



Contact: Peter McManus
Phone: 02 9228 6316
Fax: 02 9228 6455
Email: peter.mcmanus@planning.nsw.gov.au
Our ref: SSD 6603

Ecove Group Pty Ltd
c/- Samantha Wilson
Senior Consultant
Urbis Pty Ltd
Level 23, Darling Park Tower 2, 201 Sussex Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Ms Docherty

Site 68 Mixed Used Development, Sydney Olympic Park (SSD 6603) – Response to Submissions

The exhibition of the State significant development (SSD) application and accompanying Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the above project ended on Friday 19 December 2014. All submissions received by the Department during the exhibition of the proposal are available on the Department's website at:

http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=6603

In accordance with clause 85A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, the Secretary requires the applicant to respond to the issues raised in these submissions. In particular, the biodiversity offset requirements, as outlined within the submission received by the Office of Environment and Heritage, shall be addressed in full prior to the determination of the project. Please provide your response to the Department as soon as possible.

The Department has also undertaken a preliminary assessment of the EIS and identified the following issues that will require further consideration and response in addition to those matters raised in all other submissions received, as follows:


- provide an assessment of the Section 4.0 General Controls and Guidelines of *Sydney Olympic Park Mater Plan 2030*, including justification of any proposed variations;
- architectural and landscape plans shall be fully dimensioned, including details of storage, access and path widths, etc;
- proposed variations to *State Environmental Planning Policy No.65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings* shall be documented and adequately justified, including a review of the proposal against the draft *Apartment Design Guideline*;
- landscape plan details shall be provided of the proposed winder gardens;
- mitigation measures to minimise potential conflicts between service vehicles and other vehicles entering the basement, due to the location of the basement loading dock immediately adjacent to the basement car park entrance;
- details shall be provided demonstrating that vehicles entering the new road comply with would be able to safely turn around and exit back onto Bennelong Parkway, particularly when all proposed 10 road side car parking spaces are occupied.

- all recommended environmental site investigations shall be undertaken and the site certified suitable for its intended residential land use in accordance with the requirements of *State Environmental Planning Policy No.55 – Remediation of Land and Managing Land Contamination: Planning Guidelines – SEPP 55 Remediation of Land*;

Note that under clause 113(7) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, the days occurring between the date of this letter and the date on which you provide your response to submissions to the Department are not included in the deemed refusal period.

Your contact officer, Peter McManus, can be contacted on 02 9228 6316 or via email at peter.mcmanus@planning.nsw.gov.au. Please mark all correspondence to the attention of the contact officer.

Yours sincerely

 . 19.12.14

Ben Lusher
Manager
Key Sites



Our reference: DOC14/275507-02
Contact: Wendy Stevenson 9995 6866

Peter McManus
Industry, Key Sites and Social Projects
Department of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Mr McManus

**Site 68 Mixed Use Development, Sydney Olympic Park (SSD 6603)
Comments on the Proposal and Conditions of Consent**

I refer to the letter from the Department of Planning and Environment dated 14 November 2014, which invited comments from the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) on the above proposal.

Please find attached recommended Conditions of Consent and associated comments for the key issues of concern within the jurisdiction of the EPA (Attachment 1).

If you wish to discuss any of the issues raised in this letter please contact Wendy Stevenson on 9995 6866 or wendy.stevenson@epa.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Hanemann', followed by the date '16.12.2014' written in blue ink.

MARK HANEMANN
A/ Unit Head Infrastructure
Environment Protection Authority

Attachment 1 – EPA's recommended Conditions of Consent – Site 68 Mixed Use Development, Sydney Olympic Park (SSD 6603)

**Attachment 1 - EPA's recommended Conditions of Consent
Site 68 Mixed Use Development, Sydney Olympic Park (SSD 6603)**

Licensing

In previous comments on the SEARs dated 29 July 2014, the EPA noted that excavation works undertaken as part of the proposed development may constitute 'extractive activities' as defined under Schedule 1 of the POEO Act. Schedule 1 states that an environment protection licence is required for works involving "the extraction, processing or storage of more than 30,000 tonnes per year of extractive materials, either for sale or re-use, by means of excavation, blasting, tunnelling, quarrying or other such land-based methods."

The need for an environment protection licence has not been addressed in the EIS. The requirements for an environment protection licence will need to be considered and addressed prior to commencement of works.

