

27th February 2016

To whom it may concern,

Re: Objection to proposed development at Australian Technology Park (SSDA 7317)

I wish to object to the proposed development at Australian Technology Park, and highlight the following issues relating to the proposal and the EIS submission:

Proposed uses

- **Technology focus**

The proposal states that the site will be utilised for “10000 technology focussed staff” and that it will be a “collaborative technology and innovation campus”. The submitted documents do not outline how this focus will be maintained and guaranteed in perpetuity to keep the intent of ATP into the future.

I sincerely hope that ATP does not become “CBA City” – is there any guarantee that CBA will not take over any of the other buildings on the site (e.g. locomotive workshop, NICTA building etc)?

- **Tech incubation fund**

The submitted documents do not outline any mechanism to guarantee that this incubation fund will continue in perpetuity.

- **Community office floorspace**

The proposal includes “New community office floorspace in excess of 1,000m², which is proposed to be leased by Mirvac and CBA for the benefit of the community and not-for-profit organisations” (EIS, p.88)...

This community floorspace is key in Mirvac and CBA’s commitment in contributing to the ATP precinct, through GFA which is suitable as business/commercial incubator or start-up space and will be designed as a commercial space. This will give the opportunity for new ideas and innovation to be fostered in close proximity of some of the leading financial, media and research facilities within Australia. (EIS, p.42).

It is not clear whether the community floorspace is to be used as a “business/commercial incubator” or space for “community and not-for-profit organisations” or both. Is Level 2 for “community and not-for-profit organisations” and Level 3 for “business/commercial incubator”?

Whilst I support the inclusion of some community space (albeit small), the submitted documents do not outline how this space will be managed and how it will be guaranteed that the rent charged remains appropriate for such community and not-for-profit organisations for the life of the development.

- **Supermarket**

The supermarket is proposed to operate 24/7. This contradicts the statement that the facilities are provided for the people working within ATP. The size is “expected to be in the order of 600m²” (EIS, p.41), not 500m² as described in the excerpts below.

A 24/7 supermarket could potentially draw people to drive to ATP from a wide area, as there are no other 24/7 supermarkets of a similar size anywhere else in Sydney.

24/7 operation of the supermarket will lead to disruptive traffic on Henderson Road and Mitchell Road when the vast majority of local residents are asleep. The transport impact assessment and noise and vibration assessment do not adequately deal with this issue...

The proposed retail use in Building 2 includes a 500m² boutique supermarket. It is proposed to operate the supermarket on a 24/7 basis as a low scale shop serving the local community for supply of general provisions. As such, it is expected that the majority of custom for the proposed boutique supermarket would be from walk-ins from workers working and residents living in nearby developments including the existing and proposed developments within the ATP site. (GTA, 2015, p.16)

It is however expected that the approximate 500m² supermarket would generate negligible traffic outside of the daytime period particularly as no specific parking provision is provided for the retail use. (Renzo Tonin, 2015, p.22)

These are not well-considered arguments given the fact that there is no similar 24/7 supermarket, even within the CBD, so it will attract vehicles (and accompanying noise) to the area when ordinarily there are close to none. If people want to visit the supermarket between midnight and 6am they will simply find a parking spot where they can within ATP's streets or on Henderson Rd.

I strongly object to 24/7 operation of the supermarket and believe that 6am to midnight would be more than adequate to service the needs of the vast majority of ATP workers and residents in the surrounding areas. Furthermore the operation of delivery trucks (hours and route) should be addressed.

- **Hospitality**

No hours of operation are provided for the cafes and restaurants for the site. This should be restricted to avoid impacts on surrounding residential areas.

- **Public Access**

It is critical that public access is maintained throughout ATP as is currently provided. How is this to be guaranteed for the life of the development?

- **Environmental performance**

It is proposed that buildings 1 and 2 will achieve 6 star green star. Will this form one of the conditions of consent?

- **Sports courts**

It is not stated whether the sports courts are to remain in use through the development (aside from when they are resurfaced). They should remain available for use as they are well utilised by the local community.

