

# Block 11, Central Park

MP 06\_0171 MOD 10 and SSD 6673

## Response to Submissions Table

### NOTE:

The table below considered the total of 31 public submissions received by the DPE during the public exhibition period. It is noted that 28 of these submission were prepared as pro-formas or similar, with only 3 unique and individual submissions. The key issues raised within all submission have been sorted into key heading and a response provided below.



Submission Item	Proponents Response
<b>Mass and scale</b>	
Concern has been raised over the scale and massing of the building in its context, particularly the increased wall height and its adverse	<p>The form of the proposal has been carefully composed to the address the negative environmental impacts of the previous Concept Plan, whilst retaining its key conceptual tenants of locating the largest mass toward the east and then stepping down the massing from there to the west. Whilst maintaining the “street wall” articulation adjacent the Chippendale Green and creating a permeable public domain for pedestrians.</p> <p>As discussed in the Architectural Design Report (attached to the SSD and RTS Report), when compared to the previous Concept Plan, the proposal significantly increases the areas of publically accessible landscaped space on ground floor. As a result, the form is ‘slimmed down’ creating more generous setbacks to sounding building, and opening up sight line through the site.</p> <p>The wall height of the podium has been carefully considered to match the existing Castle Connell Hotel whilst providing a functional space for the occupation of a future Childcare Centre.</p> <p>Overall, the proposed design (including height, scale, and form and massing) is well integrated into its context, reduces the environmental impact, and provides significantly greater amenity to residents and the public in terms of usable open space, and ground flood activation.</p>
Submissions have questioned why the proposal has not implemented comments on the Advisory Panel in 2007 in relation to the maximum building height (being 15m).	<p>The comments of the Advisory Panel related to the Original Concept Plan approval. Following this time, the Concept Plan was significantly modified (MOD 2) to which Block 11 was amended. As part of this modification, the Design Integrity Panel (DIP) provided correspondence confirming that in the 12 months prior to November 2008 they met with the project architects seven times. They noted that the “comments and concerns raised by the DIP were taken into account in design development”.</p> <p>With regard to the building height on the southern elevation as noted in the submission, the current Concept Plan approval (Mod 9 - Plan A-1260 – Height Map Sheet 1) identifies a podium height adjacent the Castle Connell Hotel of 28.80AHD. The proposed Concept Plan modification (Mod 11 - Plan A-1260 – Height Map Sheet 1) is in fact lower, with an RL of 27.50 and 22.6AHD.</p>
<b>Overshadowing</b>	
Concern has been raised regarding the potential overshadowing impact generated by the proposal, particularly in relation to dwellings on Wellington, O'Connor, Queen and Balfour Streets	<p>Refer to Section 2.11 – ‘Solar Access and Overshadowing’ of the RTS where this is discussed in detail.</p> <p>The project Architects FJMT have provided shadow diagrams and elevation of the building on Wellington Street for each hour between 8am and 4pm on the 21st day of every month. The following is noted from the plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ many of the buildings, particularly those identified as being residential, are largely affected by existing overshadowing from existing and surrounding buildings;</li> <li>○ some additional overshadowing in the morning of March and June; and</li> <li>○ more sunlight afforded to these building in August.</li> </ul>

