally seek to comply with Section 3.2.8 External Lighting of the Sydney DCP 2012.
5	Odours from food, fumes and food from outdoor events could be carried to residential apartments	Food preparation areas within the SICEEP core facilities and separate food premises within ground level tenancies will be required to comply with the relevant standards for odour control.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	The event deck will lead to antisocial behaviour.	The Plan of Management prepared by AEG Ogden (Appendix R of the Response to Submissions report) details security initiatives which will be implemented during facility operation and includes the use of licensed security personnel and ongoing communication with the NSW Police Force. Outside of event mode the Event Deck would be closed to the public generally from sundown to sunrise.
1	Excessive traffic noise as a result of the proposal	Traffic noise has been taken into account in the Environmental Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment undertaken by AECOM as part of the EIS.
Heritage		
5	Heritage Impact Statement does not follow the procedural requirements of the Heritage Branch as it does not properly analyse each element and avoids arguments for demolition. It fails to analyse the heritage significance of 3 key buildings.	<p>The Heritage Impact Statement has been prepared by TKD Architects and is fully in accordance with the relevant guidelines. The Heritage Impact Statement follows the general guidelines for Statements of Heritage Impact, set out in the NSW Heritage Manual, Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (1996), and also follows the methodology and terminology described in <i>The Conservation Plan</i>, Sydney, National Trust of Australia (NSW), 5th edition 2000 by Dr J. S. Kerr and in the Australia ICOMOS <i>Burra Charter</i>, 1999</p> <p>DHL has given significant consideration to the functionality and adequacy of the existing facilities. As part of these investigations, a number of parties provided input in order to determine what parts of the facilities to retain and what parts to demolish. This included events organisers, architects, construction and maintenance contractors.</p> <p>A detailed review of these considerations is provided at Section 2.6 of the Response to Submissions report. In summary, retention of the existing facilities is not viable, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing SCEC cannot meet current levels of market demand, leading to lost business opportunities. • The SCEC lacks the functionality and flexibility found in state of the art facilities. • The SCEC will require significant expenditure to address lifecycle issues in the coming years. • The ageing facilities will progressively not be able to meet the technical and aesthetic standards required by international delegates and will require substantial lifecycle and maintenance investment.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
5	The Heritage Impact Statement only considers statutory listed items rather than items listed on registers of the AIA and National Trust. Statement should consider heritage in a wider context. Heritage Statement does not mention tourism industry awards and engineering of Exhibition Centre.	<p>In accordance with the Director General's Requirements, a Statement of Heritage Impact was prepared to "address the impact of the development on heritage significance of the site and adjacent area (including any built and landscape heritage items including places, items or relics of significance to Aboriginal people)".</p> <p>The preparation of a Heritage Impact Statement is not required in relation to buildings, places etc that are not listed heritage items. TKD Architects have nonetheless updated the Heritage Impact Statement to provide further assessment of the heritage significance of Darling Harbour.</p> <p>The revised Statement reiterates that the heritage assessment has only taken into account the impacts of the proposed development on heritage items that are included in statutory lists. Although the Exhibition Centre and Convention Centre have been assessed as having heritage significance by the Australian Institute of Architects and the National Trust of Australia, inclusion on these registers does not have the status of a statutory listing. On this basis, no further assessment of these items has been undertaken.</p>
1	Heritage report does not provide objective independent advice	TKD is a highly reputable independent firm with substantial experience in heritage impact assessment and conservation, and have prepared the Heritage Impact Statement based on their professional judgement and assessment of the site's heritage significance.
1	The Sydney Convention Centre, its in-situ artworks, and its external landscaping including the fountain are of state significance, and deserve to be listed by NSW heritage agencies.	The Convention Centre is not a statutorily listed heritage item. The listing of items on the NSW State Heritage Register is matter for the State Heritage Register Committee of the NSW Heritage Council.
5	Heritage report needs to consider the significance of the site as a whole rather than individually listed heritage items	The cultural heritage of the site is considered in the Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) prepared by TKD Architects based on the Statement of Significance included in the Sydney International Convention, Exhibition and Entertainment Precinct (SICEEP) Baseline Heritage Impact Assessment dated February 2013 by City Plan Heritage.
