

REVISED ADDENDUM RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS AND UPDATED AMENDED PROJECT REPORT

**QANTAS FLIGHT
TRAINING CENTRE
SSD_10154**

URBIS STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS REPORT WERE:

Director	David Hoy
Senior Consultant	Emma Fitzgerald
Consultant	Isabelle Kikirekov
Project Code	P%3994
Report Number	Final

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	2
1.1.	Overview	2
1.2.	Summary of Consultation Process	2
1.3.	Purpose and Structure of This Report	3
1.4.	Supporting Documentation	3
2.	Amended Project Description	5
3.	Agency Responses	7
4.	Assessment of Amended Proposal.....	25
5.	Conclusion	26
Disclaimer	30	

Appendix A	Updated Construction Environmental Management Plan
Appendix B	Updated Construction Management Plan
Appendix C	Updated Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan
Appendix D	Indicative Plan for King Street South
Appendix E	Updated Architectural Package
Appendix F	Updated Landscape Architectural Package
Appendix G	Site Auditor Advice
Appendix H	Addendum Traffic Advice
Appendix I	Addendum Microbat Advice
Appendix J	Addendum Acoustic Advice
Appendix K	Additional Addendum Traffic Advice

FIGURES:

Figure 1 – Changes to Project Boundary	6
--	---

TABLES:

Table 1 – Supporting Documentation	3
Table 2 – Amended Compliance	5

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. OVERVIEW

This Revised Addendum Response to Submissions (**RtS**) and Updated Amended Project Report (**APR**) has been prepared by Urbis Pty Ltd (**Urbis**) on behalf of Qantas Airways Limited (**Qantas**) (**the Proponent**) in response to Agency responses to the original RtS and APR relating to State Significant Development Application 10154 (**SSDA**) for the development of a new flight training centre, multi-deck car park, and associated supportive and ancillary works (**the Project**) at 297 King Street, Mascot (**the Site**).

The SSDA was formally lodged with the Department of Planning and Environment (now Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (**DPIE**)) on 31 May 2019. The SSDA was placed on public exhibition for 30 days between 4 June 2019 – 4 July 2019, before being extended to 12 July 2019 to allow for Bayside Council (**Council**) staff to present their proposed submission to Councillors at a General Council Meeting. The RtS and APR were formally submitted to the DPIE on 12 August 2019.

This Revised Addendum RtS and Updated APR is seeking a formal amendment of the original EIS under clause 55 of the EP&A Regulations. It has been prepared with reference to clause 85A of Division 6 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations 2000* (**EP&A Regulations**) which states as follows:

- (1) The Planning Secretary is to provide to an applicant for State significant development the submissions, or a summary of the submissions, received in relation to the application during the submission period.*
- (2) The Planning Secretary may, by notice in writing, require the applicant to provide a written response to such issues raised in those submissions as the Planning Secretary considers necessary.*

In response to the above, this Revised RtS and Updated APR identifies, discusses and addresses the submissions received by the DPIE from the exhibition of the SSDA, further feedback from TfNSW and clarifies minor issues as set out in email correspondence received from DPIE dated 30 October 2019. It sets out the final proposal to be assessed by the DPIE for determination by the Independent Planning Commission as a delegate of the Minister of Planning. The report encompasses the following:

- Identification of preferred project which outlines an overview of the proposed development and the proposed changes to the project in response to issues raised or arising from design development;
- A response to the submissions received in relation to the exhibition of the application and how these matters have been resolved in the final preferred project; and
- Additional assessment where required of the amended proposal in response to strategic and statutory considerations.

1.2. SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION PROCESS

The project was the subject of public exhibition undertaken by the DPIE in accordance with Division 6 of the EP&A Regulations.

Exhibition commenced on 4 June 2019 and closed on the 12 July 2019. The Environmental Impact Statement (**EIS**) and supporting consultant documentation was made publicly available online at the DPIE's Major Projects website, where copies of all plans and technical reports could be and remain able to be viewed and downloaded.

Following the conclusion of the extended exhibition period, the DPIE issued correspondence dated 15 July 2019 requesting that the proponent respond to the issues raised in the submissions received during the public exhibition period.

A total of seventeen (17) submissions were received during and after the exhibition period. Twelve (12) were received from State government agencies, Bayside Council, utility providers and aviation stakeholders during the exhibition period. Five (5) submissions from members of the community were received during and after the exhibition period.

During and post the exhibition period the Project team have continued to engage with stakeholders to seek to resolve any matters as they arose; this has included: DPIE; ARTC; AMP Capital; Bayside Council staff and Councillors; Travelodge and Sydney Water.

We understand that Travelodge and AMP Capital have withdrawn their objections.

The formal Revised RtS and Updated APR were lodged with the DPIE on 12 August 2019, who then furnished the relevant Agencies with copies. The following Agencies have provided responses and draft conditions: Fire and Rescue NSW; Bayside Council; TfNSW; Sydney Airport Corporation Limited, ARTC, Sydney Water and EES.

1.3. PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

This Revised Addendum RtS and Updated APR has been prepared in accordance with clause 85A of the EP&A Regulations. This report documents and considers issues raised in the submissions made to the DPIE in response to the original RtS and APR and is structured as follows:

Section 2 – Amended Project Description: Provides a description of the changes made to the proposal in response to the submissions received, design development and the additional information submitted with this report.

Section 3 – Agency Submissions: Provides an overview of the key issues raised in the Agency responses, and provides a detailed response to the matters raised, identifying additional or amended technical information as appropriate.

Section 4 – Assessment of Preferred Project: Provides a brief assessment of the amended elements of the amended project. References are made to the Environmental Impact Statement if the conclusions remain the same.

Section 5 – Conclusion.

1.4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

This Revised Addendum Response to Submissions package is supported by various technical inputs outlined in **Table 1**.

