

ISSUE	RESPONSE
Sydney Olympic Park Authority	
<p>SOPA Act & Environmental Guidelines</p> <p>The application does not include any assessment of consistency with the SOPA Act 2001 or SOPA's Environmental Guidelines. The SOPA Act (s22(2)) requires that <i>'in determining an application for consent to carry out development on land within Sydney Olympic Park, the Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning must consider the consistency of the proposed development with the Environmental Guidelines'</i>.</p>	<p>The Addendum to SOPA's submission identifies the relevant clauses of the Environmental Guidelines. these are addressed in the Addendum - Stormwater section of this table.</p>
<p>Stormwater</p> <p>The proposed development site is outside the WRAMS catchment area, and stormwater from this site cannot be readily harvested into WRAMS, however no other solution to stormwater collection and recycling (e.g. harvesting for reuse with the development) appears to have been considered in project design. All stormwater is proposed to be discharged to Bennelong Pond, and this is considered to be inconsistent with the Environmental Guidelines (Refer to Point 1 of the Addendum).</p> <p>Stormwater harvesting and recycling needs to be incorporated into the design of this project. This is particularly important given the likely cumulative impacts upon the ecology of Bennelong Pond (Refer to Point 2 of the Addendum). Construction stormwater will also need to be appropriately managed (Refer to Point 3 of the Addendum).</p>	<p>A stormwater harvesting scheme has been incorporated into the proposed development, as outlined in Section 2.1 of this report.</p>
<p>Contamination</p> <p>Given that the proposed development site is in close proximity to remediated lands, it is pertinent that the waste classification is reviewed by the EPA. The Department of Planning and Infrastructure may also wish to give consideration to requiring the proponent to provide an independent waste classification for any material that is being removed from the site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Waste Management Plan</p> <p>The proponent will need to prepare a Waste Management Plan that includes (but not limited to) progressive testing and stockpiling of the excavated material at an appropriate frequency in accordance with the EPA's <i>Waste Classification Guidelines</i> around the identified 'hot spots' to determine the extent of the contamination and ensure that any material that does not meet the human health guidelines is appropriately classified before being removed</p>	<p>A waste management plan that addresses the stockpiling and disposal of excavated materials will be prepared prior to the issue of a construction certificate, in accordance with EPA requirements.</p>

ISSUE	RESPONSE
<p>off-site for disposal.</p> <p>Demolition Staging Plan & Sediment Control Plan</p> <p>The Plans show that the existing former 'Samsung' building and adjoining car park will be demolished as part of this Application. It is not clear if some or all of these buildings/structures will be demolished as part of the works for 3 Murray Rose Ave, and the timing. This is critical to the Authority in terms of delivering the public road works (extension of Murray Rose Avenue down to Bennelong Parkway). The impact of the demolition and bulk earthworks on adjoining sites (1&2 Murray Rose, and Paddock Park) is also not clear.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Applicant should prepare a Demolition & Interim Works Staging Plan and Sediment & Erosion Control Plan for the adjoining sites (1&2 Murray Rose and Paddock Park).</p>	<p>The architectural drawings (refer Attachment G) have been amended to clarify the extent of demolition. In simple terms, the remainder of the former Samsung building is to be completely demolished, and the adjoining at-grade car park is to remain. Approval for the demolition of the car park will be obtained as part of a future application. This future application could be driven by either the development of 1 Murray Rose Avenue or the extension of Murray Rose Avenue itself.</p> <p>The demolition of the former Samsung building will not have any significant impacts on the adjoining sites, including 1 and 2 Murray Rose Avenue and the future Paddock Park.</p>
<p>Recesses</p> <p>It is noted that the depth of the recesses, and in particular the eastern façade, has been reduced to a minimum. The proposed floor plates are large and similar to those of 5 Murray Rose Avenue which has large recesses and is better articulated into 2 defined 'wings' that provides better solar access and worker amenity. The proponent should satisfactorily address why the recesses have been reduced for this development.</p>	<p>Comment in relation to the recesses has been prepared by Turner and Associates Architects (refer Attachment E). In summary, the proposed recesses have been carefully proportioned to respond to the context of the site.</p>
<p>The Cutting & the Chase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is noted that no details have been provided for the awning within 'the Cutting'. The Proponent should clarify if it is proposed as part of this application. If yes, the detailed design of the awning should be provided, and it should be consistent with advice from the Design Review Panel. The EA illustrates an interim and ultimate treatment of the loading dock and through-site pedestrian link that form part of the 'the Chase'. It is not clear when and how these ultimate civil and landscape works would be triggered as this would rely on cooperation and funding from the redevelopment of the adjoining site (1 Murray Rose); which may be under separate ownership in the future. The proponent should address 	<p>The awning is indicative only and does not form part of this application. A separate application will be submitted if the installation of the awning is to be pursued.</p> <p>The approach to the interim and final solutions for the Chase is the same as that applied to 5 Murray Rose Avenue and the Cutting. The interim works are to be completed as part of 3 Murray Rose Avenue, and have been designed to function independently of the neighbouring site. The final design of the remainder of the Chase will be dependent on any future approval at 1 Murray Rose Avenue and may be amended from what is currently shown, however the final design is intended to demonstrate that a viable and attractive design solution can be achieved. Further information is provided by Turner and Associates Architects (refer Attachment E).</p> <p>The path width will be amended to suit the</p>

