

29 March 2019

218984

Appendix A

Record and Response to Submissions

Extracts from Government agency and authority submissions received in relation to SSD 18_9270, and a response to each of these matters, has been outlined in the table below. It is noted that no submissions were received from the general public.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Extract	Response
Department of Planning and Environment (the Department)	
<p>1. Building Design</p> <p><i>I. Provide further justifications and illustrate how the detailed design proposals:</i></p> <p><i>a) reinforce the street frontage conditions along Elizabeth and Castlereagh Streets and integrate with the lower scale of 50 Martin Place</i></p>	<p>Each of the issues below are discussed in greater detail in the main RTS report, with summaries provided below.</p> <p><u>Street frontage conditions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The dominant street frontage height on Castlereagh and Elizabeth Street in proximity of the site is approximately 45m in height, created by 50 Martin Place, Qantas House, and the City Mutual Building that frame the North Site. There is otherwise considerable variety in the street frontage height on Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street in the broader context of the North Site and in the existing (pre-demolition) buildings that vary in age, character and scale and do not collectively contribute to a consistent street wall height or historic street character. The approved Concept Proposal identified the potential to define the street frontage condition along Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street, in designing the proposal as the missing link between buildings framing the North Site. This would be achieved through a 'zone of articulation' between the tower and the podium, requiring the detailed design to develop an articulated response to the key datum line of surrounding buildings, and through referencing the materiality of 50 Martin Place to continue the podium language along these frontages. The street frontage conditions are reinforced in the detailed design of the proposal, consistent with the design responses considered under the approved Concept Proposal. Along Elizabeth Street, the proposal effectively links development bordering the North Site by referencing the parapet height of 50 Martin Place and the height of Qantas House and the City Mutual Building. This is achieved by providing a terrace at the base of the tower aligned with the parapet height of 50 Martin Place, and continuing this line through the built form via deep recesses above the podium level on Elizabeth Street. The terrace and recesses create a continuous and unifying datum line and establish a consistent street frontage condition on Elizabeth Street. The proposed terrace and building recesses are also utilised on Castlereagh Street as a design treatment to reference and continue the unifying datum line, important for the legibility of the complete Precinct. However, it is recognised that the narrower width of Castlereagh Street and the curvature of this street (that bends behind the North Site past Hunter Street), means Castlereagh Street is less prominent as a continuous vista when compared to Elizabeth Street, offering more limited views of the proposal and its context at a pedestrian level. The reinforcement of predominant street frontage conditions along Castlereagh Street will, therefore, be predominantly achieved through podium materiality, recognising that on this street frontage a greater appreciation of the podium is experienced at pedestrian level. The street frontage conditions are also reinforced in the detailing of the podium, which is a reflection of the predominant architectural features of 50 Martin Place. The North Tower provides a primarily masonry base on the Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street frontages that is approximately 3 storeys in height and mirrors the granite base of 50 Martin Place, and provides fins on the upper podium that mirror the columns and rhythm of 50 Martin Place. These material responses continue the horizontal and vertical expression of 50 Martin Place, forming a contemporary extension to the 50 Martin Place building and creating a consistent condition on these frontages. The North Tower has also been designed to provide a productive and active ground plane, to reinforce the pedestrian experience along these frontages and the fine-grain human scale architecture created by a character of commercial lobbies and retail tenancies along these frontages. <p><u>Integration with lower scale of 50 Martin Place</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The North Tower provides a 6m setback to 50 Martin Place that is created by a terrace on the roof of the podium and a negative infill curtain wall at the building's junction with 50 Martin Place. These treatments visually and physically separate the tower from 50 Martin Place, to the extent that the lift overruns and cornice detailing of 50 Martin Place remain a prominent feature in the streetscape. The setback and negative space are key design moves that ensure the North Tower preserves and respects the existing scale of 50 Martin Place when viewed from Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street.

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This 6m setback is enhanced by a tapered southern facade that further steps the proposal's tower form away from 50 Martin Place. The taper on the southern facade of the building progressively increases the distance between the tower and 50 Martin Place as the building increases in height, intensifying the visual and physical separation between these two buildings. This design response gradually and comfortably transitions the lower scale 50 Martin Place to the monumental scale of the North Tower behind, and complements the proposed 6m setback in preserving the existing scale of 50 Martin Place when viewed from Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street. • The contemporary dome on the roof of 50 Martin Place has been reflected in the southern facade of the tower by using faceted tower glazing to create a 'lens' on this facade. This translucent lens echoes the contemporary dome in materiality and form, and further ensures the southern facade of the tower interfaces with 50 Martin Place. • The proposed terrace and deep recesses in the building facade define the street wall height of the podium, by emphasising and referencing the parapet height of 50 Martin Place to create a consistent street wall height with 50 Martin Place. • The materiality of the podium has also been developed to extend the detailing of 50 Martin Place along Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street, integrating the proposal with the architectural language of 50 Martin Place. This is achieved by using stone cladding to reflect the distinct granite base of 50 Martin Place and the 3 storey scale of this base, and by using projecting fins finished in a warm terracotta colour to reference the recurring columns on the upper podium of 50 Martin Place.
<p><i>b) mitigate the bulk and form of buildings, including the appropriateness of, and options for, any tower setbacks within the maximum building envelopes (including amendments to approved building envelopes under Amending Concept Proposal SSD 9347 under assessment).</i></p>	<p>Each of the issues below are discussed in greater detail in the main RTS report, with summaries provided below.</p> <p><u>Existing character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of the proposal is considered contextually appropriate as it reinforces the city's status as a global city, in-line with neighbouring 8 Chifley Square and the Deutsche Bank Building. • The proposal is not out of context in its footprint and relationship to the streetscape; • That this part of the city is not defined by typical podium and tower forms. • There is also significant variation in the street wall heights and setbacks along Martin Place, as well as the benching of the Precinct from east to west with each block forming a subtle room within the larger space of Martin Place. <p><u>Approved building envelope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approved Concept Proposal discussed the appropriateness of tower setbacks when considering potential design responses for the maximum building envelope, and developing the planning and design framework to be addressed at the detailed design phase of the development. The Concept Proposal determined that, in line with the context of the site, an appropriate design response could be achieved in the absence of tower setbacks. It was considered that the North and South Sites should establish a distinct character at the threshold locations of the Martin Place Station Precinct, requiring built form on the North and South Sites to vary the typical setback requirements for towers above a podium in Central Sydney. The North Site, particularly, should also reinforce the spatial enclosure of Chifley Square and Richard Johnson Square and align with the towers adjacent to the east on Hunter Street, to continue the scale and mass in the same proportions as these neighbouring towers. • In the assessment of the approved Concept Proposal, the GANSW confirmed that the rigorous application of setbacks may not deliver the best outcome in this part of the city and, in that respect, the DRP should be regarded as the mechanism through which to test the performance and quality of the proposed design against the intent of setbacks across the site. <p><u>Detailed proposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The detailed built form of the North Site represents a lesser building than what could otherwise be provided within the approved building envelope. The form and scale of the development has been refined from the maximum building

Extract	Response
	<p>envelope to a moulded and refined built form, in response to the site's unique context and the design direction of the DRP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above the podium, the tower has been designed to taper progressively to the building's crown. As the building height increases, the southern extent reduces and the radius of the northern corner increase. This reduces the bulk and scale of the tower and reduces the overall width of the eastern and western facades of the building, ensuring it progressively diminishes when viewing the tower at street level. This tapered form also creates a degree uniqueness or 'difference' from the surrounding built form and architecture, in recognition of the uniqueness of the site as an entry to the Martin Place Metro Precinct. • The minor tapering and rounding of the northern corners of the building contributes to the diminishing building scale as it rises in height, without degrading the tower to ground architectural expression of the Hunter Street facade of the building (discussed further below). • The tower to ground architectural expression of the Hunter Street façade of the building (also discussed in Section 2.1.3 of the main RTS report) is softened through the introduction of a reverse podium. The reverse podium suspends the base of the tower above the ground plane and station atrium, creating an open and transparent frontage on Hunter Street. The three storey opening reduces the overall bulk of the northern façade of the tower when viewed at street level. • The use of deep recesses on the eastern, western and southern facades of the tower to communicate the separation between the podium and the tower also serve to break up the massing of the tower facades. This is significant for the two storey recess on the Hunter Street façade of the building that provides a horizontal break in the façade, and articulates the tower to ground architectural treatment. • The tower has been setback 6m from 50 Martin Place above the building podium and adopts a negative infill curtain wall at the junction between 50 Martin Place and the podium. These treatments visually and physically separate the North Tower from 50 Martin Place, to the extent that the lift overruns and roof form of 50 Martin Place remain a prominent feature in the streetscape. This separation between the two buildings ensures that these structures read as separate and distinct elements, breaking up the building massing and reducing the overall bulk and form of the North Site. • The detailed materiality of the North Tower reduces the bulk of the building and creates a more human scale without the need for setbacks. The 3 storey masonry base and fins above effectively break down the mass and street wall into more human proportions and continue the character of 50 Martin Place through the streetscape. The fins contribute to defining the street wall height, terminating at the parapet height of 50 Martin Place. <p><u>Tower Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the detailed design of the North Tower has been tested and developed having regard to the site's context. It is not inconsistent with this context for the reasons discussed above, and does not undermine any existing predominant relationship between towers and podiums in the surrounding area within Central Sydney and the Martin Place Special Character Area, which was discussed at length as part of the approved Concept Proposal. • The building envelope for the North Site approved with Concept Proposal set the maximum parameters within which the future building would be designed where it was demonstrated that a tower built with zero setbacks to Castlereagh Street, Hunter Street and Elizabeth Street would fit in its context. • The Department in its assessment report for approved Concept Proposal also noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The issue of setbacks could be further explored through the detailed design; – The rigorous application of setbacks may not deliver the best outcome in this part of the city; – The DRP should be regarded as the mechanism to test the performance and quality of the proposed design against the intent of setbacks across the site, presenting an opportunity to more holistically examine the

Extract	Response
	<p>performance and quality of a more detailed architectural design response to the site and the effectiveness of any proposed setback requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the development of the detailed design in consultation with the DRP has demonstrated that the detailed design mitigates the bulk of the tower. For the same reasons, tower setbacks to Castlereagh Street, Elizabeth Street and Hunter Street were not considered necessary to mitigate the bulk and form of the North Tower. In particular, the DRP and GANSW are supportive of the building form of the North Tower following the exploration of setbacks. In particular, it is noted that significant impacts would arise to the station design if a side core is not implemented through the imposition of a setback, with the integrated station and OSD outcome ensuring a superior outcome through the opportunity to streamline station services through the tower, rather than dominating the lower ground levels. To this end, the justification for the proposed zero setbacks as outlined in the approved Concept Proposal also remains relevant, and is centred on the points discussed below, which were discussed at length in the Tzannes Urban Design Report (dated May 2017) in relation to the North Tower, and are reinforced through the Design Guidelines formally adopted by the Secretary in accordance with Condition B1 of SSD 8351: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The principle of establishing a threshold condition for the Precinct. The use of zero setbacks has the capacity to create a more distinctive character to the public space of Martin Place. The setbacks create a clear sense of arrival to Martin Place, reinforcing one of the key principles enshrined in the Gehl Urban Design Study. The tower setbacks to Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street are a significant opportunity to provide legibility to the urban morphology of the city and accentuate the importance of Martin Place as a major public space. Despite its significance in the city, Martin Place, is in effect a pedestrianised street, meaning that it is only differentiated in its formal structure from the other streets in the city through its pedestrianisation and the activities that take place there. In order to increase its differentiation or 'specialness' when moving through the city, other built form design strategies are required. The proposed zero setbacks to north – south streets (in conjunction with the design of the South Tower) contributes to providing a defining threshold to the Martin Place Station Precinct in the CBD as a whole. The relationship between these two towers also establishes the identity of the station precinct within the overall urban morphology of the city. The zero setback to Hunter Street likewise reinforces the spatial enclosure of Chifley Square and Richard Johnson Square, and is consistent with the predominant characteristics of this area detailed in the CSPS commentary. It relates directly to the commercial tower typology and scale of the adjoining buildings (8 Chifley and the Deutsche Bank building), forming the third tower with this arrangement fronting Hunter Street As identified in the approved Concept Proposal, and through the assessment of environmental impacts of the detailed design in the EIS submitted to DPE in October 2018, the absence of tower setbacks does not result in any unacceptable amenity impacts to city streets and public spaces, with the imposition of tower setbacks resulting in negligible differences in impacts such as overshadowing, wind, and sky view.
<p><i>II. Clarify and illustrate how the proposed podium articulations, materials and finishes compliment building proportions and architectural details of surrounding buildings</i></p>	<p>Each of the issues below are discussed in greater detail in the main RTS report, with summaries provided below.</p> <p>The North Site occupies an entire city block, and so whilst the North Site is not adjoined by development that is capable of redevelopment like the South Site, the North Tower has been designed with reference to neighbouring development and the wider Precinct to ground the proposal in its context. Its design is centred on establishing a mediation between the solid masonry character of 50 Martin Place and the contemporary glazed design of the adjacent towers on Hunter Street, as well as referencing the materiality and proportions of the South Site as part of a Precinct-wide design response. The detailing of the proposed podium reflects the differing site conditions that contribute to the creation of a seamless streetscape informed by the North Site's context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Relationship to 50 Martin Place</u>

