

12 March 2020

Anthony Witherdin  
Director, Key Sites  
Department of Planning Industry and Environment  
320 Pitt Street Sydney 2000 | GPO Box 39 Sydney 2001  
Attention: Marcus Jennejohn

Dear Mr Witherdin,

**SSD 9571 UTS Blackfriars Precinct Research Building – Response to request for further information and response to submissions**

Thank you for your letter regarding the above application dated 20 December 2019 and posted on the major projects website on 7 January 2020 in which you requesting further information.

The requested information is attached to this letter, as outlined in Schedules 1 and 2 and uploaded to Major Projects website. The detailed response to submissions is provided in Schedule 3.

If you have any questions, or require further clarifications please contact Alan Cadogan on 0400 906 383 or via email at [alan@urbanac.com.au](mailto:alan@urbanac.com.au).

Yours sincerely



Alan Cadogan, Director

**URBANAC**

Urbanac Pty Ltd, m: +61 400 906 383, e: [alan@urbanac.com.au](mailto:alan@urbanac.com.au)

**Attachments**

Schedule 1 – Response to Key Issues

Schedule 2 – Response to Requested Information

Schedule 3 – Detailed Response to Submissions

Schedule 1 – Response to Key Issues

Requested Information	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
<p><b>Heritage</b></p> <p>1. <i>The Department is concerned about the heritage and visual impacts of the proposed relocation of the sandstone pillar at the northernmost end of the Buckland Street, relocation of palisade fence and installation of fire-hydrant booster assembly (FHBA). The Department also notes that these works were not envisaged within the Concept Approval.</i></p>	<p>Acceptable locations for a FHBA in a new development are limited by the requirements of the NCC (Section E1.3), AS 2419.1 and the requirements of the NSW Fire Brigade.</p> <p>In general terms, to be accessible and useable the booster is required to be in sight of the main entrance of the building but must be either 10m away from the building or it must be protected or shielded from any fire in the building. It needs to be accessible by fire fighters and their vehicles and must be located such that the fire fighters and their equipment are not exposed to the fire they may be fighting. It must also be accessible by the fire brigade vehicles in the street.</p> <p>In summary the FHBA must be on a street frontage, and of the available frontages the project team evaluated the placement options and their impacts as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On Blackfriars Street would result in significant and unreasonable intervention in the recently completed childcare facility built to the boundary</li> <li>• Near the corner of Blackfriars and Buckland streets would require significant intervention in the root protection zone of the major <i>camphor laurel</i> tree in that location and likely lead to its death as well as intervention in the palisade fence</li> <li>• On Buckland Street in the front setback space of the former Girls School (CB22) could be used but would maximize the heritage impact placing the assembly in front of the most significant building on the site as well as impacting on the interpretation of its original relationship with the palisade fence where it is most intact and least changed plus intervention to the fence</li> <li>• Nearer to the driveway is not far enough from the building to meet the fire brigade’s requirements and places it at the entry point to the site where the visual impact is considered to be greater.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed location at the Broadway end of Buckland Street has the least impact on the palisade fence due to it having the the most visually discreet location and the least heritage significant location on the perimeter. It was also considered that this location did not give rise to any significant impacts in relation to the interface with the adjoining building given it is to the boundary on the street frontage and on the shared boundary with UTS (comprising an unfenestrated blank painted masonry wall) meant there could be no significant visual impact to this neighbour.</p> <p>It is reasonable to expect that for a site with a heritage palisade fence to all street frontages, some intervention to heritage fabric is inevitable when locating a FHBA in accordance with the regulations. While we agree that a location for the FHBA away</p>

Requested Information	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
	<p>from the street frontage could offer benefits in terms of design and heritage, such a location would not meet the regulated requirements.</p> <p>Accordingly, the location shown was selected as having the least visual impact on the site’s other heritage buildings and vegetation.</p> <p>This is confirmed in a letter prepared by Paul Davies (see Attachment A) addressing the heritage impacts associated with FHBA location, which also identifies the location shown as having the lowest heritage impact.</p> <p>We note the Department’s comment that the FHBA works were not envisaged in the Concept Approval. The proposed FHBA is a detailed component of the services design of the building. Section 4.22 of the Act specifically provides for the detailed proposals for a site to be the subject of a subsequent development application or applications. The inclusion of the FHBA in this stage of the development consent process is entirely consistent with Section 4.22. The level of design resolution that existed at the time approval for SSD6746 was sought did not include a building services design, consistent with normal practice. To provide this level of detail in a concept proposal would be not only unusual, it would also be in our view unreasonable and contrary to the intent of Section 4.22.</p>
<p>2. <i>The Heritage Impact Assessment states (Section 6.0, page 65) that the works to the sandstone and cast iron palisade boundary fence is ‘detailed in an accompanying report’. However, it appears the report referred to was not included within the EIS. To allow for the consideration of heritage impacts please provide the required report, in addition to a detailed assessment of the issues raised at point 1 above.</i></p>	<p>The accompanying report to which the HIS refers comprises EIS Attachment 22 as lodged - Heritage Drawings (5 A3 pages total). These detailed and comprehensive documents provide a conservation methodology, annotated images of the existing fence condition, and three sheets of detailed annotated elevational photographs labelled ‘sections’ which together constitute the report to which the HIA refers, formatted as drawings - there is no additional report as such. This is confirmed in the letter prepared by Paul Davies at Attachment A.</p>
<p><b>Design</b></p> <p>3. <i>Given the visibility of the northern elevation from Broadway, consideration should be given to</i></p>	<p>TZG Architects advise that the northern elevation was specifically designed so that it provides a neutral and muted backdrop to the heritage listed University of Notre Dame Australia and St Benedicts Church and is composed of high quality facebrick, with natural colour variance, in stretcher bond, a material and finish specifically chosen for its</p>