Construction noise and vibration

The EPA recommends the following Conditions of Consent:

- Construction works associated with the project may only be undertaken during the following hours unless permitted by a subsequent condition or otherwise approved by the Secretary:
 - a) 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Mondays to Fridays;
 - b) 8:00 am to 1:00 pm on Saturdays; and
 - c) at no time on Sundays or public holidays.
- Construction works associated with the project may be undertaken outside the hours specified under the above condition in the following circumstances:
 - a) where the construction works cause LAeq(15mintue) noise levels that are:
 - i) no more than 5dB above the Rating Background Level at any residence in accordance with the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC 2009); and
 - ii) no more than the Noise Management Levels specified in Table 3 of the *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* (DECC 2009) at other sensitive land uses; or
 - b) for the delivery of materials required by the police or other authorities for safety reasons; or
 - c) where it is required in an emergency to avoid the loss of lives, property and/or to prevent environmental harm; or
 - d) as approved through the process outlined for out of hours works.
- Construction works may be undertaken outside of the hours specified under the above condition with the prior written approval of the Secretary. Any request to undertake out-of-hours works shall be:
 - a) considered on a case-by-case or activity-specific basis;
 - b) accompanied by details of the nature of and justification for the activities to be conducted;
 - c) accompanied by written evidence to the Secretary that appropriate consultation with potentially affected sensitive receivers and notification of relevant council(s) (and other relevant agencies) has been and will continue to be undertaken; and
 - d) accompanied by a noise impact assessment consistent with the requirements of the *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* (DECC 2009).
 - e) accompanied by details of the noise mitigation measures that will be put in place.
- Any work generating high noise impact (e.g. rock hammering) must only be undertaken:
 - a) between the hours of 8:00am and 6:00pm Monday to Friday;
 - b) between the hours of 8:00am and 1:00pm Saturday; and

c) in continuous blocks of no more than 3 hours, with at least a 1 hour respite between each block of work generating high noise impact, where the location of the work is likely to impact the same receivers.

For the purposes of this condition 'continuous' includes any period during which there is less than a 1 hour respite between ceasing and recommencing any of the work the subject of this condition.

- No blasting shall occur without the approval of the Secretary.
- Prior to the start of construction the proponent must prepare a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan that is consistent with the guidelines contained in the *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* (DECC 2009) and details how construction noise and vibration impacts will be minimised and managed across the project.
- An Environmental Noise Construction Work Method Statement, based on the detailed design and finalised work methods, must be prepared for the work site to detail noise mitigation and management measures. The Environmental Noise Construction Work Method Statement shall include the following at a minimum:
 - a) identification of sensitive noise receivers likely to be impacted by construction noise and vibration;
 - b) identification of applicable Construction Noise Management Levels, vibration criteria and ground-borne noise levels, as relevant;
 - c) details of construction activities and a schedule for construction works for each work site;
 - d) identification of construction activities that have the potential to generate noise and/or vibration levels exceeding the relevant criteria;
 - e) a detailed description of what feasible and reasonable actions and measures would be implemented to ensure, to the greatest extent practicable, that these works would comply with the relevant noise objectives and vibration criteria;
 - f) procedures for notifying residents of construction activities that are likely to result in noise or vibration impacts, and procedures for responding to noise and vibration complaints; and
 - g) a description of how the effectiveness of management and mitigation measures would be monitored during construction, how often this monitoring would be conducted, how the results of this monitoring would be recorded, and the actions that would be taken if any non-compliance is detected.
- Any construction activities identified as exceeding the Construction Noise Management Levels and/or vibration criteria shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan and Environmental Noise Construction Work Method Statement.

The EPA further recommends that any conditions of approval for the project require the proponent to coordinate works with other works in the vicinity of the project to minimise impacts on and maximise respite for the affected sensitive receivers.

Operational noise and vibration

In previous comments on the SEARs the EPA recommended that the EIS include an assessment of the impacts of surrounding land uses on the proposed Site 68 development, including an assessment of the impacts of noise from the Olympic Park Rail Line and SOPA events. Consistent with this recommendation, the SEARs included the following requirement:

"Assess the impacts on the proposed development from surrounding land uses, including noise from the Olympic Park Rail Line and Sydney Olympic Park events."

