### Block 11, Central Park - Response Table

**September 2015**

**Response to City of Sydney Submission dated 12 August 2015 – Responses in Blue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Applicant’s Response</th>
<th>Addressed?</th>
<th>City’s Contention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O’Connor Street Frontage</strong></td>
<td>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 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 discussed at the meeting on and 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. Noted – these have been shown on the revised plans prepared by Foster + Partners – Concept Plan Mod 11 – Provided Attached to this response.</td>
<td>Potentially Yes</td>
<td>The document referred to (Appendix A - Plan Ref SSD 11 – 801 – 02) is not included in the Response to Submissions documentation. Reference to Plan Ref SSD 11 – 801 – 02 was a typographical error – Plan SSD 11 – 801 – 03 (an updated version) was included in the response to submissions package that shows the boundary. The boundary is shown on the attached landscape plans (Attachment D). Notwithstanding this, document SSDA-11- 1101 02 Site Plan appears to illustrate that all landscaping is within the Block 11 site boundary. – As per the note above – Plan SSD 11 – 801 – 03 was provided with the Response to Submissions Package. This is also illustrated on the subdivision plans that have been provided as part of the RTS (Appendix F – Revised Plan of Subdivision). The Consent Authority should satisfy itself that this issue has been fully resolved prior to determination of the application. As noted above, this issue has been resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellington Street Frontage</strong></td>
<td>The building has been designed 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.</td>
<td>No – See comment</td>
<td>The original comments are unchanged. As per the RTS, this issue was discussed with Council and the DPE and agreed that the final arrangement would be confirmed Council’s City Property Unit following determination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The O’Connor Street public open space has been designed to sit across both the development lot and Council land, with no clear delineation between the two sites. The existing O’Connor Street southern footway, from Abercrombie Street to Carlton Street is provided with a consistent width, a clear pedestrian path of travel adjacent to the building, and an area to the kerb with planting, trees and car parking. The proposal seeks to narrow the footway adjacent to the O’Connor Street public open space area resulting in the removal of the planting and car parking areas adjacent to the kerb.

The current proposal is not supported by the City. The public open space should be entirely under one land ownership. The design will need to be revised as part of the Public Domain Plan approval. The City requests that the Proponents discuss the land ownership arrangements with the City’s Planning Assessments, Public Domain and Properties Units to agree a way forward prior to determination of the SSD.

The eastern portion of the building fronting Wellington Street is proposed to overhang land proposed for dedication to the City for footway widening. The proposed overhang is approximately 2m.

The City will not accept the current level of encroachment above any land to be dedicated. It is the City’s preference that the proposal be amended to set back the Wellington Street elevation to ensure the building falls entirely within the property boundary. A solution to the Wellington Street frontage will need to be found in liaison with the City’s Planning Assessments, Public Domain and Properties Units, to the approval of the City.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Applicant’s Response</th>
<th>Addressed?</th>
<th>City’s Contention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kensington Street drop off and pick up bay</strong></td>
<td>During this discussion 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposal seeks to relocate parking spaces from the O’Conner Street frontage to Kensington Street to provide a drop off/pick up bay for the child care centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The bay is currently proposed along a length of footway that is not wide enough to provide an indented bay as well as a continuous suitable width of footway. Any indented bay will need to be offset by an extended dedication the same width as the parking bay around the back of the bay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval for the drop off/pick up bay is required from the City’s Traffic Committee. As such, this issue can be resolved through ongoing dialogue between the City and the proponent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childcare Centre</strong></td>
<td>In response to the request from the DPE, plans 201 and 202 have been updated to clearly delineate the areas that will be used as childcare centre on the ground floor and level 1. In addition, the Level plan also identifies the areas of outdoor open space to be used by the 0-2yrs and 3-5yrs children.</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>The comments are noted. The City maintains that in most circumstances the minimum area required for 90 children is 1,800m2. Subject to future assessment, it would appear that the area provided will be suitable for no more than 63 children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The design, as shown on the attached plans provides a total internal area of 661m2 and exterior area of 609m2, totalling 1270m2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As noted by Council, the final fit-out 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The EIS indicates a total of 607m2 of floor space is allocated to the child care centre. A 607m2 child care centre inclusive of outdoor play space does not provide enough space for 90 children. Child care centres require 20m2 per child, which includes unencumbered indoor and outdoor spaces, in addition to ancillary spaces required including kitchens, bathrooms, staffroom, hallways, laundry, safe haven etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 1,800m2 of floor space is required to accommodate a 90-place child care centre to ensure sufficient space to allocate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Central Vehicle Access/Connectivity

