



Department of Planning and Environment

Each issue raised in the Department's letter is addressed in detail in Section 2 of the Response to Submissions.

Sydney Olympic Park

| Recommendation/issue | Comment |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Ground level plant/services</p> <p>The ground level of the building is heavily encumbered with plant and services which occupy more than 50% of the ground level frontages. These impact on the size of ground level retail tenancies and the residential lobby and create long stretches of bland and inactive frontages in areas where high pedestrian use is expected.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Consider increase activation of ground level floor space, particularly along the through site link. | <p>The design of the through site link and adjoining building has been refined to further increase activation. Additional retail / commercial tenancies are provided at the eastern corners of the site link, which will provide additional activation to the link. See Section 2.2 of the Response to Submissions.</p> |
| <p>2. Quality of Materials and finishes</p> <p>While the design of the facade is generally well considered, there are concerns with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mitigating the impact of above-ground carparking. The design proposal should screen the utilitarian carpark function from the Boulevard and Sarah Durack as well as noise and fumes emanating from the carpark.• The quality of some materials: off-form concrete finishes and expanded aluminium mesh require careful consideration for a development fronting the Boulevard• The lack of certainty in relation to materials proposed. For example, slab edges are either off-form concrete or aluminium clad. There is a significant difference in quality between the 2 options offered.• Terracotta will add warmth and texture to the facade and is essential to a quality finish on the podium levels. Its continued use is strongly recommended and consideration could be given to using a greater colour range. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide details of an alternative material to expanded mesh for consideration (to all street frontages of the podium). | <p>The car park mesh panelling is proposed to be a powder coated punched aluminium mesh product. The final precise specification will be subject to the following performance specifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Wind and acoustic analysis;▪ Natural ventilation minimum area requirements; and▪ Aesthetic considerations. <p>The final mesh panelling specification will be prepared in consultation with SOPA as part of a condition of consent and submitted to the Certifying Authority for approval.</p> <p>As the detailed design of the building is still being progressed, the final materials specification is yet to be finalised. It is anticipated that the finishes will be prepared in consultation with SOPA and submitted to the Certifying Authority prior to the commencement of works. The architects have explored precast concrete, in-situ concrete and aluminium clad options for the slab edges. All options have their advantages and disadvantages in terms of buildability and aesthetics, however the design intent is a high quality continuous slab edge which achieves the curved geometries in a considered manner.</p> |

2. Consider alternative stack or rear laneway facing ventilation solutions for the carpark that don't rely on the Olympic Boulevard, Sarah Durack or street 22 frontages for cross ventilation.
3. a condition of consent requiring provision of Materials and Finishes Schedule (or a finishes board) confirming all materials and finishes and clearly indicating their application throughout the development, especially the use of the terracotta panelling, is to be submitted for approval of SOPA 's Executive Director - Operations (EDO).
4. Provide specific detail on the quality of finish on the slab edges including specifications on the thickness of slab edges to retain the quality of finish proposed for approval.

3. Tower Floor plans and Apartment layouts

The 'boomerang' shape of the buildings floor plate provides for a quality narrow footprint. The majority of apartments have a long frontage and many meet the 8m depth requirement in the ADG. Key concerns are:

- that the narrow footprint design has not been better utilised to provide greater cross ventilation, as only two of the eight apartments per floor have dual frontage to provide for cross ventilation.
- Most of the apartments on each floor have AC condenser units on the balconies. This is no longer considered to be good practice as it reduces the usability of the balconies.
- Given the fire stair has a large external wall surface and is generously proportioned, it has the potential to be better utilised on a daily basis by residents, especially if there were windows or viewing panels in the outer wall.

Recommendations:

1. Where possible seek to maximise the number of dual frontage apartments.
2. Incorporate a 'natural stack' ventilation system with registers to the rear of apartments i.e. near the kitchen, entry hall and bathroom areas for single orientation apartments.
3. AC condensers to be located away from balconies - consider enlarging the AC condenser rooms on every floor to accommodate the needs of the entire floor.