Table 1 of the EIS indicates that this requirement has been addressed in Section 8.2.3 and within the Noise and Vibration Assessment provided at Appendix L. However, while the issue has been addressed in the Acoustic Assessment (Appendix L), it has not been adequately addressed in Section 8.2.3. Noise impacts on the proposed development from events within Sydney Olympic Park and the Olympic Park Rail Line are

considered to be key issues. The EPA therefore recommends that these issues are addressed in the Conditions of Consent in consideration of the results and recommendations of the Acoustic Assessment provided at Appendix A to the EIS.

Groundwater and surface water management

The EPA notes that it is likely that groundwater and rainwater will need to be removed from excavations on site during construction and that the construction site will need to be managed to prevent off-site transport of soils and sediment and other pollutants to waterways.

The EPA recommends the following Conditions of Consent:

- Any water discharged from the site to stormwater or waterways must meet relevant ANZECC guidelines.
- Appropriate soil and water management measures that are consistent with the guidelines of the *'Managing urban stormwater: soils and construction'* publications (including *Volume 1 – Blue Book* and *Volume 2A – Installation of Services*) shall be implemented during construction.

There may be a need for ongoing groundwater discharge after project completion. The EPA notes that the issue of groundwater contamination and management has been discussed in the EIS and that the EIS identifies both the need for further assessment of groundwater and the need for further consideration of drainage requirements during detailed design.

The EPA therefore recommends that the Conditions of Consent include requirements for the further assessment of groundwater, and the ongoing management and discharge of groundwater, including contaminated groundwater.

Contamination

The EPA notes that the EIS has included a Preliminary Contamination Assessment and that a number of potentially contamination issues have been identified. The EPA recommends that the Conditions of Consent include requirements for the further assessment and management of contamination, including requirements for further assessment and management of the materials that are to remain on site and requirements for the assessment and classification of materials to be disposed of in accordance with relevant guidelines.

Dust

The EPA recommends a condition of consent be included that requires off-site emissions of dust from the construction site to be minimised.

Waste management

The EPA recommends a Condition of Consent requiring all waste generated on site be classified and disposed of in accordance with the *Waste Classification Guidelines* (DECC 2008).

The EPA also recommends a Condition of Consent requiring the proponent to develop and implement a construction waste management plan to maximise resource recovery and recycling of construction waste materials, and ensure appropriate handling of construction and demolition waste.



Office of
Environment
& Heritage

Your reference : SSD 6603
Our reference : DOC14/277813
Contact : Rachel Lonie 9995 6837

Mr Ben Lusher
Manager Key Sites
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Peter McManus

Dear Mr Lusher

I refer to your invitation to the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) to comment on exhibition of a development application for Site 68 Mixed Use Development, Sydney Olympic Park (SSD 6603).

OEH provides comments on biodiversity issues in Attachment 1.

Should you have any queries in regard to this correspondence please contact Rachel Lonie, Senior Operations Officer, on 9995 6837 or by email at rachel.lonie@environment.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,

S. Harrison 15/12/14

SUSAN HARRISON
Senior Team Leader Planning
Greater Sydney Region
Regional Operations

ATTACHMENT 1. Public Exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Development Application for Site 68 Mixed Use Development, Sydney Olympic Park (SSD 6603)

The public exhibition documents include Appendix P1 to the EIS which is titled *Flora and Fauna Assessment Report. Decommissioning Site 68 Stormwater Basin (SOPA)* (Applied Ecology September 2014) and an *Interim Biodiversity Offset Strategy (BOS)* (EcoLogical November 2014).

1. Offset Strategy

The BOS calculates the offset requirement in accordance with the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) advice (i.e. using the relevant equations from the *Framework for Biodiversity Assessment (FBA)* and suggests that the preferred means of delivering the offset is Option 3 which is to commit to purchasing/protecting an offset area of around 3 hectares within the Homebush Bay precinct. This area would include habitat creation measures aligned with ongoing management costs of the offset site. The BOS suggests that this option requires agreement from the Sydney Olympic Park Authority (SOPA) who would have to make a suitable area of land available.

OEH supports this proposed offset however the BOS and the EIS do not address the other offset requirements which are as follows.

