

Response to Issues – Miscellaneous Agencies and Authorities

80-88 Regent Street, Redfern – SSD 7080

Response to Agency from exhibition of EIS (11 February 2016 to 11 March 2016) and notification of RTS (29 November 2016 to 13 December 2016)

Matter	Particulars of Issues	Response	Location in Report	Further agency comment RTS (Nov/Dec 2016)	Response
Environment Protection Authority					
	<i>On the basis of the information provided, the proposal does not constitute a Scheduled Activity under Schedule 1 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act). The EPA does not consider that the proposal will require an Environment Protection Licence (EPL) under the POEO Act.</i> <i>Accordingly, the EPA has no comments regarding the proposal and has no further interest in this proposal.</i>	Noted.		No further submission	No further response required
Heritage Council of NSW					
	<i>The Statement of Heritage Impact is not adequate. An appropriate and thorough archaeological assessment is prepared as part of a revised statement of heritage impact, including detailed historical information, an updated statement of heritage significance which includes archaeological potential and a research design for test and possible salvage excavation based on existing Heritage Council guidance material</i>	A Historical Archaeological Assessment has been prepared.	Refer to Attachment 13.	Historical Archaeological Assessment' prepared by Urbis, dated July 2016 by provided with RTS remains current. Recommended conditions provided for inclusion in a determination	The current proposed changes do not alter the footprint and do not exceed the previous impact to archaeological relics as outlined in the archaeology assessment.
	<i>A historical archaeological Excavation Director must be nominated</i>	Refer to Historical Archaeological Assessment.			
	<i>Results of the archaeological works shall be presented in a final excavation report</i>				

Matter	Particulars of Issues	Response	Location in Report	Further agency comment RTS (Nov/Dec 2016)	Response
	<i>A suitable artefact repository for the ongoing retention for any relics of local heritage significance recovered during excavations must be identified</i>				As such the same archaeological assessment, has been resubmitted with this RRTS.
Roads and Maritime Services					
	<i>A Construction Traffic Management detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to Council prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.</i>	Noted – to be addressed through conditions of consent.	Refer to Attachment 13.	No further submission	No further response required
	<i>All demolition and construction vehicles are to be contained wholly within the site and vehicles must enter the site before stopping. A construction zone will not be permitted on Regent Street.</i>				
	<i>A Road Occupancy Licence should be obtained from Transport Management Centre for any works that may impact on traffic flows on Regent Street during construction activities.</i>				
	<i>Should the post development storm water discharge from the subject site into the Roads and Maritime system exceed the pre-development discharge, detailed design plans and hydraulic calculations of any charges are to be submitted to Roads and Maritime for approval, prior to the commencement of works on site.</i>				
	<i>The developer is to submit design drawings and documents relating to the excavation of the site and support structures to Roads and Maritime for assessment, in accordance with Technical Direction GTD2012/001.</i>				
	<i>The developer shall be responsible for all public utility adjustment/relocation works, necessitated by the above work and as required by the various public utility authorities and/or their agents.</i>				

Matter	Particulars of Issues	Response	Location in Report	Further agency comment RTS (Nov/Dec 2016)	Response
Sydney Airport					
	<i>Initial assessment indicates that at 98m AHD, the proposed development will penetrate Sydney Airport's prescribed Airspace.</i> <i>Because of this, and following a full assessment, the application will need to be referred to the Federal Department of Infrastructure & Regional Development for a determination.</i> <i>In order to carry out a full assessment, the following is required:</i> <i>The four corners of the building tower defined in MGA94 co-ordinates.</i> <i>The four corners of the lift overrun defined in MGA94 co-ordinates.</i> <i>Drawing Number DA-0502 Revision 4 shows rooftop gardens with foliage taller than the lift overrun. Details of the maximum height of the rooftop garden foliage, as well as details of how the foliage will be limited to the designed maximum height.</i>	Details included on Architectural Drawings prepared by SJB Architects.	Refer to Attachment 1.	No further submission	No further response required
Sydney Water					
	<u>Water</u> <i>The drinking water main available for connection is the 150mm main on the northern side of Marian Street.</i> <i>Detailed requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase.</i>	Noted – to be addressed through conditions of consent..		No further comments	Noted
	<u>Wastewater</u> <i>The proposed development can connect to the existing 225mm wastewater main in William Lane.</i> <i>Detailed requirements will be provided at the section 73 application phase.</i>				

