



Our Ref: F2016/00155 – D02830544

21 December 2016

Amy Robertson/Natasha Harris  
Department of Planning and Environment: Planning Services  
Level 29, 320 Pitt Street  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Madam,

**Subject: Notification of UNSW Biological Science project SSD6674 MOD1**

I refer to the above application and provide the following comments on the proposed modifications:

- **Revised ground floor layout to Building D26 and the Biolink Building, including access and entries and relocation of trees;**

Ground level layout

The loss of retail spaces at ground level associated with the revised ground floor layout may reduce the connection with the adjacent knowledge cluster and hub; however the proposal still retains a café at ground level which will retain a diversity of use that will contribute to social interaction with the hub at the north western corner of the building. Although the proposed modifications reduce the retail components at ground level the modification will continue to meet the objective in Section 4.2.4 Knowledge Cluster and Hubs in Part E2 of the Randwick Comprehensive Development Control Plan (RDCP) 2013.

Tree management

Councils Landscape Officer recommends that the two *Livistona australis* (Cabbage Palms, T60-61) identified in the revised Arborists Report by Birds Tree Consultancy, are to be transplanted to an alternative location elsewhere within the site, into undisturbed deep soil, and are to be incorporated into the building and landscape works as site features.

A detailed written Transplanting Report from a level V consulting Arborist (who must also be a registered member of a nationally recognized organization/association), must be submitted to, and be approved by, the PCA, and must document all aspects of the process, with all requirements of the approved Transplanting Report to be complied with.

➤ **Revised awning and facade treatment to Building D26;**

The revised façade treatment to Building D26 along the eastern elevation contributes to the presentation of the building along Botany Street.

➤ **Revised northern ramp and terrace arrangements to Building D26;**

No objections to the revised northern ramp and terrace (deck) arrangements to Building D26.

➤ **Extent of glazed skylight over west atrium reduced and replaced with new concrete slab;**

No objection to the reduction in glazed skylight over the west atrium and replacement with a new concrete slab.

➤ **Inclusion of an additional plant level to Building D26 and amendment to roof top plant and equipment;**

The inclusion of additional plant level to building D26 further exceeds the maximum building height standard under the RLEP 2012 resulting in screening 6.1m higher than the approved screening of roof plant and the adjoining Biological sciences building to the south (E26) and 5.08m higher than the Wallace Wurth building (C27) to the north.

Although the additional height is setback from the Botany Street frontage and buffered somewhat by the built form of the adjoining buildings on either side, it will still be intrusive when viewed from the public domain. Therefore, it is suggested that an innovative design solution be investigated that would improve its aesthetic appearance and achieve a satisfactory outcome having regard to the key objectives that seek to ensure development contributes to the streetscape character under Section 4.2.6 Buildings in Part E2 of the RDCP 2013.

#### Acoustic amenity

Acoustic Logic have provided an acoustic statement dated 12/10/2016 confirming the amended design has been reviewed and is required to comply with the "detailed design has adopted the necessary noise attenuation" as outlined in condition B4 of the approval for SSD 6674. It is also noted that condition E3 details noise control criteria that must be complied with.

In the absence of a detailed acoustic assessment for the section 96, it is recommended a noise validation report be undertaken by a suitably qualified person to confirm compliance with relevant noise criteria as such the following condition is recommended:

*Within three (3) months of commencement of the use and in accordance with the approved plan of management or as may reasonably be requested by Council, a report must be obtained from a suitably qualified and experienced consultant in acoustics, and submitted to Council which demonstrates and certifies that noise from the use and operation from the development complies with the relevant provisions of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997, NSW EPA/DECC Noise Control Manual & Industrial Noise Policy and conditions of approval.*

*The acoustic report is to include (but not be limited) to;*

*Noise emission from the proposed development (e.g. operational noise, mechanical noise, monitoring from nearest affected sensitive receiver to satisfy intrusiveness and amenity criteria)*

*Any recommendations or requirements of the acoustic validation report must be complied with.*

➤ **deletion of external stair to the north elevation of Building D26;**

No objection to this proposed modification

➤ **Amendment to development contributions to remove the monetary payment towards traffic signals.**

The proposed modification seeks to delete part b of condition A8 of the determination issued by the DPE on 20 August 2015 for SSD 6674 as shown struck through below.

A8 The applicant shall:

- a) prior to the commencement of works, pay a monetary levy of \$261,000 to Randwick City Council for the construction of public domain improvements along Botany Street pursuant to section 94B(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.; and
- ~~b) prior to the occupation of Stage 1 of the development, pay a monetary levy of \$150,000 to Randwick City Council for its construction of a signalised intersection at the Gate 11 entrance to the UNSW Campus and Botany Street pursuant to section 94B(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.~~


Council objects to removing the monetary payment towards traffic signals. Council would like to make the following relevant points:

- In the case of the Biological Sciences building, the need for traffic signals at the intersection of Botany Street and Gate 11 had been previously identified by both Council and UNSW, and thus was included in discussions with Department of Planning and Environment (DPE).
- The Modification report notes (page 15) that "the existing levels of traffic will be decreased with uptake of the light rail services", Council strongly disagrees with this statement, and believes there is strong information in the CSELR EIS documentation suggesting otherwise. The CSELR SSI 6042 mod 4 report noted that Botany Street is anticipated to carry more traffic, and as such has triggered the need for signalised intersections at 2 locations in Botany Street (Arthur street and Barker Street).
- The justification in the Modification report for not introducing traffic signals appears to focus on the UNSW campus only, and has not considered the wider impacts of the light rail on the traffic network and other substantial developments carried and likely to be carried out in the vicinity of the locality. For example, with access on High Street restricted, more traffic is expected on Botany Street to access the Randwick Hospitals Campus (with general access to Hospital Road from High Street restricted). This point's to the likelihood that the warrants for traffic signals at Gate 11 will be satisfied.

- Council further notes that traffic signals in this location are not only to manage traffic flows, but will also provide a safe pedestrian crossing point at an obvious desire line of travel to the emphasised entry point to UNSW.
- Council is often requested by DPE to identify public domain works in the vicinity of the development, with this forming a basis of the DPE's calculation of a monetary contribution.
- Council's s94A Plan is not nexus-based, and Council notes that even if the traffic signals were no longer needed (and Council does not agree that this has been adequately investigated within the broader transport network), then a monetary contribution would still be required under Council's s94A Plan. It is noted that this Modification does not reduce the amount of additional floor space, staff or student numbers, and thus Council strongly objects to any reduction in contributions. This application appears to in fact increase the number of classrooms within the building at ground level and with it a likely increase in the number of staff and students.
- Alternatively, Council would be open to discussing alternative public domain works in the vicinity of the development site instead of applying the amount to traffic signals should they not proceed. In relation to possible alternative public domain options, over the last 12 months UNSW has met with Council several times to propose substantial higher order public domain treatments to footpaths surrounding the UNSW campus, with the expectation that these would be funded by Council.

If you have any further queries or wish to further discuss any of the issues raised above, please contact, Elias Coorey in Council's City Planning Department, on 9399 0979.

Regards



.....  
Kerry Kyriacou  
Manager – Development Assessment