Achieving the offset requirement

The EIS should document the Offset Strategy that is proposed, demonstrating achievement of the offset being like-for-like (as per FBA offset rules), or a species with a higher conservation status. It should set out the species credits required by the FBA and how these species credits will be secured and obtained.

The offset must be additional to other legal requirements

The Offset Strategy must demonstrate that the proposed offset site is not subject to a requirement to implement existing conservation obligations, or, that it will adhere to the 'additionality' rules within FBA.

Offsets must be enduring

The Offset Strategy must identify the legal mechanism that will be used to secure the offset site. While biobanking agreements are the preferred mechanism for securing offsets, other conservation mechanisms may also be acceptable prior to formal commencement of the FBA. Interim mechanisms for securing offsets include (listed in order of preference):

- biobanking agreement (preferred)
- purchase and retirement of the appropriate biodiversity credits from a third party biobank site
- dedication of land under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* (NPW Act)
- Trust Agreements under the *Nature Conservation Trust Act 2001*
- a Property Vegetation Plan registered on title under the *Native Vegetation Act 2003*
- a Planning Agreement under s 93F of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.

Use of Supplementary measures

If a suitable offset cannot be located, the Offset Strategy included in the EIS must demonstrate, that all endeavours were undertaken to identify a suitable offset site, and how suitable sites were attempted to be located. In the event that it is agreed that a suitable offset site cannot be located, supplementary measures may be used. Any proposal for the use of supplementary measures must be discussed with OEH prior to the EIS being submitted for exhibition.

2. Mitigation Measures

OEH previously commented that mitigation measures should be identified such as procedures for the salvage and relocation of native fauna that may be using the detention pond and the fringing vegetation. These mitigation measures have not been provided.

Instead the draft statement of commitments states that the recommendations in Appendix P1 will be implemented. These are to:

- Conduct surveys of the aquatic zone to ensure that *Zannichellia palustris* is not present
- Conduct additional surveys of the SWQCP in spring and summer to gain a more clear understanding of the species that use the pond, and the level of usage to ensure that offsets are able to more accurately compensate for the loss of habitat; include microbat surveys in subsequent surveys
- Locate and improve habitat areas nearby for Green and Golden Bell Frog
- Locate and improve habitat areas nearby for Latham's Snipe and Cattle Egret
- Include dog and cat proof fencing around offset areas designated as substitute habitat for threatened and migratory species affected by the loss of habitat at Site 68's SWQCP
- Ensure all offsets meet all the statutory requirements detailed in the Biobanking Assessment Methodology and Credit Calculator Operational Manual (DECCW, 2008), as outlined in "Attachment 1: Biodiversity offsetting for Major Projects – Interim Arrangements for assessing and offsetting impacts" included in OEH's letter dated 30/7/14

Of the recommendations above, OEH supports further surveys for the threatened aquatic plant *Zannichellia palustris*, given the species is known from sites nearby. However, OEH notes that any such surveys for the species should not be conducted in summer given it is an annual and dies back over this period.

OEH does not support the other recommendations as listed in Appendix P1. Recommended conditions of consent are included below.

3. Water quality treatment

OEH notes that the stormwater treatment systems on the site have been sized to ensure that waters received from the upstream catchment area will be treated as well and the treatment systems have been sized to exceed SOPA's best practice targets for the whole catchment. This will ensure that the removal of the existing water quality control pond will not have an adverse impact on the downstream receiving waters.

4. Suggested conditions of consent

OEH recommends the following requirements be considered as conditions of consent:

- A revised BOS which addresses the offset requirements 1-4 above.
- The implementation of the BOS (i.e. establishment of the offset site) within a strict timeframe, with implementation of the BOS monitored and enforced by the consent authority. OEH considers the offset site should be established prior to the impacts occurring from the proposal.
- The BOS include requirements for habitat creation and ongoing management of the offset site for GGBF. It should demonstrate how the waterbody in the offset area will be maintained as gambusia free and how the fringing areas will be landscaped. Other measures may include specific requirements for managing public access and dog/cat proof fencing depending on the offset location. These requirements should be developed in accordance with OEH's GGBF recovery plan and associated guidelines and be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced herpetologist.
- The habitat should also be suitable for migratory species, such as Latham's Snipe and Cattle Egret, to offset any potential impacts on these species.
- Mitigation measures for the salvage and relocation of native fauna during decommissioning of the detention pond and associated clearing works.
- Mitigation measures for managing the site during construction to avoid impacts on threatened fauna and migratory species such as inhibiting GGBFs from the work site during the construction phase, ensuring excavation areas and pits are routinely monitored for GGBFs and that measures are in place for their relocation to suitable habitat if required. Note: there may be standard SOPA guidelines for these mitigation measures already available.