The design of the driveway leading to the basement creates a conflict of movement between pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles. Pedestrian and vehicular paths intersect on the proposed ground level layout in the busiest vehicular area leading up to the singular opening at O’Connor Street. The potential stacking of vehicles before exiting would further negate pedestrian connectivity. The conflict of pedestrian and vehicular traffic needs to be resolved.

The paving has been selected to indicate vehicle priority in the driveway in an area that is essential for the movement of pedestrians and bicycles. The vehicle control gates as they are currently positioned create an obstacle to any potential shared surface.

Pedestrian routes particularly from the Wellington Street Garden do not create a clear, safe line of movement for pedestrians. The Wellington Street Garden footpath terminates in a building column and driveway, with no clear pedestrian route through. The footpath along O’Connor Street is interrupted by the change in paving for the driveway. Pedestrian priority should again be given, and the footpath paving be continuous.

The route to the secure bicycle parking facility is blocked by the vehicle control barriers, and positioned just around the corner from the basement entry, creating several potential hazards.

### Applicant’s Response

The following amendments have been made 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.

- 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,

### Addressed?

Partially

### City’s Contention

- The submitted amended Architectural and Landscape Plans differ in terms of the proposed materials for the driveway, with plan SSDA 11-201-03 illustrating consistent materiality across the share zone, and plan SSDA 11-801-03 illustrating a different surface for the vehicular path of travel that would continue to indicate the priority of vehicles.

- A revised Landscape has been provided by FJMT showing a difference in paving material in the shared zone. Refer to Attachment D.