Table 1 – Supporting Documentation

Input	Consultant	Changes	Appendix
Updated Construction Environmental Management Plan	Arcadis	To address Council comments	Appendix A
Updated Construction Management Plan	APP	To facilitate use of King Street South for temporary construction staging / Qantas staff carparking	Appendix B
Updated Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan	CBRK	To facilitate use of King Street South for temporary construction staging / Qantas staff carparking	Appendix C
Indicative Plan for King Street South	PTC	Demonstrate proposed temporary layout of King Street South	Appendix D
Updated Architectural Package	Noxon Giffen	To reflect amended project boundary	Appendix E
Updated Landscape Architectural Package	Scott Carver	To reflect amended project boundary	Appendix F
Site Auditor Advice	Geosyntec Consultants	To confirm suitability of amended project boundary	Appendix G

Input	Consultant	Changes	Appendix
Addendum Traffic Advice	CBRK	To respond to TfNSW comments	Appendix H
Addendum Microbat Advice	WSP	To respond to EES request for clarification	Appendix I
Addendum Acoustic Advice	Norman Disney & Young	To respond to DPIE request for additional information up to 1/11/19	Appendix J
Additional Addendum Traffic Advice	CBRK	To respond to DPIE request for additional information up to 1/11/19	Appendix K

2. AMENDED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Following ongoing design development and construction planning, the project boundary has been revised to more closely align with the extent of construction activities associated with the redevelopment of the site. The project boundary has been revised to exclude the Catering Building and area to the west of it where no works are proposed to occur.

The revised legal description of the project is as follows Lots 2 & 4 of DP 234489; Lot B of DP 164829; part of Lot 1 of DP 202747; and part of Lot 133 DP 659434.

This boundary change has reduced the site area from 52,571sqm to 30,866sqm (refer to **Figure 1**), which has had a knock on effect to the project's compliance with key metrics as outlined in **Table 1**.

The revised project boundary will also form the audit boundary. As such, advice was sought from the Auditor to confirm that the revised project boundary is suitable and appropriate as an audit boundary for the site audit, and the revision to the boundary does not impact on the ability to make a land use suitability determination for the project area, from a contamination perspective. As per Appendix G, the Auditor has confirmed the suitability of the revised project boundary from an audit perspective.

The Revised Addendum RtS and Updated APR also includes the following changes:

- The proposed construction staging has been amended to reflect changes in construction schedule and proposed works.
- Correction in proposed car parking numbers.
- Remove demolition works from proposed SSDA works, approval to be sought via a separate complying development certificate (CDC).

Table 2 – Amended Compliance

Development Standard		Proposal		Compliance	
	Control	As lodged	Amended	As lodged	Amended
Site Area	-	52,571sqm	30,866sqm	-	-
Gross Floor Area	-	37,072sqm	15,087sqm	-	-
Floor Space Ratio	1.5:1.	0.7:1	0.49:1	Yes	Yes
Landscaped Area (without including front setback or vertical landscaping)	10%	9.21% or 4,845sqm	15.69% or 4,845sqm	No	Yes
Deep Soil	10%	9.01% or 4,739sqm	15.35% or 4,739sqm	No	Yes
Soft Landscaped Area (including vertical landscape and front setback area)	-	11.53% or 6,064sqm	19.65% or 6,064sqm	-	-

Figure 1 – Changes to Project Boundary



Picture 1 – Original Project Boundary



Picture 2 – Amended Project Site Boundary

Source: Noxon Giffen

3. AGENCY RESPONSES

Key issue	Comment	Response
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment		
Changes to Qantas Drive /Lancastrian Road Intersection	<p>I have attached the project overview document which can be downloaded from that web page. On page 9, it discusses potential changes to the intersection of Qantas Drive/Lancastrian Road. The changes would impact the arrival and departure routes to the site.</p> <p>As discussed this morning, it is requested that the Traffic Impact Assessment is updated to model this alternative scenario where those changes have occurred.</p> <p>Once you have had a chance to look at the above in more detail, please do not hesitate to call me to clarify any details.</p>	<p>The proposal to modify the intersection of Qantas Drive/Lancastrian Road is part of the Gateway project not this project (SSD_10154). It is the responsibility of Gateway to assess the effects of this change and identify any mitigation measures required as a result of the change.</p> <p>The purpose of Gateway is provide an overall improvement in traffic flow around the airport.</p> <p>Gateway will result in significant changes to traffic movements around the airport. Thus it is not possible to assess the impacts of the intersection of Qantas Drive/Lancastrian Road being limited to left turns to/from Qantas Drive without knowing the overall change in traffic flows post Gateway.</p> <p>In assessing this project (SSD_10154), RMS has required an assessment of the operation of the intersection of Qantas Drive/Lancastrian Road in its existing configuration and in particular the impact of the SSD on the right turn bay on Qantas Drive. In that they specifically asked for the SIDRA model to retain this intersection.</p> <p>DPIE has forwarded correspondence from TfNSW dated 28 October 2019, which provides comments and recommendations that support the continued use of the Qantas Drive/Lancastrian Drive right hand turn movement, subject to Qantas undertaking certain works which Qantas has acknowledged that it is happy to have included in consent conditions.</p> <p>In response to this matter advice has been sought from CBRK who have analysed a worst case scenario (Appendix K) where all the traffic that currently turns right into Lancaster Road (and crosses the overpass to access the corporate campus) transfers to King Street (that is continues along Qantas Drive, turns left into Robey Street, left into O’Riordan Street and then left into King</p>

Street). Traffic that currently turns right out of Lancaster Road (from the corporate campus) has also been transferred to King Street where it would turn right onto O’Riordan Street, then travel south on O’Riordan Street and then left into Joyce Drive (this traffic does not have a destination to the west).

The number of vehicles redistributed in the morning peak hour is 340 vehicles turning right into Lancastrian Drive and 44 vehicles turning right out of Lancastrian Drive. The number of redistributed vehicles in the afternoon peak hour is 34 vehicles turning right into Lancastrian Drive and 58 vehicles turning right out of Lancastrian Drive.

As discussed, due to the uncertainty of the final design of the Gateway project it is not possible to estimate the amount of the above traffic that will divert to King Street or the alternate Kent Road access. This will depend on the level of accessibility that Gateway will provide to Kent Road and the capacity of roads to both the King Street and Kent Road accesses to the corporate campus. It is possible that following Gateway, traffic using the King Street access could be less than predicted in the SSD traffic assessment.

