

Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements

Section 78A(8A) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act*
Schedule 2 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*

Application Number	SSD 7317
Proposal Name	Redevelopment of the Australian Technology Park (ATP)
Location	Lots 8, 9 and 12 at the ATP, Eveleigh
Applicant	Mirvac Projects
Date of Issue	29 October 2015
General Requirements	<p>The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must meet the minimum form and content requirements in clauses 6 and 7 of Schedule 2 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000</i>.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the key issues specified below, the EIS must include an environmental risk assessment to identify the potential environmental impacts associated with the development.</p> <p>Where relevant, the assessment of the key issues below, and any other significant issues identified in the risk assessment, must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate baseline data; consideration of potential cumulative impacts due to other development in the vicinity; and measures to avoid, minimise and if necessary, offset the predicted impacts, including detailed contingency plans for managing any significant risks to the environment. <p>The EIS must be accompanied by a report from a qualified quantity surveyor providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a detailed calculation of the capital investment value (CIV) (as defined in clause 3 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000</i>) of the proposal, including details of all assumptions and components from which the CIV calculation is derived; an estimate of the jobs that will be created by the future development during the construction and operational phases of the development; and certification that the information provided is accurate at the date of preparation.
Key issues	<p>The EIS must address the following specific matters:</p> <p>1. Statutory Context – including: Address the statutory provisions applying to the development contained in all relevant environmental planning instruments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the <i>Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979</i>; <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (State & Regional Development) 2011</i>; <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Development) 2005</i>; <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007</i>; <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Urban Renewal) 2010</i>; <i>State Environmental Planning Policy No. 55 – Remediation of Land</i>; <i>State Environmental Planning Policy No. 1 – Development Standards</i>; and <i>Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012</i>. <p>Identify compliance with the development standards applying to the site.</p>

Response to SEARS - Joy Brookes

General Requirements

This EIS:

- does not provide adequate baseline data**

- The EIS provides numbers of people entering and exiting Redfern station for the period 2004 to 2014 and service frequency in peak and some non peak times. It fails to include data re existing platform crowding and most importantly current loads on train services. Sydney Trains survey results for 2015 are publicly available online show trains loads through Redfern at am & pm peak hours are already significantly over capacity at up to 168%.

- Bus 308 timings and destinations included in the EIS are not correct.

- Mention of public transport via Waterloo station is not relevant as it will not be completed in the first 4 to 5 years after CBA occupation;

- No information re available parking in surrounding area for construction staff and CBA staff who do not catch public transport;

- No trip origin or transports modes data for CBA staff currently based at CBA locations to be relocated.

Broad data was sought from CBA, Mirvac, JBA Urban but not provided. This would be mandatory information for a true assessment of the potential for 10,000 workers to get to the ATP in 2020.

- No measure of pollution impacting non ATP surrounding streets within 200 metre of construction.

- does not** consider potential cumulative impacts due to other developments in the vicinity eg Ashmore Estate construction and resultant population, WestConnex construction and traffic, Waterloo station tunnel boring and construction.

- Very few additional jobs** will be created during the operational phase of the development. CBA will be relocating 10,000 jobs to the site from Parramatta, Lidcombe and Olympic Park. Only a small number of jobs will be created to staff the proposed facilities eg cafes, small supermarket, small gym, child care. This number of newly created jobs would likely represent less than 1% of the number of ATP site workers.

Any certification that the information in the EIS is accurate at the time of preparation is clearly wrong and should be challenged.

Key Issues 1. Statutory Context

The Environmental Assessment Act 1979

Object 5(a)(iv) To encourage the provision of land for public purposes

The comments in section 5.2 of the EIS are mainly focussed on tenants of the site. The Alexandria local residents would be considered as users of this land for public purposes but I am not aware of any local