Requested Information	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
<p><i>articulating this façade physically or through varied materials / architectural treatment. Provide a photo-realistic image of the 3D Broadway SE view (70130 Rev1).</i></p> <p><i>Note: In subsequent email correspondence the Department clarified that it did not require a photo-realistic image, but would prefer two coloured computer generated 3d images (not photorealistic) showing the view from Broadway as noted above and also from a location further west.</i></p>	<p>compatibility with the heritage context of the Chippendale Heritage Conservation Area.</p> <p>This building has been the subject of a rigorous design competitive process. The design of the northern elevation received the same level of scrutiny as the building’s other elevations. We note that the Competition Jury included staff of the Government Architect’s Office, now part of the Department, and its findings were unanimous.</p> <p>We would understand a requirement for further articulation if this were a poor quality boundary elevation similar to the common brick/exposed slab-end construction often seen in the development of streetwall typology buildings. That is not the case here. The quality of finishes and materials and the proportions of the elevation were carefully considered during the design competition and the subsequent review processes and found to exhibit design excellence.</p> <p>UTS and TZG consider that the introduction of pattern making for its own sake or the introduction of new materials to this elevation to increase its visual complexity would detract from the design excellence of the building, risks drawing attention to the elevation in a way that will undermine its ability to provide a sympathetic backdrop to its heritage context, and is disingenuous to the design competitive process.</p> <p>In the fullness of time we also note that the site to the north which has a similar height limit under the LEP is likely to be developed and the Northern Elevation of the Blackfriars building may be fully or partially obscured and the elevation as proposed provides the appropriate interface for either situation.</p> <p>A 3D view towards the proposal looking south east from Broadway is provided at Attachment B, and from further west along Broadway at Attachment C</p>
<p>4. <i>Provide a 3D view looking towards the proposed Buckland Street elevation (in context) and taken from a pedestrian’s perspective on the footpath at the south-western corner of the ‘T’ intersection between Grafton Lane and Buckland Street.</i></p>	<p>The requested 3D view is provided at Attachment D.</p>
<p><b>Safety and security</b></p> <p>5. <i>The Department notes that the retained substation and</i></p>	<p>This issue is addressed in the response prepared by JMD Design at Attachment E which clarifies the screen is a decorative brick wall proposed to be constructed from perforated breeze blocks or bricks spaced in a decorative</p>

Requested Information	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
<p><i>bins are enclosed behind a screen-wall. Consideration should be given to the safety and security of this space and how this space could be designed to address CPTED principles.</i></p>	<p>pattern of solid/void. This will allow for visual connection between the two spaces to address the safety concerns.</p> <p>It is considered that the design proposed by JMD Design is capable of achieving an acceptable balance between the desire to screen the area while ensuring it meets CPTED principles, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural surveillance – the area is well overlooked from the new building’s main entry, its east elevation and the terrace on level 3 as well as the northern veranda of CB25; the fencing will be designed with a high degree of transparency and integrated into the landscaping to ensure that it does not provide areas of concealment; the area will be provided with good lighting and CCTV cameras will be installed to provide additional active surveillance</li> <li>• Access Control – the area is an integrated part of the precinct’s landscape design and includes clear movement paths to and from the space directly from the main courtyard space</li> <li>• Territorial Reinforcement – the area will be well maintained and regularly used throughout the day as staff and contractors access bins.</li> <li>• Space Management – by providing high quality screening with an emphasis on durability, lifespan and quality that is fit for purpose integrated into the overall landscape design.</li> </ul> <p>The detailed design of the screen is yet to be completed and UTS proposes that this matter could be dealt with by a condition of approval requiring the detailed design of the screen either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to achieve a minimum performance standard (e.g. the screen should use visually permeable materials and treatments, with the height of any 100% solid component of the screening not to exceed 1m, and above that height to be visually permeable with no less than 50% open/void).</li> </ul>
<p><i>6. A recessed fire-exit door is proposed on Buckland Street. If it is to be retained in this location (see point 1), consideration should be given to the design of the door to ensure it does not result in a blind corner / area of concealment.</i></p>	<p>The only egress ‘door’ opening onto Buckland Street is a gate providing access to the public road as part of the fire egress pathway from the north western corner of the building. The gate will be designed to be sympathetic to the nearby Palisade fence and will be primarily vertical bars, with solid components limited to the minimum required to prevent tampering with the locks and hardware.</p> <p>Given the gate’s design of open metal bars it is considered that it is unlikely to be a concealment opportunity as a person attempting to conceal themselves in the space would be in full view from windows in the western elevation of the new building.</p> <p>It is a technical requirement that the building’s fire egress pathway must lead to an open space such as a public road,</p>

