

Introduction:

Infrastructure NSW submitted a State Significant Development (SSD) Development Application (DA) in relation to the Sydney Football Stadium Redevelopment for the design, construction and operation of the stadium (SSD DA 9835). The SSD DA was publicly exhibited and Response to Submissions Report (the RTS) Report was submitted by Infrastructure NSW to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) in August 2019. The following table has been prepared in response to matters raised in relation to SSD DA 9835 in the email received from the DPIE dated 13 September 2019.

DPIE Clarification	Infrastructure NSW Response
1. Submitted Plans	
There are inconsistencies between levels shown in the architectural drawings from Appendix B and the Landscape Plans (especially the Mezzanine Level and the Landscape plans with detailed levels). Please check the plans and provide an updated version of the Architectural plans that include consistent levels with Landscape plans.	<p>The Architectural and Landscape Plans have been updated to remove inconsistent line work that was derived from Cox (architects) and Aspect Studios (landscape architects) utilising different modelling software. The updated Architectural and Landscape Plans provide consistent levels.</p> <p>In aligning the Architectural and Landscape Plans, the security line on the eastern boundary has been revised, and the levels and grading plan have updated for consistency across both sets of drawings.</p>
Please add a figure showing the Stage 1 planning envelope in plan view.	The Stage 1 planning envelope has been provided on all drawings in plan view and the elevations as requested. The drawings confirm the development is entirely within the upper and lower limit of approved Stage 1 planning envelope.
Please include the upper and lower limit of planning envelope in all elevations.	
Two parts of the building, as shown in the East West and North South sections on A40.00.01, are located below RL39.3 (maximum building envelope in the Concept Proposal). Please confirm what are these area and the purpose of these sections of the building.	The parts of the building, shown in the East West and North South sections on A40.00.01, that the DPIE has identified are located below RL39.3 (maximum building envelope in the Concept Proposal) are the result of where the section was extracted from the architect's model for those particular drawings. The revised drawings demonstrate the stadium is wholly within the approved Stage 1 envelope and does not extrude beyond the upper or lower limits.
<p>Please include the following in the Landscape drawings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Final correct tree removal/replacement plan. ○ The Landscape masterplan. 	The Tree Retention and Replacement Plan (LA-015) submitted at Appendix C of the RTS Report was correct. The Plan submitted with the RTS Report identified trees approved for removal under the Stage 1 DA to demonstrate to the DPIE consideration around mature replacement numbers.

DPIE Clarification	Infrastructure NSW Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final versions of the Gradient levels plans and Planting plans. 	<p>For clarity, the Plan has been refined to identify trees approved for removal under the Stage 1 approval (purple dashed line), trees proposed for removal under the Stage 2 SSD DA (red dashed line) and trees to be retained (black solid line). ACTION: ASPECT</p> <p>The Landscape Master Plan (LA-100) submitted at Appendix C of the RTS Report was correct. Given no change has been made to the proposed landscaping design since submission of the RTS Report, LA-100 as submitted with the RTS Report remains valid.</p> <p>The Grading & Levels Plans and Planting Plans (LA-201 – LA-204 and LA-401 – LA-404) submitted at Appendix C of the RTS Report were correct. Given no change has been made to the grading, levels and planting design since submission of the RTS Report, LA-201 – LA-204 and LA-401 – LA-404 remain valid. It is anticipated that an appropriately worded standard condition of consent will be imposed requiring detailed planting plans to be approved post consent.</p>
<p>The 'Setout plans' noted as LA_301, 302, 303, and 304 are not provided as part of the RTS. Please provide these.</p>	<p>The Set Out Plans referred to by the DPIE have not been submitted and at this stage are not intended to be submitted prior to determination. Consistent with standard project construction and delivery methodologies, set out plans will be produced at future stages of the project.</p>
<p>2. Public Art Plan</p>	
<p>Please clarify whether the Public Art Plan referred to in RtS response to City of Sydney's comments, is this the 'Art Strategy' submitted with the EIS as Appendix A to the Landscape Report.</p>	<p>The reference to the Public Art Plan should refer to the Public Art Strategy.</p> <p>As set out in RTS Report and Mitigation Measures D/O-PA1, DO/-HER1 and DO/-HER2, the finalisation of the Public Art Strategy and the procurement of public art will occur in coordination with heritage interpretation for the site.</p> <p>The condition suggested in Appendix A of the RTS Report could be worded as follows (deletions struck out and new insertion <i>bolded/italicised</i>):</p>