The above traffic flows have been added to the SSD traffic assessment (existing + other developments + Qantas) and the intersections along O’Riordan Street reanalysed with SIDRA (for the weekday AM and PM peak hours) with the following results:

Intersection	Lancaster - Right Turns		Lancaster – No Right Turns	
	AM (delay/LOS)	PM (delay/LOS)	AM (delay/LOS)	PM (delay/LOS)
King St /O’Riordan St	42 secs/LOS C	35 secs/LOS C	50 secs/LOS D	38 secs/LOS
Robey St /O’Riordan St	13 secs/LOS A	15 secs/LOS B	25 secs/LOS B	15 secs/LOS

		<table><tr><td>Joyce Drive /O’Riordan St</td><td>42 secs/LOS C</td><td>47 secs/LOS D</td><td>42 secs/LOS C</td><td>47 secs/LOS D</td></tr></table>	Joyce Drive /O’Riordan St	42 secs/LOS C	47 secs/LOS D	42 secs/LOS C	47 secs/LOS D
Joyce Drive /O’Riordan St	42 secs/LOS C	47 secs/LOS D	42 secs/LOS C	47 secs/LOS D			
		<p>As can be seen the biggest impact is in the AM peak hour at the intersections of O’Riordan Street with Robey Street and King Street where the LOS falls from C and A to D and B. This is not surprising as some 400 vehicles have been added to both intersections the AM peak hour. There is minimal change in the PM peak hour.</p> <p>In addition to the traffic effects on the external road network, we note that for the worst case, the number of vehicles entering the site via King Street will increase from some 220 vph to some 560 vph. With a swipe card arrangement, the 95% queue would extend back onto King Street. Should the above situation occur, it is recommended that Qantas introduce a photo recognition system to increase the available capacity to the King Street access.</p>					
Traffic Noise King Street	<p>(30/10/2019) The Department notes Urbis responded to the Department’s comments below regarding additional traffic impacts from traffic being diverted to King Street, however the Department also queried if there would be additional noise impacts. Please clarify whether there would be any additional noise impacts:</p> <p>‘The Department notes the number of cars expected to access the development via the Lancastrian Drive/Qantas Drive intersection would increase by 114 vehicles in the AM, and the number of vehicles predicted to access the site via King Street (west of O’Riordan Street) on a weekday morning would be 157 vehicles (pg 36 of the TPA). Please provide further clarification on any additional noise and traffic impacts if 114 vehicles are diverted onto King Street due to the removal of the right-hand turn at the Lancastrian Road/Qantas Drive intersection.’</p>	<p>Additional advice has been obtained from Norman Disney & Young at Appendix J. The increase of an additional 114 vehicles, to result in a total of 541 vehicles on King Street West, is predicted to increase noise levels by 2.9B compared to the baseline. This increase is above the 2dB recommended in the NSW Road Noise Policy.</p> <p>As set out in the NSW Road Noise Policy the following reasonable and feasible mitigation measures were considered as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Road design and traffic management – not feasible given the relatively minor incremental quantum of cars on this section of road.2. Quieter pavement surfaces – not practical because at low speeds (50kph limit) the engine noise will dominate, not road surface noise, so changes to the road surface would not be effective.3. In-corridor noise barriers – not suitable as the height of the Travelodge would overlook the road even with barriers, and the barriers would need to be broken for the hotel driveways, negating the barrier effect.					

		<p>4. At-property treatments or barriers. Barriers not practical as above. Other at-property treatments would include façade upgrades. Given the size of the building and disruption to the hotel of works to the façade this would not be feasible.</p> <p>It is concluded that as the hotel is a modern building in an active area near the airport and it can be expected to have a reasonably good façade acoustically. The road is a minor road, so although the noise increase is 2.9 dB, the total traffic volumes are still low compared to other roads in the area. The total impacts to the hotel are therefore expected to be small and no mitigations are recommended acoustically.</p> <p>Furthermore, the likelihood of additional traffic movements being redirected onto King Street has been reduced significantly following the agreement by Qantas to accept conditions proposed by TfNSW in their letter to DPIE dated 28 October 2019. Which require the lengthening of the Qantas Drive/Lancastrian Drive intersection right-hand turn bay and subsequent monitoring following the completion of the Flight Training Centre.</p> <p>As per the Noise and Vibrations Emissions Assessment appended in Appendix X of the EIS, it should be noted that the façade of the Travelodge hotel has been designed to attenuate noise from planes flying over the site to appropriate internal noise levels due to its close proximity to the airport (commensurate with it's location within the 25-30 ANEF contour due to its exposure to aircraft noise) and that the hotel has no balconies.</p>
Parking Numbers	<p>(09/10/19) Section 2.2 of the RTS provides the revised parking numbers with a total of 2,097 spaces, however, the Department notes there may be a discrepancy in the overall parking numbers as it appears the 38 car spaces has been added twice (i.e. $(786 + 1,272 = 2,058) + 38 = 2,097$). Please clarify where the second lot of 38 spaces are located on-site and if the overall additional net gain of parking is 97 spaces.</p>	<p>The total number of spaces is 2,097, broken down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New car park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stage 1 – 748 spaces ○ Stage 2 – 2,059 spaces (cumulative total) – Any earlier reference to 2,058 spaces is a typographical error. • Flight Training Centre site:

Traffic Modelling

(09/10/19) Section 3.30 of the TPA (p.g 34) indicates that of the 2,098 car spaces, some 1,110 spaces are new spaces to the Corporate/Mascot Campus. It has been assumed that 75% traffic generated by the 1,110 new/relocated spaces would be new trips and would generate 450 and 310 vehicles per hour in the week day morning and afternoon peak hours. The Department notes the 1,110 spaces only account for the spaces relocated from the jet base and the domestic terminal, but does not include the additional 97 spaces that are part of the overall parking net gain. Should the traffic assessment include the 97 new spaces in addition to the 1,110 new/relocated spaces?

- 38 spaces (at-grade)

• Total – 2,097 spaces

Using the same methodology as in the TIA, the additional 97 spaces would generate 40 and 27 additional trips in the AM/PM peak hours respectively (an increase of some 9%). The table below summarises the increases in traffic (vehicles per hour, two way) at the three access points to the corporate campus.

Summary of Traffic Increases						
	AM			PM		
Access	2000 spaces	2097 spaces	Increase	2000 spaces	2097 spaces	Increase
Qantas Drive	192	208	+ 16	106	115	+ 9
King Street	205	223	+ 18	143	156	+ 13
Kent Road	66	72	+ 6	56	62	+ 6

The table shows that the increases at each access would be minor (ranging from an additional 6 to 18 vph, two way). The biggest impacts would be on the intersections of King Street/O’Riordan Street and Qantas Drive/Lancaster Road. Beyond these two intersection traffic flow increase would be less than 10 vehicles per hour (two way).

We have rerun the traffic model and found that the results from our previous analysis are unchanged. In particular the southbound right turn bay on O’Riordan Street into King Street (west) can accommodate development traffic (60m length, 95% queue 59m - was 58m). With the proposed modifications to the right turn bay on Qantas Drive for the right turn into Lancaster Road, the right turn bay can accommodate development traffic (100m length, 95% queue 100m - was 95m). SIDRA Movement Summaries are provided in Attachment B.