“Existing sports courts are refinished and re-line marked to include 1 tennis court and 2 multi-purpose courts for informal play”. It is not clear how the use of these courts will be managed. These courts should remain available for use by the local community, without any preference given to CBA employees.

Landscape

- **Light pollution**

Given the proximity of Building 1 to the residential area on Henderson Rd and beyond, there should be a commitment that internal lights as well as signage are switched off at night.

- **Street trees**

The sections show a large number of trees with significant height and canopy. Will additional soil cells be installed within the roadways to provide sufficient soil volume to ensure that the trees will not be stunted and will grow to the size shown?

Heritage

- **Protection of heritage items**

The existing heritage items on display must be protected, including smaller items such as the heritage toilet facilities on Locomotive St. Is it not clear whether the heritage tours will continue.

- **Setbacks to locomotive sheds**

Greater setbacks of Building 2 should be provided to provide better views to the heritage locomotive sheds and prevent diminishment of their significance.

Water & Geotechnical

- **Stormwater quality**

The proposal does not address the requirements for stormwater as required by Sydney DCP 2012 for stormwater quality. (e.g. design for WSUD with appropriate modelling).

[Note that SEAR's state *“Address the relevant planning provisions, goals and strategic planning objectives in the following: ... Sydney Development Control Plan 2012”*

The EIS states “MUSIC modelling undertaken by ARUP” however the ARUP report contains no details of any such modelling.

The SEAR's state that the EIS shall “address water sensitive urban design opportunities within the public domain and landscaping”. This is not addressed in the submitted documents, and one suggestion is that the new tree pits along Central Avenue could be constructed as WSUD raingardens to treat road runoff.

- **Rainwater harvesting**

The SEAR's state that the EIS shall “provide an integrated Water Management Plan including alternative water supply, proposed end use of potable and non-potable water, water sensitive urban design and water conservation measures”. This is not included, as shown by the blank space next to this requirement on page 10 of the EIS.

The civil plans show a rainwater tank of 100kL to building 1 and 245kL to building 2 but it is not clear whether these volumes will provide sufficient storage volume for the proposed demands (or to meet the requirements of a 6 star greenstar building).

- **Stormwater quantity (detention)**

The construction management plan shows use of the Vice-Chancellor's oval as a site compound. This entire oval as well as the sports courts function as an on-site detention basin, as shown in the photo in Appendix A. If the detention basin is utilised for a site compound, how will stormwater detention volume be provided? (Note that nuisance flooding is a significant issue at the corner of Henderson Rd and Davy Rd).

- **Groundwater**

The reports discuss dewatering. If dewatering is to be carried out with the effect of lowering the water table, has advice been provided by a hydrogeologist to confirm that there will be no impact on foundations of any of the surrounding buildings?

Construction Management

- **Construction hours**

The construction hours proposed will be disruptive to local residents particularly during weekend times. The construction hours should be the same as those required for all other developments in the area as outlined below:

	General construction hours	Noisy work
Monday – Friday	7.30am - 5.30pm	9.00am - 12.00pm and 1.30pm - 3.30pm
Saturday	7.30am - 3.30pm	9.00am - 12.00pm
Sundays & public holidays	No work	No work

- **Construction access to Henderson Road for Building 1**

It is proposed to construct a new construction access to Henderson Road next to the childcare centre, near Alexander St.

I object to this new access due to safety issues of traffic particularly near the Alexander St roundabout and existing childcare centre, the disruption to traffic flow on Henderson Rd and noise caused to houses on Henderson Road by construction vehicles, and believe that the construction should be able to be adequately serviced using the existing roads.

- **Contaminated materials**

The human health risk assessment does not seem to adequately deal with the risks of contaminated dust on infants (as opposed to adult workers) during construction on the existing Alexandria childcare centre, particularly lead and asbestos.

I believe that the above issues need to be addressed in this stage of the approvals, including mechanisms to ensure that the ongoing use of the site is consistent with the site's intent as a technology park.

Appendix A

Image of Vice-Chancellor's Oval detention basin during operation