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed podium has been designed with reference to 50 Martin Place that adjoins the proposal and forms the primary address and architectural 'anchor' for the North Site. The podium forms a contemporary interpretation of the detailing and proportions of 50 Martin Place. - The proposed podium has been designed with zero setbacks to 50 Martin Place, Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street to create a defined street edge and consistent street wall on the street frontages, aligned with the footprint of 50 Martin Place. - The base of the podium has been finished in stone cladding and bronze anodised framing to match the granite and bronze framing of the 50 Martin Place base. This creates a direct visual link to 50 Martin Place at street level and creates a continuous 3 storey human scale. - Above the base, vertical aluminium fins are used mirroring the pilaster columns on 50 Martin Place and provide elements of vertical expression. These fins are finished in warm terracotta colouring to reflect the terracotta tiling in the 50 Martin Place facade. - Together, the fins and granite base refer directly to the grand order of 50 Martin Place, extending the character of this masonry facade by referencing key horizontal and vertical alignments in complementary materials. - The extent of the podium further complements the proportions of 50 Martin Place, as well as neighbouring development further to the north. The inclusion of a terrace at the base of the tower and deep recesses in the building facades, aligns the height of the podium with the parapet height of 50 Martin Place to the south and the streetwall of Qantas House and the City Mutual Building to the north, marrying together the scale and proportions of these buildings with continuous and unifying datum line. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Relationship to Hunter Street</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The podium has been also been designed with zero setbacks to Hunter Street, aligning the building with the neighbouring buildings at 8 Chifley Square and 126 Phillip Street. This creates a consistent building edge and continues the pattern of development along this frontage. It also contributes to a sense of spatial enclosure to Chifley Square and Richard Johnson Square, relating the building to these open space areas and conditions created by neighbouring development. - The extent of the podium references the unifying datum line created between 50 Martin Place, Qantas House and the City Mutual Building through the inclusion of a two storey recess on the Hunter Street façade that aligns with the recesses on the Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street facades. This creates a consistent streetwall and directly relates the scale and proportions of the podium with neighbouring development. - The 3 storey human scale created by the masonry base on the Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street frontages of the North Tower is referenced on the Hunter Street facade through the reverse podium. This reverse podium creates a recess when the tower meets the ground that is aligned with the masonry base of the other frontages, and is aligned with height of the adjoining undercroft spaces at 8 Chifley Square and 126 Phillip Street. This marries the scale and proportions of neighbouring development to the north and south and directly relates the North Tower to the commercial tower typology of buildings to the east. - As touched on previously, a key driver of the materiality of the podium has been to provide a transition between the Martin Place and Hunter Street building typologies and create a seamless streetscape when moving through the city block. The detailing of the podium has been developed so that the fins on the Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street facades reduce in depth to a glazed curtain wall as the podium moves towards Hunter Street. This graduation from solid to glazed materials relates the podium to its context. • <u>Relationship to the South Site</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The recessed terrace on Level 10 of the North Tower that articulates the extent of the podium and emphasises the key datum line of the shared parapet height between the podium, 50 Martin Place, Qantas House and Chifley Square, will be carried through in design terms on the South Site, reinforcing the predominant streetwall height through the Precinct and beyond.

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The use of high quality detailed fins and recessed elements on the upper podium, forms part of a Precinct-wide facade strategy to knit together the fine grain details of the South and North Towers with 50 Martin Place. - The adoption of a darker granite base, ceramic cladding, and bronze elements mimics the materiality of 50 Martin Place and is carried through to the South Tower to create a consistent streetwall and human scale.
<p>IV. Submit a revised response to demonstrate consistency between the detailed design proposals and the Consolidated Design Guidelines adopted with the Stage 1 Concept Approval (SSD 8351), including:</p> <p>a) specify how the detailed design proposals respond to the guidelines (and remove any reference to future detailed design applications)</p> <p>b) provide appropriate reasons why a guideline is identified as not applicable to the applications.</p>	<p>The proposal's compliance with the Consolidated Design Guidelines, as amended, is included in the Design Report prepared by JPW in Appendix B. This response specifies where a guideline is not applicable, such as in instances where the guideline refers to the design of the South Site, public domain, or station elements not subject to this application.</p>
<p>2. Activation and integration with metro station</p> <p>i. Prepare and submit a wayfinding strategy for the over station development in response to advice from DRP and GANSW. The strategy shall be complementary to any wayfinding strategy and station design precinct plan for the metro station and shall include:</p> <p>a) project responses to DRP advice on the design (size and width) of through site links with respect to pedestrian legibility, permeability, safety and capacity</p> <p>b) definition of publicly accessible areas of the over station development and demonstration that the design of these areas including the through site links will achieve equitable access</p> <p>c) illustrations of the pedestrian experience along the through site links such as perspectives or sketches.</p>	<p>A Wayfinding Strategy has been prepared by Grimshaw (refer to Appendix M). The Wayfinding Strategy describes how the planning and design of the ground plane around the station and OSD entries has been developed around the principle of prioritising pedestrian movement within one of Sydney's most important public urban spaces. The Wayfinding Strategy also describes how the design of the through site links respond to advice from the DRP, describes the definition of publicly accessible areas and provides illustrations of the pedestrian experience of the spaces. Each of these is summarised in the sections below.</p> <p>The Wayfinding Strategy acknowledges that people respond to different cues within an environment, often without realising that these cues are what is driving their decision making. The strategy discusses how the design of the overall project (including station and OSD) uses a combination of elements (including accessibility, legibility, definition of spaces, sightlines and pedestrian experience of site connections) to deliver effective wayfinding in a manner which is sympathetic to and appropriate for one of Sydney's most important public urban spaces.</p> <p>The strategy demonstrates how the architectural design leverages intuitive wayfinding principles to deliver a customer-focussed environment. Our design uses a combination of good planning, architectural forms, natural light, artificial illumination, colour, and materials to ensure customers can intuitively navigate along their route through the Station and wider precinct. Refer to Appendix B for more information.</p> <p>a) <u>design of the through-site link</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The detailed design of the through-site link has been tested and developed in consultation with the DRP, including the dimensions, alignment, and entrances to the link. • The through-site link, which abuts 50 Martin Place, has been benchmarked against other contemporary through-site links in the CBD in the Design Report prepared by JPW in Appendix B. This analysis confirms that the proportions of the proposed link within the North Tower is comparable to these other functioning links within the CBD and can appropriately cater for pedestrians accessing and travelling through the site. Existing and contemporary links in the CBD offer the same distances and width, are enclosed or semi-enclosed within the building structure, and partially comprise stairs at one end of the link to address the change in level between street frontages. • The legibility of this link as a publicly accessible space and the permeability of the link is reinforced through detailed design and materiality. The paving within the proposed link will adopt the same colours and materials as that in the public domain to promote seamless connection with the public domain, assist wayfinding, and emphasise the publicly accessible character of this space. Internally, the southern facade of the link is finished in a neutral brown colour to reflect the more civic and public nature of this space and provide a backdrop for future public artworks.

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised CPTED report prepared by Arup (Appendix I) considers the detailed design of the through-site link and confirms that the proposed link can operate safely as it will benefit from natural surveillance from the adjacent public streets and retail areas overlooking this space and interfacing with the ground plane. Further design measures such as lighting within the link and at the entrances will benefit the safe operation of the link. <p>b) <u>definition of publicly accessible areas</u></p> <p>The differentiation between private areas, and public and publicly accessible private areas, is communicated through various design cues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The through-site link is designed to encourage public access and stewardship of these spaces. The design of these space utilises open entrances and unobstructed pathways, to encourage the free movement and access by members of the public during the nominated operating hours. Public artworks will be incorporated into the through-site link to draw people into this space. A colour, materials and finishes palette sensitive to the existing urban character extends through public links to the Station to aid wayfinding, accentuate movement, and reinforce the public character of the Station precinct. Future wayfinding signage in the form of Metro signs consistent with the line-wide design being developed, and business identification signage for the retail tenancies and commercial lobby, will further distinguish between the public station entrances and publicly accessible private areas. Awnings will also define the commercial and retail entrances associated with the OSD. The multi-level openings for the metro station entrance on Hunter Street have been orientated to directly address Chifley Square and Richard Johnson Square, aligning with pedestrian desire lines to the north of the city for wayfinding and to encourage pedestrian access. Full height glazing is used where practicable to allow views into these spaces from street frontages and elsewhere in the ground plane. The use of glass retains a sense of activity and connection to the public spaces, whilst providing a degree of access control to communicate the semi-public use of these areas. Entrances to the retail tenancies will be locked out of hours (as determined through separate fit-outs). Entry to the OSD commercial lobby is distinguished from the more public nature of the retail tenancies by elevating the reception above the station entry hall to the Mezzanine Level. Out of hours access to the lobby can be managed via an electronic access system and on-site security, with the potential for turnstiles to be integrated at the mezzanine level. <p>Equitable access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equitable access to the through-site link, commercial lobby, and retail tenancies is achieved where practicable in the detailed design of the North Tower, as discussed in the Design Report prepared by JPW (Appendix B) and the DDA-Accessibility Statement at Appendix Q of the EIS. It is noted that the main Station entrance on Hunter Street provides universal access to the through-site link, noting that further design work has been completed to reduce the prominence of stairs. The requirements for floor levels for the tower and station beneath, the slope of the site from Elizabeth Street to Castlereagh Street, ensures grade access in the through-site link is not possible <p>c) <u>illustrations of the pedestrian experience</u></p> <p>Additional perspectives and photomontages of the pedestrian experience for the through-site link have been developed by JPW and are contained in the Design Report at Appendix B. Further illustrations of the pedestrian experience of the through site link are being prepared and will be submitted under separate cover.</p>
<p>II. Provide details on security and operation of the proposed through site links and the lobby areas of the over station development and address:</p>	<p>a) <u>hours of operation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The through-site link will operate from 6am to 10pm, consistent with the standard hours nominated in Council's DCP. After hours, access to this space will be restricted by security gates.