DPIE Clarification	Infrastructure NSW Response
	<p><i>The Applicant must submit a final Public Art Plan to the satisfaction of the Planning Secretary prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate. The Plan is to be prepared in coordination with the Preliminary Public Art Strategy Plan prepared by Aspect Studios (June, 2019) and the Heritage Interpretation Strategy prepared by Curio Projects (May, 2019). The installation of all public art within the Public Art Plan lodged to satisfy this condition shall occur prior to issue of the final Occupation Certificate.</i></p>
3. Videoboard	
<p>The Video Board shown in Architectural plans A13.L3.04, A13.L3.05, A30.EW.01 were not included in the plans with the EIS that was publicly exhibited. There is no other information provided regarding this videoboard or additional assessment of it's impacts. The Department considers that this videoboard is inconsistent with the plans that were publicly exhibited, and therefore should be deleted.</p>	<p>References to videoboards have been removed from the plans.</p>
4. Disability access	
<p>The lift access statement states that 70% of access to the stadium is through Driver Avenue. Please confirm the basis of this conclusion.</p>	<p>The stadium is surrounded by suburbs and roads on all sides and has multiple entry and exit points that deliver access to different streets and directions to suit the needs and desires for all patrons. It would be unimaginable that all patrons would use the Driver Ave entry and exit point when there are other entry and exit points available and maybe more convenient. With this context, the assumption that 70% of access is through Driver Avenue is based on the forecast arrival mode splits and assumes that close to 100% of people arriving via light rail would use Driver Avenue, as would people walking from Central Station or parking in EQ, Sydney Boys High, MP1, EP2 etc. The pedestrian modellers then took these mode splits to work out the proportion of arrivals by entrance points.</p>
<p>The lift access statement states that the lift capacity is based on 2% of the population being disabled. However, in a broader perspective, if families with prams, elderly people with limited mobility or people with other temporary mobility challenges are included then this number would be approximately</p>	<p>The number of Persons Requiring Universal Access (PRUA) expected to attend the stadium may vary from event to event and most events are expected to be targeted at a specific demographic. For example, an opera may attract less families with prams and a rock concert may attract less elderly persons. Based</p>

DPIE Clarification	Infrastructure NSW Response
<p>5.1% of the general population (as per ABS data). Please justify the basis of the lift capacity and whether the lifts would have sufficient capacity to cater for the broader population with limited mobility.</p>	<p>on this assumption and the rarity of occurrences that would both reach full stadium capacity and attract a mixed demographic, Arup has again reaffirmed that the 2% assumption is reasonable. It is also worth highlighting that the 2% is a general rule of thumb that is applied in Vertical Transport design for rail/metro infrastructure which carries much larger numbers of patrons, and is deemed acceptable.</p> <p>Furthermore, Before Compliance's DDA Compliance Statement submitted with the RTS Report (Appendix R) indicates a maximum of 333 wheelchairs would be required and 0.25% of seating should be provided as Enhanced Amenity Seating for ambulant accessible, assistance animals and people with a requirement for greater legroom. Combined, these rates of provision would equate to 470 patrons (under a 55,000 seat event scenario), or 0.8% which is well within the assumed 2% of patrons likely to have to rely on lift access.</p>
<p>The Lift Capacity statement prepared by ARUP recommends the provision of three lifts. The proposal does not include any justification as to why 3 lifts have not been proposed. Please provide a reason as to why three lifts have not been proposed.</p>	<p>For clarity, the Lift Capacity Statement submitted with the RTS Report (Appendix I) does not recommend the provision of three lifts. Rather, it clearly concludes that the proposed two lifts (of 33 passenger capacity each) will deliver adequate capacity for the anticipated number of lift passengers. The Lift Capacity Statement acknowledges that there is no allowance for redundancy and suggests that 3 lifts could be provided instead of 2 (but are not mandatory). As outlined in the RTS Report and the supporting technical reports there is adequate provision made for the disabled and mobility impaired as well as PRUAs through the lifts and from Moore Park Road.</p>
<p>Please reissue the Disability Access Report with the relevant Appendices as part of the future additional information (This document has been submitted separately but does not form a part of the RTS).</p>	<p>The requested Disability Access Report (including all appendices) is Appendix R of the submitted RTS Report. The Disability Access Report remains valid in terms of accessibility. Appendix 1 of the Disability Access Report has been updated to refer to the Architectural and Landscape Plans that accompany this RTS Clarification Response.</p>