Requested Information	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
	<p>and must open outward (i.e. in the direction of egress). It cannot open directly onto a footpath (i.e. the gate must swing within the site boundary, so as to not strike a person using the footpath). A number of options were considered in relation to the design of this egress, but rejected as they gave rise to greater impacts than the option selected. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moving the gate east, which provided a greater depth for potential concealment and had other impacts on the building caused by having to move the stair east as well</li> <li>• Moving the path of egress south, which would have resulted in the loss of more landscape space to the hard surface of the egress path plus heritage impacts resulting from the need to open up a new gateway along the palisade fence rather than at its edges</li> </ul> <p>UTS believes the arrangement as shown balances the competing interests of regulatory compliance, egress fire safety and heritage compatibility and is an arrangement which is common in central Sydney (though typically with solid doors rather than an open gate arrangement with lesser impact as is the case here). Further safety can be provided for the space by ensuring it is well lit at night and providing active surveillance through security CCTV if necessary.</p>
<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>7. <i>Update the Acoustic Assessment (AA) to provide an assessment of impact and mitigation measures required for all nearby sensitive receivers, including 29 Buckland Street (not currently identified or assessed in the AA).</i></p>	<p>A detailed response to the issues raised is provided at Attachment F, and an updated Acoustic Report is at Attachment G.</p> <p>We draw the Department’s attention to the Acoustic Assessment as lodged and in particular <i>Table 1: Noise sensitive receivers – residential</i> on page 3 and <i>Figure 1: UTS Blackfriars Research Building Site and surrounding receivers</i> on Page 5. The residential use at 29 Buckland Street is within the report’s <i>Receiver R01</i> – which is the residential flat building in which it is located, 23-31 Buckland Street.</p>
<p><b>Servicing</b></p> <p>8. <i>In addition to responding to TfNSW’s comments please provide:</i></p> <p>a) <i>details of how pedestrian and vehicle conflicts will be avoided/managed, noting service vehicles are proposed to share the main pedestrian thoroughfare within the site</i></p> <p>b) <i>updated architectural</i></p>	<p>The requested information is provided in the following attachments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment H Servicing Details – Small Rigid Vehicle</li> <li>• Attachment I Servicing Details – Heavy Rigid Vehicle</li> <li>• Attachment J Updated Architectural Ground Plan</li> </ul> <p>In essence, existing bollards restrict vehicular access into the site without prior arrangement managing potential conflict. In addition, building entrances to the proposed building and the two major heritage buildings on the site are through veranda/porch arrangements which provide a safe transitional space for pedestrians to emerge from the buildings before moving into the parts of the courtyard that are shared with vehicles from time to time. Notwithstanding, vehicular access is</p>

Requested Information	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
<p><i>drawings with the location of the proposed servicing bays</i></p> <p><i>c) clearer vehicle swept path drawings and for clarity consider including a key/legend/clarification relating to the different coloured vehicle movements</i></p> <p><i>d) details of the existing servicing arrangements for the site.</i></p>	<p>also intended to be timed to avoid any peak pedestrian movements however this cannot be defined until the final tenants and fitouts are determined. The overall arrangement will be managed by UTS Campus Security as part of their normal duties once the building moves into the operational phase.</p> <p>Details of the existing servicing arrangements for the site are provided in the Traffic and Transport Response to Authorities at Attachment Z and Updated Traffic Report at Attachment AA, both prepared by ptc.</p>
<p><b>Landscaping and trees</b></p> <p><i>9. Provide greater clarity on proposed planting and planting density. In addition, justify the proposed selection of <i>Liriodendron Tulipifera</i>, given its potential height and tendency to be short-lived</i></p> <p><i>Consideration should be given to native tree selections instead of non-native species.</i></p>	<p>The requested information is set out the response prepared by JMD Design at Attachment E. In summary:</p> <p><b>Regarding <i>Liriodendron Tulipifera</i></b></p> <p>JMD Design advises <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> was selected as the most suitable specie based on the site’s urban condition, the desire for a lighter tree in the heritage precinct of the UTS Blackfriars, the tree’s ability to reach desirable size and provide tree canopy relatively fast, hardiness to grow in constrained conditions and aesthetic value. Consideration was also given to recent work by the City of Sydney, which has successfully planted <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> in many recent streetscape projects around CBD, including Devonshire St Surry Hills. The species is also a recommended street tree species in the City of Sydney’s Street Tree Master Plan (updated 2015) and meets the Street Tree Master Plan’s requirements of an upright, uniform tree with good branching that is pollution tolerant and suited to the high traffic environment adjacent to Broadway.</p> <p><b>Regarding Native Species</b></p> <p>JMD Design advises there will be with a mix of native and exotic species that are suitable for the site condition.</p>

Schedule 2 – Response to Request for Additional Information

Issue Raised	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
<p>10. Clarify the proposed hours of construction. The Department notes the</p> <p>a) EIS report (Section 6.17, page 69) proposes hours in accordance with the Council’s Code of Practice</p> <p>b) Acoustic Report proposes hours in accordance with the Interim Construction Noise Guideline.</p>	<p>The consideration of impacts is based on the acoustic report and the reference in the main EIS document to Council’s Code of Practice should therefore be disregarded and replaced by the Interim Construction Noise Guideline, i.e. Normal construction (ICNG page 8):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monday to Friday 7 am to 6 pm</li> <li>• Saturday 8 am to 1 pm</li> <li>• No work on Sundays or public holidays</li> </ul> <p>UTS also requests that any conditions regarding hours for construction include activities to be undertaken outside the hours above if required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By the Police or public authority for the delivery of vehicles, plant or material</li> <li>• In an emergency to avoid the loss of life, damage to property or to prevent environmental harm</li> <li>• Where the works are inaudible at the nearest sensitive receiver</li> <li>• Where a variation is approved in advance in writing by the Secretary or the nominee if appropriate justification is provided for the works</li> </ul>
<p>11. Update the drawings to include a key/legend of the annotated (abbreviated) materials. In addition, the Department notes that not all materials annotated on the drawings are listed as part of the finishes sample board.</p>	<p>A legend for materials is already provided on Drawing DA00 - COVERPAGE + LEGEND (an update of which has been provided at attachment BB) however some codes had not been provided in the Materials and Finishes Schedule as they were considered self explanatory in the Legend/Abbreviation table. These have now been added as requested and the updated Materials and Finishes Schedule is at Attachment K). We can confirm that:</p> <p><b>GL1</b> - This is clear glass specified by the Facade Engineer to be 'Clear (low-e Coated) vision glass'. (We did not place a sample of this on the board because as a clear material it is transparent and not typically apparent in photographs of the board)</p> <p><b>BG1</b> - This is a clear glass used only at the external terrace (not placed on the board because as a clear material it is transparent and not typically apparent in photographs of the board).</p> <p><b>MLF</b> - This indicates fixed metal louvres in grey anodised aluminium equivalent to AF in the Materials and Finishes Schedule.</p> <p><b>CP</b> - This is precast concrete as per Legend.</p> <p><b>FNG</b> - This required exit gate will be a simple contemporary interpretation of the adjacent heritage palisade fence. This will be addressed as part of design development and designed in close consultation with the Heritage Consultant, Paul Davies.</p>

