

Moore Theological College

Concept Plan and Project Application – Response To Submissions

Issues Raised		Proponent Response
RTA/SRDAC – Concept Plan		
1	Closure of Little Queen Street and it's implications on intersection phasing	MTC has withdrawn its request to the City of Sydney to close Little Queen Street. As a result there will be no impact on the intersection phasing of the surrounding road network.
2	Traffic report does not consider effects of long stay students' families who may arrive/leave the site during peak periods.	The Traffic Report has been revised to consider the effects of long stay students' families (see Attachment 5).
3	Removal of on street car parking should be considered to make way for short taxi rank	MTC have adopted the CoS recommendation that no taxi rank be incorporated into the proposal.
4	Clarification regarding ultimate access arrangements for Site A basement car park as no cross over shown on Concept Plans	The location of the access arrangements for Site A are now shown on the Concept Plans.
5	Proposal to provide sufficient car parking based on ultimate students and staff	Noted. An assessment of the final proposed car parking provision is located at Attachment 5 and Section 2.4 of the Preferred Project Report (PPR).
6	All redundant driveways including interim driveways for library and residential development shall be removed and replaced with kerb and gutter.	Point 6 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
7	MTC should be responsible for public utility adjustments/relocation works, as required by public utility authorities.	Point 7 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
8	Need to ensure pedestrian safety. Minimum 1.8m footpath should be maintained on all street frontages.	Footpath widths will be provided in accordance with Council requirements.
9	Consideration should be given to bicycle parking and facilities including showers, change rooms, etc	Point 9 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.

10	Swept paths to comply with AUSTROADS.	Point 10 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
11	Layout of car parking to comply with AS 2890.1 and AS2890.2	Point 11 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
12	Proposed turning areas to be kept clear of obstacles and parked cars.	Point 12 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
13	All demolition and construction vehicles to be contained within the site. All vehicles to enter and exit site in forward direction. No construction zone permitted on King Street.	Point 13 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
14	Car parking provision to Council's satisfaction	MTC have reconsidered the proposed parking provision which is discussed in Section 2.4 of the PPR.
15	All works/regulatory signposting associated with proposed development to be at no cost to the RTA.	Point 15 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.

RTA/SRDAC – Project Application

16	No explanation provided for reduced car parking provided for library. 60 spaces proposed however traffic report recommends 118 based on Council DCP. Parking to be provided in accordance with DoP and Council.	An assessment of the final proposed car parking provision is located at Attachment 5 and Section 2.4 of the Preferred Project Report. The assessment demonstrates that the final proposed parking provision is appropriate for the site.
17	Sufficient car parking to be provided on site to accommodate library redevelopment. All access to the site should be via the local road network. Access to King Street shall be removed and replaced with kerb and guttering to match existing.	An assessment of the final proposed car parking provision is located at Attachment 5 and Section 2.4 of the Preferred Project Report. The assessment demonstrates that the final proposed parking provision is appropriate for the site. All access to the site will be via Carillon Avenue and Little Queen Street. The access on King Street will be removed and replaced with kerb and guttering matching the existing.
18	Design and construction of gutter crossing off King Street to comply with RTA requirements. Detailed design plans to be submitted to RTA.	Point 18 has been incorporated into the Project Application Statement of Commitments.
19	MTC to submit detailed design drawings and geotechnical reports relating to excavation of site and support structures to RTA for assessment.	Point 19 has been incorporated into the Project Application Statement of Commitments.
20	A Road Occupancy Licence required from RTA for any road works that impact King Street	Point 20 has been incorporated into the Project Application Statement of Commitments.