Matter	Particulars of Issues	Response	Location in Report	Further agency comment RTS (Nov/Dec 2016)	Response
	<u>Sydney Water Servicing</u> A Section 73 Compliance Certificate under the Sydney Water Act 1994 must be obtained from Sydney Water.				
	<u>Building Plan Approval</u> Building plans stamped and approved before any construction is commenced.	Noted – to be addressed through conditions of consent.			
Transport for NSW					
CBD Rail Link (CBDRL) Project	There are concerns about the potential impacts of the proposed development on the structural integrity and the safe, effective operation and maintenance of the CBDRL as the proposed development is located directly adjoining the proposed future rail corridor. The placing of any foundations, other structures and building loads in or near the proposed rail alignment would affect the structural integrity and operation of the CBDRL. <u>Recommendation</u> TfNSW requests that prior to the issue of a construction certificate: • The developer and landowner are to consult with TfNSW and Sydney Trains; • All supporting design documentation, architectural plans and supporting expert consultant reports shall be prepared to the satisfaction of TfNSW and Sydney Trains; • All relevant design documentation including architectural plans and supporting expert consultant reports to TfNSW and Sydney Trains shall be provided for review and acceptance; • The developer shall confirm the foundations and supporting structure can accommodate the settlement requirement as indicated in drawing 482749-172. The developer shall confirm vertical downwards loading shall be limited as indicated in drawing 482749-172;	Noted – to be addressed through conditions of consent.	Refer to Attachment 1. Refer to Attachment 14.	Amended proposal has adequately addressed issues raised in submission. Recommended conditions provided for inclusion in a determination.	Noted

Matter	Particulars of Issues	Response	Location in Report	Further agency comment RTS (Nov/Dec 2016)	Response
	The developer shall confirm with TfNSW whether and engineering assessment of the ground/structure interaction associated with the future tunnel construction is required. The assessment is to confirm movements and stresses are within expected limitations for the proposed foundations, the rail corridor rock mass, and the future excavation of the rail tunnels. The ground/structure interaction modelling and analysis should be completed using appropriate empirical and/or numerical methods (e.g. finite element analysis); and TfNSW requests that TfNSW, and persons authorised by it for this purpose, are entitled to inspect the site of the approved development and all structures to enable it to consider whether those structures on that site have been or are being constructed and maintained in accordance with these conditions, on giving reasonable notice to the principal contractor for the approved development or the owner or occupier of the part of the site to which access is sought.				
Development near rail corridors and busy roads	The proposed development is located in close proximity to classified roads. <u>Recommendation</u> The applicant must consider how the development may impact on any rail and road infrastructure. TfNSW requests that the applicant needs to design and construct the development in accordance with the 'Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads – Interim Guideline' (2008) prepared by DP&E.	Noted – to be addressed through conditions of consent.			
Bicycle facilities	No detailed information is provided in relation to bicycle parking and end of trip facilities in the Transport Assessment Report. <u>Recommendation</u> TfNSW requests that the location of bicycle parking and end of trip facilities be provided in secure, convenient, accessible areas close to the main entries incorporating adequate lighting and passive surveillance and in accordance with Austroads guidelines and Australian Standards.	Details included in amended Architectural Drawings prepared by SJB Architects.			

Matter	Particulars of Issues	Response	Location in Report	Further agency comment RTS (Nov/Dec 2016)	Response
Loading bay access	No turning path analysis has been undertaken for heavy vehicles accessing the loading bay located off William Lane which is a narrow road. <u>Recommendation</u> TfNSW requests that the applicant undertake a turning path analysis for the proposed loading dock.	Turning path swept path analysis has been prepared for the loading bay.			
Construction traffic management	Several construction projects are likely to occur at the same time within the CBD. The cumulative increase in construction vehicle movements from these projects could have the potential to impact on general traffic and bus operations and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the CBD and its environment particularly during commuter peak periods. <u>Recommendation</u> TfNSW requests that the proponent prepare a detailed Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) prior to commencement of construction, which takes into account other construction projects (including Sydney Light Rail project) in the CBD. The CPTMP should demonstrate that the construction impacts on the road network, bus operation and pedestrian/cyclist safety and movements can be managed. The CPTMP should be prepared in consultation with TfNSW, Roads and Maritime Services and City of Sydney. The final CPTMP should be approved by the CBD Coordination Office within TfNSW prior to the issue of any Construction Certificates.	Noted – to be addressed through conditions of consent.			

Matter	Particulars of Issues	Response	Location in Report	Further agency comment RTS (Nov/Dec 2016)	Response
UrbanGrowth NSW Development Corporation					
	<u>Redfern-Waterloo Contributions Plan</u> The EIS indicates contributions will be paid in accordance with the Redfern-Waterloo Contributions Plan 2006, at a rate of 2% of the total development cost (\$37,738,941 incl. GST). The expected contribution currently equates to \$754,778.82, which would need to be indexed annually until the contribution is paid.	Noted – to be addressed through conditions of consent.	Refer to Section 4.12.		Noted
	<u>Redfern-Waterloo Affordable Housing Contributions Plan</u> In accordance with Clause 8 of the Redfern-Waterloo Authority Affordable Housing Contributions Plan 2006 (Contribution Plan), the current rate for the contribution is \$79.13/m². With a proposed total gross floor area (GFA) of 5,752m², the contribution payable is approximately \$455,155.76. The EIS proposes that development contributions under the Contribution Plan should be reduced by the GFA of the existing buildings being demolished (970m²) and should only be imposed for the additional gross floor area (4,782m²) instead of the total GFA (5,752m²). UGDC does not support partially waiving the contribution as requested by the Proponent.	The contribution for affordable housing has been recalculated to include the existing gross floor area (GFA).			