ISSUE	RESPONSE
<p>this matter in more detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pedestrian path within "the Chase" is shown as 1.2m wide and not consistent with the Authority's Access Guidelines which nominate 1.8m as the minimum width for publicly accessible paths. The SOPA Access Guidelines (May 2011) are to be Implemented as the minimum standard. It is not clear if there is provision for deep soil zones / pockets to support trees proposed over "the Cutting". This is also applicable to trees proposed within "the Chase" as Drawing EA301.G indicates a plant room/service zone under the roadway with no allowance for deep soil zones/pockets to support future tree planting shown on Drawing LA6D. The proponent should prepare a Landscape Plan with cross sections (showing minimum 1m depth tree planting pockets, root-able soil volumes and irrigation system) for SOPA's approval. 	<p>SOPA Access Guidelines.</p> <p>Deep soil zones are provided in the area adjacent to Murray rose Avenue in the Cutting and adjacent to Brick Pit Park in the Chase. These are not over any structure and so will be able to support large trees. The planting near Murray Rose Avenue in the Chase is nominated on the landscape drawings as "stepped entry planting accentuating laneway design" and does not require deep soil zones.</p>
<p>Traffic</p> <p>The Traffic Report from Better Transport Futures is generally satisfactory, however needs to be amended to use more up-to-date data, as it is relying on the traffic surveys measuring volumes at Australia Ave / Parkview Dr (carried out in October 2009) and Australia Ave / Murray Rose Ave (carried out in June 2012).</p> <p>The Australia Ave/Parkview intersection has significantly more traffic going through it in 2012 due to developments such as Australia Towers (Site 3) and Fujitsu (Site 8a) and as such the data is a little out of date. The Australia Ave / Murray Rose Ave data is based on assumptions from the 5 Murray Rose Ave (Lion building) rather than the actual usage from the (now) tenanted building.</p> <p>The SIDRA analysis for the intersection of Australia Ave / Murray Rose Ave (Table 6-2), shows that traffic entering Australia Ave from Murray Rose East in the PM peak is close to unsatisfactory (LOS D). This has potential to increase accident frequency at this intersection and, as recommended, requires an accident study.</p>	<p>The Traffic Assessment has been updated to reflect recently completed developments in the locality. Refer to Section 2.3 and Attachment C.</p> <p>It is noted that the Australia Avenue / Murray Rose Avenue intersection is anticipated as operating with a Satisfactory level of service (LOS C). Being close to LOS D is not the same as actually being predicted as LOS D, and therefore an accident study is not required. It is anticipated that an accident study may be required for any development that does actually result in a predicted unsatisfactory level of service.</p>
<p>Swept Path Analysis</p> <p>The Traffic Report mentions that a swept path analysis has been completed for vehicles using</p>	<p>The swept path analysis is provided on the architectural drawings (refer drawing EA109_C in Attachment G).</p>