Extract	Response
<p>a) hours of operation of publicly accessible areas</p> <p>b) sightlines and passive/active surveillance of through site links, lift lobbies, visual connection from Martin Place and the streets to retail spaces and publicly accessible areas</p> <p>c) consider the use of spatial design and visual cues to delineate semi-private/secured access to office towers from retail spaces and publicly accessible areas as preferred options over potential security barriers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The station entry will be closed between 2am and 6am when Metro services will no longer be running, in accordance with the recommendations of the Security Assessment completed for the site. The operating hours of the retail tenancies will be confirmed at the appropriate future stage when the tenants of these spaces are known. The commercial OSD lobby will be publicly accessible during standard office hours, and will be restricted to authorised personnel outside of these hours via an electronic access system and on-site security, with the potential for turnstiles to be integrated at the Mezzanine level. <p>b) <u>sightlines and passive surveillance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The through-site link benefits from good levels of passive surveillance both from within the podium and the surrounding street network and public domain. The station entry, retail tenancies and commercial lobby have also been designed to encourage passive surveillance and unimpeded visual connections to public areas where possible. The revised CPTED report prepared by Arup (Appendix I) confirms that there are good sightlines from the street corners around the metro station entry on Hunter Street, which have been aligned with Chifley Square and Richard Johnson Square. The proposed retail tenancies and commercial lobby either front street edges and/or the station entry hall, benefiting from and contributing to activity and passive surveillance in these spaces. The glazed shopfronts to retail spaces are also maximised in the North Tower to ensure a visually permeable ground plane, allowing for clear sightlines between Metro entrances and other publicly accessible areas. <p>c) <u>spatial design and visual cues to delineate areas</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The through-site link is designed to encourage public access and stewardship of these spaces. The design of these space utilises open entrances and unobstructed pathways, to encourage the free movement and access by members of the public during the nominated operating hours. A colour, materials and finishes palette sensitive to the existing urban character extends through public links to the Station to aid wayfinding, accentuate movement, and reinforce the public character of the Station precinct. Future wayfinding signage in the form of Metro signs consistent with the line-wide design being developed, and business identification signage for the retail tenancies and commercial lobby, will further distinguish between the public station entrances and publicly accessible private areas. Awnings will also define the commercial and retail entrances associated with the OSD. The multi-level openings for the metro station entrance on Hunter Street have been orientated to directly address Chifley Square and Richard Johnson Square, aligning with pedestrian desire lines to the north of the city for wayfinding and to encourage pedestrian access. Full height glazing is used where practicable to allow into these spaces from street frontages and elsewhere in the ground plane. The use of glass retains a sense of activity and connection to the public spaces, whilst providing a degree of access control to communicate the semi-public use of these areas. Entrances to the retail tenancies will be locked out of hours (as determined through separate fit-outs). Entry to the OSD commercial lobby distinguished from the more public nature of the retail tenancies by elevating the reception above the station entry hall to the Mezzanine Level. Out of hours access to the lobby can be managed via an electronic access system and on-site security, with the potential for turnstiles to be integrated at the mezzanine level.
<p>III. Provide a retail activation strategy and consider further improvement to the interface between the proposed buildings and the public domain/street frontages of the site. This must include:</p> <p><u>North Site</u></p>	<p><u>Retail Strategy</u></p> <p>A Retail Activation Strategy has been prepared by Retail Activation (Appendix L), which provides the vision and concept for the tailoring and legibility of retail spaces being provided across the Precinct. The strategy sets a clear retail vision for the precinct, being to develop a world class public transit project, a vibrant destination, driven by an engaging first-class customer experience, ensuring the commercial and retail components integrate seamlessly with the public realm. The Strategy will be presented to the DRP at the scheduled meeting in April (meeting #10).</p>

Extract	Response
<p>a) Further design resolution and details of the tower to ground connection at Hunter Street, particularly in terms of column design, site levels and integration with the metro station entrance and related public domain area.</p>	<p>The retail strategy has been developed to have a broad market appeal, including office workers, commuters, local residents, visitors and tourists, providing a place for everyone. The strategy considers the vision for each of the retail 'precincts' within the overall project, with the north site's main retail frontages being Elizabeth Street (lower ground and ground) and Castlereagh Street.</p> <p>The proposed retail spaces promote the activation of the street frontages, ground plane, and Metro areas within the North Tower, whilst offering functional spaces capable of accommodating a range of retail uses. Retail space on the Elizabeth Street frontage of the site has been designed as a split-level space, capable of accommodating a prominent anchor retail tenant or two smaller tenants that activate both the street and the Lower Ground concourse entry to add further visual connectivity to the Metro. The Castlereagh Street retail tenancy is located adjacent to the entry to the end of trip facilities.</p> <p><u>Hunter Street tower to ground connection</u></p> <p>The Hunter Street façade is designed to enhance and give prominence to the Station entry and to maximise its significance by providing clear wayfinding to the Concourse below. The granite walls along Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street stop short from the Hunter Street building edge to punctuate the Metro entrances. The tower glazing at Level 2, together with expressed external structural columns, come down to ground from the tower above to frame the Metro entrance hall on Hunter Street. Full height glazing along this edge allows natural daylight and visual connection to the grand Metro entrance space beyond, with minimal clutter on Hunter Street to maximise pedestrian flow paths across the site.</p> <p>The figures below demonstrate the benefits of the design of the tower to ground connection at Hunter Street, which result in clear sightlines and permeable pedestrian flow for future patrons.</p>
<p>IV. Provide details of architectural treatment/integration of services, ventilation and fire egress, etc on street level for both sites.</p>	<p>Macquarie's proposal centres on delivering Martin Place Station in its entirety as part of the Sydney Metro Project through an integrated civic, retail and commercial development. The integration of the station and OSD as part of this enables services for the Metro and OSD to be consolidated vertically through the building, minimising their scale and impact on street frontages and maximising opportunities for activity. The design of the ground plane has successfully integrated and minimised plant and services where possible, whilst also recognising that the development needs to achieve certain operational standards, which limits the available design responses for services, lifts and ducts.</p> <p>Appropriately, two thirds of the site perimeter are active, open and permeable. The following has informed the proposal's interface with street frontages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian circulation is prioritised through large and voluminous entries to the station and OSD and the proposed through-site link. Providing these openings and maximising pedestrian circulation and permeability at the ground plane is essential to the successful and safe operation of the station and OSD, and contributes to the activation of these frontages. Pedestrian entrances occupy a significant proportion of the ground plane including the entire Hunter Street frontage and parts of the Elizabeth and Castlereagh Street frontages. • With the priority to maximise permeability and circulation, and the provision of retail spaces, the space available for service ducts, fire exits and access lifts servicing the development is limited to the minimum extent possible. The intent to limit the footprint of services and their interface with the public domain within this limited space is achieved by relocating plant and back of house areas underground where possible, and vertically stacking services above ground to minimise their footprint and impact on publicly accessible lower levels. The service risers have been consolidated and are located in those parts of the site that would otherwise have least value for the activation and amenity of the public domain. The exhaust outlets have been concealed in the façade design and positioned well above street level, ensuring they do not impact on the design or amenity of the lower levels of the proposed building. • The reception area for the OSD has been raised above the ground plane and main pedestrian entrances. This design solution ensures that the lift pits for the OSD tower do not extend into the ground plane, and underground, removing the requirement to interface with Castlereagh Street and enabling active frontages below.

Extract	Response
	<p>It is recognised that building services are more prominent at the site's interface with Elizabeth Street due to the proposed side core, which has been informed by the spatial and structural requirements of the station and OSD and the desire to deliver a central atrium and high degree of light penetration to the station below. The atrium that is created by positioning the core on the western side of the building benefits the ground plane and public accessible areas. It creates a station entry that is spacious and visually prominent in the streetscape, assisting wayfinding, and importantly allows daylight penetration from this grand station entry into the station levels beneath. The central atrium benefits the amenity of the station as well as the OSD above, and visually connects the station platforms to the ground plane and street above.</p>
<p>3. Heritage <i>I. Provide further information to satisfy the requirements of the SEARs for Heritage Interpretation Plan and consultation with NSW Heritage Council</i> <i>II. Detail how the Heritage Interpretation Plans for the over station developments relate to the Sydney Metro City and Southwest Heritage Interpretation Strategy.</i> <i>Note: Please also refer to NSW Heritage Council's submissions in responding to issues mentioned in Point 3.</i></p>	<p><u>Heritage Interpretation</u></p> <p>TKD Heritage has prepared a Heritage Interpretation Strategy to inform the preparation of a Heritage Interpretation Plan as part of the Sydney Metro Martin Place Station Precinct (incorporating the station and OSD).</p> <p>The strategy (Appendix E) outlines the history and significance of heritage places associated with the Precinct for interpretation, and identifies media and locations for future implementation. The strategy represents the next phase of detailed investigations into the heritage context of the site and scope for heritage interpretation to be integrated with the site and OSD. It is informed by the Sydney Metro City and Southwest Heritage Interpretation Strategy and Interpretation Plan, and will inform a future detailed Heritage Interpretation Plan for the Precinct. The preparation of a detailed Heritage Interpretation Plan will be developed with the Heritage Council as the next phase of implementation, with additional studies, consultation, and testing to be completed to inform the plan. The strategy identifies that the following would be required to inform the next phase of the heritage interpretation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consultation with the Heritage Council of NSW to confirm the approach to heritage interpretation outlined in the Heritage Interpretation Strategy; • consideration of any recommendations contained in the salvage reports for the demolished building at 7 Elizabeth Street and the Martin Place Railway Station; • coordination of heritage interpretation with the Public Art Strategy; and • liaison with the architectural team to develop and coordinate an integrated approach to heritage interpretation, recognising that the detailed design for the Station and OSD is not finalised at this time. <p>The Heritage Interpretation Strategy developed by TKD Heritage reflects on the heritage character and significance of the site and surrounding area, including Martin Place, and outlines possible locations, methods and media to promote an understanding of the history of the Precinct. The story of the Precinct will be principally explained through the retention, restoration, and reconstruction of significant spaces, elements, and fabric as well as salvaged artwork and materials. This includes reinstating two artworks by Douglas Annand, a sculpture by Tom Bass, and the Institute of Engineers plaque.</p> <p>It is recommended that a condition of consent be imposed requiring the preparation of a Heritage Interpretation Plan in accordance with the Heritage Interpretation Strategy and the Sydney Metro City and Southwest Heritage Interpretation Strategy, and in consultation with the Heritage Council and OEH. The installation of all interpretation elements will occur prior to the practical completion of the development.</p> <p><u>Consultation</u></p> <p>It was noted in the Engagement Summary Report submitted with the EIS that regular consultation has been completed with the Heritage Council over the lifespan of the project to date. In response to the Department's and Heritage Council's requests, the Heritage Impact Statement submitted with the EIS has been updated to document all consultation undertaken with the Heritage Council, including the identification of issues raised and how the proposal has responded to those issues (refer to Appendix F). The updated statement also provides an indicative schedule of key milestones where the Heritage Council will be provided with the opportunity to flag issues and timeframes for ongoing consultation.</p>