4. Utilisation of Communal Open Space

As currently planned, The Level 7 South Podium roof space cannot be accessed. Whilst it is

The Apartment Design Guidelines state that apartments at ten storeys or greater are deemed to be cross ventilated only if any enclosure of the balconies at these levels allows adequate natural ventilation and cannot be fully enclosed.

The apartments are located on levels 7 to 39 and general include unenclosed balconies with the exception of the curved corner apartments. The wind conditions will be particularly windy around the tower corners and as such we have proposed wintergardens to the curved corners of the floorplate to mitigate these wind impacts and to provide a useable balcony for the residents, with operable windows still permitting natural ventilation.

Due to the tower and podium typology of the design it was considered an appropriate response to treat the apartments on levels 7 to 9 in the same manner as the tower floors above.

The current condenser room located on each floor of the tower cannot accommodate additional condensers, due to spatial constraints and heat impacts rising up the tower. In order to accommodate additional condensers, the floorplate would need to be increased with the condenser room protruding out from the tower massing to provide sufficient air intake / outtake openings within the facade. The AC condensers located on balconies will be screened to mitigate visual impacts. It is noted that this approach has been applied to the completed Australia Towers development and the approved Site 68 development.

Fire stairs are a critically important life safety measure, and the safety of the stairs cannot be compromised for improved amenity. The lift lobbies on each level enjoy excellent outlook and amenity for residents.

The residential communal garden is located to the north of the tower to maximise amenity derived from the northern aspect. Turf landscape architects have designed a landscape of over 1,000m² with a variety of spaces for the residents to enjoy and optimising useability, privacy and opportunities for social

understood that the space is likely to be subject to downdrafts and wind turbulence, this area is a significant exterior asset to the building and has potential to be better utilised.

Recommendations:

1. Part of the level 7 roof space could be utilised as external private space for each of the two dwellings facing onto the space to create garden apartments.
2. Provide a connection from the lobby so that the remainder of the space is accessible to residents as an alternative green landscaped passive communal recreation area, when weather conditions permit.

interaction.

The advice received from the wind consultant was that localised windy conditions will be expected on the podium roofs, and as such the communal garden has been designed with trees and raised pavilions in order to provide a calm environment regardless of wind direction.

By comparison, the southern roof is overshadowed by the tower, windy and overlooked by the glazed lift lobbies above. It was anticipated that given a choice, residents are likely to make use of the sun-drenched northern facility instead of a south-facing garden that is overlooked and overshadowed.

The south podium roof was advised to be especially windy due to prevailing winds from the south-west quadrants and proximity to the tower. The proposed landscaped roof provides a response to the climate conditions yet also providing an attractive outlook from the glazed lift lobbies on each tower floor.

If the space was to be accessed by residents, extensive screens and roof structures would be required in order to make the roof useable which would visually impact the landscape view from what is currently shown.

Early studies proposed private outdoor terraces on the south podium roof directly linked to the level 7 corner apartments. Again, due to wind advice, overlooking from lift lobbies and apartments above as well as the generous garden provided to the north, it was established that a well-designed landscape garden for outlook was the most climactically and functionally appropriate response.

5. Public domain

The colonnade zone is not well integrated into the public domain, and is less likely to be active and usable as a result. Key concerns are:

- very few connections from the colonnade to the Boulevard's public footpath
- Barriers created by continuously landscaped planting beds and seating benches
- Residential lobby entry columns partially obstruct the path of travel along the colonnade
- No information on paving treatments and how it will be integrated with the existing Trihex, Eco- Trihex and asphalt paving at this corner.

Recommendations:

1. Consider repositioning the 2 columns impeding the colonnade zone at the residential lobby entry, so that they are out of the path of travel.
2. Provide more frequent crossing points between the Hoop pines to connect the colonnade and the footpath. These should be in permeable paving i.e. Eco Trihex and could incorporate steps to resolve the substantial level changes in some areas.

Amendments have been made to the landscape drawings to reflect SOPA's comments.

The originally proposed design prioritised minimal disturbance to existing tree root zones, and assumed informal connection routes across lawn. This approach was taken as additional paved connections may impact on the health of the trees.

