

29 March 2019

218984

Appendix A

Record and Response to Submissions

Extracts from Government agency and authority submissions received in relation to SSD 18_9326, 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 proposal effectively 'reinstates' the zero setback alignment along the three street frontages of Castlereagh Street, Elizabeth Street and Martin Place, reinforcing the desired street frontage conditions along these streets, and increasing the legibility of the block structure. • The podium references the dominant street frontage condition on Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street created by aligning the South Site and the North Site with the existing podium height of 50 Martin Place and the building heights of Qantas House, and the City Mutual Building. This is defined by a recessed terrace that creates a clear visual break between the podium and the tower above on the north, east and western facades. The terrace strengthens the definition of the podium and the key datum line defining the street frontage height. • The proposed materiality of the podium contributes significantly to the reinforcement of the street frontage conditions of Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street as it directly relates to the materiality and proportions of 50 Martin Place opposite, which is a key component of the character of these streets. The podium design is divided into a podium base, mid-podium and upper podium, aligning with the stone base, colonnades and entablature (and thereby the proportions) of 50 Martin Place. The proposed podium finishes are a masonry base, deep glass bays and louvres with ceramic and bronze cladding referencing the columns of 50 Martin Place in the mid-podium, and more refined fins and bays bisected by strong horizontal bands that reference of the upper podium reference the entablature as a contemporary reflection of the materiality of 50 Martin Place. • The street frontage conditions of Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street comprise a mix of commercial lobbies and retail tenancies. The detailed design of the South Site provides retail tenancies, commercial lobbies, and pedestrian focused spaces in the form of a through-site link and the Metro station beneath, which activate the site and reinforce the dominant street frontage conditions on Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street. <p><u>Integration with lower scale of 50 Martin Place</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed street wall (podium) height is 10m less than what would otherwise be permitted under the approved (as proposed to be amended) building envelope, and has been specifically designed to reflect the height of the parapet at 50 Martin Place. In this way, the proposal responds to the existing street wall height in this block of Martin Place defined by buildings along Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street. • The division between the podium and the tower created by the recessed terrace ensures that the podium reads as a distinct and separate feature and the shared street wall height between the South Site and 50 Martin Place is more legible in the streetscape. • At the pedestrian scale, the materiality and fine-grain articulation of the podium has also been designed to read as a contemporary interpretation of the 50 Martin Place building, and to integrate the South Site with the architectural language 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>Approved / amended building envelope</u></p> <p>The approved Concept Proposal (including the Stage 1 Amending DA) considered the appropriateness of tower setbacks when considering potential design responses within the maximum building envelope, and provided the planning and design framework to be addressed at the detailed design phase of the development through a set of Design Guidelines developed by Tzannes. The Stage 1 Amending DA proposed, in line with the context and nature of</p>

Extract	Response
	<p>the site, an appropriate design response for the site can be achieved with an 8m setback to Martin Place, and in the absence of tower setbacks to other frontages.</p> <p>Through both the approved Concept Proposal and the Stage 1 Amending DA, it was considered that the North and South Sites should establish a distinct character at the threshold locations of the Martin Place metro 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 South Site, particularly, responds to the setback of the Reserve Bank Building and the site-specific development standard applying to the site (achieved through the recent LEP amendment).</p> <p><u>Detailed proposal</u></p> <p>The proposal has undergone review and development through the DRP process, shaping the optimal design response for the South Site. The bulk and form of the proposal has been appropriately managed with the proposed 8m setback to Martin Place and zero setbacks to Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street. The detailed design effectively mitigates the bulk and form of the building with consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal represents a lesser building that what could otherwise be provided within the building envelope. The key reductions in the extent of the built form from the approved building envelope (as proposed to be amended by SSD 18_9347) are the height of the podium, which is reduced from 55m to 45m in alignment with the 50 Martin Place parapet height, and a reduction in the height of the tower, which is approximately 11 metres below the height of the envelope (being the extent of the sun access plane). Together, these reductions assist in mitigating the scale of the proposal. • The setback of the tower from Martin Place and the use of a recessed terrace to the eastern and western facades, effectively separates the tower from the podium and in doing so breaks up the mass of the building. These vertical and horizontal setbacks create a legible break between the podium and the tower, reducing the perception of bulk and achieving the desired outcome of setbacks. The setback from the Martin Place boundary is greater than that of the present building and similar to the tower of the Reserve Bank to the east on Martin Place. The tower is proportionate to the podium and appropriate to the surrounding context of the CBD. • The proportionality of the podium references the three (3) distinct strata of the 50 Martin Place façade, which is characterised by a masonry base, articulated columns, and defined entablature. Integrating these distinct strata in the podium effectively breaks down the mass and street wall into more human scale proportions and continues the massing of 50 Martin Place through the streetscape. • The articulated materiality of the upper podium is counterbalanced with the masonry base and permeable ground plane of the building, which distinguishes the base of the building and creates a human scale. This human, pedestrian-focused design ensures the podium is distinctive from the tower and reduces the tower's scale when viewed at ground level. • The tower element is finished in glass and aluminium, primarily presenting as a flush glass curtainwall. Adopting transparent and recessive materials that contrast to the solid masonry podium, visually diminishes the tower and retains the prominence of the podium in the streetscape. The tower reads as a lighter and more ephemeral entity, blending into the city skyline, softening the impact of its bulk and form. <p><u>Tower setbacks (Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street)</u></p> <p>The detailed design of the proposal has been tested and developed having regard to the site's context. As established and discussed at length in the approved Concept Proposal, the proposed zero tower setbacks to Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street do not undermine any existing predominant relationship between towers and podiums in the surrounding area within Central Sydney and in the Martin Place Special Character Area.</p>

Extract	Response
	<p>As with the North Site, the building envelope for the South Site established in the approved Concept Proposal set the maximum parameters for a detailed proposal on the South Site and demonstrate that a tower built with zero setbacks to Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street would be appropriate for a building given the site's context.</p> <p>The development of the proposal in consultation with the DRP has ensured the detailed design mitigates the bulk of the tower. For the same reasons, tower setbacks to Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street are not considered necessary to mitigate the bulk and form of the South Tower. In particular, the DRP and GANSW are supportive of the building form of the proposal following the exploration of setbacks through the DRP process.</p> <p>To this end, the justification for the proposed zero tower setbacks to Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street as put forward in the approved Concept Proposal and Planning Proposal also remains relevant. This justification is centred on the points discussed below, which were discussed at length in the Tzannes Urban Design Report (dated May 2017) that accompanied the approved Concept Proposal and the Urban Design Report (dated October 2017) that accompanied the Planning Proposal, and is reinforced through the Design Guidelines formally adopted by the Secretary in accordance with Condition B1 of SSD 17_8351.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.1.3 of the main RTS report for further discussion.</p> <p><u>Tower setback to Martin Place</u></p> <p>The appropriateness of the 8m tower setback to Martin Place has been extensively tested and assessed in the development of the Planning Proposal, Stage 1 Amending DA, and this Stage 2 DA for the South Site. With reference to the above, and the technical studies prepared for the numerous planning applications applying to the site, it has been confirmed that the adopted 8m setback to Martin Place respects the spatial qualities and built form of Martin Place and in no way detrimentally impacts Martin Place. The proposed tower setback to Martin Place is contextually and historically appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is consistent with the long-term vision for the Martin Place Special Character Area because it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – protects existing significant public vistas to the east and west and ensures the proposal will not undermine the appreciation of the GPO clock tower, or views of its silhouette. – provides open views to the sky and respects pedestrian amenity along Martin Place, particularly with regard to solar access, daylight and wind conditions. – strikes an appropriate balance between conserving and enhancing the significance of Martin Place as one of Central Sydney's grand civic and ceremonial spaces, and expanding on its role as a valued business and commercial location in the Sydney CBD with excellent access to public transport. – continues to ensure that the GPO clock tower remains unobstructed from all public spaces within Martin Place. The principal impact on the view of the clock tower from the public domain occurs as a result of the street aligned podium on the South Site, which is effectively mandated by all relevant planning controls and objectives. – appropriately reinforces the spatial significance of Martin Place and its ongoing role as the commercial centre of the Sydney CBD, and also responds to the significant improvement in public transport accessibility. It does this in a manner appropriate for the future sustainability of the city whilst respecting the historic and ceremonial significance of Martin Place by providing an envelope which responds reasonably to its context. • The proposed 8m setback is marginally greater than the setback of the Reserve Bank Building, ensuring that the South Tower is not visually dominating and maintains the visual prominence and landmark qualities of the Reserve Bank Building.