ISSUE	RESPONSE
the loading dock. SOPA requests a copy of the analysis for both the interim and ultimate (when 1 Murray Rose Av is developed) treatment of the loading dock.	
Vehicle Parking MP 2030's maximum vehicle parking ratio of 1 vehicle per 80sqm should be maintained. Various improvements to public transport such as the 10-min interval train service in AM/PM peaks as well as the additional bus services (450 & 533) have resulted in better public transport services to SOP in recent years.	See discussion at Section 2.2 . In particular it is noted that Transport for NSW's submission states: <i>Given that there is no significant change in the overall public transport provision of the SOP precinct in the foreseeable future, Transport for NSW does not object to the on-site parking rate of 1 space per 55m2 of Gross Floor Area (GFA) for the proposed development.</i>
Tree Management Plan A Tree Management Plan will need to form part of the supporting documentation to address Points 4-6 in the Addendum.	Refer to addendum comments below.
Driveway The width of the proposed driveway should be reviewed and narrowed, subject to compliance with relevant standards, to reduce the disruption to the Murray Rose Avenue footpath.	The driveway width is already at the minimum to provide suitable access to the car park and loading dock.
Public Domain Plan To ensure interface levels and materials are well-integrated with Stage 2 of Brick Pit Park, the proponent will need to submit an amended Public Domain Plan in accordance with the requirements of SOPA's Urban Elements Design Manual (2009).	The proponent will prepare amended public domain plans in consultation with SOPA as the design of Brick Pit Park is further developed and finalised by SOPA.
Lighting Lighting should be designed and oriented to avoid impacts to wildlife in adjacent habitat areas. Building and outdoor lighting should not be directed to the Brickpit or Badu Mangroves, and should not be directed upwards.	Noted.
Conclusion Subject to the above issues being satisfactorily addressed by the proponent, the Authority supports the proposed development and believes that it will contribute to creating a vibrant township outlined in the Sydney Olympic Park <i>Master Plan (MP) 2030</i> .	SOPA's overall support is noted.
ADDENDUM	
Stormwater Relevant clauses of the Environmental Guidelines are: <i>Clause 4.1(b) - requiring all new developments to maximise opportunities for building and infrastructure design to incorporate water collection and recycling systems.</i> <i>Clause 4.1(c) - avoiding adverse impacts on water quality or quantity in local streams,</i>	As described in Section 2.1, the project incorporates stormwater collection for reuse within the building. Further ESD measures were described in the ESD statement submitted with the EAR. Suitable stormwater quality and quantity controls are described in the Stormwater Concept Plans submitted with the EAR.

ISSUE	RESPONSE
<p><i>wetlands and groundwater from operations, developments, and major event activities at Sydney Olympic Park.</i></p> <p>The EA erroneously states that <i>stormwater from the site will drain directly into SOPA's WRAMS</i> and that <i>the WRAMS will ensure that adverse impacts from stormwater will not arise</i>. This is incorrect - the site drains directly into Bennelong Pond in the Badu Mangroves System.</p> <p>Bennelong Pond contains the endangered plant species <i>Zannichellia palustris</i> - the potential impact of the proposal upon this endangered species is not assessed. The Badu Mangroves system is listed on the Commonwealth's Directory of Important Wetlands in Australia. Potential impacts upon this system, including cumulative impacts of future adjacent developments flagged in the assessment document are not considered.</p>	<p>A detailed Flora and Flora Impact Assessment relating to the entire 1-5 Murray Rose Avenue site was prepared by Cumberland Ecology in 2009 and submitted as part of the supporting documentation for the 5 Murray Rose Avenue development. The reasons for this were that native vegetation was to be removed and the 1-5 Murray Rose Avenue site is located within the vicinity of key ecological habitats such as the Brickpit and the Badu Mangroves.</p> <p>The 2009 assessment incorporated formal assessments of significance in relation to the <i>NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995</i> (TSC Act) and the Commonwealth <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (EPBC Act). These assessments found that no significant impacts were likely to occur to any NSW or Commonwealth listed species or community. Furthermore, a referral to the Commonwealth Minister of the Environment under the provisions of the EPBC Act was not required.</p> <p>The proposed development is considered to have the potential for indirect impacts on threatened species or communities within the Badu Mangroves or Brickpit due to increased flow and reduced stormwater quality. However, the stormwater capture proposed to be incorporated into the project will reduce peak flows into the wetland. Furthermore, the following measures will be incorporated into the stormwater drainage design to mitigate any potential impacts on the mangroves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Soil erosion and sedimentation controls to reduce the amount of sediment reaching estuaries; - Stormwater will be managed to provide appropriate water quantity and quality discharge into the mangroves and wetlands; and - Nutrient loads will be managed through appropriate filtration.
<p>Construction stormwater from this site will flow into Bennelong Pond. Should dewatering of any temporary sediment basins be required during construction, any waters discharged to Bennelong Pond must comply with EPA requirements, at a location and flow rate approved by SOPA, be approved on each occasion by SOPA, not exceed 50mg/L suspended solids, and be within the pH range 6.5-8.5.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