The landscape drawings have been amended to confirm that the "continuous landscaped planting bed" is in fact lawn with mulch under trees (as per existing conditions). This can be walked across to provide casual access to the colonnade. (Refer section on landscape drawing L-DA-9 for further clarification).

The residential lobby entry columns have been designed and located in a different manner to the colonnade columns as an integrated way-finding measure. The proposed design shows the tower corner 'interrupting' the south podium facade in order to clearly delineate the residential lobby entrance at ground and provide an articulated facade along a long site frontage. The colonnade columns under the tower

3. Relocate seating benches, to clear the crossing points recommended in point 1 above.
 4. Prepare an Integrated Public Domain Plan that coordinates the colonnade area, paving finishes and other public domain elements, to the satisfaction of the SOPA's EDO.

serve to symmetrically frame the entry as well as to provide a sense of arrival for residents and visitors.

The landscape drawings note the use of Trihex paving to match existing (L-DA-6). This is further clarified on L-DA-16.

6. Bicycle parking provisions

The proposed bicycle parking provision of 201 on-site spaces is below the minimum requirement of 387 spaces, on the basis that the required minimum residential provision is excessive. This assertion is not supported by any research into current or long term bicycle usage. The Authority is committed to promoting bicycle use for environmental benefits, health and recreational purposes and as an alternative transport option. As such, proposals which underprovide bicycle parking and associated amenities are not supported.

As detailed in the amended Traffic and Parking Assessment prepared by Parking & Traffic Consultants (refer Appendix B), the amended proposal now provides the number of bicycle parking spaces required by SOPA's controls (390 spaces).

In relation to the residential bicycle parking spaces, 282 are required and 282 are provided. Of these, 67 are located in the car parking levels, 103 are provided in the Level 9 bicycle storage room, and 112 are provided in residential storage cages.

Recommendations:

1. Provide for 387 secure, conveniently located bicycle parking spaces as required by MP2030; either on-site or alternative locations that deliver the same outcome.

7. Pedestrian Access & Safety

Pedestrian flows from P3 to/from Sports Centre/Netball Central/ Hockey/Tennis generated by major event and routine sports competition and training will be impacted by the proposed building and 'through site link'. This may create potential road crossing safety issues particularly on evenings when there are strong flows of spectators and players moving around and through Site 9. Pedestrians using the 'through site link' may short cut/jay-walk across Olympic Boulevard instead of using the pedestrian crossing at the intersection at Olympic Boulevard/Sarah Durack Avenue and be exposed to potential conflicts with vehicles.

Pedestrian crossing/jay walking across Olympic Boulevard to access P3 to and from sports centres such as the Tennis and Hockey Centres would occur regardless of the development of Site 9, as the pedestrian desire line is from the facility across Olympic Boulevard to P3. Any mitigation to direct pedestrians to the existing crossing at the intersection of Olympic Boulevard / Sarah Durack Avenue is part of a wider SOPA master planning, such as installing temporary barriers during major events.

Recommendations:

The traffic report is to address potential safety aspects of pedestrian movements around and through the building particularly in major event modes for Tennis, Hockey, Sports Centre and Netball Central and suitability of the median strip as a pedestrian refuge.

8. Tree Protection/Preservation

An agreement was reached at a meeting on March 17 2016 between SOPA Officers, developer representatives (including the consulting Arborist) to retain and protect 12 of the 14 Hoop Pines (*Araucaria cunninghamii*) proposed for removal (5.2 TURF Tree Removal drawing). All trees assessed by the Arborist were deemed to be in healthy condition and based on the successful management of Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) fencing during demolition and construction works on other town centre development projects e.g. Pullman Hotel, Netball

Ongoing consultation has been undertaken with SOPA in relation to tree management. It has been confirmed that not all of the trees in question are healthy, with Tree 13 confirmed as deteriorating.

The currently agreed position is that the proponent would work with SOPA throughout construction, on the basis that SOPA would prune and relocate the two nominated trees prior to construction. SOPA advised they will review the trees regularly during construction to manage any stress related issues experienced by the trees.

Central, Site 4B, the risk of damage to tree is regarded as low to warrant the protection and retention of these trees.