DPIE Clarification	Infrastructure NSW Response
5. Design Integrity Assessment	
Design integrity statement notes the ‘removal of landscape from the terraces to the east and west on levels 2, 3 and 4’ followed by ‘minor extension to the landscaped terraces to the east and west on levels 3 and 4 to improve landscaping areas’. It is unclear whether the terraces are removed or extended as part of the RTS. In this regard the Department also notes that the photomontages show that the terraces are accessible.	The terraces remain, however the previously proposed landscaping on them has been removed.
To clarify the above, please provide schematic diagrams to show which terraces would be accessible and which ones have been removed or are proposed to be inaccessible within the stadium.	A new drawing ASK326 has been prepared to illustrate the accessible terraces. No terrace has been removed or is inaccessible. As provided above, only the landscaping on the terraces has been removed.
Please reissue the DIA report including Appendices A and B, which have currently been excluded.	Appendices A and B are attached to the updated Design Integrity Assessment.
6. Planting	
The Landscape plans demonstrate removal of additional trees on the north eastern corner and the eastern boundary. Please confirm whether this amends the tree removal / replacement ratio and whether this reconfiguration would require the removal of additional trees.	<p>Tree Removal</p> <p>For clarity, the Stage 2 SSD DA as exhibited proposed the removal of eight (8) trees. Post exhibition, the design team confirmed that Tree B no longer required removal, however two (2) additional trees required removal to accommodate the revised MP1 layout. Consequently the RTS Report proposes the removal of nine (9) trees.</p> <p>Of the nine (9) trees proposed for removal as per the RTS Report, seven (7) are located in the north east corner of the site, and two (2) are located in the west of the site.</p> <p>Tree Replacement</p> <p>The Stage 2 SSD DA as exhibited proposed the planting of 130 trees across the public domain. Post exhibition, the RTS Report identified that 117 trees would be planted. Less trees are proposed to be planted in the landscape zone located in the middle of the stairs (as a result of this area being reduced in area) and within the MP1 car park due to the revised layout.</p>

DPIE Clarification	Infrastructure NSW Response
	<p><i>Tree Removal/Replacement Ratio</i></p> <p>Under the Stage 2 SSD DA as exhibited, the tree removal/replacement ratio equated to 1:3.8. Under the RTS Report, the ratio equates to 1:3.3.</p>
<p>Please confirm whether the additional planting proposed within the concourse in the vicinity of the Driver Avenue steps compensate for loss of shade trees originally planned.</p>	<p>The RTS Report indicates 15 trees are proposed to be planted within vicinity of the Driver Avenue stair. This is three (3) less trees than proposed by the exhibited SSD DA and is the result of the landscape zone in the middle of the stairs being reduced between the exhibited EIS and the RTS Report. A comparison of the exhibited EIS and RTS Report tree replacement proposal in this part of the site is shown in the following figure. The figure illustrates 4 less <i>Corymbia maculata</i> and 1 additional <i>cupaniopsis anacardioides</i> in the RTS Report than the exhibited EIS. In addition, the large fig has been moved from in front of the northern abutment wall to the landscape zone to avoid Sydney Water servicing infrastructure.</p> <p>Given the general location and distribution of planting is similar to the exhibited EIS the loss of shading resulting from the planting proposal identified in the RTS Report is considered marginal.</p>
<p>The western edge of the concourse is reduced in size, and the planted edge and trees are proposed to be removed. Please confirm whether replacement trees are proposed at this location.</p>	<p>For clarity, the reduction of the western concourse edge (as per the RTS Report) resulted in the planted edge at the concourse level also being reduced not removed. To compensate the removal of trees in this location, eight (8) trees are proposed on grade in MP1 (where existing services allowed), which increased the number of proposed trees to be planted on this edge (refer to LA-401).</p>
<p>7. Noise Management Plan</p>	
<p>Please specify the definition of an event that would require an individual noise management plan.</p>	<p>Infrastructure NSW confirms that no events require an individual Noise Management Plan. A Draft Noise Management Plan has been submitted with the RTS Report (Appendix F) which is proposed to apply to all events at the SFS.</p>