21	Construction Management Plan detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control to be submitted to Council prior to CC.	Point 21 has been incorporated into the Project Application Statement of Commitments.
22	All works/regulatory signposting associated with proposed development to be at no cost to the RTA.	Point 22 has been incorporated into the Project Application Statement of Commitments.
Department of Transport and Infrastructure		
23	Supports and encourages commitment to investigating opportunities to provide car share and ride share schemes.	Noted.
24	Supports commitment to prepare Travel Access Guide to reduce private car usage by 10%.	Noted.
25	Recommends preparation of Workplace Travel Plan for workers and students in addition to visitors of the site.	Point 25 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
Sydney Water		
26	Sydney Water will assess the impact of the development upon receipt of a Section 73 application.	Noted.
27	Sydney Water requests DoP to continue to require MTC to apply for Section 73 Certificate.	Noted.
28	The Sydney Water stormwater system in Campbell Street will not have sufficient capacity to carry flows in a range of storms, and these flows will impact on adjoining and private properties.	The proposed development drains to Carillon Avenue, not Campbell Street. As Campbell Street drains to Carillion Street (via Little Queen Street), the proposed development will therefore connect to the system downstream of Campbell Street and thus will not add to the flows in that part of the system.
29	Development should be designed to facilitate safe conveyance of combined overflows from Campbell Street and internal site flows from north west, from overflowing onto adjoining residential properties up to the 1 to 100 year ARI.	GS Sparks have reviewed Sydney Water's comments in regards to surcharging of the stormwater system within Campbell Street and have determined that any surcharge of this line would occur via Council's stormwater pit located near the south-western corner of the site not at Sydney Water's access structure. Additionally any overland flow that would occur from this pit would not enter the property as the local sag point in the road is located to the west of the site. The survey of the existing surface shows that overland flow would occur from this point via the property to the west of the site. This position has been confirmed with Council's stormwater drainage engineer Myl Sethivasan.

	Additional treatment beyond detention tank and Copa/CDS PL0506 GPT is required to ensure development meets contemporary water quality discharge points.	As discussed above, there is no overflow from Campbell Street entering this site due to the levels of the site and the surrounding properties. Therefore the design flow to be considered for selection of the GPT and detention basin are flows that occur on site due to storm events up to the 100 yr ARI. This level of storm event has already been taken into consideration in the current design and therefore the current proposed treatment method will meet the discharge points required by Sydney Water Corporation and the City of Sydney Council.
30	Additional information and formal application required to connect 225mm outlet pipe from site to 450mm Sydney Water stormwater pipe.	Point 30 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
31	Insufficient detail provided regarding the proposed public domain improvements to Little Queen Street in order to determine any impacts on Sydney Water stormwater assets.	Sydney Water will be consulted as part of any future Project Applications for public domain upgrades to Little Queen Street. Point 31 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
Elizabeth Moore – Online Submission (Covering Email)		
32	Advises that Owners Corp has engaged Planning Consultant to assist in preparation of submission.	Noted.
33	Requests extension for submission to be made.	Noted.
Elizabeth Moore – Online Submission (Attachment)		
34	EAR does not adequately consider the Campbell Street terraces or 53-63 King Street, Newtown.	Further assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the Campbell Street terraces and 53-63 King Street is located at Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the PPR.
35	No consultation with residential and small business.	MTC met with Elizabeth Moore, including visiting her apartment in the Rubicon development following the exhibition period. The Preferred Project has been revised to address her concerns where possible. A view impact analysis was also undertaken and is included in Section 2.1 of the PPR.
36	Intensification of the academic and institutional uses of the site.	In response to the concern over intensification of the site, MTC have significantly reduced the scale of the proposal. Whilst the redevelopment will still result in the intensification of the uses located on the campus, both the proposed academic and residential uses are generally in the same locations on the site and will not alter the character of the area. The EAR and PPR demonstrate that the proposed intensification will not have any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area.
37	Traffic impacts on Carillon Avenue.	In response to concern over the traffic impacts of the proposal, the proposed number of car parking spaces has been reduced from 340 to 270 spaces resulting in a reduction of 70 spaces.