Issue Raised	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
<p>12. Update the drawings to include detail of the appearance (or likely appearance) of the FHBA. The Department also notes that the FHBA is not shown on the Fire Services drawings.</p>	<p>UTS advises that the precise appearance of the FHBA is not yet designed. As noted above in Schedule 1, the Department would be aware being the responsible agency for the regulatory framework around fire safety provision, that there is limited potential for changing the aesthetics of the FHBA. Notwithstanding, TZG and the Consultant team are extremely aware and sensitive to the heritage nature of the palisade fence and the statutory and technical requirement of the FHBA set. This will be addressed as part of design development and will be designed in close consultation with the Heritage Consultant, Paul Davies.</p> <p>In relation to the fire services drawings, TZG advise that the fire services booster valve assemblies are shown on the hydraulic services drawings as this relates more accurately to the contractor who would be doing the work (please refer to drawing HSK04 of EIS Attachment 39d as lodged).</p>
<p>13. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) lists the drawings on which it has based its assessment (Section 9, page 9). However, the drawings referenced are different to those submitted with the EIS. Confirm whether the AIA and its conclusions /recommendations are based on the current proposal and update/revise as required.</p>	<p>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment was based on drawings that show the same extent of building as currently proposed and its list of drawings has been updated for clarity in the Updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (see Attachment L).</p>
<p>14. Update drawing 70135 Rev1 to improve the legibility of the annotations relating to the proposed signage types 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Drawing 70135 DA35 Signage Details has been updated as requested and is at Attachment M.</p>
<p>15. Confirm existing and proposed student and staff population on the site.</p>	<p><b>Existing Site Population</b></p> <p>The existing student and staff population on the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Staff: 516</li> <li>• Total Students: Nil</li> <li>• Other: 84</li> </ul> <p>This comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Childcare CB28: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Childcare Staff: 24</li> <li>- Childcare places: 84 (neither staff nor students)</li> <li>- Childcare Students: 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Issue Raised	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings CB 22 (Advanced Analytics Institute research partner and Connected Intelligence Centre)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff: 137</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CB 25 (EnergyLab and the Advanced Analytics Institute research partners)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff: 353</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CB 27               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff: 2</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Buildings CB 23 and CB 24:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nil – these buildings currently vacant</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed student and staff population:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Population: 1,075 (maximum predicted capacity in attendance at any time for impact assessment purposes) to 1,846 (maximum predicted theoretical population for engineering and certification purposes).</li> </ul> <p>This comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UTS Childcare (CB27, CB28), CB22 and CB25 – as above (no change from existing: 516 (plus 84 infants)</li> <li>• New building:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Estimated maximum population in attendance on any given day: 559</li> <li>- Theoretical maximum engineering population capacity of the building: 1,330</li> <li>- Estimated Staff: unknown at this time</li> <li>- Estimated Students: unknown at this time</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>It is not possible to provide a reliable and definitive population figure for the new building at this stage, and even less possible to provide a reliable breakdown between staff and students, until the associated fitout is known. If a research program for example, includes large pieces of equipment such as for manufacturing robotics fewer people would fit reducing the overall population. Accordingly the building can be estimated to have a range of different population figured depending on the purpose of the estimate.</p> <p>TZG advise that the fire engineering of the building has set an upper limit of 1,330 persons that could theoretically be accommodated. The vertical transportation design, provision of sanitary facilities and services and engineering generally also provide for this figure as an upper limit for regulation and certification purposes.</p> <p>Though it is designed as a Class 9B building throughout to provide for adaptability over time, Section D1.13 of the BCA does not specify a deemed to satisfy occupancy rate for university uses specifically. Should any parts be fitted out as office (Class 5) or a laboratory (Class 8) a rate of 1 person per 10m<sup>2</sup> would apply.</p>

Issue Raised	Where the information is located, and relevant comments
	<p>Despite its theoretical maximum occupancy of 1,330 UTS advises that it is extremely unlikely that this number of people would be in the building at the one time. Average attendance at the Broadway campus was measured in a space audit in August 2018 and found to be a maximum of 42% (Source: UTS Space Audit (Measuremen Pty Ltd, 2018)). Based on this data, 1,330 people would be a gross overestimate of the actual number of people expected to be in the building at any time. Instead, a figure of 559 (42% of 1,330) would be a more realistic likely maximum. In our view this figure would be the appropriate maximum population for the purposes of assessment of impacts arising out of the use of the building, the intensification of the site, and in relation to transport planning.</p> <p>The EIS as lodged discussed an estimated population of 400-600, based on a range of figures including the potential for desktop based research and laboratory space area assignments consistent with the BCA and the need to consider reduced attendance rates where a realistic assessment of impacts was required.</p>
<p>16. Confirm the GFA of existing buildings to be demolished.</p>	<p>UTS confirms that the GFA of the two buildings to be demolished is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CB23 347.1m<sup>2</sup> (former child care now vacant)</li> <li>• CB24 95.55m<sup>2</sup> (demountable building)</li> </ul>
<p>17. For information purposes, provide a map indicating the locations of UTS buildings/sites that make up the UTS City Campus and venues.</p>	<p>The UTS campus map is provided at Attachment N.</p> <p>As the Department can clearly see the vast majority of the University's facilities are located at the City Campus within short walking distance of the site (approx. 200-500m i.e. under 5mins walk) which includes gym, playing courts and sports facilities, open space of alumni green, the University library, function areas, meeting rooms, food court, bars and other facilities. Given the proximity and quality of these venues it is considered that they are likely to have a very high uptake rate by the new building's users at Blackfriars, compared to more distant facilities offered by Council or others.</p>
<p>18. Confirm the size, MWh and predicated percentage offset of electricity use of the proposed solar photovoltaic panel array.</p>	<p>The information is provided in the letter prepared by Evolved Engineering and is at Attachment O</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 76 panels each with a capacity of 360Wp</li> <li>• 33.11MWh is predicted to be generated annually</li> </ul> <p>The offset is not known at this stage</p>
<p>19. Confirm size of the proposed rainwater tank.</p>	<p>The rainwater tank will have a capacity of 87m<sup>3</sup>.</p>