(END OF SUBMISSION)



Department of
Primary Industries
Office of Water

Peter McManus
Senior Planner
Industry, Key Sites & Social Projects
Department of Planning & Environment
By email: Peter.McManus@planning.nsw.gov.au

Contact Janne Grose
Phone 4729 8262
Email Janne.Grose@dpi.nsw.gov.au
Our ref ER23041

Dear Peter

**Environmental Impact Statement for Site 68 Bennelong Parkway, Sydney Olympic Park
(SSD 6603) [Our Ref: ER23041]**

The NSW Office of Water (Office of Water) has reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement and provides comments at **Attachment A**.

Should you require further information please contact Janne Grose, Water Regulation Officer on 02 4729 8262.

Yours sincerely

Mitchell Isaacs
Manager Strategic Stakeholder Liaison
19/12/14

Encl.

Groundwater

Section 8.4 of Appendix U indicates that only minor seepage will occur into the basement and a drained basement should be suitable. It indicates that if excessive flow rates or contaminated groundwater are issues then tanking or water licensing may be required (page 11). As advised in the Office of Water's SEARs submission for the project:

- the Office of Water is unlikely to support a proposal that requires permanent or semi-permanent pumping/extraction of the groundwater and the proposal should ensure that adequate construction methods will be used to permanently seal any subsurface voids.
- If permanent or semi-permanent extraction of groundwater in excess of 3ML / year is unavoidable, the proponent must obtain a water access licence in the Sydney Basin Central Water Source of the *Water Sharing Plan for the Greater Metropolitan Region Groundwater Sources 2011* to cover the volume of ongoing take of groundwater
- A key requirement of the licence application will be to provide a clear prediction of the total volumes of groundwater likely to be dewatered during construction and operation, as well as detailed justification and explanation of methodologies to support that prediction. Details of water management and disposal during dewatering operations will also be required to support the application for dewatering authorisation from Office of Water.

Section 8.13 of the EIS indicates that it is possible that groundwater may be contaminated and an assessment of the groundwater is currently being undertaken (page 65). It also includes a mitigation measure to assess groundwater quality to determine appropriate control and disposal options (Table 8, page 69). To assist the Office of Water in its assessment as to whether the basements need to be tanked, it is requested:

- a copy of the assessment report is provided to the Office of Water once it is finalised.
- suitably detailed and justified estimates are provided of the total volumes of groundwater likely to be dewatered

Section 8.4 of Appendix U notes pumps will probably be required to remove seepage from the basement and for pile excavations during construction (page 11). Details are required on the likely volumes to be pumped and where this water is proposed to be discharged. It is important the nearby Bennelong Pond is not impacted by any discharge of construction dewatering.

End Attachment A

17 December 2014

Roads and Maritime Reference: SYD14/00776/02(A8157043)
Council Ref: SSD6603

Manager
Department of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Peter McManus

Dear Mr Lusher,

SITE 68 MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK SSD 6603

I refer to Department's letter dated 14 November 2014 regarding the abovementioned development application (SSD6603) forwarded to the Roads and Maritime Services (Roads and Maritime) for comment.

Roads and Maritime raises no objection to the application and also provides the following comments to Department for its consideration in the determination of the application:

1. The proposed development at Site 68 shall comply with the approved Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030.
2. The layout of the proposed car parking areas, loading docks and access driveway associated with the subject development (including, driveways, grades, turn paths, sight distance requirements, aisle widths, aisle lengths, and parking bay dimensions) should be in accordance with AS 2890.1- 2004 and AS 2890.2 – 2002 for heavy vehicle usage.
3. A Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to Department prior to the issue of a construction certificate.

Further enquiries on this matter can be directed to the nominated Land Use Planner Xi Lin on phone 8849 2906 or via email at development.sydney@nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,



Pahee Rathan
**Senior Land Use & Assessment
Network and Safety Section**

19 December 2014

Mr Ben Lusher
Manager – Key Sites
NSW Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Lusher,

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF EXHIBITION – SSD 6603 Site 68 SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK

I refer to your letter dated 14 November 2014 regarding the exhibition of the above application.