ISSUE	RESPONSE
Tree Management Plan Two fig trees <i>Ficus obliqua</i> as listed in the proponent's Arborist Report (trees #34 and #35) are also nominated on SOPA's significant tree register (pg. 22 and 213). These two trees are shown for retention in MP 2030 (pg. 163) and so will need to be transplanted by the proponent to a location to be agreed with the Authority, at no cost to the Authority.	An agreement has been reached between the proponent and SOPA to relocate the two fig trees to a suitable location at a suitable time.
A third fig tree <i>Ficus rubiginosa</i> (tree #50) occurs in a proposed publicly accessible pocket park (future Paddock Park, located between 2 & 4 Murray Rose Ave) and will need to be protected in accordance with the Authority's <i>Guidelines for the Protection of Trees on Development Sites</i> .	This fig tree will be protected as required.
The Arborist report has assessed trees on the adjoining sites (1 & 2 Murray Rose Avenue and future Paddock Park) and has recommended the trees proposed 'for removal' and states that the 'term removal does not necessarily mean destruction'. Where the transplanting of healthy trees (such as trees #36-49) for potential reuse on the site or anywhere else within SOP is not practical, it is recommended that these trees be transplanted to other sites outside SOP.	Noted.

ISSUE	RESPONSE
Sydney Water	
Water The drinking water main available for connection is the 200mm main in Murray Rose Avenue.	Noted.
Wastewater The system has sufficient capacity, the wastewater main available for connection is the 225mm main in Murray Rose Avenue.	Noted.
Recycled Water The recycled water main available for connection is the 375mm main in Murray Rose Avenue.	Noted.
Trade Waste Information Should this development generate trade wastewater, this correspondence does not guarantee the applicant that Sydney Water will accept the trade wastewater to its sewerage system. In the event trade wastewater is generated, the property owner is required to submit an application for permission to discharge trade	Noted.

ISSUE	RESPONSE
<p>wastewater to the sewerage system before business activities commence. A boundary trap will be required where arrestors and special units are installed for trade waste re-treatment.</p>	
Environment Protection Authority (EPA)	
<p>The proponent shall submit a report to the EPA and Department of Planning and Infrastructure in relation to the contamination. The report should provide information about the nature of the contamination sources, the contamination caused by these sources and any measures taken to eliminate the sources and address the contamination.</p> <p>The proponent should also consider whether they have a duty to notify the EPA under section 60 of the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

ISSUE	RESPONSE
Office of Environment & Heritage NSW	
<p>The Cumberland Ecology 2009 (CE) report states that the proposal will not remove any areas identified in the SOPA Frog Management Plan (2002) as a Supplementary Habitat Area for the Green and Golden Bell Frog (GGBF). However, OEH considers that the narrow strip on the northern edge of the subject land that runs alongside Bennelong Parkway, as shown in Figure 3.1 of the CE report, is an area identified in the 2002 plan as Supplementary Habitat.</p>	<p>The narrow strip of vegetation in question is well outside the site of the proposed development, and therefore this vegetation is not proposed to be removed.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposal will not remove any areas identified in the SOPA Frog Management Plan (2002) as a Supplementary Habitat Area for the Green and Golden Bell Frog.</p>
<p>The Environmental Assessment Report states that the proposal will lead to the removal of a Lilly Pilly hedge (<i>Syzygium</i> sp.). OEH notes that the threatened plant species, <i>Syzygium paniculatum</i>, is often used as a hedge species. OEH advises that the identification of the Lilly Pilly species should be confirmed, and if it is found to be <i>S. paniculatum</i>, then the impacts on this threatened species need to be adequately assessed (even though it has been planted).</p>	<p>The Lilly Pilly hedge has been identified as <i>Syzygium paniculatum</i>. Accordingly, Cumberland Ecology has prepared an addendum to their Flora and Fauna Impact Assessment submitted with the EAR. This addendum (refer Attachment F) concludes that no referral to the Minister for the Environment is required, as no significant impacts under the EPBC Act are considered likely to occur as a result of the proposal.</p>
<p>The CE report refers to a number of mitigation measures that are proposed to be undertaken, which should be incorporated into any conditions of approval to ensure they are implemented. The measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ a review of control measures required to maintain and improve water quality will be conducted as part of the detailed design phase; ➤ water quality will be maintained by the establishment of silt fences around the development site and filtration of stormwater outlets; ➤ landscape design will include vegetation suitable for mobile species to use as 'stepping stones' and suitable for less mobile species to move through the area with shelter provided by long grasses and shrubs; ➤ the connected garden beds will not include pedestrian pathways and will generally aim to deter people from accessing these areas; ➤ plant species used in these corridor gardens will be as recommended in the <i>DECC Best Practice Guidelines- GGBF habitat</i>; ➤ plantings of tall screening vegetation will be continued, and additional measures, 	<p>Noted.</p>