Extract	Response
<p>4. Signage <i>Consider the appropriateness of the proposed signage zones (and the deferral of detailed design of the signs) with respect to:</i></p> <p><u>North Site</u> <i>1. Integration of proposed signage zones with the curved facade of the North Tower with faceted panels</i></p>	<p>In order to respond to concerns raised by Council about the number of proposed signage zones, the Architectural Plans have been revised (Appendix B) to reduce the extent of signage, by removing one of the top of building signage zones. The revised design addresses Council's comments and provides two top of building signage zones, being a zone on the northern façade and western facade. The proposed signage zones have been designed with consideration of the North Tower's building proportions, roof form and the location of plant.</p> <p>The proposed zones determine the maximum size and location of future signage on the site, ensuring that signage is integrated with the detailed design of the tower. It recognises that design placement and sizing is an important consideration for this phase of the detailed design process, whilst allowing for further design development and testing to be undertaken to determine the detailed location, size, materials, detailed design, and illumination of signage on the façades of the North Tower. Future signage will need to reference the final approved design of the tower, site characteristics, and the unique context of the site.</p> <p>This further detailed design process will be subject to review and assessment. Namely, the detailed design of signs within the signage zones will be subject to the approval of the Secretary prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate, which will form a condition of consent (in the event that an approval is issued). This process has been completed for developments of this scale, type and location, including for SSD DAs at the Sydney International Convention Centre, Barangaroo, and Australian Technology Park.</p> <p>Included in Appendix S is a signage strategy which provides an illustrative scheme of potential future signage within the signage zones. The illustrative scheme demonstrates that signage within these zones can integrate with the curved façade of the building, in prominent locations and where they will not impact on tenant views. The zones are also located to ensure there is no impact to the operation of a future building maintenance unit (BMU).</p>
<p>5. Shared facilities and access <i>Clarify the detailed design and management of the proposed shared use of loading, EOT and other service facilities for the whole of the Precinct, including:</i></p> <p><i>1. Efficiency of shared use of facilities with consideration of security, capacity and user experience (ease of use and safety)</i></p>	<p>Arup has prepared an updated and Traffic, Pedestrian and Parking Report (Appendix C of the RTS report) and Loading Dock Management Plan (also Appendix C of the RTS report), outlining how the proposed shared facilities offer the best possible solution for the site in terms of security, capacity, and user experience. Owing to the constraints of the South Site, which is small in size and is required to accommodate plant, services, and structure associated with the metro station beneath, there is no possibility to provide the required facilities for the South Tower solely on the South Site. The shared facilities and access in a Precinct-wide approach is the best possible and only achievable outcome to ensure both the North Site and South Site have adequate services and facilities. Notwithstanding this shared arrangement, the facilities for the North Site are considered to be well designed and adequate.</p> <p><u>Bicycle parking and end of trip facilities</u></p> <p>Dedicated bicycle parking and end of trip facilities have been provided within the North Site basement for use of the occupants of 50 Martin Place and the North Tower. Considerations of functionality, security, capacity, and user experience have been at the heart of the design and proposed management of these facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Security – The bicycle parking and end of trip facilities will be open from 6am to 10pm daily, consistent with the opening hours for the through-site link, to ensure there is site activity and thereby limiting potential anti-social behaviour. Outside of hours, the entrance to these facilities off Castlereagh Street will be secured via a metal clad door. These facilities will also only be accessed via electronic swipe card, and will be separated from the other facilities for 50 Martin Place, retail tenancies, and the South Site that are located in other contained areas of the building basement. The facilities are also influenced by the atrium, with the glazing in the central atrium on Level B2 increasing opportunities for passive surveillance. Capacity – The proposed bicycle parking and end of trip facilities are sufficient to service the occupants of the South Tower. The quantum provided has been designed with consideration of Green Star requirements noting that the DCP does not apply in this instance. Notwithstanding this, Arup note that the quantum is comparable to that required under the Sydney DCP 2012 for staff but less than that required for visitors. This outcome remains acceptable given site's central location and very high levels of access to public transport, meaning visitors of the South Tower will largely be

Extract	Response
	<p>travelling my foot, public transport, or point to point transfers, with many trips originating from within the Sydney CBD. Arup note that the existing cycling mode share in the CBD is approximately 2% and therefore the provision of bike parking for 7.5% of staff is considered to sufficiently meet the anticipated demand while also futureproofing for any increase in cycling in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>User experience</i> – Wayfinding and user experience are essential to the success of the proposed off-site facilities. Facilities are readily accessible from the street network and will benefit from wayfinding signs, staff inductions, and transport information on the company website and distributed to visitors.
<i>II. Detailed design of the loading areas with respect to relevant Australian Standards</i>	<p>Arup confirm in the updated Traffic, Pedestrian and Parking Report (Appendix C) that Class 2 secure bicycle parking spaces will be provided for the employees of the building while Class 3 bicycle racks for visitors and Metro users will be provided (i.e. easily accessible and clearly signposted), in accordance with Australian Standards.</p> <p>The updated Loading Dock Management Plan (Appendix C) provides details of the compliance of the loading dock with Australian Standards. In summary, the proposed design is generally in accordance with AS2890.2-2002 Off-street Commercial Vehicle Facilities. Further details can found in Section 2.1 of the Loading Dock Management Plan.</p>
<i>III. Comparison with Sydney DCP 2012 requirements</i>	<p>The proposed bicycle parking and end of trip facilities have been designed to address the building's Green Star requirements. Their application to the DCP rates confirms the staff facilities are comparable, but the facilities for visitors are less than would otherwise be suggested. Arup confirm that this arrangement remains adequate to service the site in view of the site's central location, its access to public transport, and that the majority of visitor trips to the site are unlikely to be via bicycle.</p>
<i>IV. Details of any necessary agreement/covenants to support on-going shared use and management.</i>	<p>Any easements/covenants that are required to enable access to the facilities on the North Site for the South Site will be confirmed at the appropriate future stage through the preparation of draft subdivision plans and associated Section 88B instruments. This will be completed following the detailed design of the North Site and South Site and prior to the occupation and operation of these facilities.</p>
6. Additional information <i>I. Provide options to improve wind conditions where areas are designed for outdoor seating or outdoor uses, including assessment of visual impacts of any recommended structures</i>	<p>A wind assessment addendum has been prepared by CPP and is included in Appendix G. The letter considers the appropriateness of wind conditions on the terraces of each tower. It confirms that the north and east facing terraces will meet the criteria for outdoor dining and pedestrians sitting respectively, which enables these spaces to be used for dining or long-term seating or stationary activity.</p> <p>The expected wind conditions on the south facing terrace are expected to be classified as pedestrian standing, associated with short and medium-term occupation. The terrace would experience winds less than 4m/s for 90% of the time, meaning that it is only during a small proportion of the time (10%) where the winds would be stronger than a light breeze.</p> <p>Overall, CPP advise that measured conditions for the current design is similar to or better than comparable terraces in the Sydney CBD. The intended fit-out and use of the terraces will be informed by any specific tenant requirements, and which may include depending on the tenant's brief and requirements, the adoption of specific localised wind mitigation measures.</p>
<i>II. Illustrate how the detailed design proposals explore opportunities to meet stretch ESD targets as required by future environmental assessment requirement of the Concept Approval (SSD 8351)</i>	<p>An ESD addendum letter has been prepared by Arup and is included in Appendix N, which outlines how the 'stretch targets' identified in the Ecologically Sustainable Design, Green Star and NABERS report, prepared by ARUP (July 2018) are being pursued in the detailed design of the North Site, and the Precinct widely. These strategies will support the delivery of a contemporary and highly sustainable workplace that realises the opportunities to integrate the Precinct with the wider community and to implement emerging workplace practices in wellbeing and sustainability, communication and digital technologies.</p>
<i>III. Certify consultant studies (i.e. shadow study, visual impact study, sky view assessment and wind tunnel study) are accurate based on the digital modelling of the proposals and are not affected by adjustments to the model during exhibition in consultation with the City of Sydney</i>	<p>A number of verification letters have been prepared by the consultant team which certify that consultant studies submitted with the EIS which were based on the digital modelling are not affected by adjustments to the model during exhibition in consultation with the City of Sydney. These are:</p>

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix H: Wind Assessment Verification letter (CPP) • Appendix J: Sky View Assessment Verification Letter (Surface Design) • Appendix K: Visual Impact Assessment Verification letter (Tzannes/Arterra) <p>An updated shadow study (Appendix O) has been prepared in order to ensure the shadow study is accurate having regard to the adjustments to the model during exhibition in consultation with the City of Sydney. Refer to Section 4.6 of the main RTS report for further discussion.</p>
<p>IV. Provide Gross Floor Area (GFA) calculations and detailed breakdown of project GFA/FSR denoting any implications of works proposed for 50 Martin Place.</p>	<p>An updated schedule of GFA calculations and a detailed breakdown of the project GFA/FSR noting GFA implications to 50 Martin Place as a result of works to 50 Martin Place is included in Appendix B.</p>
City of Sydney Council (the City)	
<p>Amending Concept Application <i>It is noted that the separate amending application (SSD 9347) to modify the approved concept building envelope to the south site (SSD 9351) is as of the date of writing yet to be determined. Prior to the determination of that amending application it is pre-emptive to further the assessment of the current south site application.</i></p>	<p>Whilst the new Stage 1 Amending DA encompasses the entire Precinct, it principally relates to amending the Concept Proposal's building envelope for the South Site. The progression of this Stage 2 SSD DA for the North Site is not impacted by the assessment of the concurrent Stage 1 Amending DA, which may be assessed and determined independently. Further, the determination of the Stage 1 Amending DA is considered to be certain and imminent.</p>
<p>North Site <i>The proposed building form of the north tower is incongruous to the character of central Sydney and the Martin Place Special Character area. The City recommends that the northern tower be setback by at least 8m from all street frontages above the podium height of 50 Martin Place.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The detailed design of the North Tower has been tested and developed having regard to the site's context. It is not inconsistent with this context, and does not undermine any existing predominant relationship between towers and podiums in the surrounding area within Central Sydney and the Martin Place Special Character Area, which was discussed at length as part of the approved Concept Proposal. • The building envelope for the North Site determined under the approved with Concept Proposal sets the maximum parameters within which the future building is to be designed. It was demonstrating when developing this envelope that a tower built with zero setbacks to Castlereagh Street, Hunter Street and Elizabeth Street would fit in its context. • To this end, the justification for the proposed zero setbacks as outlined in the approved Concept Proposal also remains relevant, and is centred on the points discussed below, which were discussed at length in the Tzannes Urban Design Report (dated May 2017) in relation to the North Tower, and are reinforced through the Design Guidelines formally adopted by the Secretary in accordance with Condition B1 of SSD 8351: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The principle of establishing a threshold condition for the Martin Place metro station Precinct. The use of zero setbacks has the capacity to create a more distinctive character to the public space of Martin Place. The setbacks create a clear sense of arrival to Martin Place, reinforcing one of the key principles enshrined in the Gehl Urban Design Study. The tower setbacks to Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street are a significant opportunity to provide legibility to the urban morphology of the city and accentuate the importance of Martin Place as a major public space. - Despite its significance in the city, Martin Place, is in effect a pedestrianised street, meaning that it is only differentiated in its formal structure from the other streets in the city through its pedestrianisation and the activities that take place there. In order to increase its differentiation or 'specialness' when moving through the city, other built form design strategies are required. The proposed zero setbacks to north – south streets (in conjunction with the design of the South Tower) contributes to providing a defining threshold to the Martin Place Station Precinct in the CBD as a whole. The relationship between these two towers also establishes the identity of the station precinct within the overall urban morphology of the city. - The zero setback to Hunter Street likewise reinforces the spatial enclosure of Chifley Square and Richard Johnson Square, and is consistent with the predominant characteristics of this area detailed in the CSPS commentary. It relates directly to the commercial tower typology and scale of the adjoining buildings (8 Chifley and the Deutsche Bank building), forming the third tower with this arrangement fronting Hunter Street.