4	Fails to consider the cultural heritage of the site and the impact of demolishing significant buildings that contribute to the cultural heritage	Refer above. The impact of the proposed development is taken into account in the HIS and is considered to be acceptable subject to the implementation of the Interpretation Strategy.
2	Sight lines to the more important eastern façade of the Powerhouse Museum should be protected not just the less significant western façade	The Heritage Impact Statement finds that principal views to the Powerhouse Museum are available from Harris Street and will not be affected by the proposed development, while views to the building are of secondary importance. Sight lines to the Powerhouse Museum eastern façade will continue to be available from the PPP Site.
1	The heights of the proposed buildings will prevent views of the significant heritage building, currently enjoyed from the public domain precincts of the eastern foreshore of Cockle Bay.	The Goldsborough Mort is not a listed heritage item and views to the eastern façade are not deemed to be of heritage significance.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
34	Goldsbrough is an iconic historic building and views to it from Darling Harbour need to be protected. In the current proposal, Goldsbrough is almost entirely obscured from view from public spaces in Darling Harbour.	Refer above.
1	No consideration has been given to the site for its significant archaeological potential. Lend Lease must give assurance that it will avoid impacts through redesign rather than manage the impact.	It should be noted that no significant excavation works are proposed as part of SSDDA1, and as such the proposal will have limited potential impact upon archaeological deposits. The mitigation measures proposed, including interpretation of any archaeological finds, is considered appropriate.
1	Fails to consider the impact on the Chinese Gardens	The Statement of Heritage Impact notes that the Chinese Garden of Friendship is presently separated from the existing Exhibition Centre by a wide paved concourse. The proposed Theatre is sited at a distance from the Garden that is similar to the existing situation. The space between the Theatre and the Garden is to be upgraded with new landscaping works. Because the garden itself is an internally focussed item there will be no impacts on it, although the setting on its western side will be enhanced by new landscaping works.
1	Proposed Exhibition Centre loading area will extend over part of the Darling Harbour Goods Line. This item should not be affected by this development.	The Statement of Heritage Impact notes that there will be some impact on the Darling Harbour Rail Corridor resulting from the loading dock associated with the Exhibition. The impact of the loading dock is, however, limited and will not affect interpretation of the Rail Corridor or its heritage significance. The impact will be ameliorated by the removal of monorail infrastructure by others. The potential impacts are therefore considered to be acceptable.
Economic Benefits		
2	Cost and financial risk to NSW have not been identified	The financial risks and the risk allocation are outlined in the contact description document available at www.siceep.com .
1	Economic benefit of proposed development reduced from \$400 to \$200 million	<p>The difference between economic benefits identified in the submission relates to two different methodologies for calculating economic impact.</p> <p>The first figure that has been quoted of \$400 million appears to relate to a figure of \$431 million in annual economic contribution for the existing facilities. This figure originates from the SHFA FY2012 report. It is noted that this figure is based on "Sydney Convention and Visitor Bureau estimated spend per type of delegate" (p.7 - SHFA FY2012 annual report).</p> <p>The figure of \$200 million in annual economic benefit related to the new development is a figure that has been calculated on the basis of calculations by Infrastructure NSW and NSW Treasury. DHL is not party to the calculation methodology proposed by each party.</p> <p>However, it is noted that the PWC determined that the economic benefit of the new development compared to 'business as usual' at the existing facility was an annual increase of \$160 million to \$270 million. This increased amount is relative to the \$431 million quoted above (p.86, A world class convention and exhibition centre for Sydney: Pre-feasibility Study, ATEC, IPA, PCA, SBC, TTF, PwC).</p>

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	Developer profits will not be enough to 'reboot the NSW economy', if there is no social, health and educational infrastructure to support it.	The redevelopment of the SICEEP site will on the whole result in a significant increase in the economic benefits delivered by the site. These benefits will have ongoing positive impacts on the NSW economy. SSDA1 does not propose any residential dwellings which would increase demand on infrastructure.
1	Tourism will plummet, losing jobs and income.	The proposal seeks to boost business tourism by meeting the requirements of a modern international facility and allowing Sydney to continue to attract large international conferences and exhibitions into the future.