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The setback recognises the rhythm of tower setbacks on the southern side of Martin Place, and the changing character of Martin Place at the commercial eastern end. Towers to the west of the MLC tend to have deeper setbacks while the towers to the east have lesser ones. There is no established or defined tower setback from Martin Place, and as such the proposed building envelope has been developed as a response to a deep understanding of its context. • The podium follows the street alignment and matches the established street setback to Martin Place. This is consistent with the LEP controls, approved Concept Proposal and the Consolidated Design Guidelines. • The podium is consistent with the street wall height datum of 50 Martin Place, creating a uniform street wall in this part of Martin Place. • The podium is distinguished from the tower through the terrace that contributes ensures the podium and key height datum is legible and defined. <p>It is further emphasised that the proposal complies with the Sydney LEP controls, Stage 1 Amending DA building envelope, and the Consolidated Design Guidelines, specifically developed to guide its detailed design.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.1.3 of the main RTS report for further discussion.</p>
<p><i>II. Clarify and illustrate how the proposed podium articulations, materials and finishes complement building proportions and architectural details of surrounding buildings</i></p>	<p>Unlike the North Site which occupies an entire city block, the South Site forms the northernmost part of the block bound by Martin Place, Castlereagh Street, Elizabeth Street and King Street. The design has therefore been informed by the existing and potential future characteristics of development within this block in addition to the character of Martin Place and the wider precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Relationship to 50 Martin Place</u> – 50 Martin Place is the prominent and significant feature in the streetscape that defines the architecture in this part of Martin Place bound by Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street. The proposed podium design principally draws on its relationship to 50 Martin Place, understanding that development to the south within this city block does not significantly contribute to the historic or architectural context of the site. The following design responses have been adopted in the detailed design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The podium adopts a zero setback to Martin Place to reinstate the dominant street wall, referencing the alignment of 50 Martin Place and ensuring the continuation of distinct and strong built form edges. – The street wall height is aligned with the parapet height of 50 Martin Place, which is continued through the detailed design of the North Site and is referenced in the height of the Qantas Building and the City Mutual Building. This relates the proposed development to the dominant street wall height of the North Site and its context, creating a uniform datum in this part of the city. – When viewing the building alignment and street wall height together, the building proportions of the podium effectively mimic that of 50 Martin Place. This creates a uniform ‘urban room’ between the South Site podium and 50 Martin Place. – The detailed design of the podium further complements the neighbouring 50 Martin Place by referencing the three (3) distinct strata in the building’s façade. The podium design is divided into a podium base, mid-podium and upper podium, with each of these three (3) strata referencing and aligning with the proportions of the 50 Martin Place facade opposite. The adopted proportions create a consistent human scale, whilst the architectural detailing of these strata reinforcing the South Site podium as a contemporary response to the Beaux-Arts composition of the opposing facade. – The architectural detailing of the podium is strong on the northern facade, fronting Martin Place, and more refined on the eastern and western facades of the podium, creating a hierarchy of facades to give prominence to the Martin Place frontage of the building that directly interfaces with 50 Martin Place. This technique reflects the language of 50 Martin Place, where the deeper articulation of the southern (Martin Place) façade is contrasted with reduced articulation on the eastern and western facades.

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The materials used for the podium also reinforce the character of 50 Martin Place. The primary and secondary facade materials proposed for the podium are stone, ceramic, glass and bronze coloured metalwork. These respond directly to the materiality and arrangement of these materials in 50 Martin Place. • <u>Relationship to neighbouring land to the south</u> – the detailing of the podium has also considered how it interfaces with existing and potential future development adjoining to the south. The relationship between the proposed podium and this neighbouring building is defined by the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The recessed terrace that establishes the extent of the podium is not extended to the southern façade of the building, which is defined by solid ceramic panel cladding. This design response acknowledges that the building to the south has a tower setback from Castlereagh Street of approximately 5 metres, a tower setback from Elizabeth Street of approximately 5.5 metres, and a podium height substantially less than the proposed podium height for the South Site. Providing a terrace and thereby defining the street wall height for the southern facade of the podium would create an awkward built form relationship between the proposal and the existing adjoining development. - The entablature of 50 Martin Place that has been referenced in the proportionality of the South Site podium is continued on the southern façade via patterned indents. This serves to articulate the façade whilst at the same time ensuring the podium design does not pre-empt the future redevelopment of sites to the south or erode the key height datum created by aligning the South Site podium with 50 Martin Place, the North Site, Qantas House and the City Mutual Building. <p>Refer to Section 2.1.4 of the main RTS report for further discussion.</p>
<p><i>III. Further consider how the southern elevation of the south tower can achieve satisfactory streetscape and urban design outcomes with the proposed nil setback on both Elizabeth and Castlereagh Street. This should include consideration of:</i></p> <p>a) <i>how the proposed development will relate to potential built forms of future redevelopment of adjoining sites and surrounding properties</i></p> <p>b) <i>further resolution/justifications for the proposed decorative architectural treatment of the southern elevation.</i></p>	<p><u>Detailed design of the southern elevation</u></p> <p>The detailed design of the southern elevation of the South Site has been a significant focus of the DRP, and has been revised through consultation with the DRP and in response to the Department's comments through DRP #7, #8 and #9. Feedback from the DRP centred on the need to articulate the wall, particularly at the south-east and south-west corners. The DRP noted that this would mitigate the appearance of a continuous street wall, which would likely occur if future development to the south had no setbacks above the podium.</p> <p>Revisions to the design of the southern elevation were finalised at the most recent DRP meeting (#9), where the proposed design resolution for the southern facade was supported by the DRP. This included simplifying the articulation of the façade to emphasise the corners of the tower, extending ceramic cladding to the roof, the continuation of flat horizontal bands representing key slab edges along the east, west and north facades, increasing the extent of ceramic to the southern corners of the tower on the east and west facades, and replacing the previously proposed curved glass southern corners adjacent to the southern edge of the tower with a window for the full height of the tower.</p> <p>The proposed treatment of the southern façade, the corners and the roof deepen the expression of the threshold condition established by the building form. The various detailed design elements come together to ensure the southern façade serves as a grand ceramic wall and marker for the Martin Place Metro Station Precinct in the wider city context.</p> <p>It is considered that the design of the southern façade allows for the flexible redevelopment of the site to the south, as addressed through the Stage 1 Amending DA. The zero setback creates the possibility for a variety of podium heights and tower setbacks for development to the south and ensures a high degree of flexibility for the architectural form of a future redevelopment of 60 Castlereagh Street. The proposed zero setback scheme also provides flexibility for the height of podium buildings to the south of the South Site, whilst establishing a distinct character for Martin Place.</p>

Extract	Response
	<p>The detailed design refinements described above to the southern facade, roof and southern corners ensure the South Site remains a legible feature in the streetscape in the event that future adjoining development does not adopt setbacks. This includes using ceramic folds on the eastern and western corners of the facade that appear to wrap the corners of the building, and incorporating a line of curved windows adjacent to the southern edge of the tower that create an indent and strong shadow line in the facade. This feature will articulate the separation between buildings and negate the risk of a continuous street wall should future development at 60 Castlereagh Street not adopt tower setbacks.</p> <p>The proposed southern elevation neither dictates nor infers a podium height and/or street frontage setback for buildings to the south of the site. This situation allows greater flexibility and redevelopment options for these sites to the south, especially when considering they are already significantly constrained in terms of redevelopment potential given the Hyde Park Sun Access Plane.</p>
<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 Tzannes 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 North 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><u>Wayfinding</u></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. The 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. As public and semi-private spaces are communicated through their enclosure, the publicly assessable station and through site link has been design with open entrances, completely unobstructed during operational hours and ensuring it is legible.