<p>Address the relevant planning provisions, goals and strategic planning objectives in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Plan for Growing Sydney; • Sydney 2030 (The City of Sydney Council); • Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads- Interim Guideline; • Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (RMS); • NSW Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling; • NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan; • Redfern Waterloo Built Environment Plan (Stage One) August 2006; • Sydney Development Control Plan 2012; • Redfern Waterloo Authority Contributions Plan 2006; • Redfern Waterloo Authority Affordable Housing Contributions Plan 2006; • Sydney's Cycling Future; and • Sydney's Walking Future. 	<p>public needs analysis.</p> <p><i>Object 5(a)(v) To encourage the provision and co-ordination of community services and facilities.</i></p> <p>The major focus of the community services and facilities seem to be for the benefit of ATP tenants rather than the actual wider community. The Community Building will house some office/work stations, a small gym, childcare (but no info on waitlisting for places). Where are the facilities for local community groups? There will also be a selection of cafes and a small supermarket in competition with the large number of surrounding local cafes and the SPAR, IGA and Woolworths supermarkets and several convenience stores which are within easy walking distance from the ATP.</p> <p><i>Object 5(c) To provide increased opportunity for public involvement and participation in environmental planning and assessment.</i></p> <p>The "Community Consultation" to date has been poor. Instead of actual consultation, local community residents and businesses have been told by the developer "this is what we are doing" or, the (poor) best case, Urban Growth listing limited options and asking for preferences. I note that there will be further "consultation" prior to and during construction which I assume is just more dissemination of information on what they are doing.</p> <p>The timeframes for public assessment of this EIS was limited. There was apparently a problem with the Departments notification mail out and most local residents received the correspondence 2 weeks after the date shown on the letter. I requested an extension of time but my request was denied.</p> <p>Access to the multi page EIS documents limited the opportunity for public involvement. Details on large format pages cannot be easily viewed on tablet or most desktop screens eg whole site diagrams, shadow diagrams, floor plans.</p> <p>Many people do not have access to online documents. Hard copies have not been made available to individuals or local community groups. Single hard copies were available to view at a couple of CBD locations, the City of Sydney's Redfern centre and, as a result of a request by a resident, a set was later able to be viewed at the ATP.</p> <p><i>Assessment of matters for consideration in section 79C</i></p> <p><i>(b) the likely impacts of that development, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the locality</i></p> <p>Surrounding areas within at least 200 metres of the site are negatively impacted eg loss of solar, light pollution, loss of visual amenity, cafes and small retail unneeded and competing with established local businesses</p> <p><i>(d) any submissions made.....</i></p> <p>The comment made in relation to this section states that issues raised during consultation have been dealt with in the design of the proposal. During consultations I and many others in my suburb raised onsite and other local parking; traffic from WestConnex & construction and subsequent occupation of Ashmore Estate by 6,000 new residents; current overcrowding of Redfern platforms and trains; visual access to heritage workshops, recognition of Aboriginal social heritage. Most of these concerns have not</p>
---	--

been addressed or “dealt with”.

Compliance with Planning Policies

The proposal **does not** support “A Plan for Growing Sydney” eg the following

-Direction 1.2: Grow Greater Parramatta as Sydney’s second CBD

-Direction 1.3: Prioritise the growth area from Greater Parramatta to the Olympic Peninsula

-Direction 1.4: Transform Western Sydney through growth and investment

-Direction 1.7: Grow centres that provide more jobs closer to homes

In contrast it **does not** create new jobs anywhere (apart from construction & small retail), it just takes 10,000 existing jobs away from Western Sydney with associated negative impacts on investment, growth local economies let alone the many people whose jobs will be further from their homes.

While there will be jobs in “Central to Eveleigh” they are not new vacant jobs, just a movement of the deck chairs.

NSW Long Term Master Plan

The EIS states the area is “well served by public transport”. This is misleading. eg according to the Sydney Trains website, T1 line measured in March 2015 at Redfern had a maximum load at 166% in the morning peak and 168% in the evening peak. The platforms are also jam packed. Additional passengers generated by CBA cannot be accommodated on the platforms or in the carriages.

The EIS also mentions “improved access to Redfern Station” which is definitely needed but won’t help the people who can’t fit on platforms or in carriages.

Waterloo station will not be completed until well after occupation of the CBA buildings.

Compliance with Environmental Planning Instruments

It does not comply and the proposal sought should not be accepted. There are other ways to achieve a better outcome than the proposal for Building 1 and Building 2. See Comments.

SEPP (Major Development) 2005

Subclause 8

a), to establish business and technology parks to encourage employment generating activities

The proposal does not comply. It **does not** generate employment, it just relocate jobs from Western Sydney

f), to promote landscaped areas generating activities with strong visual and aesthetic values to enhance the amenity of the area

The proposal does not comply. It **does not** promote these values. The large footprints, of the buildings restrict visual access to the heritage workshops. The wall between Building 1 and the tennis courts as well as the 3 storey car park at the western end of Building 1 reduces the amenity of pedestrians on the path. Both Building 1 & 2 have severe impacts which detract from the local amenity of the local

neighbourhood residential areas. The EIS misses the opportunity to recognise the strong connections with Aboriginal social heritage.

Subclause 12

e), to promote landscaped areas generating activities with strong visual and aesthetic values to enhance the amenity of the area.

The proposal does not comply. It **does not** promote these values. See comments in *f)* above.

Subclause 21

See comments in my attachment

Subclause 22

See comments in my attachment

SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007

Clause 101

The assessment of impacts on Henderson Rd, in Appendix F is deficient. It does not discuss the demand for parking and resultant traffic from CBA 24x7 operations. Level of service data fails to take into account concurrent large local construction, immediate short term large population increases in Alexandria and Erskineville, road changes as part of WestConnex.