		As detailed in Section 2.4 of the PPR and Traffic Report at Attachment 5 the proposed development will have no adverse traffic impacts on Carillion Avenue or the surrounding road network.
38	Impact of proposed closure of Little Queen Street on Campbell Street	In response to concern over the impact of closing Little Queen Street on Campbell Street MTC have withdrawn their application to Council and the existing street network will not be altered.
39	Insufficient attention to public transport and bicycle transport routes	The number of proposed car spaces has been reduced to encourage greater use of the public transport infrastructure in the area. The proposed development will provide bike racks and shower change facilities on the site to encourage use of bicycles.
40	Heritage impacts on aesthetics of buildings and vegetation	As detailed in the AJ + C Urban Design Report lodged with the EAR, the proposed design provides a contemporary response which respects and draws on the heritage character of the existing area. The Preferred Project has generally reduced the height and massing of the proposal to further assist minimising the heritage impact of the development. It should also be noted that deep soil planting will provide opportunity for new trees to grow to a substantial size on the site.
41	Impacts of residential college buildings on adjoining properties	A detailed assessment of the proposal's impacts on the adjoining properties is located in Section 2.0 of the PPR.
42	Impacts on residents of Rubicon development	A detailed assessment of the proposal's impacts on the Rubicon development is located in Sections 2.0 of the PPR.
Rubicon Submission (Rodney Jensen)		
43	Incompatibility of use and unacceptable institutional sprawl and intensification	MTC have been located at their Newtown Campus since 1889 and is not considered to be incompatible with the surrounding area. The Concept Plan sets the long term development parameters for the site and will occur incrementally over the next two decades, it is therefore the opposite of uncontrolled 'institutional sprawl'.
44	Impacts on heritage	MTC have reduced the size of the proposal in response to concerns relating to the impact of the scale of the development on the heritage character of the area. The revised Heritage Impact State (see Attachment 3) concludes that the proposed development will have no adverse impacts on the heritage character of the area.
45	Traffic and transport	The scale of the proposed development and quantity of on-site car parking has been reduced to address the traffic impacts of the development. A revised Traffic and Transport Report has been prepared to assess the preferred Concept Plan and Project Application (see Attachment 2).

46	Urban design character	MTC have responded to the issue relating to the impact of the Research and Resource Centre on the urban design character of Newtown in Section 2.1 of the PPR. The Preferred Project Application has reduced the height and massing of the Research and Resource Centre in response to their concerns.
City of Sydney		
47	Scale of development appears excessive given current student population and despite student/staff predictions.	A justification between the scale of the development and current / predicted staff populations is located in Section 2.1 of the PPR.
48	Development has not adequately considered the character of the existing development; context of surrounds and desired future character of area and is therefore out of scale with the immediately adjoining built form.	MTC have responded to the issue of the proposal being inconsistent with the desired future character of the area in Section 2.1 of the PPR.
49	Rationale that the site redevelopment is an expansion to the institutional precinct is not supported.	<p>The City of Sydney's comments are inconsistent with the NSW Department of Planning's Sydney Sub-Regional Strategy. The site is identified in the Draft Sydney Sub-Regional Strategy as an educational use within the area mapped as the Sydney Education and Health Precinct. The key aim for the Precinct is to promote world class education and health facilities and opportunities for renewal.</p> <p>Therefore MTC's proposal to provide a world class education facility within an area identified in the State's sub-regional strategy for education uses should be strongly supported. Further discussion of this matter is located at Section 2.1 of the PPR.</p>
50	Site and buildings are removed from Sydney University and are different in scale, use and character.	See Section 2.1 of the PPR.
51	Site partially falls within the King Street Conservation Area and partially within the Bligh and Camperdown Terrace Conservation Area characterised by small scale housing.	See Section 2.1 of the PPR. It is noted that under the draft Sydney LEP 2010 the conservation areas have been revised. The revised areas no longer include the site's Carillon Avenue frontage or the Library site.
52	Council's Urban Design Study identifies the library site and Defence site as significant sites adjoining heritage/contributory items in a conservation area.	Noted.
53	Study recommends 18m/5 storeys for library site with reduced storeys fronting Carillon Avenue. Transition is fundamental for the site.	The Library (Building A1) has been reduced from 7 storeys to 6 storeys. Further discussion of the proposed development transition with the adjoining area is located at Section 2.1 of the PPR.