1	Development has significant impact on the marketability of the Novotel Hotel due to loss of views	A Visual and View Impact Assessment has been prepared. An updated Assessment responding to the design changes that have been made following public exhibition has been prepared and is included at Appendix L .
1	Cost of construction may not deliver appropriate quality	DHL has entered into a Project Deed that includes an extensive Project Brief outlining the quality of the construction outcomes for the State of NSW and Darling Harbour. These outcomes are a contractual responsibility of Darling Harbour Live.
1	There is no evidence to provide that the Exhibition Centre is inadequate for purpose, so its demolition and replacement is questionable.	Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority (SHFA) advises that over the past five years the existing facilities have been unable to accommodate about 27 international conventions, 142 national conventions and 12 exhibitions, at significant economic cost to NSW. In order to remain competitive as an international business tourism host city, Sydney must ensure that key facilities are capable of meeting the requirements of modern convention and exhibition events.
1	Sydney is currently losing ground to competitors. The proposed development will assist Sydney in attracting additional conferences and events, and will provide ongoing employment opportunities.	Noted.
1	Coupled with the Barangaroo project, the redevelopment of Darling Harbour will revitalise the western CBD.	Noted.
13	Re-development is unnecessarily and wastefully expensive as buildings could be refurbished	<p>DHL has given significant consideration to the functionality and adequacy of the existing facilities. As part of these investigations, a number of parties provided input in order to determine what parts of the facilities to retain and what parts to demolish. This included events organisers, architects, construction and maintenance contractors.</p> <p>A detailed review of these considerations is provided at within the Response to Submissions report. In summary, retention of the existing facilities is not viable, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The existing SCEC cannot meet current levels of market demand, leading to lost business opportunities. ▪ The SCEC lacks the functionality and flexibility found in state of the art facilities. ▪ The SCEC will require significant expenditure to address lifecycle issues in the coming years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The ageing facilities will progressively not be able to meet the technical and aesthetic standards required by international delegates and will require substantial lifecycle and maintenance investment.
2	Construction period will cause economic hardship to surrounding land uses	The redevelopment of the existing Convention, Exhibition and Entertainment Centres, and associated associate with the temporary closure of the facilities and environmental impacts during the construction period, is necessary in order to ensure

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
		that these facilities continue to provide direct economic benefits to the local economy and NSW. The redevelopment of the SICEEP site will on the whole result in a significant increase in the economic benefits delivered by the site.
2	If the facilities were refurbished, the funding could be used to upgrade road infrastructure, medical facilities and children's education.	The redevelopment of the SICEEP site will on the whole result in a significant increase in the economic benefits delivered by the site. These benefits will have ongoing positive impacts on the NSW economy
1	There is no primary school in the area for families with children who may live there. There is no decent library.	SSDA1 does not propose any residential uses which would give rise to demand for educational or library facilities.
1	There is no economic or financial appraisal of moving or leaving the Entertainment Centre where it stands.	The replacement of the Sydney Entertainment Centre (SEC) with The Theatre within the PPP Site allows the integration of The Theatre within the operations of the ICC Sydney and generates a significant urban design and economic opportunity to redevelop the SEC site for mixed use commercial and residential uses which better integrate within the surrounding urban framework. The development yield and economic inputs of this relocation make a significant contribution to the overall economic benefits of the SICEEP project.
1	The provision of another 'Theatre' will make the economics of 'show business' even worse.	The Theatre has been designed to replace the existing Sydney Entertainment Centre and provide an optimised venue that delivers a higher quality customer experience and is better suited to the requirements of modern events.
Social and Community Impacts		
1	Wish to endorse the project as it offers many opportunities to a wide range of communities	Noted.
1	The proposed development will result in population overcrowding.	SSDA1 does not propose any residential uses which would affect the local residential population.
3	No gain in floor area for the Entertainment facilities	The 8,000 seat centre has been sized based on recent maximum audience levels at the centre as per the INSW brief.
3	Anti-social behaviour associated with alcohol consumption will spill out to our apartment in the form of abuse such as thrown objects and general loss of privacy. No mitigation measures for anti-social behaviour from event deck patrons	The Plan of Management prepared by AEG Ogden (Appendix J of the original EIS) details security initiatives which will be implemented during facility operation and includes the use of licensed security personnel and ongoing communication with the NSW Police Force.