Extract	Response
<p><i>In particular a setback above the podium is essential for Elizabeth Street frontage to address overshadowing of Martin Place which is avoidable.</i></p>	<p>The detailed built form of the North Tower has been the subject of ongoing assessment and development, which has demonstrated that the imposition of tower setbacks will not significantly improve the amenity of public areas surrounding the site. As is discussed in detail in Section 2.1.3 of the RTS, the provision of setbacks above the podium will not significantly improve environmental impacts to the amenity of the surrounding streets in terms of wind, skyview, and overshadowing.</p> <p>When considering the overshadowing impact of the proposal, the overall shadows cast by the proposed detailed design provide 299m² of additional solar access to the ground plane of Martin Place when compared to shadows cast by the approved building envelope. The additional solar access to Martin Place equates to 18% more additional direct sunlight between 12pm and 2pm on 14 April when compared to the approved building envelope and therefore meets the requirements of Condition B2(b).</p>
<p><i>The City is concerned that the northern tower has been designed to create internal amenity within the tower (in the form of voids and linking stairs) at the expense of the amenity of the public streets which are faced by services, lifts and ducts.</i></p>	<p>The design of the ground plane has successfully integrated and minimised plant and services where possible, whilst also recognising that the development needs to achieve certain operational standards, which limits the available design responses for services, lifts and ducts. Appropriately two thirds of the site perimeter is active, open and permeable.</p> <p>It is recognised that building services are more prominent at the sites interface with Elizabeth Street owing to the proposed side core. This side core has been informed by the spatial and structural requirements of the station and OSD and the desire to deliver a central atrium. The atrium that is created by positioning the core on the western side of the building benefits the ground plane and public accessible areas, and does not merely service the internal amenity. The atrium creates a Station entry that is spacious and visually prominent in the streetscape, assists wayfinding, and importantly allows daylight penetration from this grand Station entry into the levels beneath. The central atrium benefits the amenity of the Station as well as the OSD above, and visually connects the platforms to the ground plane and street above.</p> <p>It is noted that significant impacts would arise to the station design if a side core is not implemented through the imposition of a setback, with the integrated station and OSD outcome ensuring a superior outcome through the opportunity to streamline station services through the tower, rather than dominating the lower ground levels.</p> <p>As identified in the approved Concept Proposal, and through the assessment of the environmental impacts of the detailed design in the EIS submitted to the DPE in October 2018, the absence of tower setbacks does not result in any unacceptable amenity impacts to city streets and public spaces, with the imposition of tower setbacks resulting in negligible differences in impacts such as overshadowing, wind, and sky view to city streets. The approved Concept Proposal also illustrated that there would be negligible differences between the approved building envelope (zero setbacks) and a building envelope with tower setbacks of 8m to Castlereagh Street, Elizabeth Street and Hunter Street as preferred by the City of Sydney.</p> <p>Refer to Table 1 of the main RTS report for further discussion.</p>
<p>Design excellence</p> <p><i>The City has previously commented on the importance of incorporating competitive design processes as part of proposals in accordance with Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and the 'City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy'.</i></p> <p><i>The City maintains that a competitive design process would achieve a superior outcome in terms of design excellence as compared to the design development of the schemes within the alternative design process as a design review panel.</i></p>	<p>As part of the Stage 1 Concept Proposal, an alternative design excellence approach for the project was approved by the Minister for Planning, in place of the competitive design process typically used under clause 6.21(5) of the Sydney LEP 2012 for standard development projects in Central Sydney. The approved alternative process recognised the unique circumstances of the project, where the approved CSSI station works are intricately linked to the OSD from a design, construction, functionality, and delivery perspective, and that any requirement for a design competition could only apply to the OSD component of the project, and not the station. The alternative design excellence process, employing the expertise of a site-specific DRP, was recognised as being the best possible outcome for the design development of a unique and constrained project.</p>
<p>Public domain outcome</p>	<p>The detailed design and finalisation of the public domain is subject to a separate and concurrent planning process dictated by the CSSI Approval, and does not form part of the Stage 2 SSD DA for the North Site. As this component of the Precinct is</p>

Extract	Response
<p><i>Both applications note that public domain works within and surrounding the station precinct form part of the Metro CSSI approval (SSI 7400), and an "Interchange Access Plan" and "Station Design and Precinct Plan" (Conditions E92 and E101 respectively) are required as part of that approval. The applications also notes that a holistic approach to the CSSI/Station and OSD integration is an important consideration.</i></p> <p><i>The "Interchange Access Plan" is required to inform the final design of transport and access facilities and services, including footpaths, traffic and road changes and integration with the public domain. The "Station Design and Precinct Plan" is to provide an integrated urban and place making outcome. Both are required to be approved by the Secretary. There is no clear program of when these plans will be finalised.</i></p> <p><i>The finalisation of the public domain details including services and utilities around both of the stations are recognised by all parties as being an important considerations in terms of the current proposals. These important public domain details should either form part of this application, or be required to be addressed and resolved concurrently with this application to ensure that this important integration is achieved.</i></p> <p><i>The City is concerned that separation of the consideration of the public domain and services to the OSD applications will result in significant compromises to the public domain delivery in Martin Place and the surrounding public domain.</i></p> <p><i>The City is concerned that the structural design and spatial coordination will not allow the realisation of all planned for trees in Martin Place. The City recommends that the station spatial/structural design be reviewed to confirm that all trees indicated on the plans can be provided to the City's standards, particularly within Martin Place.</i></p>	<p>deemed to be CSSI, and therefore cannot form part of this SSD DA, the detailed design of the public domain, services and utilities and the like is being developed and finalised concurrently with the OSD via the separate process.</p> <p>When the NSW Government and Macquarie reached a binding agreement (through the Unsolicited Proposal process) in September 2018, Macquarie became the proponent of both the OSD and metro station, including public domain and servicing. This charges Macquarie with delivering the complete fully integrated transport and employment Precinct, and therefore the coordination of the station, buildings and publicly accessible areas.</p> <p>The design development of all of these components of the Precinct is further being overseen by the site-specific DRP and the Sydney Metro DRP, which contain three (3) common members are often convened at the same time.</p> <p>These measures ensure a single coherent vision is being developed concurrently for both the public domain and the OSD, in accordance with the established planning framework.</p>
<p><i>The Elizabeth Street frontages of both buildings are seriously compromised by services and predominance of steps and ungainly ramps (at the intersections with Martin Place and Hunter Street). The City recommends that the floor levels be reviewed to provide grade entry from Elizabeth Street to station lifts and building lobbies.</i></p>	<p>Macquarie's proposal centres on delivering Martin Place Station in its entirety as part of the Sydney Metro Project through an integrated civic, retail and commercial development. The integration of the station and OSD as part of this enables services for the Metro and OSD to be consolidated vertically through the building, minimising their scale and impact on street frontages and maximising opportunities for activity. The design of the ground plane has successfully integrated and minimised plant and services where possible, whilst also recognising that the development needs to achieve certain operational standards, which limits the available design responses for services, lifts and ducts.</p> <p>It is recognised that building services are more prominent at the site's interface with Elizabeth Street due to the proposed side core, which has been informed by the spatial and structural requirements of the station and OSD and the desire to deliver a central atrium and high degree of light penetration to the station below. The atrium that is created by positioning the core on the western side of the building benefits the ground plane and public accessible areas. It creates a station entry that is spacious and visually prominent in the streetscape, assisting wayfinding, and importantly allows daylight penetration from this grand station entry into the station levels beneath. The central atrium benefits the amenity of the station as well as the OSD above, and visually connects the station platforms to the ground plane and street above.</p>
<p><i>Alternative options are to be presented in the flooding assessment to justify the use of flood gates.</i></p>	<p>Flood gates are not proposed.</p>
<p>Shared facilities <i>The applications include the provision of bicycle parking, loading and end of trip facilities for the south site within the basement of the north site (literally an entire street block away).</i></p>	<p>Owing to the constraints of the South Site, which is small in size and is required to accommodate plant, services, and structure associated with the metro station beneath, there is no possibility to provide the required facilities for the South Tower solely on the South Site. The shared facilities and access in a Precinct-wide approach is the best possible and only achievable outcome to ensure both the North Site and South Site have adequate services and facilities.</p>

Extract	Response
<p><i>The provision of the bicycle parking and end of trip facilities in a different building a block away is not supported. The City recommends that the southern basement be redesigned to fully accommodate the required parking and facilities. Bicycle parking and end of trip facilities should be provided in accordance with Sydney DCP 2012.</i></p>	<p>The bicycle parking and end of trip facilities being provided on the North Site for the South Site have been designed to create optimal user experience. The proposed facilities are readily accessible from the street network accessed via two dedicated lifts and a dedicated stair from the Castlereagh Street level, which have been designed to accommodate the morning and afternoon peaks. The experience of these facilities will benefit from wayfinding signs, staff inductions, and transport information on the company website and distributed to visitors. Arup confirm in the revised Traffic, Pedestrian and Parking Report (Appendix C) that the provision of end of trip facilities at a centralised location to service a Precinct is not uncommon and has been successfully established within other areas of the CBD. It is noted that Macquarie have also successfully implemented this type of arrangement in the past, achieving a good user experience.</p> <p>The proposed quantum of bicycle parking and end of trip facilities provided for the North Tower is appropriate given the given the central location of the site, the high degree of accessibility of the site via public transport, and with consideration of the cycling mode share in the CBD that is approximately 2% and is less than the proposed facilities that accommodate 7.5% of regular occupants. No change is proposed to the bicycle parking and facilities for 50 Martin Place also being accommodated within the North Site, which will continue to operate at the same capacity as approved.</p>
<p><i>In regards to the sharing of the loading dock, this arrangement could potentially be supported subject to the provision of a dedicated service corridor directly connecting the north and south basements, and subject to the creation of the appropriate easements to benefit the south site.</i></p> <p><i>Otherwise, it is noted that the small loading dock on the south site does not appear to have sufficient clearance heights.</i></p>	<p>The provision of a service corridor between the North Site and the South Site is not required. As outlined in the Loading Dock Management Plan at Appendix C of the RTS, the loading docks will operate independently with the South Site providing contingency for the North Site only in the event of an emergency and the dock is closed. Accordingly, it is only when an incident occurs that loading for the North Site will occur on the South Site, and vice versa. Given this will only occur in the event of an emergency, and will only be for small quantities of goods being moved a short distance from the loading dock to the tenants, no further design measures are considered to be necessary to service the North Site. Further, the transport of goods short distances within the CBD is not an uncommon condition, noting that there are nearby on-street loading spaces regularly used to transport goods to surrounding buildings.</p> <p>Arup note that the height of the loading dock is sufficient to service the site. Waste contractors will be selected with consideration of their vehicles types to ensure they are not restricted by the head height of the loading dock.</p> <p>Any easements/covenants that are required to enable access to the facilities on the North Site for the South Site will be confirmed at the appropriate future stage through the preparation of draft subdivision plans and associated Section 88B instruments. This will be completed following the detailed design of the North Site and South Site and prior to the occupation and operation of these facilities</p>
<p>Landscaping</p> <p><i>The proposed landscaping to terraces is a small gesture which should be improved given the scale and important location of the developments. The developments could also incorporate green walls or landscaping within the lobby, mezzanine and retail areas and include a required design deliverable for the fitout of commercial floors.</i></p>	<p>The proposed landscaping treatment for the North Site is detailed in the plans prepared by JPW at Appendix B of the RTS. The planting scheme for this terrace has been designed with reference to the roof terraces of nearby buildings, including the connecting 50 Martin Place terrace, and which embody the urban and civic context of the site. There is the potential to further relate the form and treatment of the North Tower with the surrounding Precinct by adopting this consistent landscaping treatment. There are also potential future opportunities for planting and green spaces to be incorporated into the internal design of the building, which will be investigated at the appropriate fit-out phases of the development.</p>
<p>Public art</p> <p><i>Proposals of this scale should incorporate a public art contribution including the submission of a public art plan. The City's 'Interim Guidelines for Public Art in Private Developments' provides details in terms of what should be provided in a public art plan.</i></p>	<p>Condition E101 of the CSSI Approval requires the preparation of a Station Design and Precinct Plan (SDPP) identifying opportunities for public art. The detailed design of the SDPP will be coordinated with the detailed Heritage Interpretation Plan, to ensure a resolved approach to public art in both the private and public domain.</p> <p>The preparation of a separate Public Art Strategy specifically for OSD is not considered to be necessary or warranted and would in affect duplicate a process and outcome that is being delivered through an alternative planning approval process.</p>
<p>Signage</p> <p><i>Top of building signage zones should be limited to a maximum of two zones in accordance with Sydney Development Control Plan 2012. Sufficient details should be included in this application to ensure integration and compatibility with the architectural design, materials,</i></p>	<p>In response to Council's comments on the quantum of the proposed roof signs, the number if signage zones has been reduced from three (3) signage zones to two (2) signed zone. The revised design addresses Council's comments and provides two top of building signage zones. The proposed signage zones have been designed with consideration of the North Tower's building proportions, roof form and the location of plant, as outlined in the Design Report at Appendix B and the Signage Strategy at Appendix S of the RTS.</p>