54	<p>Proposed heights do not relate well to existing adjoining low scale, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B1 is 12m over recommended height control ▪ B2 is 19m over Study's recommended 12m height control 	<p>Building B1 has been reduced from 5 storeys to 4 storeys.</p> <p>Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the PPR demonstrate that the proposed height of Buildings B1 and B2 are appropriate on the site and will have no adverse environmental impacts.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of Campbell Street development diminishes quality of terraces on that streets 	<p>Further discussion of the proposed development transition with the adjoining area is located at Section 2.1 of the PPR.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A8 building height does not relate well to proposed heritage item (A7) 	<p>Building A8 has been revised to include a 4m upper level setback to improve the relationship of Deaconess House. It should be noted that Mary Andrews House (which is proposed for demolition) is an existing 4-5 storey building directly adjacent to the proposed heritage item. Building A8 is located further away from the proposed heritage item and will therefore improve the way the adjoining building relate to Deaconess House.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of library exceeds Study controls by 12m and should be reduced to 5 storeys/12m 	<p>The Library (Building A1) has been reduced from 7 storeys to 6 storeys. Further discussion of the proposed development transition with the adjoining area is located at Section 2.1 of the PPR.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accordingly height of buildings across the site should be reconsidered having regard to the site's context, character of conservation and recommendations of the study. 	<p>The height of the buildings across the site has been reduced in response to concerns regarding the context and character of the area.</p>
55	<p>Floor to ceiling heights are more generous than the recommendations made within the Urban Design Study.</p>	<p>In recent times the floor to floor heights have increased to provide better acoustic and environmental amenity along with the accommodation of services. The proposed floor to floor heights are maximum heights to provide flexibility as building and development standards change.</p> <p>The recommended height controls are predicated on 3.6m floor to floor for commercial uses. The current best practice optimum recommended floor to floor heights allowing for services and acoustic insulation etc is 4.1m floor to floor. The UDR floor to floor heights are therefore not appropriate for the proposed uses.</p> <p>Furthermore the proposed academic uses such as lecture theatres and seminar rooms which require higher floor to floors to ensure sightlines and acoustic amenity.</p>
56	<p>Need to confirm actual heights as the heights identified in the EA differ to the architectural plans. Reference to RLS may provide too much flexibility and should be reconsidered. Documentation should show/identify maximum height of all structures.</p>	<p>The discrepancy between the heights in the exhibited Concept Plan was to allow flexibility for building plant. The architectural drawings submitted as part of the Preferred Project have been revised to to show the maximum height of the structures.</p>

57	MTC should reinstate FSRs across the site. Any approval should be for GFA and FSR and show distribution of FSRs across the site.	The proposal is for a Concept Plan and therefore takes a strategic and holistic approach to the redevelopment of the entire site. The CoS FSR recommendations, which are based on a lot by lot basis are therefore not appropriate in the broader context of the site wide approach taken by the Concept Plan.
58	No detailed GFA plans have been submitted to articulate what has been included and what has been excluded as GFA. Plans should be submitted which accurately determine the GFA (and FSR) proposed.	GFA plans have been included as part of the Architectural Drawings at Attachment 3 .
59	The FSR for the library site (the Project Application) needs to be confirmed and benchmarked against current 1.5:1 FSR control.	<p>The GFA of the Library building has been reduced from 9059m² to 7376m². The Preferred Project will therefore still not comply with the existing FSR control of 1.5:1. However, the City of Sydney has themselves recommended in the UDR that a gateway building be provided on the site with an FSR of 4:1 and the recently released draft LEP maps also set an FSR of 4:1 on the site.</p> <p>Therefore, despite Council's request for the development to be benchmarked against the 1.5:1 FSR control, this request is inconsistent with Council's long term intention for a larger building to be provided on the site and serves little value. Instead an assessment of the size of the Preferred Project is contained within the PPR.</p>
60	GFA above the current FSR on the library site (the Project Application) should be subject to a VPA.	<p>The current FSR applying to the Project Application site is 1.5:1, however, the City of Sydney's own Urban Design Report recommends that an FSR of 4:1 be adopted for the site and the recently released draft LEP maps also set an FSR of 4:1 on the site. Therefore there is no sensible logic in requiring MTC to enter a VPA over their exceedance of the existing FSR on this part of the site when both the Department and the City of Sydney have assessed it in terms of its compliance with the recommended FSR of 4:1.</p> <p>Regardless of this, MTC is a non-profit educational establishment who will, amongst other public benefits, be providing a publicly accessible world-class theological library on the Project Application site. Council's recommendation that MTC pay additional contributions for their exceedance of the FSR control (that they themselves acknowledge is no longer suitable for the site), is inappropriate and should not be adopted by the Department.</p>
61	Continuous building form along Carillon Avenue is excessively long and uncharacteristic of the area. Building forms needs to be broken up and greater articulation provided.	The design of the buildings along Carillon Avenue has been modified in response to this concern. The revised design has broken up the building form and given greater articulation consistent with the existing character along the street as requested.
62	Pedestrian through site link should be retained.	No through-site link is currently located on Carillon Avenue as indicated in Council's submission. It is MTC intention that entry to College Green remain from the formal entry points through the Research and Resource Centre and Little Queen Street.