SEPP 1 (Development Standards)

The proposed variation does not comply and the proposed designs for the buildings are unreasonable and unnecessary. See comments in my attachment.

Redfern- Waterloo Built Environment Plan (Stage 1) 2006

The proposal **is not** consistent with this Plan.

Page 62 of the EIS states “offer an appropriate interface to surrounding residential areas”. The proposal does not do this. Building 1 has impacts for Henderson Rd homes and 200 metres into Alexandria, Building 2 has impacts for residents along Garden St. See comments in my attachment.

<p>2. Gross Floor Area and Land Use Mix The EIS shall address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed distribution of Gross Floor Area across the site and justify any non-compliance with the development standards within <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Development) 2005</i>; and how the proposed land use mix is consistent with the envisaged character for the ATP precinct. <p>3. Built Form and Design Quality The EIS shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate how the proposed buildings will achieve design excellence in accordance with the general urban design principles of the Redfern Waterloo Built Environment Plan (Stage One) August 2006; address the height, bulk and scale of the proposed buildings within the context of the locality and ensure the proposal does not create unacceptable environmental impacts. This shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> view analysis to and from the site from key vantage points and streetscape impacts. Photomontages or perspectives should be provided showing the proposed envelopes; analysis and detailed justification for the proposed building height in the context of adjoining developments and height controls; consideration of the relationships and interface with existing buildings, public domain and street network; detail the design quality of the buildings, with specific consideration of the overall site layout, connectivity, open spaces and edges, façades, massing, setbacks, building articulation, materials, colours, landscaping, rooftop and mechanical plant; and address how the proposal retains and promotes the existing and future built form character and fabric of ATP. <p>4. Public domain and Urban Design The EIS shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> address all aspects of the public domain including open spaces within the precinct, road paving, on-street parking, footpaths, cycleways, tree planting, outdoor dining, public art and lighting; identify and analyse key pedestrian desire lines to the surrounding area and links to Redfern Railway Station; demonstrate the pedestrian circulation, accessibility and connections on site and to surrounding streets in a schematic form; demonstrate how the proposed development will incorporate and achieve public access throughout the site, consistent with the terms of the draft Public Access Covenant prepared for the site; identify important sight lines and visual connectivity to and through the site; address water sensitive urban design opportunities within the public 	<p>Key Issues 2. Gross Floor Area and Land Use Mix.</p> <p>The changes to the GFA do not comply with the development standards, proposed variations are not justified and the proposal is not consistent with the envisaged character of the ATP project especially when taken into the context of the immediately adjacent heritage residential area.</p> <p>Key Issues 3. Built Form and Design Quality.</p> <p>The EIS does not address the height, bulk and scale of the proposed buildings in the context of the surrounding locality.</p> <p>It looks at the buildings in the context of the ATP site with scant regard to the surrounding areas. Eg Building 1. The increased GFA, height, glass facade allows direct view into local homes and yards day and night. There will also be light pollution at night. This has a direct impact on Alexandria homes 200 metres south, not just Henderson Rd where the impacts are horrific. This proposed Building also has no step down to low rise building around the ATP which was specifically addressed in the existing planning controls. Building 2 will result in loss of privacy and light pollution impacts on the residents of Garden Street.</p> <p>Both of these buildings restrict or obliterate the views of the Heritage workshops from most parts of the local footpaths, streets and homes. This loss of amenity is not dealt with in the EIS.</p> <p>Key Issues 4. Public Domain and Urban Design.</p> <p>It does not retain and promote the heritage character of the site. Rather it hides views of and reduces access to the heritage workshops which are an integral part of history of the area.</p> <p>Again, the EIS focus is within the ATP site. Some connections to the site will be poor. Eg The east/west footpath running beside Building 1 past the tennis courts is proposed to have a 1.8 metre fence on one side. This is unlikely to provide safe accessible public access at night time and will not address crime prevention through urban design principles.</p>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> domain and landscaping; and address crime prevention through urban design principles. <p>5. Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) The EIS shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detail how ESD principles (as defined in clause 7(4) of Schedule 2 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000) will be incorporated in the future design, construction and ongoing operation phases of the developments; address the potential for sustainable technologies and/or renewable energy to achieve any sustainability best practice initiatives; and 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. <p>6. Transport and Accessibility (Construction and Operation) The EIS shall include a Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrates that the level of car parking within the development will fall within the maximum 1,600 spaces permitted across the ATP under the State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Development) 2005 while: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> addressing the demand for car parking and the loss of existing tenant parking provided on the site; demonstrating that parking rates support the shift to public transport use and sustainable travel choices; demonstrates how the development will support Government strategies in promoting sustainable travel choices, for its future staff and visitors. The EIS should determine the adequacy of pedestrian and cycle facilities to meet the likely future demand of the proposed development and give consideration of measures to be implemented; and detail the traffic and transport impacts (including bus services and infrastructure) during construction and how these will be mitigated including the preparation of a preliminary Construction Traffic Management Plan. <p>7. European and Aboriginal Heritage The EIS shall include a Heritage Impact Assessment that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> addresses the impacts of the proposal on the heritage significance of the ATP precinct; addresses how the proposal complies with the policies of the Australian Technology Park Conservation Management Plan endorsed by the Heritage Council of NSW on 20 March 2014; assesses the impact of the proposal on any aboriginal and non-aboriginal archaeology within the ATP precinct and outline any proposed management and conservation measures to protect and preserve archaeology; and demonstrates how the proposal will achieve collective management of heritage significant assets of the ATP precinct and complies with the objectives of the draft Heritage Covenant, heritage asset management strategy, and section 170 Register. <p>8. Contributions and/or Voluntary Planning Agreement The EIS shall address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the contributions payable pursuant to the Redfern-Waterloo Authority Affordable Housing Contributions Plan 2006 and the Redfern Waterloo Authority Contributions Plan 2006; and additional contributions proposed or material public benefits associated with any proposed floor space above existing planning controls. <p>9. Infrastructure Impacts The EIS shall address any potential impacts on existing Sydney Train Infrastructure in particularly the Illawarra Line Tunnels.</p>	<p>Key Issues 6. Transport and Accessibility.</p> <p>The Traffic and Transport Assessment assumptions are flawed and incomplete.</p> <p>It does not adequately address the high demand that will be generated by 2x 90 place child care places. It does not look at the preference for the many shift workers (CBA 24x7 call centre, IT, etc) to drive rather than use public transport.</p> <p>It does not address the likelihood of individual car parking spaces being occupied by different vehicles during the day and night due to shift demands of workers.</p> <p>It does not look at the traffic generated by shift workers entering and exiting the site.</p> <p>It does not look at the impacts of workers seeking parking in local surrounding streets where residents already have problems parking in the vicinity of their homes.</p> <p>It does not look at the parking problems associated with the construction and occupation of the NEP Channel 7 building.</p> <p>Information re sustainable transport options is not meaningful.</p> <p>It does not look at the existing limited capacity of public transport or the frequency or even existence of public train and bus services.</p> <p>It does not take into account the trains arriving/ departing Redfern in peak times are already over capacity and unable to accommodate the number of daily trips generated by CBA staff.</p> <p>It does not look at the inability of the Sydney rail network to increase peak train numbers through Redfern.</p> <p>It does not look at the frequency of trains for 24x7 shift workers.</p> <p>It suggests that the proposed Waterloo station and trains on that line will provide capacity for staff travel. CBA will occupy the site by 2020 but Waterloo station is not operational until at least 2024.</p> <p>The information regarding bus services and timings is wrong. Eg the 308 service frequency is incorrect, the service does not run between Redfern and the CBD during peak hours,</p> <p>It does not run between Redfern and Marrickville in the evening.</p> <p>The EIS does not address all potential impacts on Sydney Train infrastructure. eg. It does not address currently overcrowded Redfern train platforms and carriages which will be made inaccessible with the addition of the proposed staff numbers in 2020.</p>
---	---

