

SICEEP, SSDA4 – Response to Department of Planning and Infrastructure Submission

Topic	Response
SICEEP, The Haymarket Precinct - (Western, North West and South West Plots - SSDA 3, 4 &5)	
Built Form	
<p>1. The Department notes that the only architectural drawings provided are 'illustrative'. The Department requires finalised drawings of the proposed drawings for the proposal.</p>	<p>Noted. A final set of development application drawings incorporating all amendments proposed under this response to submissions is provided for approval by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure.</p>
Traffic and Transportation	
<p>2. Having regard to traffic safety, further details of the proposed billboard are required including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> photomontage from a driver's perspective; further justification for a changeable as opposed to static message billboard consideration of impact/conflicts with existing RMS variable signage 	<p>Noted. As set out in the Response to Submissions two additional photomontages have been provided in order to illustrate the driver's perspective of the proposed billboard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWP Billboard View A – View looking West; and NWP Billboard View B – View looking East. <p>The views demonstrate that the billboard is of a size and location that is appropriate and not likely to unduly affect or distract a driver. We note that there are presently already two billboard signs along this road corridor, and accordingly the proposal will result in an improved outcome from a visual perspective consolidating the signs into only one.</p> <p>The billboard is proposed to be a digital billboard for management and safety reasons. Allowing content to be managed via a digital platform will remove the need for a person / group of people to physically remove and install advertisements from the building façade manually. Importantly, the content will comprise of still images. Given the key driver for the billboard will be to promote free and ticketed events across the whole of the SICEEP site (amongst other third party and community advertising), it is essential that the content is changeable. This is particularly the case given the diversity of events that will occur across the SICEEP site, including often events occurring across different venues at the same time. Accordingly, the digital billboard provides the ability to promote dual events.</p> <p>Currently under the “North West Plot Wall Advertisement – SSDA 4 Impact Study”, it is proposed that “the content will be comprised of still images that change approximately every one minute”. Upon review of the Department’s concerns in relation to conflicts with existing RMS variable signage, the Applicant proposes to revise the regularity at which the content will change from “every one minute”, to every one hour. No objection is proposed to the imposition of an appropriate condition of consent in this regard.</p>
<p>3. The proposed cycle routes should be reviewed for consistency with the current regional bike route network</p>	<p>The proposed cycle connections have been reviewed and are consistent with the current regional bike route plan and broadly align with the City Centre Access Strategy of Dec 2013. The enhanced north south connections along Darling Drive and via a through route along the Boulevard, improves connectivity in the precinct as do the east-west cycle routes aligning with the western regional route via Liverpool Street.</p>
<p>4. Consideration should be given to meeting the City of Sydney's bicycle parking rates (DCP</p>	<p>SSDA4 currently (as exhibited) has allowed for the following regarding bicycle parking to meet an overall Green Star rating for the office component of 5 Stars:</p>

SICEEP, SSDA4 – Response to Department of Planning and Infrastructure Submission

<p>2012).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 97 spaces provided in bike store; and • 32 visitor spaces provided adjacent to entry plaza, outside abutting the building lobby. <p>In addition to the above, as part of the Response to Submissions, Lend Lease will provide an additional 49 bicycle parking spaces within SSDA4 (now relocated from Ground Floor to Level 1), together with an additional male and female shower within the change room amenities. The Response to Submissions Appendix C – Supplementary Design Report provides the detail in this regard.</p> <p>This design modification also responds to the City of Sydney’s Recommendation 33 to “Review the connections between the bicycle parking and end trip facilities to make it easier for cyclists to access”.</p> <p>Overall, the provision of bicycle parking and associated amenities is considered to more than be appropriate for the proposed development.</p>
<p>5. Consideration should be given to improving the access between the bicycle storage area and end of trip facilities, which are currently located on separate floors.</p>	<p>Consideration during the design development phase was given to the possibility of locating the end of trip facilities on the ground floor. However, this was not explored further as it resulted in lost retail area and activation of the public domain at street level.</p> <p>As an alternative, it is proposed to relocate the bicycle parking from the ground floor to Level 1 of the car park. The relocation of the bicycle parking to level 1 of the car park will result in the bicycle parking and the amenities (showers and lockers) being located on the same level. This approach will provide more convenience for cyclists and is seen as a positive response/outcome.</p> <p>In addition, as stated above an additional 49 bicycle parking bays and associated amenities is being provided as part of this Response to Submissions. Appendix C – Supplementary Design Report provides the detail in this regard. The level and location of bicycle parking and amenities being afforded is considered to be appropriate.</p>
<p>6. Consideration should be given to providing car-sharing space(s).</p>	<p>Noted. An additional car parking space has accordingly been provided within the commercial car parking area to accommodate a dedicated car share space. This space is identified in the drawings provided in Appendix C – Supplementary Design Report.</p>
<p>7. Justification is required for the level of motorcycle parking provision.</p>	<p>Motorcycle/scooter parking has been optimised within the development through their location in areas within the car park that are not suitable for standard car parking spaces or other services and plant. The current design allows for approximately 76 spaces, which may be further refined during detailed design. The proposed provision of motorcycle spaces is considered to be more than adequate and recognises a growing trend for motorcycles and scooters as alternative modes of transport.</p>
<p>Visual Impact Analysis</p>	