Extract	Response
<p><i>finishes and colours of the building. The City strongly objects to the approval of the use of more than two top of building signage zones per building.</i></p>	<p>The detailed design of top of building signs will consider the detailed location, size, materials, detailed design, and illumination of signage on the façades of the South Tower, noting that this is not possible until the tenant of the South Tower is confirmed. Future signage will need to reference the final approved design of the tower, site characteristics, and the unique context of the site.</p>
<p>Customer Outcomes <i>The path of travel from the north and south station entries to metro platforms is unnecessarily circuitous and indirect providing poor customer experience. The circulation has been designed to maximise the value of retail spaces below ground. Wynyard Park is an existing example of this type of poor form of circulation. It is also prevalent in shopping centre design and is specifically used to increase path length and retail frontage value rather than efficiency of travel. The City recommends that the circulation be made more direct with aligned and/or switchback escalator arrangements that minimise path length.</i></p>	<p>The path of travel from the station entries to the station platforms does not form part of this DA. The detailed design of the station is the subject of the separate Sydney Metro CSSI consent and the Sydney Metro Design Review Panel.</p>
<p>Government Architect NSW (GANSW)</p>	
<p>Form and mass <i>GANSW generally supports the podium / tower response to the established street wall and the existing building at 50 Martin Place. We support the proposed setback of the tower from the lift over-runs above 50 Martin Place and the increased corner curvature.</i> <i>We acknowledge the response to the heritage fabric of the surrounding context. The details of this response should be presented for discussion at the next DRP to progress the resolution of the junction and scale between the existing and proposed buildings.</i> <i>Reference to the oculus on the roof of 50 Martin Place is now visible on the southern elevation and this is consistent with our advice.</i></p>	<p>Further details were presented to the DRP in the meetings that followed lodgement, including on the podium and tower response and the junction and scale between the existing and proposed buildings. The DRP confirmed at the most recent meeting (meeting #9) that the design resolution of the North Tower podium was supported, including the proposed fins that are used to define the junction with the curtain wall and variation of the articulation of the fins to suit the differing conditions on the Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street facades. A negative infill curtain wall at the junction of the podium and 50 Martin Place visually separates the new from the old, and ensures the cornice remains legible in the streetscape.</p> <p>One additional meeting is scheduled to discuss the detailed finessing and design of the North Tower podium.</p>
<p>Architectural expression <i>GANSW supports the extent of the recessed terrace which aligns with the fins on the podium and the depth of the east and west terraces.</i> <i>We support the use of shading elements, operable blinds and low-e glass, and the solution proposed to address the heat load on the western elevation which overlooks the lift bank.</i> <i>We acknowledge that a finer level of detail is being considered in the articulation of the façade and use of materials. The materials palette and application should be presented for discussion at the next DRP to ensure the richness seen in the surrounding buildings and heritage context are reflected in the design.</i></p>	<p>Further details were presented to the DRP in the meetings that followed lodgement on facade articulation and the materiality of the North Tower. The minutes from the DRP Meeting #8 and #9 confirm that the proposed materials palette, including the use of faceted glass in the facade design glass is supported by the DRP.</p>
<p>Street level <i>GANSW supports the improvements to the Hunter Street ground level and entry. In particular, the footpath width and curved stairs which has improved the visual and physical links from Chifley Square and Phillip Street.</i> <i>The building's interface with Hunter Street is unresolved. We remain concerned about the spaces between the building and columns on the northern elevation.</i> <i>It appears that no further detailing has been applied to the Castlereagh and Elizabeth Streets frontages which may impact on the ability of the proposal to positively contribute to the street and public realm.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building interface to Hunter Street comprises 4 columns and a 12m tall glass wall ensuring there is a clear sightline between the station plaza and footpath. Full height glazing along this edge allows natural daylight and visual connection to the grand Metro entrance space beyond, with minimal clutter on Hunter Street to maximise pedestrian flow paths across the site. • The detailing of the podium as it relates to Castlereagh Street and Hunter Street has been discussed with the DRP since lodging the application. It was confirmed at the most recent DRP meeting (meeting #9) that the design resolution of the podium is now supported, including the proposed fins that are used to define the junction with the curtain wall and variation of the articulation of the fins to suit the differing conditions on the Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street facades. A negative infill curtain wall at the junction of the podium and 50 Martin Place visually separates the new from the old, and ensures the cornice remains legible in the streetscape

Extract	Response
<p>Through site link <i>GANSW maintains that it is critically important for the wayfinding and connections between the through site link and the station entrance to be legible and intuitive. The public character and operation of this space, as well proposals to celebrate the commemorative plaque and reveal the viewing window to 50 Martin Place at a future stage, should be presented for discussion at the next DRP.</i></p> <p><i>GANSW supports the public art strategy which includes proposals to reinstate the Tom Bass and Douglas Annand artworks, and the Institute of Engineers plaque. We maintain that views to the artworks should not be obstructed and suggest that an exclusion zone for the Tom Bass fountain be considered. We also recommend that the plant, which supports the fountain, be modernised to reduce its size and increase operational efficiency.</i></p>	<p>The proposed through-site links have been designed to be legible in the streetscape, and through architectural treatments, the links are intuitive to access and will read as publicly accessible areas. The alignment and volume of the entrances to the station and the through-site link mean these key public entrances are visually connected to surrounding public spaces and are inviting. The openness of these spaces removes visual and physical barriers and communicates that these spaces are for public access.</p> <p>The detailed design and instalment of public art on the site will be subject to further investigation in consultation with the DRP.</p>
<p>Next OSD DRP <i>We note the commitment by the proponent to address the following issues which remain outstanding and should be presented for discussion at the next DRP:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>design response to the junction and scale between the existing and proposed buildings</i> <i>material palette and application, including how scale, texture and interest are being addressed</i> <i>illustrations which accurately show colours, transparencies and reflectivities of glazing</i> <i>benchmark ideas and options for street activation</i> <i>design refinement at the ground plane to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>address how the seating steps meet the column on the northern elevation to Hunter Street</i> <i>include public seating between the columns on the northern elevation to Hunter Street</i> <i>define the extent of enclosure and glazing at the Hunter Street entries</i> <i>ensure frontages to Castlereagh and Elizabeth Streets are activated</i> <i>ensure differentiation between the awnings which mark entrances to public and private spaces</i> <i>ensure awnings improve weather protection</i> <i>illustrations which accurately show the Tom Bass and Douglas Annand artworks in their final situation</i> <i>Macquarie's public art strategy, including any public art commissions</i> <i>legibility, accessibility and public character of through site links</i> <i>wayfinding strategy and signage addressing vertical and horizontal circulation.</i> 	<p>These matters were discussed in DRP meeting #7, #8, and #9, with the minutes of these meetings appended to the RTS in Appendix Q, and have been addressed in the RTS report as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design responses to how the proposal responds to the scale of 50 Martin Place and neighbouring buildings – Section 2.1.1 to Section 2.1.4. Materiality of the tower and podium – Section 2.1.1 to Section 2.1.4. Additional illustrations of the building – the Design Report at Appendix B of the RTS. Further illustrations are also being prepared and will be submitted under separate cover. Retail activation strategy to inform the design of retail spaces and their relationship to the public realm and Metro station – Section 2.2.2 of the RTS report. Design refinement of the ground plane including a wayfinding strategy and signage – Section 2.2.1, 2.4 and 4.9 of the RTS report.
NSW Office of Environment and Heritage	
<p><i>The Greater Sydney Branch (Communities and Greater Sydney Division) in the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) has reviewed the EIS and relevant documents in the relation to the exhibition for Martin Place Station Precinct Stage 2 – North Site (SSD 9270) and has no comments in relation to this matter.</i></p> <p><i>Please note that the Heritage Division may provide a separate response if required.</i></p>	<p>No further assessment is required.</p>

Extract	Response
<p>Heritage Council</p> <p>Heritage Interpretation <i>The SEARs require a Heritage Interpretation Plan, providing opportunities for the proposal to reflect on the heritage character and significance of the site and surrounding area, including Martin Place.</i></p> <p><i>Section 5.8.5 of the EIS indicates that no heritage interpretation is proposed as part of this proposal. It is concluded that the Sydney Metro City and Southwest Heritage Interpretation Strategy (2018) for Sydney Metro CSSI 7400 adequately covers interpretation of the site. However, the Sydney Metro Interpretation Strategy is an overarching strategy which sets out potential themes and approaches to enable interpretation planning during the design and development across the Sydney Metro project area.</i></p> <p><i>The SEARs require an Interpretation Plan to reflect heritage setting of the proposal site, including Martin Place. The Interpretation Plan (as opposed to an Interpretation Strategy) would be a comprehensive document that proposes specific methods to understand, interpret and present the place's heritage significance, both in the short and medium term.</i></p> <p><i>As the current proposal is integrated with the Sydney Metro infrastructure project, there is a unique opportunity for Sydney Metro and Macquarie to work on a collaborative Interpretation Plan for the site. The plan should be comprehensive and incorporate both the Martin Place metro station and the Over Station Development.</i></p>	<p>Heritage Interpretation</p> <p>TKD Heritage has prepared a Heritage Interpretation Strategy to inform the preparation of a Heritage Interpretation Plan as part of the Sydney Metro Martin Place Station Precinct (incorporating the station and OSD).</p> <p>The strategy (Appendix E) outlines the history and significance of heritage places associated with the Precinct for interpretation, and identifies media and locations for future implementation. The strategy represents the next phase of detailed investigations into the heritage context of the site and scope for heritage interpretation to be integrated with the site and OSD. It is informed by the Sydney Metro City and Southwest Heritage Interpretation Strategy and Interpretation Plan, and will inform a future detailed Heritage Interpretation Plan for the Precinct. The preparation of a detailed Heritage Interpretation Plan will be developed with the Heritage Council as the next phase of implementation, with additional studies, consultation, and testing to be completed to inform the plan. The strategy identifies that the following would be required to inform the next phase of the heritage interpretation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consultation with the Heritage Council of NSW to confirm the approach to heritage interpretation outlined in the Heritage Interpretation Strategy; consideration of any recommendations contained in the salvage reports for the demolished building at 7 Elizabeth Street and the Martin Place Railway Station; coordination of heritage interpretation with the Public Art Strategy; and liaison with the architectural team to develop and coordinate an integrated approach to heritage interpretation, recognising that the detailed design for the Station and OSD is not finalised at this time. <p>The Heritage Interpretation Strategy developed by TKD Heritage reflects on the heritage character and significance of the site and surrounding area, including Martin Place, and outlines possible locations, methods and media to promote an understanding of the history of the Precinct. The story of the Precinct will be principally explained through the retention, restoration, and reconstruction of significant spaces, elements, and fabric as well as salvaged artwork and materials. This includes reinstating two artworks by Douglas Annand, a sculpture by Tom Bass, and the Institute of Engineers plaque.</p> <p>It is recommended that a condition of consent be imposed requiring the preparation of a Heritage Interpretation Plan in accordance with the Heritage Interpretation Strategy and the Sydney Metro City and Southwest Heritage Interpretation Strategy, and in consultation with the Heritage Council and OEH. The installation of all interpretation elements will occur prior to the practical completion of the development.</p>
<p>Consultation with the Heritage Council <i>The SEARs required a consultation statement with the Heritage Council. The statement was to include the below.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A description of pre-submission consultation undertaken, including a record of the stakeholders consulted, the issues raised during the consultation and how the proposal responds to those issues.</i> <i>An agreed schedule of consultation with the Heritage Council should be included in the EIS.</i> <p><i>Consultation information is provided in Appendix F of the EIS. Section 2.2.1 of Appendix F references four separate presentation dates to the Heritage Council. However, the meeting summary table (Table 1) only discusses the results of one of these meetings.</i></p>	<p>It was noted in the Engagement Summary Report submitted with the EIS that regular consultation has been completed with the Heritage Council over the lifespan of the project to date. In response to the Department's and Heritage Council's requests, the Heritage Impact Statement submitted with the EIS has been updated to document all consultation undertaken with the Heritage Council, including the identification of issues raised and how the proposal has responded to those issues (refer to Appendix F). The updated statement also provides an indicative schedule of key milestones where the Heritage Council will be provided with the opportunity to flag issues and timeframes for ongoing consultation.</p>