Schedule 3 – Response to Submissions

Issue Raised	Comment
<b>Office of Environment and Heritage</b>	
<p>1. <i>The submission raises no issues, and proposes conditions of consent to address the possibility of Aboriginal archaeological artefacts being discovered during excavations</i></p>	<p>UTS has no objection to the proposed conditions, which are standard.</p>
<b>Environment Protection Authority</b>	
<p><i>Background Noise</i></p> <p>2. <i>The EPA requested clarification on the monitoring locations, including demonstrating these locations are representative of their background noise levels and to make any adjustments to correct reverberant levels to free-field noise levels.</i></p> <p>3. <i>The EPA requested an explanation for the differences between the measured unattended ambient noise levels at Location 3 in Table 5 compared to Table 6.</i></p>	<p>This is addressed in the Acoustic Response and the updated Acoustic Assessment prepared by ARUP (see Attachments F and G).</p>
<p><i>Project Noise Trigger Levels</i></p> <p>4. <i>The EPA requested PNTLs should be reviewed and amended consistent with the outcomes of the issues raised with the noise monitoring.</i></p>	<p>This is addressed in the Acoustic Response and the updated Acoustic Assessment prepared by ARUP (see Attachments F and G).</p>
<p><i>Operational noise assessment</i></p> <p>5. <i>The EPA requests that the applicant provide a rationale for the use of the different methods (CONCAWE and ISO 9613-2) including a technical justification.</i></p>	<p>This is addressed in the Acoustic Response and the updated Acoustic Assessment prepared by ARUP (see Attachments F and G).</p> <p>The Operational Plan of Management prepared by Urbanac Pty Ltd has been updated to include the revised management measures for noise sources such as waste removal and recycling activities, other maintenance activities with the potential to generate noise at sensitive receivers (see</p>

Issue Raised	Comment
<p>6. <i>The operational management plan for the development should include noise management measures for noise sources such as waste removal and recycling activities, other maintenance activities with the potential to generate noise at sensitive receivers.</i></p> <p>7. <i>Provide further information to substantiate the conclusions in Chapter 6.2 of the noise report regarding the mechanical plant and patron noise</i></p>	<p>Attachment P).</p>
<p><i>Contaminated lands</i></p> <p>8. <i>The EPA requires that the following be submitted as part of the RTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Detailed site investigation reports which became the basis of the RAP</i></li> <li>• <i>Hazardous materials survey report</i></li> <li>• <i>Section B site audit statement confirming that the nature and extent of contamination have been appropriately assessed; and the site can be made suitable to the proposed use if the site is remediated in accordance with the remediation action plan</i></li> </ul>	<p>We note that the Department has already approved uses associated with the proposal through Concept Development Approval SSD6746, which included consideration of contamination in accordance with the EP&amp;A Act, SEPP 55, and the Sydney LEP. The granting of approval for the nominated uses of SSD6746 confirms that the consent authority must have then been satisfied that the remediated site can be made suitable for those uses.</p> <p>We note however that the regulatory and procedural framework around the management of contaminated lands has changed since the granting of that approval. UTS takes the issue of site contamination seriously and it is a matter of significant corporate pride that with the delivery of this project the entire Blackfriars site will have been through a remediation process under its custodianship. This represents a significant although invisible public benefit.</p> <p>The following reports have been included in order to address the issues raised in relation to contaminated lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site investigation reports prepared by Douglas Partners Pty Ltd (see Attachment Q)</li> <li>• Hazardous Materials Survey prepared by HLA-Envirosciences Pty Limited (see Attachment R)</li> <li>• Hazardous Materials Supplement prepared by UTS (see Attachment S)</li> </ul> <p>In relation to the provision of a Site Audit Statement at this point in time, UTS understands, based on advice from its Site Auditor, and consistent with the advice provided on the EPA website (which states “Prior to audit completion an auditor may be able to provide interim audit advice. Interim audit advice may be useful in supporting development</p>

Issue Raised	Comment
	<p><i>applications...”) that for this stage of the development it would be normal practice for a consent authority to accept an Interim Advice with a Section B site audit statement to follow later (likely to be as a requirement of a condition of approval). UTS is confident that this should be sufficient for the Department and the EPA to be satisfied and the site can be made suitable for the proposed use. It is also noted that the City of Sydney submission notes provision of an Interim Advice would be an acceptable alternative.</i></p> <p>Accordingly, the attached Interim Advice prepared by Enviroview Pty Ltd has been provided to address this issue (see Attachment T).</p>
<p><i>Proposed Conditions</i></p>	<p>UTS does not have any in-principle objection to the proposed conditions which appear to be standard but will reserve comment until it sees and has an opportunity to properly review the detail of any draft conditions the Department is of a mind to impose.</p>
<p><b>Transport for NSW</b></p>	
<p><i>Freight and Servicing Management</i></p> <p>9. <i>TfNSW requested more information re:</i></p> <p><i>a) Details of the development’s freight and servicing profile</i></p> <p><i>b) Demonstrate the proposed off street loading is adequate for future servicing</i></p>	<p>This information is provided in the Traffic and Transport Response to Authorities at Attachment Z and Updated Traffic Report at Attachment AA, both prepared by ptc.</p>
<p><i>Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management</i></p> <p>10. <i>TfNSW requested a CMTP be prepared in consultation with Sydney Coordination Office</i></p>	<p>The EIS as lodged contained a Preliminary CTMP (Attachment 48) prepared in consultation with TfNSW and RMS, which demonstrates how construction traffic can be managed for the site in-principle. UTS would expect a condition of consent would require that this is updated following selection of a builder and prior to the commencement of construction, and that this can fully address this issue.</p>
<p><b>Heritage Council of NSW</b></p>	
<p>11. <i>The submission proposes conditions of consent to manage the archaeological program in conjunction with the proposed full excavation</i></p>	<p>UTS has no objection in principle to the imposition of standard conditions in relation to archaeology.</p> <p>UTS wishes to flag however that some of the proposed conditions do not appear to be standard or are variations to standard conditions and wishes to clarify some aspects of the submissions recommended conditions, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommended condition 1, which is not clear with regard to its requirements</li> <li>• Recommended condition 3, we understand differs from</li> </ul>