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The street paving will form a continuous surface into the station entrance, breaking down the perception of boundary and communicating the public nature of the space, further contributing to the legibility of the space. • Clear sightlines between the street, retail, lift waiting zones and station, including between different levels of the station, promote passive surveillance of publicly accessible areas. <p>b) <u>equitable access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The differentiation between private areas, and public and publicly accessible private areas, is communicated through various design cues: <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. – Street paving is continued from the site boundary into the station entrance, to break down the perception of a boundary and communicate the public nature of the through-site link and concourse. – 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. – Retail tenancies and commercial lobbies are finished in full-height glazing, allowing views into these spaces from the station and street frontages. 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 further distinguished from the more public nature of the retail tenancies by elevating the entrance and using glazed revolving doors that are typical of commercial typologies. 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. Equitable access to the through-site link, commercial lobby, and retail tenancies is achieved in the detailed design of the South Tower, as discussed in the Design Report prepared by Tzannes (Appendix B) and the DDA-Accessibility Statement at Appendix Q of the EIS. <p>c) <u>illustrations of the pedestrian experience</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional perspectives and photomontages of the pedestrian experience for the through-site link have been developed by Tzannes and are contained in the Design Report at Appendix B.
<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) 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>	<p>a) <u>hours of operation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The through-site link will operate between 6am to 2am the next day, consistent with the standard hours nominated in Council's DCP. After hours, access to this space will be restricted by security gates 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 will benefit from high levels of natural surveillance owing to its visibility from adjacent public streets, retail areas overlooking and directly accessing this space, and from the pedestrianised Martin Place. The design of the link also utilises open entrances and unobstructed pathways to enable uninterrupted sightlines through the link, to the street frontages beyond. Further design measures such as lighting within the link and at the entrances will benefit the safe operation of the link.

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lifts used by the commercial offices have been designed so that the security line is adjacent to the reception area, giving the concierge service direct views of the entrance and exit points into and from the lifts, as well as the general pedestrian circulation areas and street frontages. The detailed design of this space will seek to reduce clutter and blind spots and maintain the proposed positioning of the reception area to maintain sightlines. Visual connections from the street and Martin Place to the retail spaces is achieved by finishing these spaces in full-height glazing, allowing unobstructed views into these spaces. Each of these spaces has also been orientated to overlook or directly access Martin Place, Castlereagh Street, Elizabeth Street, the through-site link, or the station ensuring there is a visual connection through the glass between the retail tenancies and public/publicly accessible areas. The curved glass line adopted for the lower podium facade also means that the retail tenancies fronting Martin Place remain visible pushing out from between the columns when viewed from Elizabeth Street or Castlereagh Street, meaning even oblique visual connections to these tenancies are available from adjacent streets. <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. These spaces utilise open entrances and unobstructed pathways to encourage the free movement and access by members of the public during the nominated operating hours. For security reasons, outside of the operating hours, security barriers are required to prevent unauthorised access that could lead to anti-social behaviour. Street paving is continued from the site boundary into the station entrance, to break down the perception of a boundary and communicate the public nature of the through-site link and concourse. Again, for security reasons, outside of the operating hours, security barriers are required to prevent unauthorised access to the metro station that could lead to anti-social behaviour. 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. Retail tenancies and commercial lobbies are finished in full-height glazing, allowing views into these spaces from the station and street frontages. 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. Entry to the OSD commercial lobby is further distinguished from the more public nature of the retail tenancies by elevating the entrance and using glazed revolving doors that are typical of commercial typologies. 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>South Site</u></p> <p>b) Further consideration of the design and location of the proposed retail spaces (at lower ground/ ground and mezzanine levels) particularly with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the effectiveness/ease of access to the retail spaces visual connection from the streets and Martin Place to the retail space and general wayfinding finished levels of ground floor / lower ground floor retail spaces relative to the surface levels of Martin Place and impact on retail/street activation 	<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> <p><u>Ease of access to retail spaces and visual connection</u></p> <p>The semi-private spaces for retail and the commercial lobby are enclosed by full height glazed facades. The full height glazing allows views into these spaces from the station and public domain. The dual aspect retail spaces at ground and lower ground allow a visual connection between the station entrance and Martin Place that increases legibility. This, together with street level access, communicates that whilst the retail is not part of the public domain, it is open to the public during hours of operation. Glazed double doors to the retail units maintain visual permeability whilst providing security outside of operational hours. All entrances have level thresholds for accessibility.</p>

Extract	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistency with the Consolidated Design Guidelines in providing a Martin Place address for the building and the provision of recesses / non-awning weather protection to entrances from Martin Place. 	<p><u>Consolidated Design Guidelines</u></p> <p>The detailed design of the South Tower also achieves the objective for Martin Place to be the primary commercial and station address for the South Site, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commercial lobby of the proposed design can be accessed from Martin Place and looks directly on to Martin Place. The provision of retail tenancies is maximised on the Martin Place street frontage, with two levels of tenancies fronting Martin Place. The Lower Ground tenancies have been designed with flush thresholds to promote footfall to the lower ground retail spaces and offer an opportunity to activate portions of Martin Place with retail uses. The use of full-height glazing for the retail spaces creates a visual connection from the Metro Entrance to Martin Place, through active retail. Joint access from Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street allow for a choice in address, although both entrances have covered access to Martin Place. <p>The detailed design also achieves the objective for the provision of recesses/non-awning weather protection. No awnings have been provided on the street frontages or to Martin Place, with the podium instead using recesses at the building entrances to provide weather protection without the need for awnings.</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 South Site to be consolidated, minimising the scale and impact on street frontages and maximising opportunities for street activation. Notwithstanding this, it is recognised that the South Site is a highly constrained site and that there are significant station servicing requirements that have influenced the detailed built form for the South Site ground plane.</p> <p>The rationale for the design and location of services for the South Site has been to consolidate services to the core at the southern end of Castlereagh and Elizabeth Street, away from the primary active frontage to Martin Place and the station entrances. The proportion of the Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street frontages that are used for services in the overall facade have been minimised as much as possible, and the proportions are comparable between these frontages, meaning no one facade is overly burdened.</p> <p>The integration of services, ventilation, and fire egress has created opportunities for the articulation of the podium to ensure these elements are integrated with the overall design and complement the architectural details of the building. Ventilation ducts on the upper podium are designed as metal barre grilles between stone clad bays, services at the ground plane are concealed by stone and ceramic cladding, and fire egress doors are set back from the street in a recess on the southern boundary that extends the full height of the base and articulates the boundary between buildings at street level. These architectural treatments ensure the services are appropriately integrated into the detailed design of the podium, and do not compromise the aesthetics, use or amenity of street frontages.</p>
<p>3. Heritage</p> <p>I. Provide further information to satisfy the requirements of the SEARs for Heritage Interpretation Plan and consultation with NSW Heritage Council</p> <p>II. Detail how the Heritage Interpretation Plans for the over station developments relate to the Sydney Metro City and Southwest Heritage Interpretation Strategy.</p> <p>Note: Please also refer to NSW Heritage Council's submissions in responding to issues mentioned in Point 3.</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 integrated station development (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,</p>