Two trees were identified for developer funded transplanting to other sites on the Olympic Boulevard where specimens are in poor condition (see below):

- specimen closest to the Sarah Durack Ave corner (TURF: identified as tree 1)
- specimen located where the proposed through-site link joins the Olympic Boulevard northern footway (TURF: identified as tree 7)

Recommendations:

- Construction works to be in accordance with SOPA's Tree Protection on Construction Sites Guidelines
- Tree Protection Zone fencing (height 1.8m) is required during demolition and building construction phases
- Any service connections within the TPZ must be supervised by a consulting Arborist and be aligned to minimise loss of root plate using manual trenching and/or boring
- Paved pedestrian crossings are allowed (maximum 2m) wide equidistant between Hoop Pine trees using Eco-Trihex permeable pavers (as per UEDM 2009)
- Minor 'crown lift' pruning of lower branch 'whirls' to be agreed and supervised by SOPA Authority's Manager Site Presentation.

9. Stormwater Management

The SSD is to address SOPA's Stormwater Policy, which requires the following minimum information to be submitted with a development application:

- An integrated water cycle management plan including a description of how all stormwater generated on the site will be managed and a water balance report
- Justification for why each element of the water sensitive urban design strategy has been selected over alternate approaches
- Design assumptions including design rainfall events used to size rainwater tanks and water sensitive urban design elements
- A site layout plan showing the location of each element of the proposed stormwater treatment train; design details of each element
- Monitoring and maintenance plan

10. Contamination and Remediation Action Plan

SOPA considers that the Remediation Action Plan (RAP) - Project DL3620, prepared by DLA Environmental Service, is generally well considered. However, as the holder of the Contaminated Lands Management Act Notice issued in relation to the site, SOPA will need to carefully review the relevant management plans to ensure they contain a sufficient level of detail, address the relevant ongoing environmental risks in relation to the remediated landfill and do not impede the Authority's ability to comply with its ongoing statutory responsibilities.

A Water Cycle Management Plan has been prepared by AJ Whipps that addresses the stormwater management issues. This report concludes:

The findings of this report and associated concept designs indicates effective stormwater management measures can be integrated into the proposed development, in accordance with authority engineering standards, and that no major factors relating to stormwater management would preclude the proposed development of the site.

An amended Remediation Plan has been prepared by DLA Environmental Services. This amended RAP has been reviewed and accepted by SOPA.

11. Accessibility & Building Code of Australia

Any construction plans are to demonstrate compliance of the provisions for persons with a disability with the requirements of AS 1428.1 SOPA's Access Guidelines 2015 and the recommendations contained in the Access Report by Access Solutions dated the 31 51 March 2016.

Noted.

EPA

| Recommendation/issue | Comment |
|---|--|
| <p>Contamination Management</p> <p>The EPA has the following comments regarding contamination issues at the site:</p> <p>1) The proposed mixed use development is proposed to be constructed on a putrescible waste containment area that is producing landfill gases at significant concentrations. This causes an explosion hazard; an adequate assessment and management of this hazard is of utmost importance.</p> <p>2) The EPA notes that a site auditor accredited under the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997 has been engaged to provide independent advice on the suitability of the site for the proposed land uses as well as advice on the appropriateness of the proposed engineering and management response to address the landfill gas issue. The EPA supports the requirement for a site auditor accredited under the Contaminated Land Management Act.</p> <p>3) In relation to the site audit process, the EPA recommends the following site audit statements and interim site audit advices should be issued:</p> <p>a. A Section B Site Audit Statement, issued prior to the remediation works and prior to the commencement of construction works that certifies the appropriateness of the following detailed plans: remediation action plan, leachate management plan, gas management plan, and any other environmental management plan developed for the site.</p> <p>b. A Section B Site Audit Statement, issued following the remediation and construction works but prior to the occupancy certificate being issued; this site audit statement should certify that the land can be made suitable for its uses subject to implementation of the above plans.</p> <p>c. Interim Site Audit Advices, issued annually until a Section A Site Audit Statement has been issued; the interim site audit advices should confirm that the implementation of the above plans is appropriate and that the objectives of the plans are being met.</p> <p>d. A Section A Site Audit Statement, issued three years after the first Interim Site Audit Advice has been issued; this site audit statement should certify that the site is suitable for its uses subject to the ongoing implementation of the above plans.</p> <p>4) The EPA further recommends that DPE requires a separate risk analysis and assessment that considers the details of the gas and leachate management systems and evaluates both probabilities for the systems to fail and consequences if the systems were to fail (in that context, DPE may consider the applicability of State Environmental Planning Policy 33 and relevant documents listed In Appendix 1 of</p> | <p>The amended RAP addresses these items, and will be complemented by a full Risk Assessment and Hazard Identification prior to the commencement of works.</p> <p>The recommended Site Audit Statements have been reviewed by the Site Auditor, and are acceptable to be included verbatim into the conditions of consent.</p> |