SICEEP, SSDA4 – Response to Department of Planning and Infrastructure Submission

<p>8. Addition view-points from the following locations are required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> an east facing view-point from William Henry Street, as shown on Figure 1; a west facing view-point from Pier Street, as shown on Figure 1; and an as proposed north west facing view-point from the south eastern corner of the proposed Haymarket Square <p>9. For clarity and reference purposes, revised 'as proposed' images of the Ground View Photomontages are required, which show the proposed building without the white-lined extent of approved building envelope.</p>	<p>Noted. Additional photomontages as requested are provided in Appendix E – Addendum Ground View Photomontages. In addition the Ground View Photomontages have been provided without the white-lined extent of the approved building envelope (see Appendix E – Addendum Ground View Photomontages).</p>
<p>Stormwater and Flooding</p>	
<p>10. The Department notes that Sydney Water has raised concern regarding water, wastewater and stormwater assets. Consideration and response to Sydney Water's comments is required.</p>	<p>The considerations of Sydney Water have been addressed sequentially in the Response to Sydney Water Submission within Appendix A.</p>
<p>Crime Prevention</p>	
<p>11. The Department considers that the security of the western side of the development where it abuts the landscaped area and the bicycle storage area should be improved. The Department notes Council's comments seeking improvements in this regard.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. No objection is raised with the imposition of appropriate conditions of consent.</p> <p>CCTV monitoring will be undertaken by building management and the buildings security contractor as part of the building management plan.</p> <p>The proposal has been reviewed in response to CPTED concerns along the western side of the development and adjustments have been made to improve sight lines and passive surveillance whilst maintaining the functionality of a WSUD area. The path has been moved away from the building face to improve surveillance and sightlines. As such the WSUD zone has been shifted to the building face and the path moved adjacent to Darling Drive (to be provided as part of SSDA5). This realignment allows for rationalised pedestrian movement, servicing of the dropoff bay and an improvement of safety and sight lines. Surveillance is provided from the student housing and passing traffic. Safety is further ensured through low level planting and adequate lighting provided from Darling Drive street lighting. Appendix D – Supplementary Public Domain Report and Drawings provides the detail in this regard.</p>
<p>EIS Drawings and Documentation</p>	
<p>12. The architectural plans are not provided with a drafting date. A drafting date is required for inclusion of the list of plans within the final instrument</p>	<p>A Final set of Architectural Drawings (with a drafting date) for approval has been provided at Appendix C.</p>
<p>13. Two different copies of Page 92 of Appendix I the 'Architectural Drawings, Demolition Plan, Excavation Plan and Photomontages has been provided. Confirmation of which page is</p>	<p>A Final set of Drawings and Plans for approval has been provided at Appendix C.</p>

SICEEP, SSDA4 – Response to Department of Planning and Infrastructure Submission

intended for submission is required	
Consistency with the Concept Proposal	
<p>14. Please note that any response to submissions will need to demonstrate consistency with any approval of The Haymarket Stage 1 Concept Proposal (SSD 5878) currently being assessed by the Department. In this regard further information, plans and documentation may be required for this purpose. The Department will advise you of any specific requirements pending the determination of this application</p>	<p>An addendum letter received from the Department has clarified conditions of the Stage 1 Concept Proposal Approval which are required to be addressed. The consistency of the proposed development with all conditions of the Stage 1 Approval is outlined in Appendix L.</p>
Reports to be Updated	
<p>15. All reports submitted as part of the EIS should be reviewed in light of any revisions made in the resolution of the issues noted. Supplementary and technical reports should also be reviewed and amended to ensure that the extent of the proposed Concept Proposal is accurately reflected.</p>	<p>Noted. All reports submitted with the EIS have been reviewed and the relevant reports and plans updated to reflect the resolution of issues and the approval of the Stage 1 Concept Proposal. Refer to Table of Contents for a full list of revised supporting documentation.</p>
Consistency with the Concept Proposal – Key Issues Addendum	
<p>1. Please note that any response to submissions will need to demonstrate consistency with The Haymarket Stage 1 Concept Proposal (SSD 5878). In order to ensure consistency, the following amendments/documents are required:</p> <p>a) responses are required to conditions: B1 – architectural design; B3 – street level activation; B4 – pedestrian sightlines; B5 – Building Design and Laneway Visual Assessment; B12 – Public Art Strategy; B17 – ground floor car parking; B20 – bicycle parking; B24 – environmental performance; B26 – ESD principles; B30 – Waste Management Plan; B32 – impacts of construction; B33 – impact on utilities; and B36 – provision of IQ Hub.</p> <p>b) the red site boundary line on drawing SNW_DA30005 Rev1, ‘Site Demolition Plan’ and on the Civil Infrastructure Drawings appears to be inconsistent with the site boundary of the Concept Proposal; and</p> <p>c) the Department notes that the proposed planting along the northern boundary of the NW Plot has been reduced from a row of 11 trees (as suggested within the Public Domain Concept Proposal), to a single tree located adjacent to the Boulevard. Justification for the reduction is required and consideration should be given to additional tree planting in this location.</p>	<p>The consistency of the proposed development with the Stage 1 Concept Proposal is outlined in Appendix L. The proposed development is consistent with all relevant conditions of the Stage 1 Approval.</p> <p>The revised plans now ensure consistency with the SICEEP site boundary as reflected within the approved Concept Proposal.</p> <p>This issue is addressed in the Response to Submissions Appendix D –Supplementary Public Domain Report.</p>