Extract	Response
<p><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></p> <p><i>Note: Please also refer to NSW Heritage Council's submissions in responding to issues mentioned in Point 3.</i></p>	<p>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 area. The story of the project 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 on the North Site 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 & Southwest Heritage Interpretation Strategy, in consultation with 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 had 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, TKD Architecture has provided additional information on the issues raised and how the proposal has responded to those issues from consultation with the Heritage Council (refer to Appendix G). 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>
<p>4. Signage</p> <p><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>South Site</u></p> <p><i>II. The proportion and size of proposed signage zones in response to the unique "crown" roof line/forms of the South Tower.</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>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). The illustrations at Appendix S demonstrate how an illustrative signage design could integrate with the building within the north facade zone.</p> <p>The designs of the signage zones are considered to be appropriate with reference to the unique 'crown' roof line of the South Tower. The signage zones have been scaled with regard to the proportions and profile of the South Tower roof.</p>

Extract	Response
<p>5. Shared facilities and access</p> <p><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>I. Efficiency of shared use of facilities with consideration of security, capacity and user experience (ease of use and safety)</i></p>	<p>Refer to Section 2.4 of the main RTS report for further discussion.</p> <p>Arup has prepared Traffic, Pedestrian and Parking Report (Appendix C of the RTS report) and an updated Loading Dock Management Plan (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.</p> <p><u>Bicycle parking and end of trip facilities</u></p> <p>Dedicated bicycle parking and end of trip facilities have been provided on the North Site for use by the South Site. Considerations of functionality, security, capacity, and user experience have been at the heart of the design and proposed management of these facilities, recognising the atypical shared arrangement between the North Site and the South Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Security</i> – 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. These facilities will be accessed via electronic swipe card, and will be separated from those for the North Tower, 50 Martin Place, and retail tenancies that are located in other <i>contained areas of the building basement</i>. • <i>Capacity</i> – 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 sites central location and very high levels of access to public transport, meaning visitors of the South Tower will largely be travelling by 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. • <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. <p><u>Loading dock</u></p> <p>The revised Loading Dock Management Plan prepared by Arup (Appendix C of the RTS report) confirms how the loading dock for the South Site will be managed efficiently in terms of the security, capacity, and user experience. The following is noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Security</i> – Principally, a loading dock booking system will be employed for the operation of the loading docks that will control access to pre-authorised vehicles only. The booking system will allocate deliveries to a time slot and loading bay and will generate a security code used to gain access to the loading dock and when exiting the loading dock. This system ensures access to the dock is managed and monitored, and that no unauthorised or out-of-hours access is possible. Further, a dock manager and concierge service will be present during the loading dock operating hours, meaning trained and dedicated staff will be present on the site at all times to manage and monitor the use of the dock. • <i>Capacity</i> – The South Site is capable of accommodate loading and servicing for the South Tower when employing the proposed supply chain consolidation, off-site consolidation centre, and mitigation strategies outlined in the

Extract	Response
<i>II. Detailed design of the loading areas with respect to relevant Australian Standards</i>	<p>LDMP. The intended operation of the loading dock has been developed in consultation with TfNSW. This includes the potential for the South Site to operate in the event of emergencies, with the North Tower (or other approved location) providing flexibility for the South Tower should an incident occur, and the dock is inaccessible. This Precinct-wide approach provides capacity for the South Tower to operate during unplanned events.</p> <p>Arup confirm in the Loading Dock Management Plan (Appendix C) that the proposed loading dock on the South Site has been designed in accordance with the relevant Australian Standards with regard to the layout of the facility and for the loading and unloading of commercial vehicles, including design requirements for access driveways across the property boundary and for internal circulation roadways. However, some departures from the Australian Standard are necessitated because of the constrained site, and are manageable as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 General (c) - requirement to accommodate bays for site servicing vehicles: as outlined in the Management Plan, no long-dwell service vehicles will be permitted in the loading dock. These vehicles will be redirected to a surrounding suitable public car park. • Table 4.1 – service bay dimensions: the AS pertaining to off-street parking facilities for commercial buildings does not specify a vehicle clearance head height for loading docks. It merely stipulates the limiting dimensions of particular vehicles. • 4.3.1 (h) – major service area should accommodate at least one HRV: the waste management contractors hired for this site will not use vehicles that would be restricted by the height of the loading dock. <p>Arup confirm that these departures from the Australian Standards do not prevent the safe operation of the South Site loading dock.</p>
<i>III. Comparison with Sydney DCP 2012 requirements</i>	<p>As discussed previously, the proposed bicycle parking and end of trip facilities have been designed to address the buildings 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>
<p>6. Additional information</p> <p><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> <p><i>Note the wind assessment considers the podium terrace of the South Site is appropriate for 'pedestrian standing' only.</i></p>	<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 proposed terrace.</p> <p>Overall, CPP advise that the measured conditions for the terrace are similar to or better than comparable terraces in the Sydney CBD. The terrace would experience winds less than 4m/s for 85% - 90% of the time, meaning that it is only during a small proportion of the time (10% - 15%) where the winds would be stronger than a light breeze.</p> <p>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>Arup has provided further details on how the detailed design and operation of the Precinct is intending to meet the ESD stretch targets nominated in the Ecologically Sustainable Design, Green Star and NABERS report prepared by Arup. A range of strategies are currently being explored (as detailed in Appendix N) which will support the delivery of a contemporary and highly sustainable workplace that realises the opportunities to integrate the Precinct with the</p>

Extract	Response
<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>	<p>wider community and to implement emerging workplace practices in wellbeing and sustainability, communication and digital technologies.</p> <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.</p> <p>Additionally, the minor adjustments to the rooftop and southern elevation made post lodgement and in response to the DRP also do not affect the original conclusions. These are:</p> <p>Appendix H: Wind Assessment Verification letters (CPP) Appendix J: Sky View Assessment Verification Letters (Surface Design) Appendix K: Visual Impact Assessment Verification letters (Arterra)</p> <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 as well as the minor refinements made to the rooftop and southern elevation made in response to DRP feedback. Refer to Section 4.7 of the main RTS report for further discussion.</p>
<p><i>IV. Provide Gross Floor Area (GFA) calculations and detailed breakdown of project GFA/FSR denoting any implications of works proposed for 50 Martin Place.</i></p>	<p>Refer to details of GFA calculations and project GFA/FSR included within Appendix B.</p>
City of Sydney Council	
<p><i>Amending Concept Application</i></p> <p><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>The Stage 1 Amending DA was approved by the Minister for Planning on 25 February 2019. Accordingly, this SSDA can be determined.</p>
<p><i>South Site</i></p> <p><i>The City remains convinced that an 8 metre tower setback to Martin Place is insufficient and reiterates the City's and Heritage Council's concern that the heritage values of the place will be reduced by the proposed form. The City recommends that the southern tower be set back by at least 25m from Martin Place above the podium height of 50 Martin Place.</i></p>	<p>The appropriateness of the 8m tower setback to Martin Place has been extensively tested and assessed in the development of the Planning Proposal, Stage 1 Amending DA, and Stage 2 DA for the South Site. This has included detailed assessments of the heritage values of the site and Martin Place, which have confirmed that the adopted 8m setback to Martin Place respects the spatial qualities and built form of Martin Place and in no way detrimentally impacts Martin Place. In assessing the Planning Proposal, which amended the planning controls for the South Site, the Department confirmed that the 8m setback to Martin Place was appropriate in the circumstances.</p> <p>The following summarises how the detailed design of the South Tower with an 8m setback to Martin Place is contextually and historically appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is consistent with the long term vision for the Martin Place Special Character Area because it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protects existing significant public vistas to the east and west and ensures the South Tower will not undermine the appreciation of the GPO clock tower, or views of its silhouette. Provides open views to the sky and respects pedestrian amenity along Martin Place particular with regards to solar access, daylight and wind conditions. Strikes an appropriate balance between conserving and enhancing the significance of Martin Place as one of Central Sydney's grand civic and ceremonial spaces, and expanding on its role as a valued business and commercial location in the Sydney CBD with excellent access to public transport.