this SEPP; we also refer DPE to the document entitled “EPA Guidelines for the Assessment and Management of Sites Impacted by Hazardous Ground Gases 2012” (<http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/resources/clm/120932GroundGas.pdf>) and particularly Figure 5 on page 23 outlining the risk analysis and assessment process).

Air Quality Management

Air quality from construction activities must be managed to prevent impacts to sensitive receivers located near the site. Activities need to be monitored closely for air quality impacts such as excess dust generation and where necessary effective controls need to be implemented to prevent air quality impacts to nearby sensitive receivers. The implemented air quality controls should be reviewed for performance and take into account changing site activities/methodologies and conditions that may adversely affect air quality at nearby sensitive receivers.

Air quality will be managed through a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan to be developed and approved prior to works commencing.

Soil and Water Management

Soil and water impacts and associated management measures from each activity/section of the proposed works will need to be identified. Each proposed activity/zone may vary in requiring management methodologies that are more suited in order to achieve the EPA’s discharge expectation of meeting the water quality objectives for the receiving environment. ANZECC water quality triggers should be adopted for all activities including potential discharges.

To ensure minimal impacts to soil and water quality, the proponent should thoroughly assess their activities and associated controls. When reviewing current controls and performance the proponent should consider the following:

- How sediment and other potential pollutants will be managed to prevent water quality impacts especially during construction activities;
- How any fuel, hydraulic oils, paints, chemicals, etc. involved with the project will be managed to prevent/manage spillage;
- How well management practices/operating procedures perform in reducing water quality impacts;
- How any issues around soil and water quality are detected and promptly acted upon/rectified to prevent impacts;
- If discharges are required into the receiving environment at any stage, how these are to be managed to prevent adverse effects; and
- If required, how the use of flocculants/coagulants or other water treatment measures associated with the water quality improvement processes are selected and managed to prevent water quality impacts from these additives.

Any contractors or personnel undertaking works on the premises should be made aware of any risks associated with water quality and implement/maintain effective controls. These controls should be reviewed for performance throughout the duration of the activity. For example, any excess concrete slurry from any potential concreting works undertaken at the premises should be stored/disposed of adequately as to not impact the receiving environment. Any materials present on the premises should be stored/handled appropriately as to not negatively affect stormwater runoff from the premises.

Soil and water impacts will be managed through a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan to be developed and approved prior to works commencing.

Noise Impact Management

In undertaking these operations the proponent should identify and manage any noise sources from the construction and operational phase and undertake all practical measures to mitigate the impacts of noise on any potential sensitive receivers.

The EPA recommends that any significantly audible construction activities are undertaken within the following recommended standard hours of operation:

- Monday to Friday 7:00am to 6:00pm
- Saturdays 8:00am to 1:00pm
- No work on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Construction noise associated with the project should be assessed/managed using the Interim Construction Noise Guideline, EPA, 2009. The above guideline can be viewed online at <http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/noise/constructnoise.htm>

Operational noise from all activities to be undertaken on the premises should be assessed/managed using the guidelines contained in the NSW Industrial Noise Policy, EPA. The above guideline can be viewed online at http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/resources/noise/ind_noise.pdf

Renzo Tonin & Associates have been engaged by Ecove to review the construction hours approved for the site and determine whether an extension of construction is reasonable (refer Appendix F). Ecove are proposing extend construction hours on Saturday's from 1pm to 3pm. Ecove have no objection to the start time of 8am on Saturday and no objection to the construction hours from Monday to Friday.