The Sydney Olympic Park Authority (SOPA / the Authority) supports the proposed development and believes that the proposal generally complies and contributes to the vision of a vibrant township as outlined in the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030.

The Authority has reviewed the submitted application and wishes to raise the following in relation to the proposed development.

Apartment Mix

The Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030 (SOP MP 2030) requires a unit mix comprising a minimum 15% of units to be studio or 1 bedroom units and a minimum 15% of units to be 3+ bedrooms. The proposal only provides for 10% of the total units being 3+ bedrooms. The proposal provides no justification for this departure. It is recommended that more 3 and 4 bedroom apartments be considered, which in this area could be attractive to the market, and would contribute to greater diversity in the SOP community.

Built Form & Scale

1. Given the constraints of the site in terms of geometry, its relationship to the parkland and through-site linkages, the additional height, FSR and separated built form arrangement is generally supported. However, the increase in height and FSR is a trade-off and should not be seen as a precedent for future increases to height and scale for the childcare site and/or the whole site in general.
2. The indicative form and location of the future child care centre is strongly supported due to the high visibility of the site. Although specific details of the centre will be assessed as a separate Local Development DA, the current proposal provides for future lift and service access, drop off and car parking in the basement levels below the future building. There should also be adequate access to utilities and height clearances for structural support of the future building.

Solar Access

The proposed development provides an assessment of solar access between 9am and 4pm. The proposed development should provide an assessment between 9am and 3pm (as per MP 2030) and provide justification if the 70% target is not achieved.

Storage

The SOP MP and the RFDC both identify specific and identical storage requirements for residential units. Note: There is an anomaly in the MP, which refers to the storage requirement as m² as when it should be m³.

It appears that some of the proposed storage for certain types of Units falls significantly short of the required storage space and no specific details are given in relation to the amount of basement storage to be provided for each unit type (pg. 62 Appendix C).

Bicycle Parking

The SOP MP requires 1-2 bicycle space per unit depending on Unit type (in addition to visitor). The EIS indicates that 580 spaces are provided, but the plans appear to provide 156 spaces only. Bicycle parking should be at Basement level 2 as this is the only level on-grade with the street entry.

Pedestrian / Cycling Access

1. Cycling through the rail tunnel underpass is not supported due to potential conflict with pedestrians. In this regard paving materials, directional signage and ground stencilling should be used to direct cyclists to the existing asphalt concrete share way on the Australia Avenue pathway.
2. Secondary cycle route from Bicentennial Park to the Town Centre to link with Parkview new street (Road 4).
3. Primary pedestrian route shown as '5m shareway': paving material to be clearly differentiated from primary cycle route (AC10).
4. Paving for the upgraded connection with new pedestrian/cycle bridge is to maintain AC10 surfacing (paving type 1) with appropriate directional signage as required in the Sydney Olympic Park Urban Elements Design Manual.
5. Management of vehicle traffic for Childcare Centre and Residential Lobby drop-off needs delineation of paving and bollard elements to reduce vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.

Landscape / Public Domain Plan

Given the prominence of the site at a significant entry point to the Sydney Olympic Park town centre and the complexity of level changes and circulation around the site, the quality, presentation and maintenance of external areas and public domain is a critical consideration.

The proposed landscape requires further refinement to improve spatial cohesion, site lines through the site and provide a more legible public address to the child care centre and apartment building. The following issues should also be addressed:

1. The proposed 'Phoenix Palms', are at risk from 'Fusarium' infection (root pathogen), and provide roosting sites for the Australian White Ibis which are considered a pest avi-fauna species. Only healthy trees should be relocated to the child care frontage. Alternatively, a more suitable tree /palm species could be nominated.
2. Larger scale alternative species of shade trees should be considered in place of Chinese tallow tree (*Sapium sebiferum*), which is out of scale with residential tower.
3. Legend does not show 'Existing trees for protection' or Existing trees for removal'
4. Street trees shown in Parkview New Street (Road 3) should be noted as 'future proposed trees by others'.
5. Legend is to include existing and proposed public area lighting. New lighting is to meet relevant Australian Standards and UEDM lighting category (P/V) standards.
6. The following are to be confirmed for the Water Feature / Cascade Pond:
 - a) Species for all bio-retention areas and irrigation systems.
 - b) Compatibility of stepping stones pedestrian access and seating niche with wetland plantings.
 - c) Linings and materials of cascade ponds and bridge.
 - d) Location of pumps, filters and control room/chamber.

Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

There is little passive surveillance to the ground level of the proposed development and this is considered an issue. It is not clear from the documentation provided whether the proposed planting consists of low ground covers with tree planting. The location of tree planting should

ensure that clear and unobstructed sight lines are retained for passive surveillance of the ground floors of the new building, as well as ensuring any new planting discourages antisocial behaviour.

Substations

Proposed substation on corner of Bennelong Parkway and new street (Road 3) is in conflict with the corner gabion wall in SOPA civil package – Parkview New Streets.

Mechanical Ventilation

Provide elevation details of the Exhaust Vents / Plenum / Intake Vents and confirm vent materials.

Ecology

1. The Flora & Fauna assessments (FFA) shall consider off-site impacts of the development to flora and fauna, including shadowing of the tower over the habitats of Lake Belvedere and surrounding public parkland areas, and impacts of changes in stormwater flows to flora and fauna in Bennelong Pond.
2. The FFA only provides recommendations for further ecological surveys and habitat improvement works (on land outside the development site which have not been discussed or agreed with SOPA). The FFA shall be amended to include specific management measures, that are discuss and agreed with by SOPA.
3. The Biodiversity Offset Strategy (BOS) does not state which of the 4 options proposed is to be implemented to offset impacts of the development. Two of the options state that they require agreement with SOPA. The proponent is to consult these options with SOPA.
4. The BOS states that the offset required can be reduced because new bio-retention ponds will be Green and Golden Bell Frog habitat. The suitability of these sites as frog habitat should be considered as the development site will become a highly urbanised site. Should the development site be used to reduce the offset required, an appropriate management plan should be developed and implemented by the Proponent.

Stormwater Management

1. The stormwater system is to be designed so that the discharge flow rates into Bennelong Pond meets SOPA requirements.
2. The Applicant is to revise the Stormwater & Flooding Assessment Report including the Integrated Water Management Plan (Appendix Q) to address all aspects of SOPAs Stormwater Management and Water Sensitive Urban Design (SMWSUD) Policy.
3. The Applicant be required to revise the Stormwater & Flooding Assessment Report (Appendix Q) to address the longer term ecological impacts on Bennelong Pond arising from the increased water quantity outflows from Site 68 during larger storm events (refer Table 5) and ways to manage or mitigate these impacts e.g. the high flow bypass.
4. The Applicant provide a maintenance and performance testing regime for the new treatment system prior to approval of the DA (consistent with the SOPA SMWSUD Policy).
5. DA consent conditions should address recommendations stemming from these reviews.

Contamination and Geotechnical Reports

The contamination report prepared by Douglas Partners identifies fill material including some asbestos and hydrocarbon contamination within the site and notes the potential for contaminated groundwater to be present that may impact on the proposed building. The proponent should be required to implement the recommendations of the Contamination Report. The following conditions are recommended for any consent granted:

1. Prior to commencement of construction, the proponent must:
 - a. Undertake the additional assessment and classification works outlined in the report prepared by Douglas Partners titled "*Report on Preliminary Site Investigation (Contamination) – Project No. 73942*" and dated September 2014 including:

- further assess the contamination in the existing fill and soil that will remain on the site for areas outside the proposed basement excavation;
 - assess the groundwater quality on the site;
 - engage a suitably qualified expert to prepare a report outlining results of the soil and groundwater assessments and providing recommendations, if required, on any control and disposal options and / or mitigation measures that may be required to be incorporated into the building as a result of soil or groundwater contamination;
 - submit a copy of the report to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure for approval and
 - provide a copy of the report to the Sydney Olympic Park Authority for information.
- b. Prepare a detailed Waste Management Plan for construction works including but not limited to segregation and management of contaminated materials and spoil stockpiles for the approval of SOPA's General Manager – Operations & Sustainability.
2. During construction, the proponent must undertake waste classification of all material to be transported off site for disposal in accordance with the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (2009) *Waste Classification Guidelines*. The proponent must:
- a. dispose of all wastes to a facility that can lawfully receive that waste; and
 - b. keep all documentation including waste classification reports, receipts and weighbridge dockets for materials disposed off site and provide these to SOPA or the regulatory authority if requested.