Issue Raised	Comment
	<p>the standard practice since 1977 for a 12 month delivery timeframe for Final Reports in NSW to 9 months with potentially adverse consequences for the project.</p> <p>This is fully described in the Attachment U prepared by AMAC Group.</p> <p>The submission also contains the Heritage Assessment team’s comments on results of the August 2019 Archaeological Test Excavation report in relation to SSD 6746 Conditions B9, B10 and B11. The assessment in our view contains a number of errors and/or misinterpretations that could influence the Department’s assessment of the proposal, and the attached response from AMAC Group sets out in detail these matters. Contrary to suggestions in the submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The August 2019 Test Excavation Report did not indicate that the test program was incomplete</li> <li>• Condition B9 states that “testing must confirm <i>where the archaeology may survive</i> within the site and <i>the degree to which it survives</i>” and Test Zone 1 achieved that requirement</li> <li>• The submission interprets Condition B9 as requiring activities not stated in its actual wording</li> <li>• The August 2019 report outlined opportunities for conservation in situ as a preference, but also explained that at this site the insitu conservation opportunities are poor, and also outlined opportunities for interpretation</li> <li>• ‘partial conservation in situ’ does not automatically equate to a positive heritage outcome because there is a real risk that it may only amount to ‘fragmentary survival.’</li> <li>• Conservation in situ is AMAC Group’s first mitigation strategy as a matter of policy, however, it is also AMAC Group’s professional opinion that, based on the significance of the Blackfriars archaeology: the unavoidable and additional heritage impacts caused by more piling outweigh the compromised benefits of ‘partial conservation’ or fragmentary survival</li> <li>• There is no disagreement between the EIS and the Archaeological report and no misquoting of it on page 29</li> </ul> <p>We would be happy to meet with the Heritage Council to further discuss and resolve any inconsistencies.</p>
<b>City of Sydney</b>	
<p>12. <i>The submission provides general support for the proposal</i></p>	<p>Noted, with appreciation.</p>
<p><i>Development Contributions</i> 13. <i>The Council does not support exemptions or reductions to</i></p>	<p>UTS acknowledges that the proposal will intensify the use of the site, however Council’s submission makes a number of assertions unsupported by data or other evidence that would cause UTS to revise its position. Council’s submission does not</p>

Issue Raised	Comment
<i>development contributions</i>	<p>appear to have taken into account any of the facilities that will be available to the workers and students at the proposed building and which UTS makes available to the wider community, or the specific contribution the development will make in terms of accessible open space, reduced stormwater and traffic</p> <p>UTS maintains that in the specific circumstances the Department and the Minister could not reasonably be satisfied that the increase in worker population resulting from the Proposal will contribute to the need for the City of Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2015 nominated facilities and infrastructure as set out in the EIS. For a list of the university provided facilities within 5 minutes walk of the site please refer to Attachment N</p>
<i>Heritage and Urban Design</i> 14. Council requested the CMP be made available	<p>The CMP for the site was provided as part of the documentation for the Concept Development Approval SSD6746 and that it can be downloaded from the Department's Major Projects website. A copy is also provided at Attachment V.</p>
15. Council expressed concern about the method of stone cleaning	<p>Issues related to the heritage fence are addressed in Schedule 1.</p>
16. Council asked for more information regarding the detail of the heritage interpretation	<p>As set out in the EIS documentation UTS intends to provide further heritage interpretation detail but this can only occur following the archaeological excavation. We have no issue with providing further detail at that time and prior to its implementation and expect that this will likely be the subject of a condition of approval.</p>
17. Council requested that the height of the totem sign be reduced and that the building identification signs not be illuminated	<p>The totem sign is not part of this application. UTS will take Council's comments into consideration before finalising a design for a future totem sign.</p> <p>The illumination of the building identification signage, which is a simple white sign, is not considered to detract in any way from the heritage or urban design qualities of the site or its visual catchment and UTS respectfully disagrees with Council's opinion on this matter. UTS notes that the signage is consistent with a number of other signs across the UTS campus many of which were approved by the Council.</p> <p>UTS notes that the sign on the northern elevation is composed of a white glazed brick intrinsic to the brick wall and is not illuminated.</p>
<i>Contamination</i> 18. Council requested the RAP be peer reviewed and include a Section B Site Audit Statement or an	<p>This matter is addressed in Schedule 1.</p> <p>UTS 's agrees with the City 's approach requiring Interim Audit followed by a Section B SAS.</p>