		In summary the traffic effects of the additional 97 spaces within the proposed development are the same as our previous assessment.
Construction Staging	<p>(30/10/2019) Please re-confirm the construction staging. The Department has assumed the stages are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1: Construction of FTC • Stage 2: Construction of Stage 1 of car park • Stage 2: Construction of Stage 2 of car park <p>Please provide further clarification around changes to the construction timing. The EIS states that the existing flight training centre must be vacated by 30 June 2021. If this is no longer the case, we will need to update our report, including the discussion around a 23-month construction/installation period.</p>	<p>Since submission of the EIS the programming of the project has been and will continue to be refined.</p> <p>Assuming a DA is approved imminently, Qantas intends to start work (excluding demolition of which will be subject to separate CDC) no later than the 1st week of December. Based off this start date, the programme would have Qantas finishing Construction between April - May 2021. Upon completion of construction, Qantas will work with the Simulator relocation contractor with moving simulators from the existing building (B148) to the new facility. As each simulator takes approx. 4 – 6 weeks to deconstruct, relocate then reconstruct, a 6 – 7 month timeframe has been allocated to moving the simulators one at a time. The reason only one simulator is relocated at any time is due partly to business continuity and also partly due to the workload in reconstructing the simulators and gaining CASA approval after their commissioning.</p> <p>The above construction and relocation timeframes are all intended to be completed before January 2022, this aligns with Gateway's project programme before it begins to encroach on Qantas' existing simulator building (B148). If there are delays into the 2022, then there is an increased risk of operational impact due to potential noise and vibration impact.</p>
	<p>(30/10/2019) Provide further clarification on the number of construction staff and their traffic movements.</p>	<p>As stated in the Updated Construction Management Plan and Updated Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan, staff parking will be accommodated within the site boundary or within Qantas land directly south of the site, King Street South (KSS) car park. The KSS car park currently provides 369 spaces and can be expended to include an additional 170 spaces to offset loss of parking during construction works.</p> <p>Number of construction staff will not be determined until contractor is appointed.</p> <p>Additional information on staff traffic movements will be outlined in the detail Construction traffic Management Plan to be prepared at the Construction Certificate stage.</p>

Bayside Council		
Development Engineering	Council staff note the applicant's response to Council's submission in relation to management of stormwater and recommend the attached conditions.	Noted and accept conditions
Strategic Planning	<p>Council recommends the following condition in relation to management of stormwater:</p> <p><i>"Plans demonstrating no impact on adjacent properties as a result of overland flow paths are to be provided to the Certifier prior to issuance of any Construction Certificate for the car park."</i></p>	Noted and accept condition
Environmental Science	<p>It is noted that the applicant welcomes a condition of consent requiring the submission of a site audit and that <i>"this is reflected within the revised Preliminary Construction Environmental Management Plan provided in Appendix L, which outlines roles and responsibilities of the Site Auditor"</i>.</p> <p>However, a review of the submitted Preliminary Construction Environmental Management Plan reveals that no reference is made to contaminated land, SEPP 55-Remediation of Land, or that the Site Auditor is required to be registered with the NSW Environmental Protection Authority. Council requires the Preliminary Construction Environmental Management Plan to be amended and a copy submitted to Council for review.</p> <p>09 September 2019 –</p> <p>With the exception of SEPP 55-Remediation of Land, the Addendum CEMP appears to have addressed Council's comment in the RtS letter.</p>	<p>On 04 September 2019, Council was provided with the Addendum CEMP that was part of the Response to Submissions package.</p> <p>Arcadias have updated the Addendum CEMP with an assessment of the project against SEPP 55. The updated Addendum CEMP is provided at Appendix A.</p> <p>On 09 September 2019 Council confirmed that the updated Addendum CEMP addressed Council's comment in the RtS letter with the exception of SEPP 55. On 12 September 2019 the updated Addendum CEMP was provided to Council, they are expected to confirm its suitability on 16 September 2019.</p> <p>In correspondence dated 03 October 2019 Council confirmed that the Addendum CEMP and CMP have addressed Council's concerns in regards to contaminated land management at the site.</p>
Landscape Architecture	<p>The amendments made to the proposal are supported subject to the inclusion of various conditions being included in the determination:</p> <p>1) The Final Landscape Plan shall be generally in accordance with the Landscape Plan prepared by Scott Carver, revision 2, dated 31st July 2019 and comprise detailed landscape construction documentation (plans and specifications) to be submitted to, and approved by Bayside Council's Landscape Architect the Principal Certifying Authority prior to the issue of the</p>	<p>The proposal for planters across the carpark facade currently are not intended to support trees. The proposal shows planters suitable for a mix of shrubs, groundcovers & climbing plants.</p> <p>The proposal includes irrigation connected to the rainwater tank to all proposed soft landscape in the King Street North but the carpark soft landscaping will be irrigated from potable water.</p>

<p>Construction Certificate. The landscape documentation shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <p>a) Planting plan at 1:100 showing all plant locations/ groupings and plant centres/ species. There is to be a dense layered planting scheme consisting of trees, shrubs and groundcovers in all of these areas.</p> <p>b) Construction Details of the proposed 21 façade planters that work as green walls and the bus shelter green roof, including details of planting; and a 12 months maintenance schedule of these elements.</p> <p>c) Elevated planter box sectional details and drainage details. All planter box depths and dimensions shall be in accordance with Council's DCP and capable of supporting medium and large trees a mix of shrubs, groundcovers & climbing plants.</p> <p>d) Specifications detailing soil and mulch finishes, root barriers, irrigation, edging and other landscape works such as retaining walls, steps, planter walls, feature walls, skateboard restrictions, tree pits, tree grates, tree guards, tree pit treatments.</p> <p>e) Construction/ section details for areas of paving, edge treatments, and tactile areas including a schedule of materials.</p> <p>f) Details of all fencing, privacy screening, arbors and the like, including elevations and materials visible to public domain areas.</p> <p>g) Details of all other hardscape landscape elements such as street furniture, pedestrian amenity lighting, bins, bollards, as required. Locations are to be clearly identified on plan. Sectional construction details and elevations to be provided.</p> <p>h) A Landscape Maintenance Schedule shall be submitted that covers a 12 month period to provide a guide to the landowner or occupier on how to best maintain the constructed landscaped areas; and is to include the following information:</p>	<p>Therefore, it is requested that the recommended condition is updated to reflect the above – amended condition in (red).</p>
---	--

- shrub pruning/ trimming (frequency, plant requirements);
 - Fertilising and pest control (soil testing, types, rate, frequency);
 - Mulching, weeding and soil improvement (frequency, materials);
 - Irrigation (checks, adjustments);
 - tree maintenance (fertilising, mulching, tree stakes adjustments, special tree requirements);
 - Maintenance of hard landscape elements (paving, edges, walls, pergolas, seats, and planter box walls); and
 - planter boxes/ roof gardens/ green wall(s) (specialised maintenance requirements).
- i) Irrigation. To ensure satisfactory growth and maintenance of the proposed landscaping, a fully automatic drip irrigation system is required in all landscaped areas. The system shall be installed by a qualified landscape contractor and provide full coverage of planted areas with no more than 300mm between drippers, automatic controllers and backflow prevention devices. Irrigation for the site to the south of the Sydney Water Channel, ~~and~~ should be connected to a recycled water source. Irrigation shall comply with both Sydney Water and Council requirements as well as Australian Standards, and be maintained in effective working order at all times.
- 2) Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate, the applicant shall submit a Frontage Works Application. The Public Domain Landscape Improvements Plan shall be submitted to Council for approval. The plan shall be undertaken by a suitably experienced Landscape Architect and shall include but not be limited to new street tree planting, footpath paving (segmental/ other), street tree pit treatments and tree guards, ~~street furniture~~, in ground landscaping, irrigation, lighting. The plan shall be in accordance with Council's City Identity Program, Landscape DCP and any other Council specification or requirement. Civil drawings shall be included detailing levels and detailed footpath construction sections in accordance with Council's Engineering

	<p>Services requirements. Contact Council's Landscape Architect for further details of specific requirements in preparation of the plan.</p> <p>3) New street trees shall be maintained by the owner for a period of 24 months after final inspection by Council. Maintenance includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • twice weekly watering within the first 6 months then weekly thereafter to sustain adequate growth and health; • biannual feeding, • weed removal round the base; • mulch replenishment at 3 monthly intervals (to 75mm depth); • and adjusting of stakes and ties. <p>Note: Maintenance does not include trimming or pruning of trees under any circumstances.</p> <p>4) A suitably qualified project arborist (AQF level 5 or greater) is to be engaged to implement tree protection measures before and during construction to all existing trees to be retained within the site and along the verge strip of King Street in accordance with the management plan contained in the Arborist report prepared by The Ents Tree Consultancy, dated 30th July 2019. Evidence of engagement of a project arborist is to be submitted to, and approved by, Council.</p>	
Section 7.11 contributions	<p>Council staff note that the applicant agrees to condition of consent requiring payment of Section 7.11 contributions in the amount of \$680,612.14 to be paid to Council in accordance with the <i>City of Botany Bay Development Contributions Plan 2016</i> (Amendment 1).</p>	<p>Noted and agree to condition of consent to pay Section 7.11 contributions.</p>
Transport Planning	<p>Council staff note that the applicant supports the inclusion of a condition of consent requiring the preparation of a Workplace Travel Plan and Transport Access Guide. The condition is to include the requirement to provide appropriate end of trip facilities within, or near, the proposed Flight Training</p>	<p>Noted and accept condition to prepare a Workplace Travel Plan and Transport Access Guide. As stated in the original RtS, EOT bicycle storage is proposed at the ground floor level of the basement car park and the intention is to use EOT</p>

	Centre, noting that the existing showers in Qantas Building D are located approximately 180 metres distant from the proposed Flight Training Centre.	change facilities located in Building D within the Qantas Campus which are located immediately adjacent the car park.
Traffic impact	The 'Response to Traffic Matters Raised in Submissions' (traffic response) dated 31 July 2019 concludes that the King Street/ O'Riordan Street intersection would operate at a satisfactory level. Council officers note the applicant's response, however, a condition should be considered for inclusion in the determination requiring a peer review of the traffic response to determine an appropriate monetary contribution, if any, toward the King Street/ O'Riordan Street intersection upgrade works.	This condition suggested by Bayside Council is not required as the updated SIDRA analysis to include matters raised by RMS has found no upgrades are required at the intersection of King Street and O'Riordan Street. Furthermore we note that the RMS engaged an external consultant to review the SIDRA analysis.
Urban Design	Council staff note the applicant's response to the issues raised in Council's submission.	Noted.
Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW)		
Traffic Assessment	<p>The Response to Submission states the following:</p> <p><i>"The SIDRA analysis shows that with the SSD, the right turn bays for the right turns from Qantas Drive into Lancaster Road and from O'Riordan Street into King Street (west) can accommodate the volume of right turning traffic. The 95% queue into Lancaster Road was found to be 66 metres with the right turn by 80 metres long."</i></p> <p>It is advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It appears that there has been some misinterpretation of the analysis undertaken by the proponent's consultant. A review of the SIDRA analysis indicates that the average queue length for the right turn into Lancaster [sic] Road has been reported and not the 95th % as stated. The 95th% queue length is considerably longer than the average; and • Any queuing beyond the length of the right turn bay would block one of two through lanes along the Qantas Drive eastbound approach, which would result in reducing through traffic to a single lane. This would have a significant impact on the network operations in the area; and 	<p>Colston Budd Rogers & Kafes Pty Ltd prepared an addendum letter, dated 5 September 2019, in response to traffic matters raised in further agency submissions. The letter is attached at Appendix H.</p> <p>The SIDRA analysis has been updated to include suggested changes by RMS, redistributed Qantas traffic, traffic from other approved developments and the additional traffic from other developments. Updates include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The missing traffic flows through the King Street/O'Riordan Street intersection • Set cycle times at signalised intersections have been increased to be within the range of 120 and 130 seconds <p>The updated SIDRA analysis found that with the inclusion of the RMS Airport North Precinct upgrades in place that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intersection of Qantas Drive/Lancastrian Road would operate with average delays of some 46 seconds and 11 seconds per vehicle in the AM and PM hours respectively. This is a satisfactory (service D) level of intersection operation for the AM and a good level (service A) of intersection operation for the PM.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis of the intersection of Qantas Drive/Lancaster [sic] Road included in the Traffic Report does not reflect the existing operation of the traffic signals at this location in relation to cycle time and signalised pedestrian crossings. In particular, the proponent has used a much lower cycle time that is not used on major roads during peak periods. The reported analysis shortens the queue length but reduces overall system efficiency. <p>It is recommended that the applicant addresses the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact at the Qantas Drive/Lancaster [sic] Road intersection needs to be reassessed to reflect more closely the SCATS operation of the traffic signals in relation to cycle time and signalised pedestrian crossings. The traffic modelling needs to report the 95th% queue lengths; Mitigation measures (if any) may need to be implemented to ensure that impacts on Qantas Drive as a result of the proposed development are manageable; and Any further work should be discussed and agreed with TfNSW and Roads & Maritime Services prior to resubmitting to the Department to avoid any further unnecessary delays. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 95% queue length for the right turn into Lancastrian Road was 97 metres in the AM peak hour and 19 metres in the PM peak hour. This may result in some minor works to extend the right turn bay from 80 metres to 100 metres. The intersection of O'Riordan Street/King Street would operate with average delays of some 46 seconds and 53 seconds per vehicle in the AM and PM peak hours respectively. This represents a satisfactory level of intersection operation (service level D). The 95% queue length for the right turn into King Street (west) was 61 metres in the AM peak hour and 35 metres in the PM peak hour. The RMS concept plans for the upgrade of O'Riordan Street show that the right turn bay is approximately 60 metres long. Therefore, the right turn bay can effectively accommodate the 95% queue length for the right turn into King Street (west).
Heavy Vehicle Access	It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to require all vehicles entering and leaving the site to do so in a forward motion. Note that if B-Doubles are intended to be used, a permit will need to be obtained from the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator (NHVR).	Noted and accept condition as appropriate.
Travel Demand Management Strategy and Workplace Travel Plan	It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to prepare a Travel Demand Management Strategy and Workplace Travel Plan in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW.	Noted and accept condition as appropriate. .

Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management	It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to prepare a Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW.	An Updated Construction and Pedestrian Traffic Management Plan is attached at Appendix C . This outlines management measures for truck movements, construction vehicle management, internal site access, construction workers, pedestrian management and community public consultation measures to keep residents informed of any vehicular and pedestrian changes during the construction period.
Conditions	TfNSW in its letter dated 28 October 2019 suggested conditions be included in an approval for the SSD.	The conditions outlined by TfNSW are considered appropriate to mitigate the traffic effects of the SSD on the intersection of Qantas Drive and Lancastrian Drive.
Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC)		
Construction Management Plan	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.
Native Species	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.
Preliminary Construction Management Plan	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.
Civil Engineering Plans and Section 6.1.1 of EIS	<p>ARTC Comment on EIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easement along west side of project boundary includes provision for vehicular access from the proposed site to another Qantas site, running along ARTC land of which Qantas formerly held a license. This license with ARTC is due for renewal. There is no reference to this easement on any drawings or plans. In addition, without renewal of that licence, it could inhibit the project as proposed. Note that there is a contradiction in Section 6.1.1 of the EIS that states that ARTC is not considering acquiring land associated with the project. 	<p>As discussed in a meeting between Qantas and ARTC, held on Thursday 4 July 2019, Qantas advised that they want to maintain the catering bridge and renew the license over the western easement located within ARTC land. ARTC confirmed at this meeting that they are looking to update/renew all licenses/agreements with Qantas, as currently all licenses are in 'holding' due to uncertain land/project requirements.</p> <p>Continued negotiations will occur between Qantas and ARTC to formalise a license agreement that also maintains ARTC's requirement to share the accessway.</p>

	<p>While no proposal for acquisition is anticipated at this point in time, the license has not been renewed. As discussed with Qantas, ARTC requires shared use of that access way and would seek to resolve requirements through ongoing discussion around the relevant license.</p> <p>Qantas Response to Submissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proponent has commenced negotiations to renew the license over the western easement located within ARTC land. These license negotiations will be finalised prior to the expiration of the current lease to allow ongoing use of the land for provision of vehicular access from the proposed site to the western half of the Mascot Campus. <p>ARTC Final Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lease has never been in place with respect to the parcel of land referenced. The previous licence is expired. Qantas access to ARTC land is currently on the basis of month to month hold-over. Negotiations have not yet commenced; however, any new licence will be subject to ARTC's operational and commercial requirements. The updated submission does not address the original comment. 	
Noise and Vibrations Emissions Assessment	<p>ARTC Comment on EIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 11.4.1 of the Noise and Vibration Assessment notes that there is some equipment typically used during construction projects that could impact the proposed facilities. ARTC notes that this and other equipment is often used as part of standard maintenance and operations within the full extent of its corridor boundary (which could be within 20 metres of the proposed facility). ARTC does not support limitation to its standard operations and maintenance in proximity of the proposal. <p>Qantas Response to Submissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 10 of the Assessment of Noise and Vibrations Emissions Report prepared by NDY outlines the Assessment of Impact from External Sources on the Development. In this assessment consideration has been 	<p>As outlined in Section 11.4 of NDY's Acoustic SEAR's report, the design threshold is based on the premise that any adjacent rail or construction/maintenance works will need to limit construction vibration to the cosmetic damage threshold limits outlined in the RMS Construction Noise and Vibration Guideline (CNVG) 2016.</p> <p>Therefore, the flight training centre building is designed so that there will be no adverse impact to the operation of the facility subject to construction and maintenance works being within the CNVG structural damage threshold limits.</p> <p>NDY notes that this would only preclude the use of the very upper end of the nominated equipment including a vibratory roller (>300kN, >13 tonnes) as well as a Large Hydraulic Hammer (1600 kg, 18-34t excavator). This equipment would</p>

	<p>given to both expected constructions work (road, rail and adjoining properties) as well as increased volume of aircraft, rail and road traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed flight training facility and car park have been designed to mitigate vibration from compliant construction activities within the surrounding area, including those emitted from ARTC's construction sites. These measures include structural isolation, structural design and location of sensitive activities within exclusive parts of the site. <p>ARTC Final Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Acoustic Report developed by NDY was not based on plant equipment commensurate to ARTC's Operation and Maintenance works and requirements. ARTC's position still stands that ARTC does not support limitation to its standard operations and maintenance in proximity of the Qantas Flight Training Centre. 	<p>exceed the cosmetic damage threshold limits both to the Qantas flight training centre site and the other neighbouring receivers along the corridor.</p> <p>Therefore, the flight training facility has been designed so that there will be no adverse impact to operational requirements provided that the rail and construction/maintenance works are within the CNVG cosmetic damage threshold limits.</p>
Infrastructure Report – car park	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.
Stormwater Management and Civil Design Report	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.
Piling and excavations (Section 4 of EIS)	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.
Stormwater Management and Civic Design Report	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.

Stormwater Drainage Design	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.
Cumulative impacts	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.
Preliminary Construction Management Plan	ARTC have no further comment regarding this item.	Noted – item resolved and closed out.
Sydney Water		
N/A	Sydney Water confirms that previously raised issues have been addressed.	Noted – all issues resolved and closed out.
Fire and Rescue NSW (FRNSW)		
N/A	<p>FRNSW are satisfied that comments and recommendations submitted in correspondence D19/44692 on 27 June 2019 to Jessica Fountain (Department of Planning, Industry and Environment) have been adequately addresses.</p> <p>FRNSW are currently undergoing consultation with representatives from Qantas by way of the Fire Engineering Brief Questionnaire process to address recommendations regarding the development's fire and life safety systems.</p>	Noted – all issues resolved and closed out. Ongoing consultation to continue between FRNSW and Qantas regarding the Fire Engineering Brief Questionnaire.
Environment, Energy and Science (EES)		
Biodiversity <i>Microbats</i>	An EES search for the same area of fauna records held in Bionet at 23 July identified 13, not four, records of Large-footed Myotis <i>Myotis macropus</i> , since 2000; and 90 records of Large Bent-winged Bat <i>Miniopterus orianae oceanensis</i> (formerly <i>M. schreibersii</i>), of which 45 have been recorded since 2005, a species which the report failed to identify at all. EES would appreciate an explanation of these discrepancies and why <i>M. orianae</i>	<p>WSP the biodiversity consultants provide the following response:</p> <p><i>“The first draft memo (RevA) sent to APP, highlighted the Large-footed Myotis and Large Bent-winged Bat as species to target for survey based on desktop searches for a specific date range. Given both of these species utilise similar</i></p>

	<p><i>oceanensis</i> was not identified or considered for survey, as it is a species that is known to use older buildings, culverts and other structures for roosting. EES also notes that since 23 July further, very recent, records of <i>M. orianae oceanensis</i> within two kilometres of the site (Sydney Park, 2015; Mill Stream, 2018; Tempe, 2018). have also been added to Bionet.</p> <p>If the SSD is approved, EES agrees with the RTS that as a safeguard measure a condition of consent is includes which requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A pre-clearance survey by a suitably qualified ecologist must be undertaken for native fauna immediately prior to the demolition of buildings • Any native fauna found in the buildings should be appropriately captured prior to demolition commencing by a licensed wildlife carer and released in appropriate habitat locations. 	<p><i>roosting habitat, if either species had been present on site, they would have been detected.</i></p> <p><i>2. It is general convention in the consulting industry to not use BioNet database records older than 10 years as they are often problematic (and in some cases, locally extinct). I used July 2009 as the oldest date range for the original database search (which equals 10 years' worth of data). This is one of the reasons BioNet provides the function to search for records within a particular date range. I have personally recorded two Large Bent-winged Bats at Tempe in a toilet block in 2006, and I took this into consideration when preparing for the targeted survey, based on my knowledge of the species' roosting requirements.</i></p> <p><i>3. I have re-run a BioNet Atlas search this evening (12/09/19) in response to the EES queries, with no specific date range selected this time, and the numbers that EES provided still don't match what I have provided below. Perhaps EED has special access to sensitive records or can interrogate data further than consultants? You can see from my BioNet output below for the same search area I used before the numbers are:</i> <i>Large-footed Myotis – 5 records</i> <i>Large Bent-winged Bat – 21 records.”</i></p> <p>Noted and accept proposed conditions.</p>
	<p>(30/10/2019) With the removal of demolition from the application, further clarification is sought around the completion of the pre clearance survey for the existing buildings on site. When is this proposed to occur? This should be set out in response to the EES comments on page 19/20.</p>	<p>A pre-clearance survey is currently being undertaken in accordance with EES requirements. A copy will be provided to the DPIE for information purposes upon completion which is expected within the next week.</p>
<p>Biodiversity</p> <p><i>Urban Tree Canopy and Landscaping</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the RTS indicates that Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub (ESBS) once occurred on the site, EES encourages a greater use of ESBS plant species where available. • EES concurs with the RTS that should local provenance stock at the requires sizes be found to be available it should be used in preference to other stock. EES suggests the proponent contacts Randwick Council's 	<p>Scott Carver, the landscape architect consultant, accept the advice and recommendations made by EES, however note the following:</p> <p><i>“Some trees and plants within the staff forecourt, fire trainer and at grade car park areas are not limited to the ESBS species. Within these areas it is recommended that the species can be a mix of locally indigenous and native</i></p>

	<p>nursery or other local native nurseries to determine if the nursery can grow and provide ESBS and other local plant community species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EES recommends that if the SSD is approved the following condition of consent is included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All replacement trees and landscape species will consist of a diversity of local provenance plant species from the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub Bioregion where available and practical. EES also recommends that any trees to be planted shall use advanced and established local native species from the relevant vegetation communities which have once occurred locally to assist with the mitigation of the loss of existing urban tree canopy from the site, reduce the urban heat island effect and enhance the local habitat. 	<p><i>planting, with exotic deciduous trees species limited to the staff forecourt area to allow more sun during the Winter months."</i></p> <p>Therefore, it is requested that the recommended condition is updated to reflect the above – amended condition in (red).</p>
Aboriginal Cultural Heritage	EES was unable to review the ACHAR, and advised in its submission on the EIS that while EES has decided not to provide comments on Aboriginal cultural heritage matters at this time and that this does not represent EES support for the proposal and this matter may still need to be considered by the consent authority. EES repeats that Aboriginal cultural heritage may still need to be considered by the consent authority.	Noted.
Building design	EES notes the response provided in the RTS in relation to the EES, DPIE and Council recommendation to incorporate green roofs and green walls into the design.	Noted - item closed out.
Sydney Airport Corporation Limited		
Height Construction equipment	SACL re-provided their previous approval for the building heights and note that consent to operate construction equipment (i.e. cranes) should be obtained prior to any commitment to construct.	Noted – item closed out, and approval for cranes will be obtained.

4. ASSESSMENT OF AMENDED PROPOSAL

The exhibited EIS addressed the potential impacts of the proposal against a range of matters relevant to the development. Except where addressed in the following sections, the conclusions of the original assessment and original RtS and APR remain unchanged. In particular, the assessment of the following matters remains unchanged:

- **Strategic Policy Assessment** – the proposal remains highly consistent with the directions and priorities contained in the *Greater Sydney Region Plan* and *Eastern City District Plan* as well as other relevant policies and guidelines discussed in the EIS.
- **Statutory Planning Assessment** – the assessment generally remains unchanged, however the project has increased its compliance with landscaping controls to deliver in excess of what is required as a result of a reduced project boundary.
- **Built Form** – the assessment remains unchanged.
- **Urban Design** – the assessment remains unchanged.
- **Landscaping** – this Revised Addendum RtS and Updated APR proposes no changes to the landscaping proposed, however as a result of the project boundary being reduced the project's compliance with numeric controls has been increased.
- **Staff Parking During Construction** – the proponent is currently working towards finalising their construction parking management strategy, this will likely involve the temporary intensification of car parking on the King Street South site, complemented by leasing the remainder of the lost car parking spaces within the surrounding Mascot precinct for use of employees and visitors during the interim construction period of the development. The proponent will manage transporting employees from these temporary areas through the amplification of current transport practices, ensuring there will be no major inconvenience to employees or visitors.
- **Traffic access via Qantas Drive/Lancastrian Drive** – This issue has been addressed in **Table 2** above, noting that:
 - TfNSW have supported the continuation of right turn movements from this intersection subject to measures that can be included in the consent and;
 - Arising from this the likelihood of additional traffic being directed onto King Street west of O'Riordan has been mitigated and accordingly the potential for incremental increase in noise associated with these potential traffic movements is unlikely.

5. CONCLUSION

This Revised Addendum RtS and Updated APR report provides a comprehensive and consolidated response to the Agency submissions received in response to the original RtS and APR for SSD_10154 for the development of a new flight training centre including car parking and associated supportive and ancillary works at 297 King Street, Mascot.

During the RtS process the proponent and the project team have consulted with a variety of stakeholders, and have sought to close out all matters raised by Agencies.

The key findings and recommendations of this Revised Addendum RtS and Updated APR report are underpinned by a suite of technical reports prepared by a specialist consultant team, these are attached as **Appendices A - I**. The technical reports address the amended project and provide an assessment of the project amendments to confirm that the modification has limited environmental impacts beyond those originally identified in the EIS. As discussed in the EIS as amended by the original RtS and APR, and this Revised Addendum RtS and Updated APR, the revised proposal is considered to have significant planning merits for the following reasons:

- The land is zoned 'IN1 – General Industrial' under the BBLEP 2013. The project is permissible with consent and consistent with the land use objectives of IN1 zoning;
- The project demonstrates design excellence;
- The project demonstrates a high compliance with statutory controls;
- The project will not create any adverse significant social, economic or amenity impacts which cannot be mitigated via the proposed mitigation measures in this application;
- This project is critically important to maintaining the operations of Qantas, by ensuring their ongoing ability to train pilots and cabin crew in accordance with CASA regulations;
- There are no significant environmental constraints limiting the project; and
- Traffic can be managed, and the project will not result in new traffic to or from the airport precinct, rather it is considered to be a redistribution of existing trips.

The project is in the public interest for the following reasons:

- The project is crucial in maintaining Qantas' operational effectiveness as a global airline, whose headquarters/home base are at Mascot. In the absence of a flight training centre, Qantas' ability to operate and thus in turn effectively support the Airport and the National economy will be undermined;
- The project has been prepared having regard to Council's planning policies and this Revised Addendum RtS and Updated APR have increased the project's compliance with the aims and objectives of the controls for the site;
- Subject to the various mitigation measures recommended by the specialist consultants, the project does not have any unreasonable impacts on adjoining properties or the public domain in terms of traffic, social and environmental impacts;
- The site is well serviced by public transport and various walking and cycling routes and the road network. Further, the project will centralise some of Qantas' staff parking into a central location facilitating more effective transport of staff within the Campus and Airport;
- The project will result in the development of a world class training facility to service the Qantas fleet that at its completion it will be the largest flight training centre in the Southern Hemisphere reinforcing Sydney as a Global Aviation Training Hub;
- The location of the flight training centre in Sydney enables Qantas' long-term employment generation to remain predominantly in Sydney and represents a logical co-location with Qantas' Head Office in its Corporate Campus. More specifically the project will create a new strategic centre for the airline's operations, within a new Qantas Corporate Precinct;

- The project demonstrates design excellence and is intended to be a material expression of Qantas' identity as the national carrier; with 'earth' inspired elements to reflect the red earth of the Australian soil; and 'air' inspired elements referencing aviation and the sky;
- The building form and design addresses the urban design constraints of the site and the functional requirements of the facilities with a clear understanding of the industrial context informing an appropriate contextual design response;
- The effective day to day operation of Qantas' business at Mascot generates demand from some 5,480 spaces across multiple airside and non-airside locations which the proponent controls through ownership, lease or rental arrangements. The proponent's parking strategy is to maintain existing parking supply by proactively replacing known future parking losses to allow it to continue to successfully operate;
- Construction of the new multi-deck car park will allow for consolidation of Qantas staff parking within the campus site resulting in the proponent being able to better manage its parking facilities;
- The project will contribute positively to energy efficiency and environmental sustainability. The design has incorporated many ESD features to reduce energy consumption during the life of the proposed development with a targeted equivalency to a 5 star Green Star benchmark with a 6 star Green Star aspiration;
- The Revised Addendum RtS and Updated APR has sought to address and resolve matters raised during the exhibition period to deliver a superior outcome; and
- Given the site is suitable for the development and the proposal is in the public interest, this application should be approved.

DISCLAIMER

This report is dated 31 October 2019 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd's (**Urbis**) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of Qantas Airways Limited (**Instructing Party**) for the purpose of addendum response to submissions and amended project report (**Purpose**) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose, and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report, and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.

APPENDIX A UPDATED CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

APPENDIX B UPDATED CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN

APPENDIX C UPDATED CONSTRUCTION PEDESTRIAN AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

APPENDIX D INDICATIVE PLAN FOR KING STREET SOUTH

APPENDIX E UPDATED ARCHITECTURAL PACKAGE

APPENDIX F UPDATED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL PACKAGE

APPENDIX G SITE AUDITOR ADVICE

APPENDIX H ADDENDUM TRAFFIC ADVICE

APPENDIX I

ADDENDUM MICROBAT ADVICE

APPENDIX J

ADDENDUM ACOUSTIC ADVICE

**APPENDIX K ADDITIONAL ADDENDUM TRAFFIC
ADVICE**