63	Library building does not provide any street activation or a distinct pedestrian entrance.	To address this concern the proposal has been revised to provide street activation and a distinct pedestrian entrance.
64	Location of administration services on ground floor not considered appropriate in this location. More active uses need to be incorporated into the design.	The administration services have been relocated to the upper levels of the building and active library uses, similar to those at City of Sydney's Surry Hills Library, have been relocated to the ground and basement level.
65	Curved recess on King Street is an awkward design resolution. Should be deleted and consideration be given to a integrated bus shelter into facade design.	The curved recess on King Street has been removed from the proposal. As discussed in Section 2.3 of the PPR an integrated bus shelter is not supported by the Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure.
66	No awnings proposed and should be provided along length of King Street frontage to facilitate pedestrian movement.	<p>An extended awning will be provided at the entrance to Resource and Research Centre. However, no awning is proposed along the rest of the King Street frontage (in front of the Project Application site) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ an awning would be incompatible with the building design; ▪ pedestrian movements along this section of King Street are relatively low as the retail areas have ended; and ▪ there is no awning to the north along City Road, which means additional awning coverage would be of little value to pedestrians travelling in that direction.
67	Corner of King Street and Carillon Avenue should be designed to ensure the pedestrian movement is not obstructed. Consideration should be given to widening footpath to ensure adequate space is provided for pedestrians.	The proposed planted areas are located within the site and will not obstruct pedestrian movements. Based on the current pedestrian traffic, the existing circulation is adequate and widening is required.
68	Significant overshadowing is anticipated to the terraces on Campbell Street and all day during winter.	The overshadowing impacts of the proposal have been considered in Section 2.2 of the PPR. The height and massing of the proposal has been revised to reduce the overshadowing impacts on Campbell Street.
69	Height and overshadowing of North Newtown Public School is of concern. School is heritage listed and development needs to be sympathetic to significance of school site.	The overshadowing impacts of the proposal have been considered in Section 2.2 of the PPR. The height and massing of the proposal has been revised to reduce the overshadowing impacts on North Newtown Public School.
70	The development will result in an undesirable precedent for 96 City Road.	The future redevelopment of 96 City Road will be required to consider the site's context and LEP height and FSR controls that apply to the site. As part of the design and assessment process the development of 96 City Road will required to consider the environmental impacts such as overshadowing on Darlington and an undesirable impacts are unlikely to be supported by the Department or the City of Sydney and gain approval.