Extract	Response
<p><i>Issues previously raised by the City in terms of reduced or not provided setbacks to Castlereagh and Elizabeth Streets include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>inconsistency with the Martin Place Special Character Area and long-term vision for Martin Place;</i> <i>inconsistency with the proposed draft Central Sydney Planning Strategy setback requirements and sustainability targets;</i> <i>the reduced setback intruding on the Martin Place views including the prominences of the GPO clock tower;</i> <i>the lack of building setbacks impacting on pedestrian amenity at both Castlereagh and Elizabeth Streets and negatively affecting the site immediately to the south;</i> <i>the proposed FSRs are not supported by robust analysis; and</i> <i>the proposal inappropriately using the 60 Martin Place development consent as a precedent for the south site setbacks.</i> <p><i>These issues remain unresolved in this proposal and the City objects to the proposed building form. The tower form remains insufficiently separated from the podium given the lack of side street setbacks to Castlereagh and Elizabeth Streets.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the GPO clock tower remains unobstructed by the South Site envelope from all public spaces within Martin Place. The principal impact on the view of the clock tower from the public domain occurs as a result of the street aligned podium on the South Site, which is effectively mandated by all relevant planning controls and objectives. appropriately reinforces the spatial significance of Martin Place and its ongoing role as the commercial centre of the Sydney CBD, and also responds to the significant improvement in public transport accessibility. It does this in a manner appropriate for the future sustainability of the city whilst respecting the historic and ceremonial significance of Martin Place by providing an envelope which responds reasonably to its context. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed 8m setback is comparable to the setback of the Reserve Bank Building, ensuring that the South Tower is not visually dominating and maintains the visual prominence and landmark qualities of the Reserve Bank Building. The setback recognises the rhythm of tower setbacks on the southern side of Martin Place, and the changing character of Martin Place at the commercial eastern end. Towers to the west of the MLC tend to have deeper setbacks while the towers to the east have lesser ones. There is no established or defined tower setback from Martin Place, and as such the proposed building envelope has been developed as a response to a deep understanding of its context. The South Tower podium follows the street alignment and matches the established street setback to Martin Place. This is consistent with the LEP controls, approved Concept Proposal and the Consolidated Design Guidelines. The podium is consistent with the street wall height datum of 50 Martin Place, creating a uniform street wall in this part of Martin Place. The podium is distinguished from the tower through the terrace that contributes ensures the podium and key height datum is legible and defined. <p>It is emphasised that the adopted setback to Martin Place is compliant with the site-specific planning controls contained in the Sydney LEP 2012, the maximum building envelope contained in the Stage 1 Amending DA, and the Consolidated Design Guidelines that were developed to guide the detailed design of the South Tower.</p> <p>The consideration of tower setbacks to Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street has been extensively tested and assessed in the approved Concept Proposal, Stage 1 Amending DA, and the Stage 2 DA for the South Site. The issues previously raised by Council have been addressed when developing the suite of planning applications applying to the South Site, confirming that the proposed nil setbacks to Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street adopted for the proposal are appropriate and will not result in any adverse environmental impact. Specific reference is made to the Planning Proposal application to amend the Sydney LEP 2012 controls (refer specifically to the Response to Submissions – dated 20 December 2017) and the Stage 1 Amending DA (refer specifically to the Response to Submissions – dated 2 November 2018), which confirmed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Martin Place Special Character Area and long-term vision for Martin Place</u> The proposal is consistent with the long-term vision for Martin Place and the Martin Place Special Character Area because it re-instates the desired built form along Martin Place. The Proposal strikes an appropriate balance between conserving and enhancing the significance of Martin Place as one of Central Sydney's grand civic and ceremonial spaces, and expanding on its role as a valued business and commercial location in the Sydney CBD with excellent access to public transport. Sydney Metro is Australia's biggest public transport project that will shape Sydney for generations to come. The Proposal is consistent with the objectives of the applicable FSR and height controls. The proposal has been further assessed in the Statement of Heritage Impact by TKD Architects (Appendix D of the EIS), which confirms that the proposal including the nil setbacks to Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street are appropriate, as:

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed tower provides a bookend to Martin Place, reinforcing the strong linear character and spatial enclosure of Martin Place; - the tower adopts a restrained and simple form, clad in neutral, reflective materials and an interstitial space that together ensure the tower rising above the podium is differential to nearby significant items and the podium beneath; and - the building retains the significant fabric and setting of Martin Place, including views of Martin Place and unobstructed views to the GPO, ensuring that the tower form does not impact the appreciation or legibility of this space. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Draft Central Sydney Planning Strategy setback requirements</u> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the Draft Central Sydney Planning Strategy has contemplated a change in circumstances which result from the construction of the Sydney Metro project, the proposal appropriately balances the proposed threshold condition arising from the station opportunity and the historic podium and setback arrangement to Martin Place. The proposal respects the 45 metre street frontage wall requirement and, as discussed in the Urban Design Report which supported the Planning Proposal, the proposal is a response to the specific urban design context of the site and built form relationships with both surrounding buildings and public space and the metro opportunity provided by the station. The proposed OSD presents a significant opportunity to create a new landmark CBD location and a world-class transport hub.</p> • <u>Draft Central Sydney Planning Strategy sustainability targets</u> <p>Cl. 7.26 of the CSPA Planning Proposal requires office development to achieve a minimum 5 star NABERS Energy rating. The proposed development achieves this requirement, and the sustainability targets established for the OSD towers under Condition B5 of the approved Concept Proposal. Condition B5 requires that the proposal achieve a 5 star NABERS Energy minimum based on the 2016 protocol, a 3.5 star NABERS Water Rating minimum based on the 2016 protocol, a 6 star Green Star Office Design and As-Built v1.1, and occupant wellbeing.</p> • <u>Views and prominence of the GPO clock tower</u> <p>The envelope protects existing significant vistas to the east and west and ensures the South Tower will not detrimentally affect the silhouette of the GPO clock tower. The View Impact Analysis and in particular the view studies of Martin Place submitted with the Planning Proposal, approved Concept Proposal, Stage 1 Amending DA, and the detailed Stage 2 DA for the South Site demonstrate that the GPO clock tower remains unobstructed by the South Tower from all public spaces within Martin Place. The principal impact on the view of the clock tower from the public domain is through the design of the podium of the South Site, which meets all relevant planning controls and objectives.</p> • <u>Pedestrian amenity</u> <p>The zero setbacks to Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street play important roles in the urban morphology of this part of the city. These setbacks, in contrast to the typical setbacks of the city, provide distinctive thresholds into major public spaces in the City, Chifley Square and Martin Place. This is particularly important in the case of Martin Place which has a typical street morphology. Compared to a building envelope which contained tower setbacks, the modelling of the proposed building reveals there are negligible additional impacts with regards to shadows, wind and sky views (refer to Section 2.1.3 of the main RTS report for further discussion). This has been confirmed in the technical studies that accompanied the Stage 2 DA for the South Site including the Shadow Study prepared by Virtual Ideas and Tzannes (Appendix K of the EIS), Wind Tunnel Testing prepared by CPP (Appendix L of the EIS), and the Skyview Analysis prepared by Surface Design (Appendix X of the EIS).</p> • <u>Floor Space Ratio of the South Site</u> <p>The proposal is compliant with the site-specific FSR control under the Sydney LEP 2012. The FSR was considered at the Planning Proposal stage and determined to have strategic merit on the basis that it satisfied</p>