Extract	Response
<p><i>In addition, the table does not clearly identify issues raised during the consultation and how the proposal responds to those issues. The Heritage Council Approval Committee minutes from the 2 May 2018 (published online) indicates that the Committee required more details prior to provision of extensive comment.</i></p> <p><i>A schedule of ongoing consultation has not been provided in Appendix F of the EIS. The Section 2.2.1 of Appendix F indicates that the Heritage Council has invited Macquarie to consult further, as matters for discussion arise through the detailed design and construction stages. An overarching schedule of design/construction milestones would be beneficial in the EIS, to afford the Heritage Council an opportunity to flag issues that require consultation and understand relevant timeframes</i></p>	
<p>Recommendations</p> <p><i>It is suggested that the following be considered for the proposal to meet the SEARs requirements that relate to heritage.</i></p> <p><i>The following advice should be incorporated into the proposal, as part of the Response to Submissions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Update the pre-submission consultation statement to include all consultation with the Heritage Council. Details of consultation need to clearly identify issues raised during the consultation and how the proposal responds to those issues.</i> <i>Provision of high level design/construction milestones and timeframes, to provide the Heritage Council an opportunity to highlight matters they wish to comment on.</i> <p><i>Develop a Heritage Interpretation Plan in collaboration with Sydney Metro, which reflects on the heritage character and significance of the site and surrounding area, including Martin Place. The site-specific Interpretation Plan should be guided by the Sydney Metro Interpretation Strategy.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix F of the RTS provides further details on the pre-submission consultation undertaken with the Heritage Council. • Appendix E of the RTS provides a Heritage Interpretation Strategy which will inform a future Heritage Interpretation Plan with detailed recommendations on the practical and specific actions through which to implement the Strategy. It is suggested that the requirement for a Heritage Interpretation Plan be conditioned to be provided at an appropriate future stage.
Transport for NSW	
<p>Protection of Sydney Trains Structures and Easements</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p><i>The existing Eastern Suburbs Railway is located in close proximity to the proposed development. Any works within 25m of the rail corridor should comply with the relevant ASA standards.</i></p> <p><i>There are concerns about the potential impacts of the proposed development on the structural integrity and the safe, effective operation and maintenance of the existing rail corridor. The placing of any foundations, other structures and building loads in or near the corridor may affect the structural integrity and operation of this corridor.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendation</u></p> <p><i>Sydney Trains requests that the Department of Planning and Environment imposes the conditions included in TAB A.</i></p> <p><i>TAB A conditions:</i></p> <p><i>General Condition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Sydney Trains or Transport for NSW (TfNSW), and persons authorised by those entities for the purpose of this condition, are entitled to inspect the site of the development and</i> 	<p>The Eastern Suburbs Railway and the associated rail corridor is not located within 25m of the North Site, noting that this corridor runs through the southern end of the Metro Martin Place Station. This corridor is not directly impacted by the North Tower.</p> <p>The Structural Statement and Rail Corridor Impact Report confirmed that the proposed development on the North Site will not impact the structural integrity or safe, effective operation and maintenance of the existing Eastern Suburbs Railway.</p> <p>In view of this, the conditions contained in TAB A do not apply to the North Site and do not relate to the development for which consent is sought under this SSD DA. The imposition of these conditions would not appropriately relate to the proposed development.</p>

Extract	Response
<p><i>all structures to enable it to consider whether those structures have been or are being constructed and maintained in accordance with the approved plans and conditions of consent, on giving reasonable notice to the principal contractor for the development or the owner or occupier of the part of the site to which access is sought.</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the Issue of the Construction Certificate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate, a Risk Assessment/Management Plan and detailed Safe Work Method Statements (SWMS) for the proposed works are to be submitted to Sydney Trains for review and comment on the impacts on rail corridor or as otherwise agreed by Sydney Trains. The Principal Certifying Authority is not to issue the Construction Certificate until written confirmation has been received from Sydney Trains confirming that this condition has been satisfied.</i> <i>Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate, a tunnel monitoring plan (including instrumentation and the monitoring regime during excavation and construction phases) is to be submitted to Sydney Trains for review and endorsement or as otherwise agreed by Sydney Trains. The Principal Certifying Authority is not to issue a Construction Certificate until written confirmation has been received from Sydney Trains advising of the need to undertake the tunnel monitoring plan, and if required, that it has been endorsed.</i> <i>Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate the Applicant is to contact Sydney Trains Engineering Maintenance Interface Section to determine the need for public liability insurance cover or as otherwise agreed by Sydney Trains. If insurance cover is deemed necessary this insurance be for sum as determined by Sydney Trains and shall not contain any exclusion in relation to works on or near the rail corridor, rail infrastructure. The Applicant is to contact Sydney Trains Engineering Maintenance Interface Section to obtain the level of insurance required for this particular proposal. Prior to issuing the Construction Certificate the Principal Certifying Authority must witness written advice from Sydney Trains confirming that this condition has been satisfied.</i> <i>Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate the Applicant is to contact Sydney Trains Engineering Maintenance Interface Section to determine the need for the lodgement of a Bond or Bank Guarantee for the duration of the works. The Bond/Bank Guarantee shall be for the sum determined by Sydney Trains. Prior to issuing the Construction Certificate the Principal Certifying Authority must witness written advice from Sydney Trains confirming that this condition has been satisfied.</i> <i>Prior to the issuing of a Construction Certificate the Applicant is to submit to Sydney Trains a plan showing all craneage (including mobile cranes) and other aerial operations including loading details for the development and must comply with all Sydney Trains requirements. If required by Sydney Trains, the Applicant must amend the plan showing all craneage and other aerial operations to comply with all Sydney Trains requirements. The Principal Certifying Authority is not to issue the Construction Certificate until written confirmation has been received from the Sydney Trains confirming that this condition has been satisfied.</i> <p><i>Prior to the issue of the Occupation Certificate</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the issuing of an Occupation Certificate the Applicant is to submit as-built drawings to Sydney Trains and Council. The as-built drawings are to be endorsed by a Registered Surveyor confirming that there has been no encroachment into Sydney Trains property or easements, unless agreed to by Sydney Trains. The Principal Certifying Authority is not to</i></p>	

Extract	Response
<p>issue the final Occupation Certificate until written confirmation has been received from Sydney Trains confirming that this condition has been satisfied.</p>	
<p>Point to Point Services</p> <p><u>Comment</u> <i>The Transport, Traffic, Pedestrian and Parking Report prepared to support the development application does not include details in relation to point to point transport services for the proposed development.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>It is requested that further details be provided in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office as part of the applicant's response to submissions for the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Likely demand for point to point transport (particularly during peak periods) and how point to point transport services accessing the proposed development will be catered for on the surrounding transport network; and</i> • <i>Potential kerbside locations that are available to accommodate future demand for point to point transport services.</i> 	<p>Point to point transfers have been addressed in the updated Transport, Traffic, Pedestrian and Parking report prepared by Arup and included at Appendix C of the RTS report. Approximately 0.5% of community trips to the CBD are via taxi, which for the North Tower would indicate a demand of approximately 20 trips per hour during peak periods for point to point transfers. These point to point services can be accommodated in the surrounding road network. Whilst the final design of the public domain is being developed, as part of a separate planning process, it is likely that point to point transfers will utilise the existing taxi rank on Castlereagh Street outside the North Site. Additional areas for point to point services may be developed as part of public domain works.</p> <p>Further consultation will be undertaken with the Sydney Coordination Office to discuss this matter and others.</p>
<p>Freight and Servicing</p> <p><u>Comment</u> <i>It is noted that a draft Loading Dock Management Plan (LDMP) has been prepared to support the development application.</i></p> <p><i>The LDMP identifies that a key principle for accommodating the development's servicing requirements is supply chain consolidation, and considers the use of off-site consolidation centres. The LDMP also recognises the potential need for the North Tower loading dock to provide resilience for the South Tower in contingency situations.</i></p> <p><i>TfNSW advises that it has previously discussed the use of these measures with the applicant to ensure that the freight and servicing requirements of the development can be accommodated entirely within the on-site loading dock.</i></p> <p><i>TfNSW strongly supports and encourages the use of these measures which provide numerous benefits for the traffic and transport network. These include reducing the number of vehicles entering the CBD and using the road network, reducing the number of vehicles entering the loading dock, ensuring all freight and service activity is accommodated within the onsite loading dock and reducing the likelihood of vehicles servicing the development contributing to traffic queues and congestion.</i></p> <p><i>TfNSW recommends the applicant be conditioned to implement and use supply chain consolidation and off-site consolidation to accommodate the development's servicing requirements in conjunction with the use of the proposed on-site loading dock. TfNSW also recommends the applicant be conditioned to provide resilience for the South Tower loading dock through the North Tower loading dock in contingency situations.</i></p> <p><i>It is also advised that the LDMP needs to include management of conflicts between pedestrians and service vehicles using the loading bays, including the provision of signage/marked walkways.</i></p>	<p>The preparation of the detailed Loading Dock Management Plan, and the ongoing management of the South Site loading dock, will be undertaken in accordance with the recommended condition.</p>

Extract	Response
<p><u>Recommendation</u> It is requested that (as stated in TAB B):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant be conditioned to prepare the final LDMP; • The applicant be conditioned to implement and use supply chain consolidation and off-site consolidation in conjunction with the on-site loading dock for the life of the development, or until such time as alternative arrangements are approved by TfNSW which continue to ensure that the freight and servicing task is accommodated wholly within the on-site loading; • The applicant be conditioned to provide resilience for the South Tower loading dock through the North Tower loading dock in contingency situations; and • The LDMP is implemented once the development is operational in order to manage the freight and servicing associated with the proposed development. <p>TAB B conditions: Prior to the Issue of the Occupation Certificate</p> <p>The Applicant shall prepare the final Loading Dock Management Plan (LDMP) in consultation with Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW and submit the final LDMP for the review and endorsement of the Coordinator General, Transport Coordination within TfNSW prior to the issue of the Occupation Certificate.</p> <p>Post occupation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant shall implement the Loading Dock Management Plan in order to manage the freight and servicing associated with the development. • The Applicant shall implement and use supply chain consolidation and off-site consolidation in conjunction with the development's on-site loading dock, to accommodate the development's servicing requirements, in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW. The use of all these measures shall be maintained for the life of the development, or until such time as alternative arrangements are approved by TfNSW which continue to ensure that the freight and servicing task is accommodated wholly within the on-site loading dock. • The Applicant shall provide resilience for the South Tower loading dock through the North Tower loading dock in contingency situations, for the life of the South Tower development, or until such time as alternative arrangements are approved by TfNSW which continue to ensure that the freight and servicing task is accommodated wholly within the South Tower loading dock. 	
<p>Construction pedestrian and traffic management</p> <p><u>Comment</u> It is noted that the applicant has prepared a framework Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) as part of the Stage 2 application.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> It is requested that:</p>	<p>Arup has prepared an updated CPTMP, provided in Appendix C, which has been prepared based on consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office on 13 March 2019. Whilst the final detailed CPTMP will be prepared in accordance with the recommended condition, the updated CPTMP prepared and submitted with the RTS addresses each of the points in the suggested condition.</p>