Submission Item	Proponents Response
	<p>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.</p>
<b>Community Consultation Process</b>	
<p>Concern has been raised over the community consultation process undertaken in the pre-application phase.</p>	<p>As set out in Section 4 of the EIS submitted with the SSD, consultation was undertaken with various stakeholders, Department of Planning and Environment, Council and the broader public</p> <p>In addition to discussion with City of Sydney Council and the Department of Planning prior to lodgement, and following lodgement of the SSD, the following consultation was undertaken:</p> <p><b>Targeted Briefings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On 30 May 2014 from 11:00am-12:45pm a briefing was held with the Chippendale Residents Interest Group. This was attended by five members of the Group, including a resident from one of the terraces located on Wellington Street.</li> <li>On 16 June 2014 from 2:00pm-3:00pm a briefing was held with the University of Technology Sydney. This was attended by three officers of the University.</li> </ul> <p><b>Community Information and Feedback Session</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was held on Saturday 31 May 2014 from 10am to 1pm in an office at Central Park, 7 Carlton Street, Chippendale. The session featured two short presentations by the project architect at 10:30am and 11:30am.</li> </ul> <p>Presentation material was uploaded to the Central Park website and YouTube channel shortly after the information session to allow members of the community to review information further as part of their submissions.</p> <p>A summary of the outcomes/items raised during the consultation described above, as well as the proponent's response and where these items have been addressed in this report and accompanying consultant reports. The details response table is provided as part of the Consultation Report submitted with the SSD.</p>
<p>Concern has also been raised regard information that was missing during the consultation process, and the identification of shadow impacts</p>	<p>During the targeting briefing with the CRIG on 30 May 2014, information was requested to be provided in relation to solar access, and overshadowing impacts. The following day (31 May 2014) this information was provided at the community information and feedback session, to which an invite was extended to the CRIG.</p> <p>As noted above, presentation material was uploaded to the Central Park website and YouTube channel shortly after the information session to allow members of the community to review information further as part of their submissions.</p>
<b>Pedestrian Movement Form Kensington Street</b>	
<p>Concern has been raised by residents that design of the proposal encourages visitor and patrons from Kensington Street into the residential neighbourhood around Wellington Street, Dick and Balfour Streets.</p>	<p>The proposal has been designed to maximise areas of open space on the ground plan, and reducing the building footprint. As shown on the Architectural Plans, pedestrian connections are provided through the ground level.</p> <p>As part of the proposal, the existing conditions and arrangement of Wellington Street footpaths (on the northern side) will also be significantly improved, providing a much safer pedestrian environment.</p>
<b>Noise from Residents and Pets</b>	
<p>Concern has been raised over the potential acoustic impact from residents and their pets facing south, with the proposal to removal all balconies form the southern elevation</p>	<p>The proposed building design incorporates a comparably large separation distance between the southern elevation and building to the south on Wellington Street.</p>

Submission Item	Proponents Response
	It is anticipated that suitable conditions may be imposed on the determination to maintain appropriate levels of amenity for nearby residents
<b>Wind Impacts</b>	
Concern over the wind impacts generated by the development – concern over the validity of this testing	Refer to Section 2.12 of the RTS where this is discussed in detail. 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. As a result of the assessment, wind conditions were determined as being suitable for pedestrians standing and walking, with building entries located away from corners where potential wind interference would be most likely.
<b>Excavation Impacts</b>	
Concern that damage may be caused to surrounding buildings as a result of the excavation process in proximity to surrounding buildings	The proposed development is accompanied by a Geotechnical Assessment that provides comments and recommendations for excavation and construction. It is anticipated that suitable conditions will be imposed manage this process and mitigate any impacts. These conditions are a standard requirement for any development involving excavation and have been Additionally, as noted in the RTS, the proposal has been revised to reduce the extent of excavation from three levels to two.
<b>Traffic Flow and Management</b>	
Concern has been raised over the over the management of traffic and impact	Traffic Report accompanying the DA indicates that the proposed development will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network, and has previously been considered as acceptable by the RMS. Refer to the EIS and Traffic Impact Assessment for further detail. Given the modification to the basement layout, removing level 3 and loss of 78 car parking spaces, the impact of operational traffic will be significantly less
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
A request has been made for the proponent to ensure that the construction will not unduly interfere with businesses and residents in Wellington Street and their safety.	A construction Management Plan has been submitted with the application, along with a Noise Impact Assessment considering the impacts of construction Noise and vibration, along with various recommendations. It is anticipated that these compliance with these recommendation will be imposed on the application y was of condition. To ensure that construction impacts (including construction Traffic) are suitably managed to minimise the impacts to surrounding residents. City of Sydney have also provided recommended condition in this regard to the DPE.