Renzo Tonin & Associates have reviewed the approved constructions hours for the residential development at Site 9 and have compared them to Site 68 and have noted the inconsistency in permitted hours for Saturdays.

The nearest noise-sensitive receivers to both of these sites has been identified as the existing residences of Australia Towers II on 1 Australia Avenue. Site 68 which has a permitted Saturday working period of 8am to 3pm is located across the rail corridor from Australia Towers II (approximately 20m). Site 9 is located at a much greater distance away from the Australia Towers II residences (approximately 450m south-west) however its Saturday work hours are proposed to be restricted to 1pm. Construction noise emanating from Site 9 would have a significantly less impact to the existing residences than activities on Site 68 due its greater distance away and in addition, there are noise shielding effects from nearby buildings such as commercial buildings and a 3 storey carpark situated between Site 9 and the noise-sensitive receivers.

Therefore, on the basis of reduced noise impacts, Renzo Tonin & Associates support the extension of construction hours for Site 9. This does not negate the requirement to comply with the quantitative assessment stipulated in the EPA Interim Construction Noise Guideline.

Dangerous Goods/Chemical/Waste Management

The proponent must ensure that environmental risks associated with the storage, procession and handling of hazardous materials and dangerous goods are reviewed appropriately. Storage and handling of any dangerous goods must be undertaken in accordance with The Storage and Handling of Dangerous Goods Code of Practice, 2005 which can be viewed online at - http://www.workcover.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/17074/storage-handling-dangerous-goods-1354.pdf

The type, quantity and location of all dangerous goods, chemicals and wastes needs to be easily identified by site personnel and included in management plans/documentation for the premises. Effective controls need to be implemented and maintained in the storage, procession and handling of chemicals at the premises. These controls should also include operating and maintaining bunds or spill containment systems where necessary to minimise the risk of pollution from potential spills and leaks. Information on bunding and spill management can be found online at - <http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/mao/bundingspill.htm>

Wastes generated from the proposed works must be classified within the EPA Waste Classification Guidelines; Part 1: Classifying Waste, November 2014 found online at <http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/resources/wasteregulation/140796-classify-waste.pdf>

These issues will be managed through a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan to be developed and approved prior to works commencing.

General Advice

The proponent needs to be aware of the strict liability provisions of the POEO Act. All site personnel must be aware of the details of the any works plans, environmental legislation/guidelines and associated pollution controls before any works commence and during the undertaking of relevant activities.

The proponent should note and be aware of its responsibility to notify each relevant authority of any pollution incident, in accordance with Section 148 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act). Incident triggers and notification protocols need to be detailed so that compliance with section 148 of the POEO Act is achieved.

Noted.

RMS

| Recommendation/issue | Comment |
|--|---|
| <p>1. The traffic exiting from the development site onto Sarah Durack Avenue would perform right turn movements into Olympic Boulevard at the newly constructed right turn bay at Sarah Durack Avenue & Olympic Boulevard. To mitigate this difficulty it is necessary to re-construct the Traffic Control Signal at this intersection providing diamond turn signal phases in Olympic Boulevard as well as dedicated indented right turn bays (both approaches) in existing median.</p> | <p>Parking and Traffic Consultants have undertaken initial modelling on the intersection of Olympic Boulevard and Sarah Durack Avenue to assess the necessity of incorporating right turn bays and diamond turning facilities.</p> <p>This modelling indicates that the introduction of these facilities would not significantly improve the proposed Level of Service of the intersection, (LOS C in the PM peak) post the completion of the development.</p> <p>The installation of right turn bays (75m in length) would result in the requirement to remove 20 existing trees within the central median of Olympic Boulevard.</p> |
| <p>2. The proposed traffic control light at the intersection of Sarah Durack Avenue & Olympic Boulevard shall be designed to meet Roads and Maritime requirements. The Traffic Control Signal (TCS) plans shall be drawn by a suitably qualified person and endorsed by a suitably qualified practitioner.</p> <p>The submitted design shall be in accordance with Austroads Guide to Road Design in association with relevant Roads and Maritime supplements (available on www.rms.nsw.gov.au). The certified copies of the civil design plans shall be submitted to Roads and Maritime for consideration and approval prior to the release of a Construction Certificate and commencement of road works.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