Extract	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The draft CPTMP be updated in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW. The CPTMP should be in consistent with the Construction Traffic Management Framework prepared as part of the Sydney Metro City and Southwest; and</i> <i>The applicant be conditioned to prepare the final CPTMP as stated in TAB B.</i> <p><i>TAB B condition:</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the Commencement of Works</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant shall update the draft Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW and provide a copy of the final CPTMP for the review and endorsement of the Coordinator General, Transport Coordination, prior to the commencement of any works on site. The CPTMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Consistency with the Construction Traffic Management Framework prepared as part of the Sydney Metro City and Southwest;</i> <i>Loading and unloading details, including the locations of all proposed work zones;</i> <i>Haulage routes;</i> <i>Construction vehicle access arrangements;</i> <i>Proposed construction hours;</i> <i>Estimated number and type of construction vehicle movements including morning and afternoon peak and off peak movements, distinguishing concrete pours from other construction activity and noting that construction vehicles would be restricted from using work zones on Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street during certain times of the day;</i> <i>Construction program, highlighting details of peak construction activities and proposed construction 'Staging';</i> <i>Details of specific measures to ensure the arrival of construction vehicles to the site does not cause additional queuing on Elizabeth Street, Hunter Street, Castlereagh Street and King Street;</i> <i>Details of construction vehicle marshalling areas outside the CBD;</i> <i>Details of pedestrian and traffic management measures;</i> <i>The staging of works and simultaneous construction with other projects in the precinct including the Sydney Light Rail Project, Sydney Metro City and Southwest and private development to mitigate the cumulative construction impacts of projects;</i> <i>Any potential impacts to general traffic, cyclists, pedestrians and bus services within the vicinity of the site from construction vehicles during the construction of the proposed works; and</i> <i>Measures proposed to mitigate any associated general traffic, public transport, pedestrian and cyclist impacts should be clearly identified and included in the CPTMP.</i> 	
NSW EPA	
<p><i>On the basis of the information provided, the development proposal does not constitute a Scheduled Activity under Schedule 1 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act). At this stage, the EPA does not consider that the proposal will require an Environment Protection Licence (EPL) under the POEO Act. Additionally, the activity is not</i></p>	<p>The proposed development has been assessed against the NSW DEC's <i>Assessing Vibration: a technical guideline</i> in the Acoustic Assessment Report prepared by Arup that accompanied the EIS in Appendix P. An assessment of the</p>

Extract	Response
<p><i>proposed to be undertaken by or on behalf of a NSW public authority. The EPA is therefore not the appropriate regulatory authority under the POEO Act for the environmental performance of the development itself.</i></p> <p><i>As an advisory comment, the development will be located above tunnels accommodating current and under construction operational rail lines, for which EPA has a regulatory responsibility. The consent should include acceptable vibration and groundborne noise limits for spaces within the development drawn from the EPA's Rail Infrastructure Guideline (EPA, 2013) and Assessing Vibration: a technical guideline (DECC, 2006).</i></p>	<p>development against the EPA's <i>Rail Infrastructure Guideline</i> has been undertaken in and is noted in the updated Acoustic Report included in Appendix D of this RTS (refer to Section 4.4.4 of that report).</p>
Roads and Maritime Services	
<p><i>Roads and Maritime has reviewed the submitted application and raises no objection to the proposed development. Advisory comments, in relation to the subject development application Transport, Traffic, Pedestrian and Parking Report can be found in Annexure A.</i></p> <p>ANNEXURE A</p> <p><i>Transport Assessment Section 4.2 'Development Proposal'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Section 4.2 Future Mode Share states that "The removal of the majority of on-site car parking is anticipated to reduce the car driver mode share". The report does not indicate how much on-site car parking will remain apart from the 6 loading dock spaces (3 Medium Rigid Vehicle (MRV) + 3 Small Rigid Vehicle (SRV)).</i> <p><i>Transport Assessment Section 5.1 'Traffic Generation and Road Network Impact'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Section 5.1 Traffic Generation and Road Network Impact of the main report, indicates that the estimated number of deliveries is 154 and the total capacity of the loading dock will be 10-15 vehicle per hour. Appendix A – Loading Dock Management Plan Table 4 indicates that the estimated number of deliveries is 162 and Section 7.4 Booking System indicates that the pre-booking system will accommodate bookings in 30 minute windows. This puts the maximum capacity at 12 vehicles per hour.</i> <p><i>Appendix A – Loading Dock Management Plan</i></p> <p><i>Section 5.2 Daily Delivery Trips of the report indicates that the estimated number of deliveries is 154. Table 4 indicates that the estimated number of deliveries is 162. The 3x MRV + 3x SRV spaces proposed would provide a capacity of 168, based on 14 hours of operation (6am to 8pm, as indicated in Section 7.3).</i></p> <p><i>As currently presented, this does not provide a great level of resilience or flexibility. This is also dependent on a distribution of MRV and SRV being balanced 50/50 (maximum of 84 MRV deliveries per day).</i></p> <p><i>If there are a greater proportion of MRV vehicles, the 3x MRV spaces will not be sufficient to accommodate the MRV demand, as it is assumed the SRV spaces will not be able to accommodate MRV vehicle.</i></p> <p><i>Roads and Maritime recommends that a contingency plan be developed to ensure the loading dock has appropriate level of resilience.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The redevelopment of the site facilitated through this staged DA process, and the Sydney Metro consent, will remove the existing (pre-demolition) car parking spaces on-site at 55 Hunter Street and separately on the South Site. These spaces will not be replaced in the detailed design of the North Tower or the concurrent Stage 2 SSD DA for the South Site, thereby permanently removing the majority of on-site car parking in the Precinct. The remaining on-site car parking pertains to a small number of existing spaces in the basement of 50 Martin Place that will remain in-situ, noting that no change is proposed to the operation of the approved 50 Martin Place building as part of this DA or any other DA. This small proportion of on-site parking includes existing loading dock spaces. The estimated number of deliveries has been clarified in the updated report at Appendix C, with the North Tower predicted to generate 162 deliveries per day. The maximum capacity is, therefore, 12 vehicles per hour. The design of loading docks on the site assumes an even split between MRV and SRV. However, should the future operation of the building require a change in the split of MRVs and SRVs entering the site, the Dock Master will have the option to reallocate time slots allowing shorter dwell times for specific deliveries and then creating additional slots, or extend the hours of operation beyond 6.00am to 8.00pm. They will also have the discretion to re-schedule of use MRV bays for SRVs as the need arises. This provides the proposed loading facilities with an appropriate degree of resilience in the event of need changes in the future. Refer to the updated Loading Dock Management Plan at Appendix C of the RTS report.

Extract	Response
<p>Sydney Water</p> <p><i>Drinking Water Servicing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The existing infrastructure has sufficient capacity to supply drinking water to the proposed development.</i> <i>The development site is under Centennial Park Water Supply Zone.</i> <p><i>Wastewater Servicing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The existing infrastructure has sufficient capacity to service the proposed development.</i> <i>The development site is under Bondi Sewerage System.</i> <p><i>This advice is not a formal approval of our servicing requirements. Detailed requirements, including any potential extensions or amplifications, will be provided once the development is referred to Sydney Water for a Section 73 application.</i></p> <p>ATTACHMENT 1</p> <p><i>Sydney Water Servicing</i></p> <p><i>A Section 73 Compliance Certificate under the Sydney Water Act 1994 must be obtained from Sydney Water.</i></p> <p><i>The proponent is advised to make an early application for the certificate, as there may be water and wastewater pipes to be built that can take some time. This can also impact on other services and buildings, driveways or landscape designs.</i></p> <p><i>Applications must be made through an authorised Water Servicing Coordinator. For help either visit www.sydneywater.com.au > Plumbing, building and developing > Developing > Land development or telephone 13 20 92.</i></p> <p><i>Building Plan Approval</i></p> <p><i>The approved plans must be submitted to the Sydney Water Tap in™ online service to determine whether the development will affect any Sydney Water sewer or water main, stormwater drains and/or easement, and if further requirements need to be met.</i></p> <p><i>The Sydney Water Tap in™ online self-service replaces our Quick Check Agents as of 30 November 2015.</i></p> <p><i>The Tap in™ service provides 24/7 access to a range of services, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>building plan approvals</i> <i>connection and disconnection approvals</i> <i>diagrams</i> <i>trade waste approvals</i> <i>pressure information</i> <i>water meter installations</i> <i>pressure boosting and pump approvals</i> <i>changes to an existing service or asset, e.g. relocating or moving an asset.</i> 	<p>No further assessment is required at this stage of the development. The proposed conditions are supported.</p>

Extract	Response
<p>Sydney Water's Tap in™ online service is available at: https://www.sydneywater.com.au/SW/plumbing-building-developing/building/sydney-water-tap-in/index.htm</p>	
Sydney Airport	
<p>Sydney Airport have reviewed the amended plans and can advise the following:</p> <p>17/0469 – SSD 9270 - MARTIN PLACE PRECINCT NORTH SITE – 194m AHD - penetrates the OLS of 156m AHD – approved by Federal Department of Infrastructure & Regional Development (DIRD) to a height of 214.2m AHD</p>	<p>No further or separate approval is required.</p>
Air Services Australia	
<p><u>Decision</u></p> <p>As you may be aware, the Secretary is required under regulation 15(1AB) of the Regulations to make a decision about the proposal within 28 days of receiving the application. I am the Secretary's Delegate for the purposes of the Regulations.</p> <p>Due to delays in our processes a decision was not made in this timeframe. Therefore, under regulation 15(2) this proposal was taken to have been refused. However, the Department has now considered the application in full and I have re-made the decision.</p> <p>In accordance with regulation 14, I approve the controlled activity for the intrusion of a building at Martin Place Precinct North Site, Sydney NSW into prescribed airspace for Sydney Airport to a maximum height of 214.2 metres AHD.</p> <p>In making my decision, I have taken into consideration the opinions of the proponent, the Civil Aviation Safety Authority, Airservices Australia's advice number SY-CA-489, airlines and SACL.</p> <p>In accordance with regulation 14(1)(b), I impose the following conditions on my approval:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building must not exceed a maximum height of 214.2 metres AHD, inclusive of all lift over-runs, vents, chimneys, aerials, antennas, lightning rods, any rooftop garden plantings, exhaust flues etc. 2. The proponent must advise Airservices Australia at least three business days prior to the controlled activity commencing by emailing <ifp@airservicesaustralia.com> and quoting SY-CA-489. 3. Separate approval must be sought under the Regulations for any construction equipment (i.e. cranes) required to construct the building. Construction cranes may be required to operate at a height significantly higher than that of the proposed controlled activity and consequently, may not be approved under the Regulations. Therefore, it is advisable that approval to operate construction equipment (i.e. cranes) be obtained prior to any commitment to construct. 4. At the completion of the construction of the building, a certified surveyor is to notify (in writing) the airfield design manager of the finished height of the building. 	<p>The proposed development does not require any further assessment impact to airspace operations. The required approvals for future construction cranes will be the subject of a separate application.</p>
Fire and Rescue NSW	

Extract	Response
<p><i>It is imperative with such integrated developments that firefighters can effectively and readily locate all fire services (such as hydraulic fire service boosters, fire control rooms etc.) that correspond to the location of an incident.</i></p> <p><i>Recommendations</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. That Fire & Rescue NSW continues to be consulted with respect to the operational compatibility of the Precinct's proposed fire and life safety systems and their configuration at the project's preliminary and final design phases.</i> <i>2. That the pedestrian connection interfaces between the various sites of the precinct are appropriately assessed by fire engineering analysis with respect to emergency occupant egress, fire and smoke compartmentation, smoke hazard management and firefighting intervention.</i> <i>3. That FRNSW also be listed as a stakeholder and continue to be consulted during the design and construction of the buildings, as well as any relevant stages post construction.</i> 	<p>The letter prepared by Arup (Appendix P of the RTS) confirms that the North Tower has been designed so that firefighters can effectively and readily locate all fire services. Arup are committed to continuing to work with FRNSW through the detailed design process for the building.</p>