- The City maintains that vehicles should not have priority in the shared zone, and that pedestrian priority movement should be achieved throughout. **Noted**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Applicant’s Response</th>
<th>Addressed?</th>
<th>City’s Contention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improving sight lines, removing obstructions and ensuring pedestrian priory is retained. It is considered that this item has been suitably addressed through the proposed design amendments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Street Garden</td>
<td>The Wellington Street Garden provides little in terms of useable recreation space. This may result in a poorly used, largely inactive space. Although the vegetation can provide both visual and ecological benefits, the overlooking, activity of the park and defensiveness of the ground level units needs to be carefully considered. The design should ensure ground level units achieve a balance of safety and overlooking for the gardens. Consideration should be given to the incorporation of seating within these gardens and replacing some areas of shrub planting with lawn. 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.</td>
<td>No – See Response</td>
<td>The proposed inclusion of benches and a wider footpath are welcome design amendments. Notwithstanding this, the area is still largely inactive and heavily planted with shrubs. The inclusion of chairs in this space was as per the discussion with Council’s Public Domain team to allow for passive recreation. The treatment of the Wellington Street park was also as a result of community consultation with local residents who requested the space be kept free of the potential for active recreation opportunities. The mounds have been retained, which in places rise up to 1.2m above the footpath and in conjunction with the shrub planting provides concealment opportunities. The arrangement has been reviewed by Elton Consulting as part of the CPTED Report and considered suitable, whilst also providing a level of privacy and separation to the dwellings in this location. Particular concern is raised with the eastern portion of the pathway which is situated between two mounds planted with shrubs. A response to Council’s concerns in relation to the mounds has been included as part of the RTS. The original comments are unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Roof Planting</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>No – No further information warranted</td>
<td>The applicant states that building management will have access to the landscaping on the outside of edge of the building, but this is not clear from the submitted drawings. The applicant should demonstrate how this will be achieved. The original comments are unchanged. 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. The final method of access to this area by building management will be determined following discussion with the selected building operator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Applicant’s Response</td>
<td>Addressed?</td>
<td>City’s Contention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Design and Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building configuration and apartment layout</strong></td>
<td>The proposal employs a combination of multiple cores to support dual aspect apartments as well double loaded corridors with single aspect units. It is noted that only 45% of apartments achieve natural cross ventilation and 19% of the apartments are south facing, which does not comply with the Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC). The proposed apartment mix and unit areas range vastly. The proponent maintains that variations to the RFDC are in response to market demand and location. Provision of 21% of studio apartments has been justified due to demand of student population associated to surrounding universities and TAFE educational institutes, which is supported. However variances with regard to internal and external apartment sizes that exceed the +/-5% variance should be reviewed.</td>
<td>All apartments within Block 11 are naturally ventilated, with 45% of apartments being naturally cross ventilated, and a further 24% having hybrid natural cross ventilation system which creates a managed two-way cross ventilation path connecting vertical fresh air shafts to the apartments. A detailed analysis of ventilation is provided within the Architectural Design Report. The proposals incorporates apartments that take advantage of the western aspect and expansive views, apartments facing northern and southern views. It is noted that the number of south facing apartments is 19%. As detailed in the Architectural Design Report, it is however noted that the amenity of outlook over Chippendale, given its lower scale, is excellent as is the quieter orientation to Wellington Street and connection with the new Wellington Street park to be created.</td>
<td>No Yes – Refer to comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Building expression and materials | The proposal achieves successful layering of expression on facade treatments using appropriate built form, setbacks, materials and details. Proposed elevations respond positively to the adjacent Castle Connell Hotel and Block 5A in scale and height. The proposal has adopted a materials pallet which is sensitive to its surrounds. The use of terracotta finishes, timber-batten screening, earthy-toned metal screens amid clear glass curtain walls are considered appropriate. | 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. | N/A Yes | Comments noted. Noted |