DPIE Clarification	Infrastructure NSW Response
8. Stormwater Management Plan	
<p>Emergency flood evacuation is proposed through the gates to Fox Studios, however these gates are locked during events. Please confirm how the flood evacuation plan would work during an event, considering this scenario.</p>	<p>After further discussion with the operator SCSG Trust, it has been confirmed that egress during a flood would not occur through the Fox Studios Australia gates as previously indicated in the Aurecon report.</p> <p>Egress would occur onto the external concourse and onto Moore Park Road if it is safe to do so. Paddington Lane is grade separated from this external concourse and would not be a means of egress for SFS patrons.</p> <p>In addition, should unsafe conditions present, staff and patrons would remain in situ during a significant flood event until such time as it is safe to egress.</p> <p>The gates from Paddington Lane to the Fox Studios Australia site and access across the Fox Studios Australia site is not an emergency evacuation path for SCG patrons.</p>
9. Socio Economic Assessment	
<p>The Socio-economic assessment states that up to 2000 staff can be employed during larger events. Please confirm that the current assumption that a maximum 1,500 staff for the new stadium is accurate or whether up to 2000 staff members are proposed.</p>	<p>The Socio Economic Assessment submitted at Appendix M of the RTS Report considered the potential for direct employment benefits associated with hosting events. The capacity for direct employment at the stadium was extrapolated from the assumptions on jobs contained in the Stage 1 Socio Economic Impact Assessment (Ethos Urban, June 2018). The Stage 1 assessment confirmed that <i>'It is difficult to specify an aggregated employment impact, due to the mix of full-time, part-time and casual employment. In many cases of service contribution, there would not be more persons employed per se, but rather more working hours available to existing workers'</i>. Accordingly, whilst it specified that 55-61 jobs could be created for every 1,000 attendees, this was ultimately extrapolated to an <i>'increase equivalent to 300 fulltime jobs'</i>, which would grow the 1,200 jobs at the former stadium to 1,500 jobs at the proposed stadium. This maximum 1,500 jobs considers the maximum</p>

DPIE Clarification	Infrastructure NSW Response
	<p>attendance at the stadium and as such remains relevant and appropriate for Stage 2 of the redevelopment.</p> <p>The Socio Economic Assessment submitted at Appendix M of the RTS Report utilised the measure of 55-61 jobs created per 1,000 attendances. The acknowledgement in the Socio-Economic Assessment that during large events there may be further jobs created over and above the 1,500 is a scenario that existed under the former stadium and is an assumption that remains unchanged over the course of the Stage 1 DA approval and Stage 2 SSD DA currently under assessment. The maximum number of workers required on site during the running of an event at the stadium remains at 1,500.</p> <p>Additional jobs (beyond the 1,500) may be created outside of events, most notably during the bump-in and bump-out stages prior to and after the hosting of an event. These jobs would typically be off site (but are associated with an event) and would be in the form of catering, management, organisers, rubbish collection, and other associated fields.</p>
10. Vehicle Ramp	
<p>The RtS states the 'reinstatement of the vehicle ramp with on-grade access to the eastern boundary of the site that is utilised by Fox Studios'. Please clarify this Statement.</p>	<p>The proposed interface between the stadium site and the Fox Studios Australia site is as shown in the Landscape Plans (Aspect Studios, August and September 2019). The references to a vehicle ramp in the RTS Report is in error and should be disregarded.</p>