Issue Raised	Comment
<i>Interim Audit</i>	
<i>Public Domain</i> 19. Council requested the MUSIC model be adopted for stormwater quality	The proposal has adopted the MUSIC model for stormwater quality and copies of the relevant file and report are at Attachments W and X.
20. Council requested the Blackfriars Street footpath be upgraded to match Buckland Street	Blackfriars Street footpath is being upgraded as a condition of consent for the UTS childcare centre, but has been delayed due to the contractor going into liquidation. UTS confirms this is being undertaken separately with a new contractor recently being appointed to complete the works.
<i>Landscape</i> 21. Council has requested: a) Further detail in the landscape design b) Additional information regarding the raised seating landscape treatment around the camphor laurel to avoid root impacts c) More information regarding green walls on heritage fabric	UTS is happy to provide further detail with regard to the landscape design following its further design development including in relation to green walls, and recommends that the timing for this would normally be at the time the above ground parts of the building were certified.  JMD Design, landscape architects for the project, advise (see Attachment E) in relation to the seating around the Camphor Laurel that typical details will be provided for certification that allow flexibility in location, with root mapping and footing location to be determined on site during construction in the presence of arborist.  As a point of clarification, UTS advises that the proposal does not include any green walls on heritage items (other than the dividing boundary wall, which is partially covered by an existing vine growing from over the boundary on the other side of this brick wall). JMD Design confirm the proposal does not include any green walls – there are however cables attached to non-heritage significant structures to allow climbing plants to grow up including at the existing external concrete lift structure to CB22, to the north eastern portion of façade of the new building and to the new free standing screen to the substation.
<i>Tree removal</i> 22. Council has recommended exploring methods of canopy modification pruning to retain the trees.	Removal of trees was extensively considered in stage 1 and is provided for and approved in Concept Approval 6746, which contains conditions of approval regarding the minimum sizes for replacement trees at the time of planting and at maturity.
<i>Tree planting</i> 23. Council has recommended exploring methods of canopy modification pruning to retain the trees.	Removal of trees was extensively considered in stage 1 and is provided for and approved in Concept Approval 6746, which contains conditions of approval regarding the minimum sizes for replacement trees at the time of planting and at maturity.
<i>Transport and Access</i> 24. Council requested conditions regarding:	<b>Service Vehicle Use, CTMP</b> Issues relating to the use of service vehicle and the provision of a CTMP are addressed in the responses to other submissions

Issue Raised	Comment
<p>a) use of service vehicles on the site</p> <p>b) a CTMP be provided</p> <p>c) bicycle parking and end of trip facilities for 60 Class B bike spaces, 60 lockers, 6 showers and change rooms be provided</p> <p>c) that a Green Travel Plan be provided</p>	<p>above.</p> <p><b>Bicycle Parking</b></p> <p>Regarding bicycle parking, UTS is a strong supporter of active transport. It provides bicycle parking facilities throughout its city campus sites and the UTS Sustainable Transport Plan commits to an increase in these numbers.</p> <p>The EIS proposes 44 spaces be provided – 16 external and 28 internal with end of trip facilities associated with the internal provision.</p> <p>UTS understand the principle behind the “build it and they will come” efforts of the City’s cycling policies expressed in its DCP and its role in changing the cycling culture in Sydney to bring it up from a very low base.</p> <p>UTS’ experience on its City Campus however is that the uptake of these facilities beyond the levels predicted by its transport and traffic advisors is slow. Since 2010 numerous reports based on survey data many of which the Department would be aware, including the traffic reports submitted for all recent UTS SSD applications, represent a body of evidence that the growth in bicycle parking demand at UTS is progressing at a different rate.</p> <p>The highest average actual use of cycling facilities at the Broadway Campus is 52%. Based on the latest information contained in the UTS Central Green Travel Plan dated April 2019 and submitted to the Department in relation to SSD7382, cycling demand at UTS Broadway Campus is currently 2.1 spaces per 100 staff and students, with growth of 0.1 spaces per year. UTS consider that these findings can be equally applied to the Blackfriars site only 200m from the Broadway Campus. The provision of 60 spaces would not be required for the new population expected to be present on the Blackfriars site for decades.</p> <p>UTS is not opposed to providing 60 bicycle parking spaces in principle, and at the right time, but it is opposed to providing 60 spaces at the commencement of operation, contrary to the recommendations of transport experts and the best available evidence, only to then find that a substantial proportion of them are underutilised for a prolonged period.</p> <p>To address this issue, UTS proposes that the development should initially provide 44 spaces as proposed, but with a condition of consent that requires monitoring of the bicycle parking uptake monthly (as currently occurs at the UTS City Campus) so that when the uptake is consistently at a high level (such as 80% actual demand plus 20% float utilised at peak times between 12 and 3) this would trigger a requirement for the parking supply to be augmented to provide additional spaces up to the maximum of 60 spaces. This requirement</p>

Issue Raised	Comment
	<p>could also be reflected in the operational plan of management.</p> <p>The Department can be confident UTS would be well placed to deal with such a condition in good faith, balancing the need to manage expenditure of public funds for best public benefit while at the same time providing appropriate support for cycling. This is because UTS is not only a public authority and a long term land owner but also because its commitment to evidence based research and sustainability are at its core. We note that the suggested provision of 60 spaces derives from the conditions of consent for SSD6746, which do not specify a number but refer to compliance with the City of Sydney DCP 2012. We respectfully remind the Department that in accordance with State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2009, DCPs do not apply to State Significant Development. Notwithstanding we consider that the approach outlined above, despite not achieving the numerical requirements of the DCP, is nevertheless in accordance with the relevant objectives (DCP 2012 Section 3.11) which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Ensure that the demand for transport generated by development is managed in a sustainable manner.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ensure that bike parking is considered in all development and provided in appropriately scaled developments with facilities such as change rooms, showers and secure areas for bike parking,</i></li> </ul> <p>and as a result complies with the DCP and condition B13 of SSD6746.</p> <p><b>Green Travel Plan</b></p> <p>UTS confirms that it has no objection to providing a site-specific Green Travel Plan. The EIS describes the manner in which such a plan would be produced in consultation with the UTS Sustainability Group and relevant stakeholders and that it would include the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Key Objectives of the Green Travel Plan</li> <li>• Existing Travel Conditions</li> <li>• Methods of Encouraging Modal Shifts; and</li> <li>• Management of the Plan</li> </ul> <p>Especially in light of the Government’s delivery of new transport infrastructure in the vicinity, UTS considers that from an operational and practical point of view the timing for producing such a plan should be prior to the occupation of the building. At an earlier time, such as prior to the certification of the building, the final occupants of the building might not be known and this would risk reducing the plan’s efficacy as it would be generic rather than specific in relation to the building’s users.</p>
Sustainability	This information has already been provided in Water Artwork:

Issue Raised	Comment
<p>25. Council requested further information regarding:</p> <p>a) further use of grey water</p> <p>b) energy performance of the proposed solar PV</p>	<p>Rain Falls Report by Studio TCS, with full detail design of water system, detailed drawings including size of tanks, method of reticulation, and size and equipment for associated plant room.</p> <p>The energy performance of the solar PV is addressed in Schedule 1.</p>
<p>Waste</p> <p>26. Council requested a number of amendments including nomination of waste collection points, dedicated waste collection points, storage areas for bulky waste (4sqm min), food recycling and beverage containers.</p>	<p>At UTS, recycling rates for general operational waste are currently around 80%, placing UTS among the top in the Australian tertiary education sector. Dedicated waste streams have been progressively introduced for paper and cardboard, e-waste, fluorescent-lamps, batteries, and most recently food waste which is separated and used to generate green electricity.</p> <p>UTS notes Council's requests and advises the Department that its preference is to manage waste in accordance with its university wide approach to waste handling outlined in part 1 of the UTS Waste Management Plan 2018. This public document outlines the framework for waste management at UTS identifying waste streams, and the systems and procedures in place to manage them (see Attachment Y).</p> <p>UTS considers this demonstrates a commitment to waste reduction to achieve the objectives behind Council 's request, via slightly different means tailored to suit the particular circumstances of the university campus. If strict compliance with the City's more general controls were required it would risk undermining the efficiencies gained by a whole-of-campus approach, and is not considered necessary.</p>
<p>Public Art</p> <p>27. Council supported option 1 for the 'Rain Falls' artwork</p>	<p>UTS notes Council's preference is for Option 1. UTS advises that either option is considered to be appropriate and the Design Development stage of the artwork will inform of any limitations in providing the more detailed sequencing of Option 1.</p>
<p><b>Roads and Maritime Services Division (withdrawn)</b></p>	
<p>28. Supported the proposal</p>	<p>RMS no longer exists as a separate entity following its merger with TfNSW on 1 December 2019. TfNSW requested that the submission was disregarded in favour of the TfNSW submission.</p>
<p><b>Sydney Water</b></p>	
<p>29. The submission confirms that the development can be serviced by existing water and wastewater infrastructure</p>	<p>Noted and as anticipated and provided for in the service design. No need for design changes.</p>
<p>30. The submission confirms that onsite stormwater detention will be required</p>	<p>Noted and as anticipated and provided for in the service design. No need for design changes.</p>

Issue Raised	Comment
<b>Public Submissions (1)</b>	
31. <i>The proposal looks nice</i>	Noted. Thank you.
32. <i>Questioned the use of evaporative cooling given Sydney's humidity</i>	The evaporative cooling contributes to an overall sustainability program for the environmental systems of the building that includes many different parts. In humid weather the contribution of the evaporative cooling component of that overall 'toolkit' will be reduced, however it is considered still worthwhile not only for its comparative low cost in relation to the environmental benefits but also for its contribution to the "Rain Falls" artwork being able to be seen as encompassing the whole of the building.

## List of Schedule Attachments

- Attachment A. Heritage Response prepared by Paul Davies
- Attachment B. 3D view towards the proposal looking south east from Broadway prepared by TZG
- Attachment C. 3D view towards the proposal looking south west from Broadway prepared by TZG
- Attachment D. 3D view towards the proposal looking south west from the south west corner of Grafton Lane at Buckland Street prepared by TZG
- Attachment E. Landscape Response prepared by JMD Design
- Attachment F. Acoustic Response prepared by ARUP
- Attachment G. Acoustic Report Update prepared by ARUP
- Attachment H. Servicing Details Plan – Small Rigid Vehicle prepared by TZG
- Attachment I. Servicing Details Plan – Heavy Rigid Vehicle prepared by TZG
- Attachment J. Updated Architectural Ground Floor Plan prepared by TZG
- Attachment K. Updated Materials and Finishes Board prepared by TZG
- Attachment L. Arboricultural Impact Assessment update prepared by Earthscape Horticultural Services
- Attachment M. Updated Drawing 70135 DA35 Signage Details prepared by TZG
- Attachment N. UTS City Campus Map and Directory
- Attachment O. Energy Response prepared by Evolved Engineering
- Attachment P. Plan of Management Update prepared by Urbanac
- Attachment Q. Site investigation reports prepared by Douglas Partners Pty Ltd
- Attachment R. Hazardous Materials Survey prepared by HLA-Envirosciences Pty Limited
- Attachment S. Hazardous Materials Supplement prepared by UTS
- Attachment T. Interim Advice (contamination) prepared by Enviroview Pty Ltd
- Attachment U. Archaeological Response prepared by AMAC Group Pty LTD
- Attachment V. Blackfriars Conservation Management Plan prepared by Paul Davies
- Attachment W. MUSIC model for stormwater quality
- Attachment X. MUSIC model report
- Attachment Y. UTS Waste Management Plan 2018 Part 1
- Attachment Z. Traffic and Transport Response to Authorities prepared by ptc
- Attachment AA. Updated Traffic Report at Attachment prepared by ptc
- Attachment BB. Drawing DA00 - COVERPAGE + LEGEND