<p>| Public domain and place-making | The modification to the approved Concept Plan has enabled wider open spaces in both the north and south public open space areas. The north facing public open space at the corner of O’Connor and Kensington Street has the opportunity to become a key urban space in the precinct, particularly in association with activation through cafes and other retail uses at the ground floor. Potential opportunities existing to further increase activation through the treatment of this park as a civic space, such as a plaza or square, rather than a landscaped front garden as currently proposed. In contrast to Chippendale Green or Central Park, the scale of this urban plaza within dense urban fabric around the Kensington Street junction would help to | No response. Response to this comment was provided in Section 2.5.2 of the Response to Submissions Report (RTS). | No Yes – refer RTS Report and Comments adjacent | The original comments are unchanged. 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). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Applicant’s Response</th>
<th>Addressed?</th>
<th>City’s Contention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>act as a counter activity node to Railway Square, by being away from primary vehicular roads yet close enough to major transport hubs. Consideration should be given to the incorporation of expanded footways, public gathering spaces and public art to transform the park into a dynamic urban space benefitting surrounding developments, and complimentary to the civic nature of Chippendale Green and Kensington/Cartlon Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Castle Connell Hotel</strong></td>
<td>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. An Assessment of the heritage impact has been undertaken by Urbis, 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 facades.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The comments are noted. <strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blackwattle Creek Ovoid Drain</strong></td>
<td>As proposed, landscape works are near the ovoid drain and adequate protection methods should be taken to protect this item throughout all stages of works.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The original comments are unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car and Bicycle Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The reduction in parking is supported. It is noted that the storage spaces previously located on the level 3 basement level have been redistributed to the remaining levels. <strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A total of 236 car parking spaces are proposed including 218 residential spaces, 3 retail, 3 child care, 10 car share and 2 service bays. The proposed parking spaces comply with the relevant controls under Sydney LEP 2005 however it is noted that if this DA were assessed under the parking provisions of Sydney LEP 2012, a maximum of 132 residential spaces would be permissible. The City would support a substantial reduction in the amount of parking provided. Consideration should be made to parking take up rates in other Central Park buildings, which have experienced higher supply than demand resulting in unused parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Applicant’s Response</td>
<td>Addressed?</td>
<td>City’s Contention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child care centre parking</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comments noted. <strong>Noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Parking</strong></td>
<td>The required number of parking space (4) is maintained for the Childcare Centre as a result of the modification to the basement. 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.</td>
<td>Partially – Yes - refer comments</td>
<td>The Response to Submissions Report and the Traffic Report state that each dwelling will be provided with one bicycle parking space, however this is not reflected on the plans which only show visitor parking, on-street parking, retail parking, and a non-allocated residential parking area. <strong>The basement plans identify the areas allocated for storage for each apartment.</strong> All residential dwellings should be provided with a Class 1 bike locker in accordance with the Sydney DCP 2012. Each locker should be in addition to any basement storage required to meet the storage requirements of the RFDC. <strong>The proposal complies with the relevant provision of the DCP – namely Control 3.11.3 (2)(b).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Applicant’s Response</td>
<td>Addressed?</td>
<td>City’s Contention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPTED Response</td>
<td>No response to issues raised by Council. <strong>This has been considered and addressed in Section 2.4 of the RTS</strong></td>
<td>No. N/A</td>
<td>The original comments remain unchanged. <em>This is not a matter for consideration as part of this SSD. Future fluct and use will be subject to separate approvals.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustic and Construction Noise/Vibration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal traffic noise intrusion</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The comments are noted. In addition to the conditions provided in the City's original submission, the following condition is recommended for inclusion: <em>Noted</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted noise levels are discussed in the report, and recommendations are made with regards to glazed windows and doors, and acoustic seals on windows and penetrations in external walls. The report confirms mechanical ventilation/air conditioning will be required as an alternative source of air supply. The ventilation system chosen and installed must be appropriately acoustically designed to ensure the noise criteria are not exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External noise emissions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report identifies the main source of noise emissions from the proposed development as mechanical plant. Project specific noise goals are identified for each time period, and the consultant advises that mechanical plant ultimately selected for installation will need to meet these noise emission goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The recommended Conditions of Consent include Condition 45: ‘Compliance with the Acoustic Report prior to Construction and or Occupation Certificates’. <em>Noted</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care centre</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations are made regarding glazing requirements for the building facade to ensure the criteria for internal noise levels are satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Applicant’s Response</td>
<td>Addressed?</td>
<td>City’s Contention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise emissions from the child care centre are also predicted and are compared with project specific noise goals for nearby residences as well as future residences above the child care centre (in the multi-unit development). Noise emissions are predicted to comply with criteria as long as certain assumptions regarding slab construction, acoustic treatment, and external glazing are adhered to. The recommendations of the report will need to be implemented to ensure noise emissions are adequately managed.</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The original comments remain unchanged. Noted - No response required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electromagnetic Radiation</td>
<td>The Electromagnetic Field Radiation Report recommended that during construction of the child care centre, all walls should be internally lined with aluminium backed Sisalation Heavy Duty Foil (450), 1200mm wide. This same foil should also be installed on the ceiling and on the floor below the carpet. The assessment and recommendations of the report are supported by the City.</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>The application includes a detailed waste management plan for the demolition, construction and use of the proposal. The plan has been prepared in accordance with the City’s Policy for Waste Minimisation for New Developments and the DECC Better Practice Guideline for Waste Management in Multi Unit Dwellings. The provisions of the submitted waste management plan should be complied with during all phases of the development.</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>