



Table 1 – Department of Planning and Infrastructure

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
View and Visual Impacts	Provide a thorough view loss impact assessment, in accordance with the requirements of Tenacity (NSW Land and Environment Court planning principle), from residential buildings to the southeast of the site looking toward the site. This assessment should include, but not be limited to, apartments across a number of levels within the Millennium Towers and Parkroyal. Should this analysis indicate a significant impact, further consideration should be given to the extent of the proposed built form to mitigate these impacts.	Refer Section 2.1.2 of Response to Submissions. In summary, the Residential Visual Impact Assessment prepared by GMU concludes ' <i>on balance, it is therefore considered that the view impacts are reasonable</i> '.
	Provide an updated visual impact analysis (including perspective views) from key vantage points of the proposal and its relationship with the exhibited Sydney International Convention and Exhibition Centre (SICEEP)- International Convention Centre Hotel	Refer Section 2.1.2 of Response to Submissions. An amended Public Domain Visual Impact Assessment prepared by GMU provides additional montages and consideration of the SICEEP precinct.
Built Form - Overhang Over Harbour Street	Further analysis of the impacts to Harbour Street as a result of the proposed overhanging building form is to be provided. This should include consideration of additional measures to improve the pedestrian environment in this area and linkages where employees and visitors enter and exit the area.	Refer Section 2.2.2 of Response to Submissions.
Public Domain	Further consideration of the public domain treatment and design is to be provided, with particular reference to:	Refer Section 2.3.1 of Response to Submissions for detailed discussion regarding the Public Domain.
	<p>a) clarification of the site boundary at its western extent and resolution of any encroachment into the SICEEP Core Facilities site;</p> <p>b) the western extent of the site to ensure a seamless functional and aesthetic relationship with the approved open space design on the adjoining SICEEP Core Facilities site;</p> <p>c) the functionality of the public domain to the west of the building to ensure that this area has been designed to cater for the expected outdoor events held in the immediate area and minimise squeeze points;</p>	<p>The western extent of the proposal has been coordinated with SICEEP site footprint. The project team will coordinate with the SICEEP design team to ensure a seamless interface between the two projects' open spaces, both functionally and aesthetically.</p> <p>As above</p> <p>Refer to the Aspect drawing submission for the event space 'zone'. It is anticipated that the screen will be the focus of the majority of events in this space. Due to the height and orientation of the screen, an area of circulation will naturally be provided to the east of this space along the building frontage. 'Overspill' can be taken up further west by the terraced edge without reducing circulation zones. Relative to the existing conditions, the new design provides a significantly wider public realm 'throat'.</p>

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
	d) ensuring that adequate circulation widths and visual corridors are provided along the Cockle Bay foreshore; and	New drawing SK004 (refer Appendix B) details the proposed circulation widths and visual corridors along the Cockle Bay foreshore.
	e) potential improvement of linkages to the existing pedestrian bridge to the northeast of the site.	New drawing SK004 (refer Appendix B) details the proposed pedestrian linkages to the existing pedestrian bridges.
	An analysis is to be undertaken of the adequacy of existing pedestrian footpaths and pedestrian crossings at nearby intersections to cater for the additional pedestrian movements to and from the site, including identification of potential upgrades.	GTA have provided the following comments in relation to the adequacy of surrounding pedestrian footpaths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There are limited opportunities to improve footpath widths along the primary identified routes, however it is broadly expected that adequate footpath capacity is available to service the needs of the proposed development. – GTA Consultants report submitted as part of the DA adequately addresses pedestrian capacity and facilities in the immediate vicinity of the site including a first principles assessment using Fruins Theory.
	Additional photomontages are to be prepared from pedestrian level (along Harbour Street and either side of Cockle Bay) to enable an assessment of impacts to way finding and view corridors across the precinct.	Refer Section 2.3.1 of Response to Submissions for additional photomontages.
Signage	Clarification is to be provided on the nature of the intended use of the signage zones and City screen having regard to the requirements of SEPP 64 - Advertising and Signage. Details are to be provided demonstrating consistency with the assessment criteria in Schedule 1 of SEPP 64.	The City Screen is intended to be used for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Promotions and advertisements from businesses that are tenants of the building – Security announcements and information – Precinct information and promotions overseen by SHFA – IMAX movie trailers and "what's on" information – Special events (sporting finals, NYE events and the like) – The screen will not be used for any third party advertising. An assessment of the proposed signage against the criteria of Schedule 1 of SEPP 64 is provided at Appendix F .
	Architectural plans are to be submitted that identify the location and size of the City screen. Details are also to be provided which demonstrate that the City screen will not be able to be viewed from motorists on the Western Distributor (as indicated in the EIS).	Additional drawing SK001 (refer Appendix B) details the size and location of the City Screen. The screen will not be visible from the western distributor.
Heritage	Further analysis is to be provided on the impact of the proposal on the heritage significance of Pyrmont Bridge as outlined in the NSW Heritage Council correspondence.	Refer Section 2.5.2 of Response to Submissions.

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
	Submission of the following reports: a) arborist report assessing the proposed removal of the existing palms with the view of greater retention; and b) Archaeological report to address the matters raised in the correspondence received from the NSW Heritage Council.	Refer Section 2.5.2 of Response to Submissions.
	Further information is to be provided in regard to the Carousel and Organ and how its relocation has been considered against the Conservation Management Plan to address comments provided in the City of Sydney Council submission. Additional information is also to be provided in relation to the retention of the Sewage Pumping Station No. 12.	Refer Section 2.5.2 of Response to Submissions.
	Further analysis is to be provided in relation to the impact the proposal has on the 'Jay Flowers' on Harbour Street.	Refer Section 2.5.2 of Response to Submissions.
Owners Consent	Prior to the department finalising its assessment of the proposal, land owner permission for the proposal and also for the built form located outside of the site boundary (the area located over Harbour Street and Wheat Road) is to be provided.	Owners consent has now been provided by SHFA (refer Section 2.6.2 of Response to Submissions).
Further Clarifications	Plans are to be submitted illustrating: a) the site boundary across all floors and elevation plans; b) the existing and proposed built form compared to adjoining buildings; and c) details of the revised I realigned Wheat Road and location of drop-off areas and the identified 'minor mitigating road improvement works' as stated within the GTA Transport Impact Assessment.	The site boundary is now shown on all relevant drawings (refer Appendix B) Additional drawing SK002 demonstrates the existing and proposed built form compared to surrounding buildings (refer Appendix B). Additional drawing SK003 demonstrates the revised Wheat Road alignment (refer Appendix B).
	Additional information is to be submitted demonstrating consistency with RMS requirements for setbacks and clearance requirements to the Western Distributor.	Refer Section 2.7.2 of Response to Submissions.
	Further assessment of the loading, bicycle and motorbike spaces within the proposal is to be undertaken to address the City of Sydney Council submission.	Refer Section 2.7.2 of Response to Submissions.
	Additional traffic impact analysis of the proposal upon key intersections with the locality is to be undertaken to address the City of Sydney Council submission.	Refer Section 2.7.2 of Response to Submissions.
	Assessment of the proposal against the provisions of the draft Sydney City Centre Access Strategy.	The draft Sydney City Centre Access Strategy highlights a number of major changes which could be implemented to achieve three key outcomes in the Sydney City Centre, including: 1) Reduced congestion 2) Provision for future growth 3) Improved customer experience. With an overarching aim to shift a greater proportion of people using Public Transport to access key locations around the Sydney City. This proposal complements the outcomes of the Strategy, with a suitable car parking, bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities and adequate links to public transport. In addition, the proposal is not expected to

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
		have an adverse impact on the surrounding pedestrian and cyclist network. Refer to Sydney City Centre Access Strategy Assessment prepared by JBA (Appendix I)
Reports to be Updated	All reports submitted as part of the EIS should be reviewed in light of any revisions made in the resolution of the issues noted. Supplementary and technical reports should also be reviewed and amended to ensure that the extent of the proposal is accurately reflected.	Refer Section 4.0 of Response to Submissions.

Table 2 – City of Sydney

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
Built Form	The reduction of views and visual access and legibility at the ground plane and below the western flyover from Cockle Bay to the Darling Harbour Live exhibition and entertainment facilities and the boulevard is excessive and should be reviewed.+ A view loss analysis should be carried out for residences to the south of the site and the Department should assess view loss impact as per the Tenacity planning principles.	Refer Section 2.1.2 of Response to Submissions.
Public Domain	All options to connect the site more directly to Bathurst Street should be explored and documented.	A bridge link from the existing southern pedestrian bridge to the east of the site has previously been investigated and ruled out as the elevated roadways interrupt this path. On grade access across Harbour Street north of the current crossing would require pedestrians crossings back to Day Street and changes to the Bathurst Street/Harbour Street intersection.
	Further consideration should be given to how the Harbour Street pedestrian link will connect to the surrounding public domain and pedestrian connections to the south, particularly to address the 'back of house' between the site and Darling Quarter.	The site is surrounded by well-established pedestrian facilities which accommodate several key pedestrian desire lines. Pedestrian volumes from the east, particularly from Bathurst Street have two options, including the Bathurst Street Pedestrian Bridge and at-grade crossing points across Harbour Street. The Transport Impact Assessment undertook a detailed pedestrian assessment in the vicinity of the site, which indicated that there would be a significant increase in pedestrian volumes accessing the site during the AM and PM peak hours. However, given that the site will mostly accommodate commercial land use and with consideration of the existing 70% mode share for public transport in the Sydney CBD, the primary origin and destination for pedestrian trips would be Town Hall Station. As there is not a clear direct route to the site, pedestrians would utilise both the direct link between Town Hall and the site via the pedestrian overpass, with access from Druiett Street, as well as the Bathurst Street connection. As such, the existing pedestrian connections with Bathurst Street are considered suitable. The proposal would not adversely impact the Harbour Street pedestrian link. It is anticipated that the proposal would further activate site frontages along the north and east, with the removal of a level difference between the site access and public domain. Pedestrian amenity in this area would be improved.
	Public domain materials and finished must be integrated with the Darling Harbour Live project and where possible draw from the City's palette of materials. The number of trees to be removed / transplanted should be minimised. Opportunities to increase canopy cover should be explored.	Noted – to be addressed during detailed design
	It is recommended that slotted drains are removed from the proposal as they have maintenance implications and are not consistent with the existing Darling Harbour precinct and Darling Harbour Live project paving.	Noted – to be addressed during detailed design

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
	Consideration needs to be given to removing or containing the event space A large event space on the western side of the building must not diminish the primacy of the north-south pedestrian movement through the precinct.	The proposal minimises the protrusion of the building alignment into the public domain, with the building set-back similar to the existing set-back in this location. As such, the proposal would not adversely impact north-south pedestrian movements along the western alignment of the site. The width of the pathway has been significantly increased in the proposal.
	If the event space is retained, a Pedestrian Plan of Management should be prepared and implemented during major events. The Plan of Management should be based on credible estimates of pedestrian counts and desire lines from the proposed development, the approved exhibition and entertainment centres and general background pedestrian traffic.	Post-construction and prior to any special events, additional pedestrian analysis would be conducted to review the major pedestrian desire lines and the pedestrian volumes.
	Landscaping canopy spread, particularly key stands of palms should be maintained or increased where possible rather than reduced.	Noted – to be addressed during detailed design
	An assessment against the heads of consideration in SEPP 64 – Advertising and Signage and RMS Guidelines should be carried out to determine whether the proposed large screen will be a distraction hazard to vehicles.	As the sign is visible from the Western Distributor, an assessment of potential distraction hazards is not required.
Transport, Parking, Cycling and Walking	An assessment of the adequacy of existing footpaths and intersections along the Bathurst Street and Druitt Street routes should be undertaken to determine pinch points, inadequate footpaths and inadequate circulation/storage around intersections taking into account forecasted pedestrian traffic from the proposal.	There are several key pedestrian routes linking the site with public transport, car parking facilities and the cycling network; all of which experience heavy pedestrian volumes, with no delay or capacity issues as noted in the Transport Impact Assessment. Given this, with consideration for the proposed pedestrian volumes calculated and presented within the Transport Impact Assessment, the pedestrian volumes will be distributed across the network (spatially and temporally), with limited impact on any one particular pedestrian route or intersection. The scope of this project to improve pinch points away from the site are limited. Intersection queuing is typically best addressed through operational adjustments (including cycle times) where possible.
	The setback of the north eastern corner of the proposed building (i.e. at the northern point of Tenancy 1) should be increased to ensure pedestrian flows through the area are not significantly impacted	The Transport Impact Assessment indicated that there would little to no impact on pedestrian capacity along the footpath adjacent to the north-eastern corner of the site. Fruin Theory was applied to the reduced footpath width and a LOS A would be maintained.
	Limit the commercial car parking provision to 77 spaces or reallocate the 86 proposed spaces according to the various land uses of the building.	The provision of 86 spaces in total is considered appropriate, with the proposed allocation unknown at this stage. As such, the total parking requirements comply with City of Sydney LEP requirements and can be supported.
	A minimum of 8 motorcycle parking spaces are to be provided	The small number of motorcycle parking spaces is not material to the overall transport task associated with the proposed development. The site proposes to provide 5 motorcycle spaces, which is considered suitable for the use of this site and constrained basement layout.
	Traffic modelling should be undertaken at the intersection of Erskine Street with Shelly Street and Sussex Street and the cumulative impacts of the Barangaroo development considered.	It is understood that there is no existing traffic model which adequately assesses the cumulative traffic and transport impacts of Barangaroo, Wynyard Walk and the City Centre Access Strategy. As such, the effects of the proposed development along with the above and future road network changes need to be

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
		included in any future traffic model prepared. It is difficult to accurately access the cumulative impacts of these developments at this time, noting the relatively small percentage contribution of the proposed development.
	A Loading Dock Management Plan should be prepared and submitted to Council prior to the Occupation certificate for the site/use being granted. This Plan would identify the management arrangements for loading vehicles, general parking and cyclists and pedestrians. Once approved, the Plan will need to be provided/communicated to all tenants and external users of the area. The disabled parking space is to be maintained and a separate shared area adjacent to the space provided, in line with AS 2890.6:2009.	A Site Access Management Plan (i.e. including a Loading Dock Management Plan) was recommended within the Transport Impact Assessment and would be prepared prior to occupation.
	A detailed plan of the revised Wheat Road Layout should be submitted with the Response to Submissions. It should be noted that sections of Wheat Road (particularly if realigned closer to Harbour Street) fall within the area of Central Sydney Transport and Traffic Committee and as such, consideration of any proposed new arrangements by this Committee may be required.	Additional drawing SK003 demonstrates the revised Wheat Road alignment (refer Appendix B).
	The number of bicycle parking spaces should be increased to a minimum of 446 for employees and 100 for visitors. The 100 visitor parking spaces should be a combination of secure, enclosed spaces (as currently proposed at ground floor level) and short stay, bicycle racks within the public domain.	The bicycle provision is considered suitable, given the anticipated cycling mode share outlined in the NSW Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling. Given that the site is predominately commercial, the majority of bicycle parking should be provided for this use. Some expansion of bicycle parking for staff could be achieved through reallocating internal visitor parking to staff, while providing suitable visitor parking provisions within the public domain subject to SHFA's approval as land owner. Given the site's location and accessibility by bicycle, it is unlikely that demand would exceed the proposed bicycle parking provisions in the foreseeable future. The maximum green star credits (three TRA-3 credits) will be achieved, which results in 276 staff and 56 visitor bicycle spaces.
	A minimum of one bicycle locker per employee bicycle parking space should be provided.	Noted.
	A secondary access to both bicycle parking areas should be provided from the public domain. For employees, a second entrance to the bicycle parking area should be provided via the ground floor passageway between tenancy 4 and Tenancy 5. For visitors, a second entrance to the bicycle parking area should be provided via the passageway between the southern side of the IMAX cinema and the SHFA buildings. Both passageways should be a minimum of 2.5m wide to allow for passing between cyclists.	The suggested visitor bicycle park access suggestion is problematic as it is at odds with the desire to limit access to areas between the building and roadway structures due to vandalism and CPTED concerns. As noted above, it would be preferable to locate a higher number of visitor spaces within the public domain.
	Clear signage and wayfinding should identify access points to visitor bicycle parking areas from the public domain.	Appropriate signage is recommended to be installed to direct visitors to/ from the bicycle parking locations, however the emphasis on this could be reduced, with the provision of more bicycle parking located within the public domain area. Signage would be addressed during detailed design.

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
	A minimum path width of 1.6m is to be maintained within the loading area. In particular, the pinch point on the eastern corner of the hydrant booster (at the entrance to the loading zone) should be rectified.	Within the loading area a shared zone is to be linemarked and be at least 16m wide. A 1.2m zone will be provided at the 'pinch point' of the eastern corner.
	A Green Travel Plan and transport access guide should be prepared prior to the occupation of the building.	A Green Travel Plan was a recommendation of the Transport Impact Assessment originally submitted, and will be prepared prior to the occupation of the building.
Heritage	<p>A complete Heritage Impact Statement should be prepared for the proposal. This should consider a larger catchment of heritage assets, including those in the western CBD, Pyrmont peninsula, and Darling Harbour.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Statement should discuss resultant loss of heritage character and setting for heritage items and special character areas within the City of Sydney as a result of the visual impacts of the proposal.</p> <p>Section drawings should be provided to demonstrate the impact of the proposal on Sewage Pumping Station No. 12 and other heritage assets.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Statement should assess the impacts on important views from Sydney Harbour in respect of the Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005, specifically Section 25 Foreshore and Waterways Scenic Quality that requires certain matters to be taken into consideration in relation to the maintenance, protection and enhancement of the scenic quality of foreshores and waterways.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Statement should assess how the bulk and scale of the proposal maintains visual connectivity between the western precinct of the CBD and Darling Harbour, the Pyrmont Peninsula, and Pyrmont Bridge.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Statement should assess the geographic connectivity between heritage items in the harbour and between the CBD and Pyrmont Peninsula.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Statement should demonstrate how the proposal interprets the natural and cultural heritage of the area</p> <p>Any proposed relocation of the Carousel and Organ should be preceded by a thorough planning exercise developed in accordance with the policies and procedures outlined in the Conservation Management Plan for these items (SHFA 2012).</p>	Refer Section 2.5.2 of Response to Submissions.

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
	<p>In accordance with Policy 16 of the CMP, the current setting of the Carousel and Organ is compromised by the 1992 Carousel enclosure. Consideration should be given to a revised structure which evokes a sense of a carnival or fairground. The scale of the current enclosure dwarfs the Carousel. Any revised structure should be more modest in scale, have a higher level of transparency and better interpret a fairground setting, while establishing an appropriate safety zone for the Carousel.</p> <p>The relocation of the Carousel must ensure that the Carousel and Organ be retained as a group, appropriate views and vistas are maintained to and from the Carousel in current and future settings, allowing for the Carousel to be viewed in the round with a clear and unobstructed curtilage (Policies 17, 18).</p> <p>The Construction Management Plan should be amended to include the relocation of the Carousel and Organ.</p> <p>An Archival Record of the Carousel and Organ must be undertaken prior to relocation. Full records of the relocation must be carried out in accordance with the CMP (2012, Policy 8).</p> <p>Any proposed relocation of Jay Flowers should be preceded by a thorough planning exercise which carefully considers the new position of the piece. The current setting of Jay Flowers has been compromised by its increasing isolation. The new setting must give consideration to the artistic intention of the piece, in that it was meant to create a meeting place, and to stand at one of the pedestrian gateways to Darling Harbour.</p> <p>The Construction Management Plan should be amended to include the relocation of Jay Flowers.</p> <p>An assessment of the likely impacts of the proposal on Sewage Pumping Station No. 12 and proposed conservation and mitigation measures must be clarified prior to works. This should include a section drawing showing the Sewage Pumping Station in relation to the proposed development, and an assessment of the proposal on the setting of the Pumping Station. The assessment must consider the impacts of the proposed works in accordance with Sydney Water Environment Impact Assessment guidelines. The assessment should consider physical impacts to the fabric of items directly affected by the works, as well as impacts on the curtilage and setting of items, and views to and from items.</p> <p>Vibrations from the proposed works may have an impact upon the fabric of Sydney</p>	

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
	<p>Water's Sewage Pumping Station No. 12. A dilapidation survey should be undertaken prior to works.</p> <p>Consultation with Sydney Water should be undertaken prior to works.</p> <p>Archival and photographic recording of Sewage Pumping Station No. 12 should be undertaken in accordance with Heritage Council guidelines prior to works. Copies of the archival record must be lodged with Sydney Water Archives and the NSW Heritage Office.</p> <p>Interpretation of the importance of the Sydney Water Pumping Station should be incorporated into the overall interpretation strategy (refer below).</p> <p>An interpretation strategy should be prepared for the site. This must include interpretation of both Aboriginal and historic heritage. The interpretation strategy must include the provision for interpretation of any archaeological resources uncovered during the works. The archaeologists should be consulted in the development of themes and interpretative concepts. The interpretation strategy should include details of the proposed location for interpretation and display of archaeological findings, historical information about the development on the site and information about the natural history of this section of the harbour foreshore and early modifications made to the shoreline.</p> <p>As part of the interpretation process consultation with stakeholders including the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority, Sydney Water, City of Sydney Council, the Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council and the NSW Heritage Council should be undertaken.</p> <p>Interpretation of the importance of the Sydney Water Pumping Station should be incorporated into the design.</p> <p>Site allocation must be made to include space for interpretation.</p> <p>The proponent should incorporate the interpretation outcomes into the finished buildings and landscape, information that explains and illustrates the history of the place, its associations and its archaeological profile</p> <p>Landscape Planning should be undertaken in close collaboration with Interpretation Planning (see below). This needs to be developed for the integration works to guide and explain the approach to heritage significance, use of materials, and public art. The interpretation strategy should be coordinated with the City of Sydney, Eora Journey and Cultural Ribbon projects. Documentation on these projects can be provided.</p>	

Category	Recommendation/issue	Comment
	<p>An archaeological assessment of the likely impacts of the proposal on both potential Aboriginal and historic archaeological remains, including mitigation and conservation measures and research design should be prepared for the site prior to works. This should be prepared in accordance with best practice conservation approaches and guidelines including the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, and Heritage Council assessment and significance guidelines.</p> <p>An archaeological management plan should be developed to best manage archaeological issues on site. Testing of areas to be impacted by the development should be carried out to establish the nature of the archaeological resource.</p> <p>The Construction Management Plan should be amended to allow contingency for archaeological excavations.</p> <p>The Master Programme should be updated to allow for archaeological excavation contingencies.</p>	

Table 3 – Office of Environment and Heritage, Heritage Division; as delegate of the NSW Heritage Council

Recommendation/issue	Comment
<p>The greater height (20 storeys), larger footprint (than the existing IMAX) and graduated form of the proposed new building will make it visually one of the most dominant buildings surrounding the harbour. It is anticipated that this will alter the current visual setting of the Pyrmont Bridge significantly, even though it is located at a distance, potentially impacting on its significance. It is recommended that the scale and bulk of the development should be reconsidered to mitigate these visual impacts.</p> <p>The proposed development is generally considered to be acceptable in terms of its potential impacts on the Darling Harbour Carousel and the SPS (within the Zone of Influence) subject to conditions requiring the proposed landscaping and pathways to be sufficiently setback from the SPS curtilage, and the preparation and submission of an appropriate methodology for the disassembly and relocation of the Carousel.</p> <p>The Heritage Division recommends that an Archaeological Report should be prepared and submitted by the proponent prior to the approval of the project so that the approval can be appropriately conditioned taking into account the mitigation measures recommended by the report.</p> <p>The Archaeological Report should include an assessment of the archaeological potential of the site and an appropriate mitigation strategy prior to or during works on site; the strategy may encompass archaeological monitoring. The proponent must supply the name of an appropriately qualified and experienced historical archaeologist who will be the nominated excavation director undertaking the archaeological mitigation strategy as part of the works on site. Following the receipt of the Archaeological Assessment, further archaeological conditions may be imposed by the Department as part of the project approval to manage the archaeology.</p> <p>Matters such as (but not limited to) fieldwork methodology, artefact analysis, final reporting and interpretation may be included as part of these archaeological conditions.</p>	<p>Refer Section 2.5.2 of Response to Submissions.</p>

Table 4 – Ausgrid

Recommendation/issue	Comment
<p>Ausgrid recommends, prior to the commencement of works, the proponent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Must enter into an agreement to ensure Ausgrid's capacity to design, construct and operate existing and future infrastructure id not impeded, including works affecting easements, duct corridors, cable routes or works that require the removal or relocation of existing infrastructure; – Must confirm the location and status of existing Ausgrid infrastructure; – Liaise with Ausgrid in relation to any aspects of the development that may impact or potentially impact Ausgrids infrastructure or ability to safely maintain and operate its infrastructure; – liaise with Ausgrid to determine the relocation of any existing infrastructure; and – Must ensure compliance with Ausgrid's Network standard NS 156 – working near or around underground cables; and – Must comply with the terms of the agreement. 	<p>Grocon have been in active dialogue on all levels with differing departments within Ausgrid namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Contestability Sydney South & East Distribution Operations and Reliability – Project Developments & Approvals CBD & Sydney East – Major Connections <p>A Technical review and assessment by Ausgrid has commenced and is work in progress.</p> <p>Discussions have commenced regarding the need and potential form of agreement and Grocon expect these to continue in Jan / Feb '14.</p>

Table 5 – NSW Environment and Protection Authority

Recommendation/issue	Comment
<p>The EPA notes that all activities during construction and operation should be undertaken in accordance with relevant noise guidelines.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Table 6 – Railcorp

Recommendation/issue	Comment
<p>The applicant must identify and existing RailCorp services such as pipes and cables and structures within the development area. If RailCorp services are discovered on the site, the applicant must enter into discussion and agreement regarding the accommodation of the services.</p> <p>It is requested that the following condition of consent is imposed on the development approval: <i>Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate the applicant shall undertake a services search to establish the existence and location of any rail services. Persons performing the service search shall use equipment that will not have any impact on rail services and signalling. Should rail services be identified within the subject development site the applicant must discuss with RailCorp as to whether these services are to be relocated or incorporated within the development site.</i></p> <p>RailCorp requests to have a copy of the final consent forwarded to them to enable monitoring of the applicants compliance with rail related conditions of consent.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Table 7 – Roads and Maritime Services

Recommendation/issue	Comment
General Comment	<p>Grocon have been in active dialogue and conducted numerous workshops with various stakeholders within RMS since July 2013. Outcomes from the workshops are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agreement on the scope of services that will be included in the Works Authorisation Deed (WAD) – Scope of Works / Services include outcomes from review done by RMS, Engineering (Structure & Fire), Project Management and Asset Management – Requirements from RMS regarding the Western Distributor, contribution to RMS overall traffic studies and including, but no limited not the requirements noted in Table 7
No permanent infrastructure is to be constructed within two metres of any part of the Western Distributor. Consultation with the RMS Sydney Asset manager is required at the preliminary design stage to ensure compliance with this;	Noted : All new structures will be constructed no closer than 2m to the existing Western Distributor, unless there are exceptional circumstances which preclude this.
Any activity with the potential to affect an RMS road shall be investigated for integrity and serviceability by a practicing bridge structural and geotechnical engineer. These activities are required to comply with the RMS Technical Direction – Excavation adjacent to RMS infrastructure and submit the required reports. RMS approval is required for any new structures and footings adjacent to the deep raked piles of the western distributor piers.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
The design must provide noise insulation in accordance with the NSW Road Noise Policy.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
Structures are to be provided with fire protection and exhaust systems such that heat, smoke and exhaust from the proposed structure do not damage RMS structures or vehicles on them.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
Assessment of the potential reflectivity from the proposal on the surrounding areas is to be undertaken and submitted to the RMS.	Refer to reflectivity report prepared by Cundall for impact on roadway traffic.
The proposal is to be designed to reduce any object from falling and impacting adversely on the Western Distributor or members of the public.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
External facades are to be designed to minimise impact from potential vandalism or debris impact from passing traffic.	All facades will have laminated glass to outer leaves and heat strengthened where required, designed for impacts as required by relevant Australian standards and codes. External northern and southern facades will be structurally glazed, the eastern facade will be encapsulated with glazing beads.
The relevant part of the proposed building must be able to carry a load of no less than 2.5kPa to facilitate repair works to the soffit of the bridge deck access.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
Access between the western distributor and the IMAX building must be restricted to prevent vandalism. RMS will provide at least 48 hours of notice when undertaking maintenance works on the Western Distributor that require access through the proposed building.	All areas not in full public view between the new building and existing roadway structure will be secured to prevent access, as part of the CPTED design principles for the site.
In the case of an emergency the RMS requires immediate access to the western distributor, 24 hours per	Noted and will be covered in the WAD

Recommendation/issue	Comment
day.	
There is the potential for RMS to carry out maintenance work during the site investigation activities The applicant is required to enter into a Works Authorisation Deed for the works associated with the development.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
An emergency Site Access Management Plan and Site Access Management Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the RMS for review.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
A Construction Traffic Management and Access Plan is to be prepared in consultation with the RMS addressing the cumulative impact on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Barangaroo – CBD & South East Light Rail – Central Park – Four Points by Sheraton – Sydney City Centre Bus Plan – Sydney Harbour bridge Toll Plaza upgrade – Sydney International Convention Exhibition and Entertainment Precinct – Wynyard Walk 	Noted and will be covered in the WAD. Grocon to contribute to a broader / cumulative impact study being undertaken by RMS
A road occupancy licence must be obtained from the TMC for any activity likely to impact on the operational efficiency of the road.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
An Emergency Response Plan is to be prepared addressing standard operating procedures for managing construction, site emergencies/incidents to the RMS/ council /TMC for approval prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
The temporary gantry over harbour street must address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Crash protection – Fire protection – Lighting – Sight lines – Working width sway envelope conditions – 5.5m height clearance from Harbour street pavement 	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
The Western Distributor Structure is to be appropriately protected during demolition.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
The proposed crane must not carry any loads over the western distributor.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
In accordance with Section 3.2.4 of the Department of Planning's Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines, the proposed cinema screen is not to be approved if it is facing any of the nearby road reservations or if it is visible to drivers.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD

Recommendation/issue	Comment
The loading dock, parking areas and access driveway are to be in accordance with AS 2890.1 – 2004 and AS 2890.2 - 2002 .	Noted
The sweep paths of the longest vehicle entering the site shall be in accordance with AUSTROADS.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD
Demolition must be contained within the site and vehicles are to enter the site before stopping All works associated with the proposed development are to be at no cost to the RMS.	Noted and will be covered in the WAD

Table 8 – Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority

Recommendation/issue	Comment
The authority expects that activities in relation to crane use, public safety, and pedestrian and vehicular traffic flows and events functionality will be addressed in the proponent's response to Director-General's Environmental Assessment Requirements.	All these issues have been addressed in the EIS and Response to Submissions. Subsequent to discussions with SHFA, in-principle agreement has been reached in relation to the location and operation of the crane on site.

Table 9 – Sydney Water

Recommendation/issue	Comment
Water There is sufficient trunk capacity to service the development Adjustments will be required to the existing DN150 water main currently supplying the IMAX Theatre and the DN200 water main that loops through Tumberlong Park to accommodate the proposed development A link main will need to be constructed between the two existing DN150 and DN200 water mains to provide a point of connection with adequate capacity for domestic and commercial services.	Noted
Wastewater There is sufficient trunk capacity for the proposed development Adjustments to the existing DN525 and DN300 wastewater mains will be required to accommodate the proposed development A wastewater main connection will be required if the point of connection is remote from the property boundary.	Noted
Stormwater The proposed development is in close proximity to existing Sydney Water stormwater assets	Further documentation relating to stormwater and existing water infrastructure has

There is insufficient information within the submitted documentation to facilitate a clear understanding of the potential impacts of the proposed development on Sydney Water's stormwater assets or the potential impacts of local flooding

The applicant is requested to provide a Stormwater Impact Report to assist Sydney Water in the assessment of the proposed development and the formulation of further requirements related to stormwater

The Stormwater Impact Report is to be prepared by a qualified person (Water Servicing Coordinator to verify) with access to the current Sydney Water GIS Database via lodging Water Servicing Coordinator

Any component of the proposed development within 10 metres of an existing Sydney Water stormwater asset is to be clearly identified by the Water Servicing Coordinator in plan and described in the report

No new structure is to be placed in, on or near the stormwater asset in a manner that interferes with the operation or accessibility of the asset.

Sydney Water would consider a proposal to deviate/relocate an existing Sydney Water stormwater asset to facilitate an improved development outcome.

been prepared by Bonacci, Billbergia and EFWF (refer **Appendix K**). This documentation confirms that the proposed development provides:

- Adequate protection of Sydney Water Assets (by providing clearance to the assets as required);
- Adequate protection to the 100 year flood level; and
- Additional floodway area due to promenade works.

Furthermore, the documentation confirms that the issues raised by Sydney Water relating to water and wastewater are standard items normally associated with the redevelopment of such building sites. The works will require a design to be prepared in accordance with Sydney Water's Standards which will be carried out as part of the normal Section 73 compliance Certificate process.