Extract	Response
	<p>the assessment criteria in the Department of Planning and Environment's <i>A Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals</i> as it "responds to a change in circumstances, such as the investment in new infrastructure or changing demographic trends that have not been recognised by existing planning controls."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60 Martin Place development consent <p>60 Martin Place has been used as an element of the overall justification for the proposal when developing the concept for development on the site. Precedents relate to the urban design outcome, and are not specifically used to justify the proposal's setbacks. It is also noted that 60 Martin Place did not have a Metro station beneath it contributing to its FSR allocation. The proposed setback to Martin Place is compliant with the site-specific planning controls contained in the Sydney LEP 2012, the maximum building envelope contained in the Stage 1 Amending DA, and the Consolidated Design Guidelines that were developed to guide the detailed design of the proposal.</p>
<p><i>In spite of the wind study the City remains concerned about the potential for adverse wind environmental effects.</i></p>	<p>The modelled wind conditions are generally rated as being suitable for pedestrian standing, including at the metro station entrance on Elizabeth Street (pedestrian standing) and Castlereagh Street (pedestrian sitting) which is in accordance with the requirements of the Consolidated Design Guidelines and the Concept Proposal conditions of consent. The terrace is also rated as being appropriate for pedestrian standing. All areas have been assessed and are confirmed to be suitable for their intended use in this section of the city, excluding those locations where existing conditions already exceed desirable levels of amenity.</p>
<p><i>As previously recommended by the City in response to amending concept application SSD 9347, in lieu of requiring these setbacks and ignoring the Planning Assessment Commission's (PACs) recommendations regarding street frontage conditions along Elizabeth and Castlereagh Streets, building returns should be incorporated in the southern street corners of the building as a transition to the adjoining development to the south above the podium height. This would in part assist in achieving the outcome of the PAC's advice of reinforcing the importance of the urban character and integrity of Martin Place and the associated city blocks. A return of 8m x 8m is recommended for each corner for the tower above a nominal 45m podium height.</i></p>	<p>The potential for building returns on the southern corners of the tower has been reviewed and considered at several stages of the process. The site-specific DRP, established to review the detailed design development of the Precinct, did not support the inclusion of these returns as documented in the DRP advice from Meeting #6. Further, the potential for building returns was discussed in detail in the documentation of the Stage 1 Amending DA, which extensively detailed how the inclusion of building returns would not generate the desired built form or result in any meaningful environmental benefit. Reference is made to the Response to Submissions report prepared for the Stage 1 Amending DA, dated 2 November 2018, which confirmed that the inclusion of recesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> would not result in any environmental benefit; would undermine the creation of a successful transition to the adjoining development to the south; would undermine the distinct threshold condition being created by the proposed development that reinforces the uniqueness and legibility of Martin Place and the Metro Precinct within the urban fabric of the city; and would restrict the flexibility of sites to the south in responding to the constraints of the Hyde Park Sun Access Plame in the scenario of future redevelopment. <p>Refer to Section 2.15 of the RTS report for more information.</p>
<p>Design excellence <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 <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</i></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 South Site. As this component of the Precinct is deemed to be CSSI, and therefore cannot form part of this SSD DA, the detailed design of the public</p>

Extract	Response
<p><i>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>domain, services and utilities and the like is being developed and finalised concurrently with the OSD via the separate process. Whilst forming part of a separate process, a holistic approach to the integration of CSSI/Station and OSD at the ground plane is an important consideration and has been embodied in the site-specific Urban Design Framework established under the Concept Proposal that applies to both the Station and OSD.</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><u>Integration of services, ventilation and fire egress</u></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 South Site to be consolidated, minimising the scale and impact on street frontages and maximising opportunities for street activation. Notwithstanding this, it is recognised that the South Site is a highly constrained site and that there are significant station servicing requirements that have influenced the detailed built form for the South Site ground plane.</p> <p>The rationale for the design and location of services for the South Site has been to consolidate services to the core at the southern end of Castlereagh and Elizabeth Street, away from the primary active frontage to Martin Place and the station entrances. The proportion of the Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street frontages that are used for services in the overall facade have been minimised as much as possible, and the proportions are comparable between these frontages, meaning no one façade is overly burdened.</p> <p>The integration of services, ventilation, and fire egress has created opportunities for the articulation of the podium to ensure these elements are integrated with the overall design and complement the architectural details of the building. Ventilation ducts on the upper podium are designed as metal barre grilles between stone clad bays, services at the ground plane are concealed by stone and ceramic cladding, and fire egress doors are set back from the street in a recess on the southern boundary that extends the full height of the base and articulates the boundary between buildings at street level. These architectural treatments ensure the services are appropriately integrated into the detailed design of the podium, and do not compromise the aesthetics, use or amenity of street frontages.</p> <p><u>Floor levels and grade entry on Elizabeth Street</u></p>

Extract	Response
	<p>The detailed design of the building and specifically the finished floor levels for the ground plane where it interfaces with the street frontages has been informed by specific site conditions. These conditions have informed where at-grade entry to the site is possible, and where stairs are required to maintain access, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the significant 5m level change between the Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street frontages of the site, which significantly impacts the possibility for at-grade movements across the site; the interplay of finished floor level requirements for the station beneath that have flow-on effects for the tower levels above; the need to prioritise the Martin Place frontage of the site in terms of at-grade access for building entrances, consistent with the Consolidated Design Guidelines that require this frontage to be the commercial address for the site; the requirement to design all entrances and access to the South Site to achieve the 1 in 100 year flood level, or the higher of the 1 in 100 year flood level plus 0.5m or the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) level where providing access to the underground levels such as the through-site link entry on Elizabeth Street. <p>The interaction of these constraints has informed the site levels and dictate that it is not possible to remove steps entirely from the Elizabeth Street frontage of the site. Notwithstanding this, accessible paths of travel are provided from every frontage of the site and at every entrance, including those on Elizabeth Street. This ensures the South Site remains accessible and will achieve DDA requirements, as confirmed in the DDA-Accessibility Statement at Appendix Q of the EIS.</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><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>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 Site 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> <p>In view of this, the provision of bicycle parking and end of trip facilities on the North Site for use by the tenants of the South Site is considered to be the best outcome for maintaining active transport options for the South Site. 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. One example of this is at Barangaroo, where there is a central bike parking (>1,000 bike racks) and end of trip facilities area for workers in the Barangaroo International Tower, with walking distances to these facilities ranging from 100 to 150m. This distance is a similar scale to that proposed for the South Site, with the time taken for the journey between the South Tower lobby and end of trip facilities on the North Site being approximately 2 minutes.</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 North Site providing contingency for the South 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 South Site will occur on the North 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 North Site loading dock to the South Site tenants, no further design measures are considered to be necessary to service the South 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>

Extract	Response
	<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 <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 South Site terrace is detailed in the updated design report prepared by Tzannes (Appendix B of the RTS). It notes that the proposed planter boxes have been designed with reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the roof terraces of nearby buildings, including 50 Martin Place, which embody the urban and civic context of the site; the potential to create a consistent relationship between the South Tower terrace and 50 Martin Place opposite through a consistent landscaping treatment for the aligned terraces; and the structural limitations of the building, noting that the planting strategy for the terrace has been designed with reference to the constraints of the station below. <p>There are 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 <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 <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, 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>In response to Council's comments on the quantum of the proposed roof signs, an alternative strategy has been developed for the future top of building signs on the site. It is proposed to reduce the number of signage zones to two (2) as detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Tzannes. The proposed reduction addresses Council's comments whilst also providing flexibility for further design and testing to confirm the most appropriate siting and configuration of signage at the detailed design stage, taking into consideration the needs of the anchor tenant of the South Site when confirmed.</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 Site, noting that this is not possible until the tenant of the South Site 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>Refer to Section 2.4, Section 3 and Section 4.10 of the RTS report for more information.</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 CSSI Approval and the Sydney Metro DRP.</p>