1	Event deck bar is an unsuitable land use and is not necessary	The Oxygen Bar is required to support the operations of the Event Deck.
3	Sporting and recreation facilities need to be provided as part of this redevelopment, and could be provided in place of the event deck	Tumalong Park has been designed to accommodate activities including social grass sports, and there is potential for half-court basketball adjacent to the existing Darling Quarter Playground. The Event Deck has also been designed to enable its use for similar uses.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
2	Should consider providing a City Farm as part of the redevelopment to enhance place making and green credentials	The primary function of the PPP Site is to act as a tourism precinct and recreational space. Whilst these uses do not preclude the future inclusion of a City Farm or similar, it is considered that the primary purpose of the precinct is better suited to the dedication of space to other uses.
1	A need to provide a child care centre as part of this development	SSDA1 does not propose any residential uses which would give rise to the need for a child care centre.
1	No evidence for benefit of co-locating exhibition centre and convention centre	There are clear synergies in co-locating the exhibition centre and convention centre, with many large-scale events requiring access to both exhibition and convention facilities. There are also efficiencies in terms of the provision of transport and tourism-related services such as accommodation.
1	Improved signage should be included as part of this proposal	Signage and wayfinding measures will be implemented through an integrated signage and wayfinding strategy developed in consultation with INSW/SHFA.
Construction Impacts		
1	Construction hoardings will restrict access to the Harbourside shopping centre fire control room and sprinkler valve room and this is not acceptable	The details of construction hoardings will be developed as part of the detailed Construction Management Plan to ensure that appropriate access is provided to the Harbourside shopping centre.
4	Construction issues including noise, air quality and hoardings have not been adequately addressed	Construction issues including noise (Section 5.17 of EIS), air quality (Section 5.16 of EIS) and construction site management (Section 5.24 of EIS) have been addressed in the environmental assessment of the project.
1	Conditions placed on the SICEEP development should not limit the development potential of Harbourside	Works proposed under SSDA1 does not limit the development potential of Harbourside.
1	Consent needs to condition that Lend Lease cannot provide canteen services or food outlets within the development during the construction period	SSDA1 does not seek consent for the operation of any food outlets or canteens during the construction period.
Process Related		
1	Lack of need for redevelopment is not backed up by data.	A number of reports investigating the need for redevelopment of the site have been prepared, including <i>A world class convention and exhibition centre for Sydney: Pre-feasibility Study</i> (ATEC, IPA, PCA, SBC, TTF, PwC).
1	A Concept Analysis should have been prepared ahead of the detailed design.	INSW engaged Woods Bagot to prepare Urban Design and Public Realm Guidelines for the site. Woods Bagot is a highly reputable architectural firm, and the suitability of the guidelines is demonstrated by the high quality proposal which is the subject of this application. The guidelines respond to the brief, and balance the financial, sustainability and operational requirements of the development.

Number of Submissions	Item Raised	Proponent's Response
1	The DA should be decided by the Sydney City Council.	The Minister for Planning is the nominated consent authority as the proposed development is within a State Significant Site under Schedule 2 of <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011</i> and has a capital investment value in excess of \$10 million.
8	Development should not be assessed exempt of the ICC Hotel development.	The ICC Hotel will be subject to a separate planning application.
1	Without a Strategic Plan for the Bays Precinct, it is difficult to respond to the DA in isolation. There needs to be a strategic plan in place to cater for the communities who live in these areas.	The proposed development is consistent with the objectives and permissible uses defined for the site under <i>Darling Harbour Development Plan No.1</i> .
1	Process has not been adequately laid out for public involvement and has been rushed	DHL has undertaken extensive consultation with the local community as part of an ongoing process.
1	There has been a lack of consultation with residents in the Goldsbrough.	DHL has directly engaged with the Executive Committee of the Goldsbrough building, which has been identified as a key stakeholder in the consultation framework for the project.
1	Many residents of Ultimo were not sufficiently informed of the proposed development.	Community consultation has included the distribution of printed material, face-to-face communications and the use of electronic methods to distribute information relating to the SICEEP project. DHL has engaged with peak community groups including the Council of Pymont and Ultimo Community Associations and Ultimo Village Voice, and will continue to liaise with the local community as the project progresses.