

21 May 2018

File No: 2018/270295
Ref No: R/2018/7
Your Ref: SSD 8636

David Gibson
Team Leader
Social Infrastructure Assessments
Department of Planning and Environment
320 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Attention: Teresa Gizzi
Email: teresa.gizzi@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Teresa

SSD 8636 – Engineering And Technology Precinct, The University Of Sydney, Darlington Campus

I refer to your letter dated 16 April 2018 seeking Council's input on the above subject SSD application.

It is understood that the proposal is seeking consent for partial demolition of the existing Electrical Engineering Building (Building J03) including site excavation and earthworks, construction of an eight storey building comprising teaching spaces, offices, research facilities, storage areas and a loading dock. The proposal also incorporates an upgrade to the southern tower of the Electrical Engineering Building, and associated landscaping and public domain works.

The City has reviewed the information and provides the following comments:

Section 7.11 Contributions

The application indicates that both the Redfern-Waterloo Authority Contributions Plan 2006 and the Redfern-Waterloo Authority Affordable Housing Contributions Plan 2006 apply to the development.

To clarify, the Redfern-Waterloo Contributions Plan (refer to Part 1(6)) applies to development for which the Minister is the consent authority under Part 4 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 by operation of Clause 9A (1) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Projects) 2005, now known as State Environmental Planning Policy (State Significant Precincts) 2005. State Environmental Planning Policy (State Significant Precincts) 2005 does not apply to the proposed development as per the Land Application Map and Schedule 6 of the SEPP (as referenced in Clause 9A (1)). Consequently, the City of Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2015 (the Plan) applies to the proposed development. No affordable housing contribution applies to the subject application.

The Plan does not exclude University developments from a contribution (refer Section 1.3 of the Plan). The application seeks to increase the total gross floor area (GFA) by 6,071.30sq.m. The City remain of the view that the proposed redevelopment and upgrades, which amount to almost double the existing GFA, will result in additional staff or students numbers. This would be an increased demand of local services and infrastructure due to the likely net population increase. It is both necessary and reasonable to impose Section 7.11 contributions, and **if a condition requiring the payment of contributions is not proposed to be imposed as required by the plan, the City objects to the approval.**

Trees and Landscaping

The Arborists Report (Tree IQ USYD/ETPSSDA/AIA/A - Rev A, and dated 3 April 2018) indicates that a total of 6 trees will be removed and 2 trees will be retained by the proposal. However, it is apparent that approximately 21 additional trees on site are likely to be impacted by the proposal, if approved. In accordance with the requirements of the SEARS, the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and corresponding landscape plan should clearly identify and assess all of the trees that are proposed for removal and retention. Where suitable, consideration should be given to transplanting significant trees on site.

The landscape concept plan and sections are hand drawn and illustrative in nature. The information submitted does not provide a sufficient level of detail to understand the complexity of the public domain areas or offer assurance that necessary coordination between the architect, landscape architect, civil engineer and arborist has occurred. In order to make an informed assessment of the proposal, the Department are advised to request the proponent prepare a more detailed landscape package of information including:

- With reference to existing trees to be retained and trees located in raised planters, it is not clear what the height of planter walls is and whether there is adequate soil depth and volume to support the mature trees. The design must achieve a minimum 1000mm soil depth (excluding draining and mulch layers) for all trees on slab or podium;
- The focus of the design appears to be patterning the ground plane rather than resolving the detail and how changes in levels, stairs, ramps, and structures are dealt with in the public domain. These spaces need to be appropriately illuminated.
- It is not clear if permeable pavement is proposed, which would help mitigate overland flow issues and increase areas of deep soil provision on the site;
- There is no clear indication of what furniture and fixtures including lighting, water features, seating, benches, tables, bins, bike racks etc. are to be provided within the landscaped public domain areas, and any impact they may have on accessibility;
- Methods of irrigation and drainage are not clear from the package; and
- The drawn information shows the building per level. There is no overall site plan that shows thresholds and entrances relative to the public domain. Updated sections should be provided that show existing and proposed ground levels.

Flooding

The proposal includes provision of a new flood storage basin in the location of the current electrical engineering car park, which is proposed to become the new southern courtyard. The City request more detailed information about the new flood

storage basin including but not limited to a cross-section, capacity, provide the design and existing RL's, weir/overflow, outlet and permissible discharge rate, location and details, ponding depth of floodwater inside the basin, and any fencing requirement around the basin.

The proponent is requested to demonstrate compliance with the City's Interim Floodplain Management Policy (2014).

Ecologically Sustainable Development

The proposal indicates a clear intent to install renewable energy systems on the roof such as photovoltaic arrays and solar water heating panels, which is supported by the City. However, the roof plan does not indicate how they will be accommodated. The Department are advised to request that the plans show clearly where these systems will be accommodated.

Environmental Reports Certification

If the Department are minded to approve the application, they are encouraged to impose conditions requiring confirmation that the recommendations of the Noise and Vibration Assessment, Ref. S16785RP1, Revision A, prepared by Resonate Acoustics, dated 28 November 2017, and the Preliminary Hazard Analysis, ref. CN171057, prepared by CETEC Pty Ltd, dated 30 November 2017, are adopted by the development.

Transport

The new loading dock arrangement requires further consideration as concerns are raised that it leads to poor pedestrian amenity and safety. At a minimum, vehicles should enter and exit the dock in a forward direction, especially if there are 12.5m HRVs using the dock.

Coordination between existing and proposed pedestrian links have not been demonstrated by the application. It is noted that details relating to lobby access arrangements into the building are limited.

End of Trip facilities including separate staff and student bicycle parking in an accessible on grade location are not clearly identified in the proposal. Facilities should be secure and incorporate lighting and passive surveillance. No information is provided on how bicycle paths will be provided within the development site. Access is strongly preferred which provides a dedicated bicycle entry/exit arrangement.

Heritage and Urban Design

Two gas stores and a 'vie tank', which is two storeys in height and screened only by a security fence are proposed along the Shepard Street frontage. Concerns are raised that these structures give a poor 'back of house' presentation and will detrimentally impact the appearance of the building from the street and residences opposite. It is recommended that these structures are relocated so as not to be visible from the public domain.

In view of the moderate heritage significance of the existing Electrical Engineering Building (Building J03), if approved, the Department are encouraged to impose a condition requiring submission of a photographic archival record of the existing building to be carried out in accordance with NSW Heritage Division guidelines prior

to the commencement of works and a copy of the record lodged with the University Archives. In addition, it is recommended that any original features that are part of the stylistic character of the late 20th century Brutalist Style building should be retained as part of the upgrade works.

If you require any further information please contact Maria O'Donnell, Specialist Planner, on 9265 9834 or at modonnell@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'GJahn', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Graham Jahn AM
Director
City Planning | Development | Transport