Extract	Response
NSW Government Architect	
<p>Architectural Expression <i>GANSW supports the approach to the form and massing of the podium and tower which presents a positive approach to Martin Place.</i></p> <p><i>We note proposals to increase the setbacks at the south east and south west corners of the tower and for windows on the southern façade have not been pursued and this is consistent with our advice.</i></p> <p><i>We acknowledge that articulation of the southern facade is being explored through textured and patterned cladding. The resolution of this facade remains unresolved and further detail should be presented for discussion at the next DRP.</i></p> <p><i>As requested, tower floor plans have been provided and building setbacks above the podium are understood.</i></p>	<p>The detailed design of the southern facade of the building has been the subject of ongoing design development, testing, and discussion with the DRP. The ultimate design of the southern facade has been revisited to resolve the textured and patterned cladding, as shown in the additional information prepared by Tzannes (Appendix B of the RTS). This design resolution has ultimately been supported by the DRP at the most recent meeting (meeting #9) where it was resolved that the proposed infill detail where the curved corner abuts the adjoining site at the southern boundary and the modelling and ceramic materials proposed for the southern facade was supported.</p> <p>The southern facade will not adopt additional setbacks in the south eastern and south western corners and will not incorporate windows, consistent with the GANSW advice and the outcomes of the DRP Meeting #6. This resolution is discussed in the Updated Design Excellence Report at Appendix Q.</p> <p>The revised southern facade incorporates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The continuation of flat bands at the key slab edges from the northern, eastern and western facades so that the proportions of the podium are referenced in the southern facade of the podium. • The curved glass corner adjacent to the southern edge of the tower is replaced by a line of windows orientated to the south that cast a stronger shadow, articulating the junction of ceramic and glass and emphasising the verticality of the tower. • The use of folded ceramic cladding articulates the eastern and western edges of the tower with profiled panels that cast vertical shadows. When contracted with the flat cladding used on the rest of the facade, it accentuates this texture and deepens the expression of the threshold condition. • The ceramic folds on the east and west facades of the tower also appear to wrap the corners when viewed obliquely, whilst at the same time maintaining strong corners to the south east and south west, expressing the southern wall as a structural blade that unites the tower and podium. • The ceramic cladding has also been extended to the roof portion of the southern facade. <p>The southern facade remains more restrained in its articulation compared with the remainder of the building, consistent with the desired hierarchy of facades, to give prominence to the Martin Place frontage of the building. It is clad in ceramic panels that reflect the proportions and design language of the podium and tower, and have been designed to ensure the south tower responds to the proportionality of 50 Martin Place whilst at the same time maintaining a positive relationship with development to the south (both existing and future). When viewed from the south or in the city skyline, this grand ceramic wall will be a marker for Martin Place in the wider city context.</p>
<p>Wayfinding and activation <i>GANSW supports the articulation of the ground plane and Metro station entry which achieves a positive contribution to the street.</i></p> <p><i>We acknowledge that activation of the frontages to Castlereagh Street and Martin Place have been considered in the design, however the ways in which this is achieved are not supported by an overall strategy for activation.</i></p> <p><i>The internal scale of the Metro station entrance is not fully understood. Larger scale and dimensioned drawings, and 3D visualisations should be provided to show heights, the pitch of stairs and depth of beams.</i></p>	<p>Retail Strategy has prepared a Retail Activation Strategy for the Precinct (refer to Appendix L of the RTS). The Strategy outlines the requirement to</p> <p>Tzannes has provided further detailed visualisation in the design report at Appendix B of the RTS, showing the design of the through-site link and station entries. It is emphasised that the design and construction of the station entries form part of the CSSI Approval, and as such these additional visualisations are provided for information only. The ongoing detailed design and documentation of these elements are the subject of a separate process, and are being developed in consultation with the Sydney Metro DRP.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the detailed design of the South Tower has been developed with consideration of street activation and creating usable and connected retail spaces. The following design measures have been implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All proposed retail tenancies overlook Martin Place, or are directly accessible from Martin Place, Castlereagh Street and Elizabeth Street. This ensures that each tenancy contributes to the creation of an active frontage,

Extract	Response
<p><i>It is also not clear whether visual access to the Metro station and its facilities has been considered. In particular, the design of food and beverage spaces should ensure a significant level of transparency is provided to enable a visual connection.</i></p>	<p>noting that the proportion of retail tenancies informing the ground plane has been maximised within the constraints of the Station and OSD servicing requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear visual relationship between these tenancies and the public realm is achieved by treating the tenancies with full-height glazing. This creates unimpeded views into and from these tenancies from the public domain and other publicly accessible areas such as the through-site link. • Those tenancies on the Ground Level and Lower Ground Level with street level access have flush thresholds, enabling direct pedestrian access from street frontages. Promoting ease of access is essential to support the overall success of the retail tenancies and the creation of an active destination Precinct. • Retail on the mezzanine level of the development can be integrated into the commercial lobby for the OSD without the need for intertenancy walls, such as coffee kiosk or the like, which will improve passive surveillance, activation and reduce visual impediments within future lobby.
<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"> • resolution of the material treatment to the southern façade • further design refinement to improve the internal scale of the Metro station entrance • retail activation strategy to inform the design of retail spaces and their relationship to the public realm and Metro station • wayfinding strategy and signage. <p><i>We anticipate that following the DRP, the response to these issues will be documented in the Response to Submissions.</i></p>	<p>These matters were discussed in the DRP meetings #7, #8, and #9 and have been addressed in the RTS report as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resolution of the material treatment to the southern façade – Section 2.1.5 and 4.3 of the RTS report. • further design refinement to improve the internal scale of the Metro station entrance – Section 2.2.1 of the RTS report, noting that the station entries form part of the CSSI Approval. • 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. • wayfinding strategy and signage – Section 2.2.1, 2.4 and 4.10 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 – South Site (SSD 9326) and has no comments in relation to this matter.</i></p>	<p>Noted. No further assessment is required.</p>
Heritage Council	
<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><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 integrated station development (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>

Extract	Response
<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>	<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 area. The story of the project 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 on the North Site 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 & Southwest Heritage Interpretation Strategy, in consultation with 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><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><u>Consultation</u></p> <p>It was noted in the Engagement Summary Report submitted with the EIS that regular consultation had 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, TKD Architecture has provided additional information on the issues raised and how the proposal has responded to those issues from consultation with the Heritage Council (refer to Appendix G). 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>
<p>Comments <i>It is suggested that the following be considered for the proposal to meet the SEARs requirements that relate to heritage.</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

Extract	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update of the pre-submission consultation statement to include all consultation with the Heritage Council. Details of consultation to clearly identify issues raised during the consultation and how the proposal responds to those issues. Provision of high level design/construction milestones and timeframes, to provide the Heritage Council with an opportunity to highlight matters they wish to comment on. Development of 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 could be guided by the Sydney Metro Interpretation Strategy. 	<p>implement the Strategy. It is suggested that the requirement for a Heritage Interpretation Plan be conditioned to be provided at an appropriate future stage.</p>
Transport for NSW	
<p>Protection of Sydney Trains structures and easements</p> <p><u>Comment</u> 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. 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.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> Sydney Trains requests that the Department of Planning and Environment imposes the conditions included in TAB A.</p> <p>TAB A conditions:</p> <p>General Condition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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. <p>Prior to the Issue of the Construction Certificate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 	<p>The Structural Statement and Rail Corridor Impact Report prepared by Arup (Appendix G and I of the EIS, respectively) assessed the detailed design of the proposal and confirmed that the proposed development would not impact on the structural integrity or safe, effective operation and maintenance of the existing Eastern Suburbs Railway. Further, it confirmed that all relevant aspects of the Metro Martin Place station design works (which are subject to a separate planning process) have been undertaken in accordance with TfNSW's Asset Standards Authority (ASA) standards.</p>