71	All heritage items should be retained and conserved, and partial demolition should be limited to items of little heritage significance at the rear of the items.	<p>All heritage items on the site are being retained and conserved. The proposed demolition of the rear of 21-25 King Street retains the significant building fabric, in particular the King Street façade, and allows for the adaptive reuse of the buildings to ensure their long term conservation.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Statement prepared for the EAR demonstrated that if the works were undertaken in accordance with the Conservation Management Strategy prepared for MTC, then the proposed works will not significantly adversely affect the identified heritage significance of the property.</p>
72	All contributory items should be retained except for 30-32 Carillon Avenue. Any approved demolition of contributory items (if granted by DoP) should be only where replacement building is proposed.	<p>The proposed demolition of 3 contributory buildings is the outcome of a detailed site analysis and design process on a site heavily constrained by heritage. The demolition of the contributory buildings will allow MTC to achieve the growth they require whilst allowing the College to conserve and enhance the other more significant heritage buildings on the site. Therefore, on balance, the demolition of these buildings (most of which are in a state of disrepair) is an acceptable outcome on the site because it will allow for the development to proceed whilst still retaining the heritage significant buildings and the majority of the contributory buildings on the site.</p> <p>Discussion regarding the demolition of the contributory buildings to accommodate the temporary car park is located in Section 2.4 of the PPR.</p>
73	Adaptive reuse of contributory items should be sympathetic.	Noted.
74	Rear additions to heritage items should be subservient to main parts of the building.	The intent of Point 74 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments to ensure that a sympathetic design solution will be achieved to the rear addition of 23-27 King Street as part of the future Project Application for the detailed design.
75	New development along Campbell Street should be reduced in height to relate to predominant one and two storey scale context.	The upper level of Building B4 has been setback to provide a better relationship with the adjoining development along Campbell Street.
76	Addition of third levels to 1-13 and 6-18 Little Queen Street not supported.	The Heritage Impact Statement at Attachment I of the EAR supported the additions to the third levels to 1-13 and 6-18 Little Queen Street. The detailed design of the additions, which will be assessed as part of a future Project Application will be sympathetic to the heritage buildings.
77	A heritage interpretation strategy should be prepared and implemented.	Point 77 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
78	All buildings to be demolished should be archived.	Point 78 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
79	Submitted CMS too general. Detailed and appropriate conservation	

	strategies for each contributory and/or heritage item.	The submitted HIS and CMS, in conjunction with the Statement of Commitments are considered satisfactory. Future detailed Project/Development Applications for works on the affected heritage buildings will provide additional conservation measures if required.
80	Potential archaeological responses to be managed in accordance with Heritage Branch Guidelines.	Point 80 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
81	Demolition of 84 and 86 Campbell Street for library project application not supported and should be retained for residential purposes.	The demolition of 84 and 86 Campbell Street supported by the Heritage Impact Statement.
82	<p>There are inconsistencies between EA and plans (demolition) regarding 1-13 Little Queen Street.</p> <p>The EAR and UDR do not correctly state the heritage status of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 King Street ▪ 23-25 King Street ▪ 33-35 King Street 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>1-13 Little Queen Street is not proposed for demolition, this was an error in the EAR.</p> <p>It is noted that 21 King Street, 23-25 King Street and 33-35 King Street are all local heritage items.</p>
83	Note that Deaconess House has been listed as a draft heritage item in Council's LEP.	Noted. This building is proposed to be conserved and enhanced as part of the Concept Plan.
84	Consideration should be given to whether matters such as building separation, building depth and solar access comply with SEPP 65.	A conceptual SEPP 65 analysis was undertaken as part of the Concept Plan EAR and the Statement of Commitments commit all future Project Applications to demonstrating compliance with the ten design principles in SEPP 65 and the Rules-of-Thumb in the Residential Flat Design Code. Further SEPP 65 analysis will be undertaken as part of future project/development applications on the site.
85	Council does not support MTC's request for an exemption from Section 94. Proposal does not satisfy exemptions criteria in Section 94 Plan.	MTC stands by its position on Section 94 outlined in the EAR.
86	Clarification required as to exact extent of ESD commitments	The Concept Plan and Project Application Statement of Commitments have been revised to provide more substantial ESD Commitments.
88	Council does not support proposed number of car parking spaces given majority of students will live on campus and proximity of site to public transport.	Car parking on the site has been reduced by 70 car spaces. A revised traffic assessment has been provided at Attachment 5 .
89	Traffic report applies car parking rates that differ from Council rates and if applied would result in significantly reduced car parking provision.	Car parking on the site has been reduced by 70 car spaces. A revised traffic assessment has been provided at Attachment 5 .