Sydney Water

| Recommendation/issue | Comment |
|---|---------------|
| <p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The drinking water main available for connection is the 150mm main in Olympic Park Boulevard. Amplifications of this main may be required. | <p>Noted.</p> |

| | |
|---|--------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed drinking water infrastructure for this development will be sized & configured according to the Water Supply Code of Australia WSA 03-2011-3.1 (Sydney Water Edition - 2012). • Detailed water requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase. | |
| <p>Recycled Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recycled water main available for connection is the 250mm main in Olympic Park Boulevard. • Detailed recycled water requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase. | Noted. |
| <p>Wastewater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wastewater main available for connection is the 150 mm main constructed within the proposed development site. • The proposed development site is traversed by a number of wastewater mains. Where proposed works are in close proximity to a Sydney Water asset, the developer may be required to carry out additional works to facilitate there development and protect the wastewater main. Subject to the scope of development, servicing options may involve adjustment/deviation and or compliance with the Guidelines for building over/adjacent to Sydney Water assets. • Detailed wastewater requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase. | Noted. |

Transport for NSW

| Recommendation/issue | Comment |
|--|---|
| <p>Walking and Cycling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider existing and future demands, total daily and peak hour walking and cycling trips surrounding the proposed site. • Update figures of the existing walking and bicycle networks as per Sydney Olympic Park Authority (SOPA), Master Plan 2030 and the Auburn Cycle- map 2004. • Illustrate improvements that encourage walking and cycling, including intersections that facilitate pedestrian use, so that they meet the objectives of the SOPA Master Plan 2030. • Develop wayfinding strategies and travel access guides to assist with increasing the mode share of walking and cycling. • Provide appropriate bicycle parking provisions for the according to SOPA Master Plan 2030, Section 4. • Provide detail of how the bicycle parking allocation is differentiated by usage; usage by residents, visitors (residents and commercial), and commercial (permanent/employees) | <p>The amended Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by Parking and Traffic Consultants (Appendix B) addresses the walking and cycling issues raised by Transport for NSW.</p> <p>In relation to end of trip facilities, these will be provided at all levels of the commercial tenancy for the convenience of workers that run or ride to work.</p> |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| <p>across the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate the end of trip facilities in a convenient and accessible for people walking, running or cycling to work, close to bicycle parking to encourage sustainable transport options (SOPA Master Plan 2030, Section 4). | |
| <p>Recommended condition of consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proponent should be conditioned to prepare a Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) in consultation with the Sydney Olympic Park Authority (SOPA) prior to the commencement of construction. The CPTMP needs to specify any potential impacts to general traffic, cyclists, pedestrians and bus services within the vicinity of the site from construction vehicles during the construction of the proposed works. Should any impacts be identified, the duration of the impacts and measures proposed to mitigate these should be clearly identified and included in the CPTMP. | <p>Noted.</p> |

Office of Environment and Heritage

| Recommendation/issue | Comment |
|---|---------------|
| <p>After reviewing the relevant documents, OEH's Greater Sydney Planning Team has concluded that the matter does not contain biodiversity, natural hazards or Aboriginal cultural heritage issues that require a formal OEH response. We have no further need to be involved in the assessment of this project.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

Heritage Council

| Recommendation/issue | Comment |
|--|---------------|
| <p>The proposed development would not physically impact any State Heritage Register (SHR) items, or places identified of state heritage significance. Its design is consistent with existing scale of residential development at Sydney Olympic Park, and would not impact on significant views to and from SHR items in the vicinity.</p> <p>The Archaeological Assessment provided as part of the EIS concludes that there is nil-low potential for historical archaeological 'relics' or Aboriginal heritage to be located within the study area.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that further consultation with the Heritage Division is not required.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |