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1.0 Introduction

This Response to Submissions (RTS) and Preferred Project Report (PPR) is in relation to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a State Significant Development Application (SSDA) for a residential mixed use development known as Block 11 at Central Park, Chippendale (SSD – 6676). The application was publicly exhibited for a period of 4 weeks between 10 December 2014 and 2 February 2015.

The RTS/PPR also relates to the an Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) for a Section 75W Modification Application for amendments to the approved Concept Plan (MP06_0171) – Mod 11 for a mixed use precinct at Central Park, Chippendale. This modification application was publicly exhibited concurrently with SSD 6676.

1.1.1 Block 11 Residential/Mixed Use Development, SSD - 6676

The proponent, Frasers Broadway Pty Ltd has reviewed and considered the submissions and has responded to the issues raised. The RTS/PPR sets out the proponent’s response to the issues raised, and details several amendments to the proposed development.

A total of six (6) submissions were received by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) in response to the exhibition for SSD from Government and state agencies as follows:

- State authorities and agencies
  - Road and Maritime Services (RMS)
  - Sydney Water
  - NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH)
  - Transport for NSW (TfNSW);
  - Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)
- City of Sydney Council (CoS); and

A total of 32 public submission were received during the exhibition period, 28 of which were pro-forma/template responses. Each of these submission has been responded to in the Response to Submission Table provided at Appendix E.

Of the six (6) agency submissions, including Council none proposed objection to the proposal, or required modifications Rather, the submissions suggested comments for consideration by DPE in its determination of the application, most of which to be undertaken prior to the commencement of operation, prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate or during the works.

Section 2 of this RTS addresses the key issues as raised by City of Sydney Council (CoS), State agencies, and the DPE. Section 3 outlines the key changes made to the proposal as a result of the submissions received.

1.1.2 Concept Plan Modification

This RTS should be read in conjunction with the Modification to the Approved Concept Plan (MP 06_0171 Mod 11) which was submitted concurrently with the SSD. During exhibition, comments were received from CoS, RMS, as well as single public submission. These are addressed below, as relevant to the Concept Plan Modification.
1.2 Additional Consultation

Following the submission of the SSD in December 2014, the proponent has been engaged in ongoing consultation with Council, and the DPE. The meetings between the proponent, DPE and Council included the following:

- 14 October 2014 – Meeting with the DPE to discuss the project prior to lodgement;
- 3 March 2015 – Meeting with City of Sydney Council’s, Planning, Public Domain and Property Unit, following receipt of Council’s submission to the SSD;
- 16 March 2015 – Joint meeting with the DPE and Council at the Department to discuss the comments received from Council at the prior meeting (3 March 2015), as well as the interim responses to the various items raised by the DPE and Council.

It is again noted that prior to finalisation and submission of the SSD, and in accordance with the Direct General Requirements (DGRs) a number of engagement sessions were undertaken, involving presentation and discussion with residents and the Chippendale Resident Interest Group. These sessions were undertaken on 29 and 30 May 2014.
2.0 Key Issues and Proponent’s Response

This section identifies the submissions received and provides the respective response, broken down by category. A response to resident submissions received during the public exhibition period is provided at Appendix E. A response to Concept Plan submissions as relevant have also been included in this section.

2.1 DPE and City of Sydney Council Submissions Summary

This section looks to address the main issues raised by the DPE and CoS in their respective submissions. To avoid duplication, the response has been arranged by issue. A summary of each of the submission is provided below.

DPE Submission

The DPE provided their letter on 19 February 2015, with the key items raised set out below in Table 1, along with where they are addressed in detail as part of this RTS.

Table 1 – DPE Submissions Items Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Location Addressed in this PPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Vehicular Access and pedestrian movement</td>
<td>Section 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overshadowing</td>
<td>Section 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wellington Street pedestrian footpaths</td>
<td>Section 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kensington Street drop off/pick up car parking bays</td>
<td>Section 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• O’Connor Street Park</td>
<td>Section 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Childcare Centre</td>
<td>Section 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wellington Street pedestrian footpaths</td>
<td>Section 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wind Impacts</td>
<td>Section 2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Signage</td>
<td>Section 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sun’s Eye View Analysis</td>
<td>Section 2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Sydney Council Submission

The City of Sydney provided their comment on 30 January 2015, and did not raise objection. The key items raised by CoS are set out below in Table 2, along with where they are addressed in detail as part of this RTS.

Table 2 – Submissions Items Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Location Addressed in this PPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Amendments to the O’Connor Street/northern public open space design to address issues of land ownership.</td>
<td>Section 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amendments to the Wellington Street elevation to locate the building entirely within the property boundary.</td>
<td>Section 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ongoing dialogue between the proponent and the City to facilitate the approval of the proposed Kensington Street drop off/pick up bay by the City’s Traffic Committee.</td>
<td>Section 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirmation of the total floor space allocated/number of places for the proposed child care centre. The current floor space is inadequate to support a 90 place centre.</td>
<td>Section 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reconfiguration of the ground level central vehicle access to ensure pedestrian and bicycle priority movements throughout.</td>
<td>Section 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of additional bicycle parking in accordance with the requirements of Sydney DCP 2012.</td>
<td>Section 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suggested landscape and urban design modifications to improve the amenity, safety and privacy of future residents</td>
<td>Section 2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Public Domain

2.2.1 Wellington Street Frontage

Concern has been raised by Council regarding the building arrangement to the Wellington Street frontage of the site, specifically in relation to the building overhang from level 2 and above. Concern was raised in relation to the potential arrangement.

As shown on the Architectural Plans (Appendix A, Figure 1), the building been design to match the southern building line of the Castle Connell hotel in this location at level 2 only, whilst maintaining in excess of 3m to the pedestrian footpath at ground floor. Given the building design above, this footpath will provide additional weather protection in this location. Additionally, the proposed built form allows for the indoor and outdoor area of the childcare centre located on Level 2 to be maximised. Various openings, as well as windows to the gym and community room are provided along this elevation (See Figure 5).

This item was discussed with both the DPE and Council, in order to establish the rationale for the concern from Council. During this discussion is was clearly indicated by Frasers that the final land ownership arrangement with Council would be subject to detailed discussion with the Council’s City Property Unit.

2.2.2 O’Connor Street Frontage

Concern has been raised by Council regarding the design and treatment of the O’Connor Street Park at the northern end of the site. Specifically, the concerns related to the delineation of public and private land, and the width and delineation of the paths of travel. Council have requested that the public open space (O’Connor Street Park) should be all in one ownership and confirm the land ownership arrangements in this area.

In response to Council’s concern, the proponent and FJMT have clarified the land arrangements along the O’Connor Street frontage, confirming the land ownership. As shown on the revised Architectural Plans (Appendix A - Plan Ref SSD 11 – 801 - 02) the Block 11 site boundary (identified in blue) clearly delineates that all landscaping will be within the Block 11 site, with the adjoining O’Connor Street footpath maintaining a minimum width of 3m at the narrowest point. This issue was disused at the meeting on 3 March and 16 March with both Council and the DPE.
These amendments will subsequently be made to the Concept Plan Public Domain Plan as part of the concurrent S75W Modification.

2.2.3 Kensington Street Drop off and pick up

Concern has been raised by the DPE and Council regarding the width of the footpaths adjacent the proposed drop off and pick up bay on the western side of Kensington Street. An extended dedication, the same width as the parking bay, has been requested to be dedicated in order to ensure suitable access is maintained.

Following receipt of the submissions, the arrangement of the drop-off bay as well as the surrounding footpath were discussed with Council’s Public Domain officer. The issue was subsequently discussed at the joint meeting between the DPE and Council.

As indicated on the revised architectural drawings proposed by FMJMT (Appendix A), and as shown in Figure 2 below, adequate pedestrian footpath has been identified surrounding the drop-off bay on Kensington Street to a distance of in excess of 3m. This arrangement ensures an unobstructed access path will be maintained in the location in response to the required from Council.

The location and size of the bay has also been considered by Council to be appropriate to service the proposed use, in order to provide both childcare drop off/pick up, parking and loading areas for the adjacent retail tenancies. The requirement for approval to be obtained from the City of Sydney Traffic Committee is noted, and will be obtained following determination of the SSD.

![Figure 2 – Kensington Street drop-off bay and footpath arrangement](Source: FJMT)

2.3 Central Vehicle Access/Connectivity

In their submission, Council raised concerns over the potential conflicts between pedestrian, vehicles and bicycles – particularly where these intersect on ground level. The concern primarily related to the paths of travel of potential safety concerns, partially with the entering, existing and potential queuing of vehicles, as well as perceived ambiguity of the pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and priority.
Council recommended that consideration be given to the reconfiguration to ground level to ensure pedestrian priority, and a clear visible route to the bicycle parking facility when arriving from both the northern and western access paths.

The following amendments have been made to the ground floor plan, in particular, the interface between vehicle, bicycle and pedestrians paths (refer to Appendix A). As shown on the revised Architectural plans, these include the following:

- Relocation of the traffic control point and boom gate for vehicles entering and exiting the site further north, towards O’Connor Street, and further away from the interaction point between the pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle pathways. This arrangement provides for a clear and unobstructed area for pedestrians priority.

- Redesign of the ground floor building footprint, to provide a clearly delineated pedestrian access path to and from the ground floor bicycle storage area. The modification involved the redesign of the bicycle parking area, and fire stairs. The reduction in building footprint and additional unobstructed area directly west of the building will be delineated as a pedestrian zone with a change in paving.

- Increase in the size of the access path through the Wellington Street path, in response to comments from Council to ensure the path is appropriately sized for both pedestrians and cyclists, despite cycling being discouraged through this area.

- As a result of these modifications, the potential conflict between cyclists, vehicles and pedestrians is also removed, providing an unobstructed movement in either direction for cyclists arriving or leaving from the bicycle parking area.

A comparison between the existing and proposed ground floor plans in this location is provided below in Figure 3. As shown in this figure, the recommendations from Council have been adopted, with changes to built form as well as the driveway arrangement. These changes, as proposed, are considered to be an improvement to the functionality of this space, improving sight lines, removing obstructions and ensuring pedestrian priority is retained.

It is considered that this item has been suitably addressed through the proposed design amendments.
2.4 CPTED Response

In their response, City of Sydney have identified concerns that may arise from future venues on the site. Whilst Council have acknowledged that the fitout and use of these tenancies will form part of separate approvals, their concern has been identified. Other comments regarding crime and public safety have been flagged in relation to the landscape treatment and activation of the Wellington Street Park and pedestrian footpath and built form in the south eastern corner of the site.

The DPE have also noted the potential blind corner created adjacent the Castle Connell Hotel and suggested further consideration be given to measures to address the potential for anti-social activity in this location.

As part of the CPTED Report accompanying the SSD, Elton Consulting met the site Crime Prevention Officer of the Redfern Local Area Command. The purpose of the meeting was to provide details of the Block 11 proposal to the Crime Prevention Officer, discuss key CPTED issues relating to Block 11 and obtain feedback on CPTED matters for consideration in the ongoing design of Block 11.

In response to Wellington Street Park and the ground floor units, the following items were raised, and subsequent response provided (Table 3).

Table 3 – Redfern Local Area Command Comment and Response (Source: CPTED Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Localised mounding in the public domain should not inhibit visual connections – the height of the mounding must ensure sightlines are maintained.</td>
<td>Maximum 1.2m depth to mounding will enable visual connections and sightlines (See Figure 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing or hedges should be used to deter people accessing balconies for Ground Floor dwellings.</td>
<td>A fence is provided to ground floor units, approximately 1.5m in height. At this height, the fence allows for some passive surveillance and reduces the likelihood of an intruder hiding behind the fence. Climber plants are proposed to add visual privacy to the private open space of dwellings on the ground floor. (See Figure 4, and Landscape Plan submitted with the SSD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Figure 5 below, and noted above in Section 2.1, a number of windows to the gym and community room are provided along the southern elevation of the building fronting Wellington Street.

Figure 4 – Landscape Section of Wellington Street Park - mounding
Source: FJMT

Figure 5 – Wellington Street ground floor façade (southern façade)
Source: FJMT

2.5 Landscaping

2.5.1 Wellington Street Garden

Concern has been raised by DPE and Council and the over the usability of the landscaped area within the Wellington Street Park, noting the benefits of the vegetation proposed, whilst cautioning the lack of activity and defensiveness of the ground floor units. Council suggested that safety of the ground floor units be considered as well as consideration to additional seating in this area.

In response to these items, FJMT have made a number amendment to the landscape area, furniture, and access path through the Wellington Street Park. These include:

- Widening the pathways through Wellington Park from 1.5m to 2m (increase of 500mm)
- Addition of two benches, indented into the landscape area (not obstructing movement along the path) that will provide a respite point for pedestrians and encourage passive

In response to the safety and security of the ground floor units, a detailed response is provided in Section 2.4 of this report. A series of undulating mounds with trees provides screening to transition the private apartment courtyards to the public open space, whilst still maintain sign lines. As discussed in the meetings with DPE and Council, and in accordance with the recommended condition of approval from Council an appropriate lighting strategy will be implemented in this area. Figure 6 below identifies the changes referred to above (existing and proposed), including the addition of seating along the northern side of the pathway.

![Existing and Proposed Landscape](image)

Figure 6 – Wellington Street Park – proposed landscape treatment

Source: FJMT

### 2.5.2 O’Connor Street Park

The DPE has suggested that consideration be given to increasing the civic nature of the O’Connor Street Park. Council also commented on the potential opportunities of increasing activation into this space through further consideration and treatment as a civic space.

As discussed in the meeting with Council and the DPE, the O’Connor Street Park has been carefully designed to provide a range of spaces throughout that provide connect with the retail to the south, passive recreation opportunities for visitors and residents and a transition or buffer between Kensington Street promenade in front of the Block 11. The design of the landscaping in this area consistent of a range of spaces, dividing by their uses (as discussed in further detail within the landscape report).

The Northern planter addresses the topography with a sloped top that reduces the scale whilst creating interest and softening the edge. Gentle arcs define a series of flat and sloping lawns that will be utilised by residents and visitors as passive
recreation space, and likely overflow of retail tenancies that will occupy the ground floor of Block 11.

2.5.3 Maintenance of Roof Planting

In response to the rooftop planting, City of Sydney has recommended that the balustrades on Levels 7, 8 & 9 be repositioned to the outside edge of the planting to ensure planting is easily and safely accessed for maintenance.

The upper level landscaping has been designed to allow building management to access to the landscaping. The location of the balustrade and landscaping on the ‘outside’ edge of the building forms a key part of the façade scheme, and external presentation of the building when viewed from the surrounding public domain. This design ensures the clear interpretation of the stepping in the building form at the upper levels.

2.6 Signage

The DPE has requested that an assessment of proposed signage zones be provided against the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy No 64 – Advertising and Signage. Signage zones have been indicated on plans at Appendix A. An assessment of these signage zones against State Environmental Planning Policy No 64 – Advertising and Signage is provided at Appendix I.

2.7 Urban Design and Planning

2.7.1 Building Configuration and Apartment Layout

As requested by the DPE, a compliance table against the Draft Apartment Design Guide has been provided at Appendix D.

2.7.2 Building Expression and Materials

City of Sydney makes positive comments on the proposal successful layering of expression to the facade and sensitive materials selection. Council have also noted the positive response of the building elevations adjacent to the Castle Connell Hotel.

2.8 Residential Amenity

In response to the request from the DPE, A compliance schedule against the draft Apartment Design Guide has been provided at Appendix D.

2.9 Heritage

2.9.1 Castle Connell Hotel

In their Submission City of Sydney have noted the proposal design to maintain significant views to the prominent corner location of the Castle Connell Hotel with a carefully design connection between new and old buildings and scale being achieved. The Council positively comments on the proposal materials and colour palette, providing a contemporary reference to the exiting masonry building, as well as the newer building in neighbouring Central Park.

As part of the Response to Submission and preferred project, clarification is provided to confirm approval being sought for the demolition of a former laundry room located on the roof of the former hotel. The structure to be removed is located on the roof of the hotel and forms a small third storey located to the rear corner, formerly accessed separately externally via a stair from the rear courtyard (location and extent of works shown in the Architectural Plan Package – Appendix A). An Assessment of the heritage impact has been undertaken by Urbis (Appendix F), who confirm that the proposal will have no negative heritage
impacts. Their conclusion states that proposed works have a minor impact to original fabric that is of low significance and is purely utilitarian. The proposal has no negative visual impact to the heritage significance of the site as it is not visible from the public domain, does not form part of the architectural style nor is it visible from the two principal façades.

2.9.2 Blackwattle Creek Ovoid Drain

Council has noted that adequate protection should be taken to project the Blackwattle Creek Ovoid Drain that runs through the very northern extent of the site, below proposed landscaping.

2.10 Childcare Centre

City of Sydney have raised concern over the size of the childcare centre, and its ability to accommodate the proposed population of 90 children. Their concern is primarily related to the availability of both indoor space and outdoor open space. The DPE have subsequently requested that the size of the indoor GFA and outdoor area be provided. In addition, drawings SSDA -11-201 and SSD 11-202 were requested to be updated to clearly indicate the location and extent of the proposed childcare centre.

In response to the request from the DPE, plans 201 and 202 have been updated (provided at Appendix A) to clearly delineate the areas that will be used as childcare centre on the ground floor and level 1. In additional, the Level plan also identifies the areas of outdoor open space to be used by the 0-2yrs and 3-5yrs children.

The design, as shown on the attached plans provides a total internal area of 661m² and exterior area of 609m², totalling 1270m².

As noted by Council, the final fitout and use will be the subject of a separate development application. The overall size, both internal and external, has been carefully considered by FJMT Architects in order to comply with the relevant provision of the Sydney DCP 2012 and the relevant regulations.

2.11 Solar Access and Overshadowing

To further clarify the potential overshadowing and solar access provided to the Wellington Street buildings south of the site as a result of the proposal, elevation drawings of the neighbouring buildings fronting Wellington Street indicating the extent of overshadowing caused by the approved Concept Plan envelope and the current proposal. The DPE also requested further clarification on the view from the sun diagrams provided within the Solar Response.

As requested, these plans have been prepared by FJMT (Appendix A). The information provided includes an elevation of the Wellington Street building as well as a plan, of every hour from 8am to 4pm for the 21st day of every month of the year. The existing residential and non-residential uses along the southern side of Wellington Street are identified on these plans. The following is noted from the overshadowing analysis:

- many of the buildings, particularly those identified as being residential, are largely affected by existing overshadowing from existing and surrounding buildings;
- some additional overshadowing in the morning of March and June; and
- more sunlight afforded to these building in August.

The results demonstrate improvement in the overall level of solar access afforded to the buildings fronting Wellington Street south of the site, when compared to the current approved Concept Plan.
Additionally, in response to the request from the DPE, the red coloured elements on the view from the sun diagrams indicate the elements of the building facade and open space that receive solar direct solar access.

2.12 Wind Impacts

Further analysis is requested from the DPE for the comfort levels of people sitting outside of the proposed retail uses as well as standing outside of the proposed child care centre entry, with appropriate mitigation measures as required.

As part of the SSD, a Wind Impact Assessment was undertaken by Cermak Peterka Petersen (CPP). Wind tunnel testing was completed on the 1:400 scale model which includes surrounding buildings within a 570m radius around the site. Measurements of winds likely to be experienced by pedestrians were taken at 19 locations for 16 wind directions each, including adjacent to the childcare centre entry and retail frontages.

Wind conditions north of the east wing are classified as suitable for pedestrian standing. To improve the wind conditions at this location, and in response to recommendation of the Wind Report, increased tree planting has been proposed as part of the ground floor/landscape treatment to assist in wind reduction.

Wind conditions along Kensington Street to the east of the site are classified as suitable for pedestrian walking with calmer (pedestrian standing) conditions in the centre of the block, adjacent to the childcare centre entry. Importantly, locating the childcare entry away from the building corners avoids sudden wind changes. Figure 7 below is an extract of the wind testing locations on ground floor and results.

![Figure 7 - Wind testing location and results](source: CPP)

2.13 Bicycle Parking

The proposal provides bicycle parking spaces for all residential dwellings. In addition to one space per unit, a total of 164 bicycle spaces are proposed. The following parking provision (in addition to the residential unit allocation) is proposed include the following:

- Ground floor Bicycle Storage area - 90
- On Street Bicycle Parking - 18
- Basement Level 1 - Retail - 22
- Additional Residential Parking - 34
- Total: 164

2.14 Car Parking

The proposal involves the removal of the third basement level, previously included as part of the application. As a result, the total number of parking spaces provided as part of the proposal has reduced from 235 to 157 spaces. The revised basement layout is shown on the revised plans at Appendix A.

A Parking report has been prepared by Positive Traffic (Appendix C) that reviews the proposed changes to the design of the basement car parking area and associated parking provision.

The provision of 157 spaces is below the maximum permissible within Sydney LEP 2005. Further, the provision of 157 spaces will not result in the overall site parking provision exceeding the maximum of 2,000 spaces, as stated in the Concept Plan. The required number of parking space (4) is maintained for the Childcare Centre as a result of the modification to the basement.

Positive Traffic confirm that the basement and parking layout comply with the relevant Australian Standards and are considered to be satisfactory.

Whilst not included in this application at this stage, some residents may be provided access to vacant parking spaces within the combined basement below Block 2 (One Central Park) and Block 5. This will require the modification of the existing parking allocation within this basement.

2.15 Acoustic Impact

The proposal has been designed with regard to the internal noise environment of the residential dwellings as a result of traffic and childcare noise. It is anticipated that standard conditions will be imposed as part of a future determination with regard to external noise impacts (i.e plant and equipment).

2.16 Transport for NSW Submission

TfNSW reviewed the SSD application, including the supporting documentation and noted their appreciation of the proponent’s efforts to support and promote active transport within Central Park. Their comments, and proponent response, are provided below.

2.16.1 Construction Management Plan

TfNSW has requested the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) include a requirement that pedestrian and cycle movements will be maintained along footways and cycleway at all times. Additionally, TfNSW have requested that and regular buses services that may be potentially impacted during construction, be identified.

In accordance with the recommended condition of CoS, A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be submitted and approved by Council prior to a Construction Certificate being issues. This CTMP will include the requirement for pedestrian and cycle movement to be maintained along footways and cycleway, where possible. As noted by TfNSW, should construction activities require closure of either, adequate safety and diversion measures should be put in place to minimise time delay and detour distances. In addition to the above, any bus services that are affected by the proposed construction will be identified, as mitigated as necessary.
2.16.2 Travel Access Guide

TfNSW have requested that a condition of consent be imposed by the consent authority that a Travel Access Guide be prepared prior to an Occupation Certificate being issued. This Guide would provide details for employees, resident and visitors to the site.

The proponent acknowledged the recommendation of this conditions and will prepared the required Guide, prior to the issue of an Occupation Certificate.

2.17 Sydney Water Submission

Sydney Water was notified of the application and provided comment in relation to waste water, potable water, recycled wart, and stormwater. The submission notes availability of connection to Water and wastewater infrastructures and well the private recirculated wastewater scheme that services the development. The submission also notes the presence of a Sydney Water easement through the open space at the northern end of the site. No modifications to the proposal are required in this respect.

2.18 Roads and Maritime Services

Roads and Maritime Services were notified of the proposed development, and raised no objection in their response. The following key items were raised in their response, all of which will be adhered to/provided as part of the proposal:

- The layout of parking should be in accordance with AS 2890.1-2004, AS/NZS 2890.6:2009, and AS 2890.2-2002;
- The swept path of the longest vehicle (including garbage trucks) entering and exiting the subject site, as well as manoeuvrability through the site, shall be in accordance with AUSTROADS; and
- CTMP detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to the Department prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.

It is anticipated that these requirements would imposed as relevant conditions of approval.

2.19 EPA and OEH

OEH and EPA were notified of the proposed application. Both agencies had reviewed the application and did not raise any objection. The EPA confirmed that the project does not constitute a Scheduled Activity under Schedule 1 of the Protection of the Environment Operations 1997 Act. No further response is required to these submissions.

2.20 Concept Plan Modification – Mod 11

The Concept Plan (MOD 11) will subsequently be revised to reflect the minor modification proposed as part of the Block 11 SSD including, the ground floor plan (public domain) and the revised footprint.
3.0 Preferred Project

In response to the submissions received, as well as further development of the design, amendments have been made to the proposed development. The following section outlines the scope of development for which approval is sought, based on the revised Architectural Drawings prepared by FJMT and provided at Appendix A.

3.1 Summary of Changes to the Proposal

The key revisions resulting from the response to submissions and further design development includes the following. Note that all changes to the proposal are identified on the revised Architectural Plans (Appendix A). A revised Architectural Design Report, development schedule and summary of changes has also been prepared and is provided at Appendix B.

- Removal of the third level of basement, resulting in a reduction of vehicle parking spaces from 235 to 157;
- Changes to the ground floor plan in relation to vehicular access, and pedestrian paths including:
  - Relocation of the traffic control point and boom gate for vehicles entering and existing the site further north, towards O’Connor Street, and further away from the interaction point between the pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle pathways. This arrangement provides for a clear and unobstructed area for pedestrians priority;
  - Redesign of the ground floor building footprint, to provide a clearly delineated pedestrian access path to and from the ground floor bicycle storage area. The modification involved the modification of the secure bicycle parking area, and fire stairs in this location. As shown on the ground floor plan, the additional area directly west of the building will be separately delineated by. This removed the obstruction, and allows for a clear pathway.
  - Increase in the size of the access path through the Wellington Street path, in response to comments from Council to ensure the path is appropriately sized for both pedestrians and cyclists, despite cycling being discouraged through this area.
  - As a result of these modification, the potential conflict between cyclists, vehicles and pedestrians is also removed, providing an unobstructed movement in either direction for cyclists arriving or leaving from the bicycle parking area.
- Clarification of partial demolition of the laundry of the Castle Connell Hotel (refer to the revised Architectural Plans (Appendix A) and Heritage Letter (Appendix F);
- Minor modification to the upper levels of the building (as set out at Appendix B) that results in a minor modification to the unit mix, but no change to the number of apartments (296);
- Modification to the width of O’Connor Street pathway, and inclusion of additional seating;
- Landscape changes to the Wellington Street footpath as shown on the architectural plans (Appendix A); and
- Confirmation of landscaping extent surrounding the site and delineation between ownership, including the consequential amendments to the subdivision and strata subdivision plans (Appendix G and H).