ISSUE	RESPONSE
<p>such as light timers in the buildings at night, will be implemented to minimise the effects of light spill on the mangroves;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ specific mitigation measures, such as use of brightly coloured strips or angling windows, have been incorporated into the design of the buildings to reduce the occurrence of bird strike; ➤ a site-specific GGBF Sub-plan will be prepared as part of the Construction Management Plan prior to the start of works; and ➤ during construction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if GGBF are detected, works will cease immediately and the GGBF response provisions of the Environmental Management Plan would be implemented; - the GGBF response provisions would include detailed instructions for the management of the species and its habitat during the project; and - methods of cleaning of equipment used for works will be undertaken to minimise the likelihood of transmission of any frog pathogens. 	

ISSUE	RESPONSE
Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee	
The proposed development should be consistent with the overall objectives contained in the Draft Sydney Olympic Master Plan 2030.	The objectives of MP 2030 are addressed in Section 5.2.8 of the EAR.
Car parking provision to the satisfaction of Department of Planning's and Sydney Olympic Park Authority's requirements.	See discussion at Section 2.2 . In particular it is noted that Transport for NSW's submission states: <i>Given that there is no significant change in the overall public transport provision of the SOP precinct in the foreseeable future, Transport for NSW does not object to the on-site parking rate of 1 space per 55m² of Gross Floor Area (GFA) for the proposed development.</i>
The layout of the proposed car parking areas associated with the subject development (including but not limited to, driveways, grades, turn paths, sight distance requirements, aisle widths, aisle lengths, and parking bay dimensions) should be in accordance with AS 2890.1- 2004 and AS 2890- 2002.	Noted.
All vehicles are to enter and leave the site in a forward direction.	Noted.
All vehicles should be wholly contained on site before being required to stop.	Noted.
A Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to the Department of Planning for review prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.	Noted.
The developer is to implement a location-specific sustainable travel plan (eg 'Travelsmart' or other travel behaviour or change initiative) to address the implications of the proposed development for non-car travel modes) including public transport use, walking and cycling)	Noted.
The location-specific travel plan should indicate the provision of facilities proposed to increase the non-car mode share for travel to and from the site. This will entail an assessment of the accessibility of the development site by means of public transport. This should be prepared in accordance with the SOPA Travel Planning Opportunities Travel Plan Guidelines.	Noted.
All works/regulatory signposting associated with the proposed development are to be at no cost to RMS	Noted.

Transport for NSW	
Transport for NSW has reviewed the EA and associated Traffic Impact Assessment report and supports the ongoing development of the Sydney Olympic Park (SOP) precinct.	Noted.
Given that there is no significant change in the overall public transport provision for the SOP precinct in the foreseeable future, Transport for NSW does not object to the on-site parking rate of 1 space per 55m ² of Gross Floor Area (GFA) for the proposed development as outlined in the Traffic Impact Assessment report. Over time, Transport for NSW would support future commercial development within the SOP precinct decreasing the provision of commercial car parking. This would be linked to significant investment into major public transport improvements within the precinct.	Noted. Discussion relating to car parking rates is provided at Section 2.2 .
In addition to the above, Transport for NSW also supports the initiatives outlined on page 24 of the Traffic Impact Assessment report with regard to the planning and ongoing operation of the commercial development by incorporating the preparation and management of a location-specific Travel Plan and the provision of facilities to increase the non-car mode share for travel to and from the site.	Noted.