90	Library does not generate car parking if students live predominantly on site and therefore car parking should be reconsidered.	The Project Application has been revised to not include any additional car parking.
91	<p>Temporary car park concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detracts from streetscape ▪ Provides no public domain benefit ▪ Provides no opportunities for casual surveillance ▪ Potential longevity of car park once constructed ▪ Requires removal of contributory items ▪ Entry/exit arrangement and resultant impacts ▪ Overall demand given basement car parking proposed in library 	MTC have responded to the issues associated with the proposed Temporary Car Park in Section 2.4 of the PPR.
92	Proposed bicycle provision is well below Council requirements – 70 space shortfall	Bicycle car parking will be provided for the Project Application and Concept Plan in accordance with the CoS requirements.
93	Details on actual number of end trip bicycle facilities not provided. Secure bicycle facilities should be provided.	<p>End trip bicycle facilities are proposed within the Site A basement.</p> <p>Secure bicycle facilities are proposed within the Site A basement.</p>
94	Library car park should be restricted to left in left out. Signage also required.	No library car park is proposed as part of the Preferred Project.
95	Impact of Little Queen Street closure needs to be considered. Design of future buildings to potentially pedestrianised streets needs to be considered.	MTC have withdrawn their application to Council to close Little Queen Street.
96	Public domain improvements likely to be recommended. Provision of bollards only not considered sufficient.	MTC have withdrawn their application to Council to close Little Queen Street.
97	Green Travel Plan for the site should be prepared and include education campaigns for staff and students.	Point 97 has been incorporated into the Concept Plan Statement of Commitments.
98	Should be noted that existing terrace houses will no longer be eligible for parking permits.	The existing terrace houses should retain their parking permits up until the time the Site B car park is completed. Removal prior to that time on the basis there is an approved Concept Plan on the site would be unreasonable.
99	Unlikely a taxi zone will be permitted by Council on Carillon Avenue.	The taxi zone on Carillon Avenue has been removed from the proposal.

100	Servicing needs and loading dock proposals to be reconsidered as access from a future pedestrianised street is unacceptable.	MTC have withdrawn their application to Council to close Little Queen Street.
101	<p>Pedestrian connection and access concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No public domain or pedestrian safety improvements proposed between Site A and Site B ▪ Potential pedestrian/vehicle access and potential conflicts in/around Little Queen Street ▪ Additional shelters required for pedestrians within the Sites A and B ▪ Disability access not satisfactorily considered 	The detailed design of the pedestrian access and public domain upgrades will be detailed as part of the future Project Applications on the site.
102	Plaza-shared zone with delivery vehicles creates conflict between pedestrians and vehicles	In response to the CoS' concern, the Plaza shared zone has been revised to no longer be a shared zone and will now serve strictly as loading dock access area with separate pedestrian access between Site A and B.
103	Tree removal on Council property has not been justified and arborist report identifies they are of high significance. In any case it requires approval from Council.	The proposal has been revised to ensure that the tree located on Council property is no longer proposed to be removed.
104	Little consideration given to tree retention on site. Trees should be retained as much as possible.	The proposal has been revised to retain an additional 3 trees on the site. As a result of the proposed staging, the Concept Plan will not involve the removal of all the trees at one time, rather the incremental removal and replanting of trees across the site.
105	No deep soil zones provided.	The proposal will provide deep soil zones as shown in Attachment 2 .
106	A detailed environmental assessment required to address site contamination and any required RAP prior to approval of Concept Plan to confirm site is suitable for proposed uses.	The preliminary findings confirm site is suitable. Detailed ESAs will be prepared for subsequent Project Applications. The Concept Plan Statement of Commitments have been revised accordingly.
107	Further details required to ensure noise levels are acceptable for intended educational uses.	The acoustic report submitted with the EAR concluded that the noise levels are acceptable for educational uses.
108	Separate approval required by Council for use of hydraulic equipment.	Noted.
109	If tri-generation proposed, further details required to be submitted and referred to DECCW.	No tri-generation is proposed.