Extract	Response
<p><i>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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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.</i> <i>• 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>During Construction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Unless advised by Sydney Trains in writing, all excavation, shoring and piling works within 25m of the rail corridor are to be supervised by a geotechnical engineer experienced with such excavation projects.</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 issue the final Occupation Certificate until written confirmation has been received from Sydney Trains confirming that this condition has been satisfied.</i></p>	
<p>Point to point services</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p>	<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 South Site would indicate a demand of approximately 7 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</p>

Extract	Response
<p><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></p> <p><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 will utilise the existing taxi rank on Elizabeth Street outside the South Site. Additional areas for point to point services may be developed as part of public domain works.</p> <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with the Sydney Coordination Office to discuss this matter and others.</p>
<p>Freight and Servicing</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p><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 the development's servicing requirements cannot be accommodated solely within the development's loading dock without the implementation and use of the following measures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Supply chain consolidation;</i> <i>Operation of an off-site consolidation centre; and</i> <i>Providing resilience in contingency situations through the North Tower loading dock.</i> <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>To ensure the development is adequately serviced now and into the future, TfNSW recommends the applicant be conditioned to implement and maintain these measures 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.</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><u>Recommendation</u></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><i>It is requested that (as stated in TAB B):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The applicant be conditioned to prepare the final LDMP; and</i> <i>The applicant be conditioned to implement and use supply chain consolidation and off-site consolidation in conjunction with the on-site loading dock, and provide resilience through the North Tower in contingency situations, 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; and</i> <i>The LDMP is implemented once the development is operational in order to manage the freight and servicing associated with the proposed development.</i> <p><i>TAB B conditions:</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the Issue of the Occupation Certificate</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Post Occupation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Applicant shall implement the Loading Dock Management Plan in order to manage the freight and servicing associated with the development.</i> <i>The Applicant shall implement and use supply chain consolidation and off-site consolidation in conjunction with the development's on-site loading dock, and provide resilience in contingency situations through the North Tower loading dock, to adequately 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.</i> 	
<p>Construction pedestrian and traffic management</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p><i>It is noted that the applicant has prepared a framework Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) as part of the Stage 2 application.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendation</u></p> <p><i>It is requested that:</i></p> <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 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>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
<p>TAB B condition:</p> <p>Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management</p> <p><i>Prior to the Commencement of Works</i></p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency with the Construction Traffic Management Framework prepared as part of the Sydney Metro City and Southwest; • Loading and unloading details, including the locations of all proposed work zones; • Haulage routes; • Construction vehicle access arrangements; • Proposed construction hours; • 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; • Construction program, highlighting details of peak construction activities and proposed construction 'Staging'; • 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; • Details of construction vehicle marshalling areas outside the CBD; • Details of pedestrian and traffic management measures; • 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; • 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 • Measures proposed to mitigate any associated general traffic, public transport, pedestrian and cyclist impacts should be clearly identified and included in the CPTMP. 	
NSW EPA	
<p>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 proposed to be undertaken by or on behalf of a NSW public authority. The EPA is therefore not the</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 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>

Extract	Response
<p><i>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>Roads and Maritime Services</p> <p><i>Roads and Maritime has reviewed the submitted application and whilst raises no objection to the proposed development, has provided some advisory comments in regards to the application's, Transport, Traffic, Pedestrian and Parking report in Annexure A.</i></p> <p><i>Annexure A:</i></p> <p><i>Transport Assessment Section 4.2 'Future Mode Share'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"The removal of the majority on-site car parking is anticipated to reduce the car driver mode share to just 3% with a subsequent increase in the public transport and active travel mode shares as result", however in Section 8: Conclusion "No car parking is being provided as part of the development". Confirmation is required as to which of the above statement is accurate.</i> <p><i>Appendix B – Swept Path Analysis</i></p> <p><i>Please include the lane configuration on the swept path diagram for trucks entering/exiting the Castlereagh Street.</i></p>	<p>An updated Transport, Traffic, Pedestrian and Parking report has been prepared and is included in Appendix C of the RTS. In response to RMS comments, the report confirms that no parking is being provided as part of the development (note four existing spaces at 50 Martin Place are being retained). The 3% car driver mode share includes trips made by staff to off-site locations (e.g. for meetings), parking in nearby parking lots or when staff travel by car for the longest part of the journey. As no on-site parking is provided, the proportion of staff driving to the North Site itself will be close to 0%.</p> <p>Swept path plans have been provided at Appendix C of the RTS.</p>
<p>Sydney Airport</p> <p><i>In accordance with the Airports Act and the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations, the application was forwarded to CASA and Airservices; their comments are attached.</i></p> <p><i>At a height of 164m AHD, the proposed development would penetrate the OLS by 8.0 metres.</i></p> <p><i>Sydney Airport believes that at 332m AHD, Obstacle #5058 (Centrepont Tower) would shield the proposed development.</i></p> <p><i>If the Department decides to approve the proposed development, we recommend that the following minimum conditions be imposed on that approval, which the Department is entitled to do under r14 (3) of the Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>We believe that these conditions are in the interests of the safety, efficiency and regularity of air transport operations at Sydney Airport:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The maximum height of the proposed development may not exceed 164m AHD, inclusive of all lift over-runs, vents, chimneys, aerials, TV antennae, construction cranes etc.</i> 	<p>No further assessment is required at this stage of the development.</p>

Extract	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Separate approval must be sought under the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996 for any cranes required to construct the buildings. 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 Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations, therefore Sydney Airport advises that approval to operate construction equipment (ie: cranes) should be obtained prior to any commitment to construct.</p>	
<p>Ausgrid</p> <p>Ausgrid notes that Appendix E to the EIS identifies that the proponent has made an initial application for connection to Ausgrid for the new development.</p> <p>Ausgrid has no further submission.</p>	<p>No further assessment is required at this stage of the development.</p>
<p>Sydney Water</p> <p><i>Drinking Water Servicing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing infrastructure has sufficient capacity to supply drinking water to the proposed development. The development site is under Centennial Park Water Supply Zone. <p><i>Wastewater Servicing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing infrastructure has sufficient capacity to service the proposed development. The development site is under Bondi Sewerage System. <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>A Section 73 Compliance Certificate under the Sydney Water Act 1994 must be obtained from Sydney Water.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Building Plan Approval</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>No further assessment is required at this stage of the development.</p>

Extract	Response
<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><i>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</i></p>	
<p>Civil Aviation Authority</p> <p><i>CASA has reviewed the documentation and has no objections or comments on the Strategic Airspace Reports and concurs with the respective Conclusions.</i></p> <p><i>The South Site report indicates that the peak height of the tower is 152.440m Australian Height Datum (AHD). At this height the building will be under the Outer Horizontal Surface for Sydney Airport and does not need to be assessed by CASA.</i></p> <p><i>Please note that CASA's review does not include the possible impact on aviation safety by any cranes used to construct or maintain the towers.</i></p>	<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>
<p>Fire & Rescue NSW</p> <p><i>FRNSW notes that the proposed development consists of an Over Station Development (OSD) above Martin Place metro station, comprising three sites which include the North Site, South Site and 50 Martin Place.</i></p> <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> <p><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></p>	<p>The letter prepared by Arup (Appendix P of the RTS) confirms that the South 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>

Extract	Response
<p><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></p> <p><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>	