Plans and Documents	<p>The EIS must include all relevant plans, architectural drawings, diagrams and relevant documentation required under Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000. Provide these as part of the EIS rather than as separate documents.</p> <p>In addition, the EIS must include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site plan, clearly identifying the extent of the site; • architectural drawings; • site survey plan, showing existing levels, location and height of existing and adjacent structures/buildings; • site analysis plan; • stormwater plans; • shadow diagrams; • view analysis/photomontage; • public domain and landscape plans; • 3D perspectives & photomontages of the proposed development; • heritage impact assessment; • archaeological impact assessment; • ecologically sustainable development report; • traffic and parking impact statement; • draft Construction Traffic Management Plan; • geotechnical and structural report; and • contamination report. 	
Consultation	<p>During the preparation of the EIS, you should consult with the relevant local, State or Commonwealth Government authorities, service providers, and community groups. You are recommended to consult with the City of Sydney Council, Urban Growth NSW Development Corporation, Transport for NSW, Sydney Trains, and NSW Heritage Council.</p> <p>The EIS must describe the consultation process and the issues raised, and identify where the design of the development has been amended in response to these issues. Where amendments have not been made to address an issue, a short explanation should be provided.</p>	
Further consultation after 2 years	<p>If you do not lodge a development application and EIS for the development within 2 years of the issue date of these SEARs, you must consult further with the Secretary in relation to the preparation of the EIS.</p>	
References	<p>The assessment of the key issues listed above must take into account relevant guidelines, policies, and plans as identified. While not exhaustive, the following attachment contains a list of some of the guidelines, policies, and plans that may be relevant to the environmental assessment of this proposal.</p>	