Accessibility & Building Code of Australia

1. Any construction plans are to demonstrate compliance of the provisions for persons with a disability with the requirements of AS 1428.1 *SOPA's Access Guidelines 2011* and the recommendations contained in the Access Review by Morris Goding dated the 19th September 2014. An Access Impact Statement is to be prepared by an appropriately qualified person to demonstrate how the proposed development will integrate into the town centre with compliant paths of travel and services.
2. All non-deemed to satisfy compliance issues as identified in the BCA Assessment Report prepared by McKenzie Group dated the 19th September 2014 are to be captured into the Construction Certificate process as alternative solutions to the current Building Code of Australia (BCA) provisions.

Should you require any further information on the above please contact me on 9714 7139.

Dat Tran
A/Manager, Planning

Ben Lusher
Manager, Key Sites
Department of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Attn: Peter McManus

Dear Mr Lusher

**Site 68 Mixed Use Development, Sydney Olympic Park (SSD 6603)
Notice of Exhibition**

Thank you for your letter dated 1 November 2014 requesting Transport for NSW review and comment on the above referenced Notice of Exhibition.

Roads and Maritime Services will be submitting a separate response.

Transport for NSW (TfNSW), has undertaken a review of the Traffic and Transport Assessment prepared for Site 68, Sydney Olympic Park and finds that the report does not adequately address the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements.

TfNSW is unable to support the proposed development until clarification addressing the SEARs is provided. Detailed comments are provided in **Attachment 1**.

Additionally, TfNSW suggests the following development conditions be placed upon this proposal:

- The development is to provide for bicycle access and servicing as provided in the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030, Section 4.0: General Controls and Guidelines for Bicycle Access and Servicing.
- The development is to provide an approved sight triangle device on the western side of the drive to alert pedestrians to the presence of cars.
- Prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which details construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control. The plan should also specify any potential impacts to bus services operating on roads within the vicinity of the proposal site from construction vehicles during construction. Any potential impacts to pedestrian access or public transport infrastructure including train and bus stops are to be specified. Should any impacts be identified, the duration of the impacts and the measures proposed to mitigate these, including any temporary relocation of services, are to be clearly explained and committed to being enforced. The CTMP should be submitted to the Department of Planning & Environment for review prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.

Thank you for providing TfNSW the opportunity to provide advice on this development application. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Robert Rutledge on 8202 2203 or Robert.rutledge@transport.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'M. Ozinga', written over a circular stamp or seal.

18/12/14

Mark Ozinga

**Manager, Land Use Planning and Development
Planning and Programs**

CD14/21511

Attachment 1 Transport for NSW Comments

Transport for NSW has reviewed the Traffic and Transport Assessment and other supporting documentation provided in support of the public exhibition of SSD 6603. The following comments are provided for consideration:

Key Issue 10: Transport and Accessibility

Bullet 1: "Detail existing pedestrian and cycle movements within the vicinity of the site and determine the adequacy of the proposal to meet the likely future demand for increased public transport and pedestrian and cycle access."

- The Traffic and Transport Assessment does not appear to address this key issue, other than presenting existing public transport maps.

Bullet 2: "Identify measures to promote travel choices that support the achievement of State Plan targets, such as implementing a location-specific sustainable travel plan."

- The Traffic and Transport Assessment does not appear to address this key issue.

Bullet 3: "Provide details of the total daily and peak hour trips generated by the proposed development, including accurate details of the current and future daily vehicle movements and assess the impacts of the traffic generated on the local road network, including intersection capacity and any potential need for upgrading or road works (if required)."

- Section 7: Traffic Considerations in the Traffic and Transport Assessment describes the impact the proposed development will have on Bennelong Parkway. However, it does not provide any analysis of where the project traffic not utilising Bennelong Parkway and New Road disperses. It assumes this traffic will use the new north/south road west of the proposed project entrance and be distributed on Australia Avenue. Intersection analysis needs to be performed, and results provided for review by TfNSW and Roads and Maritime Services on all intersections impacted by project traffic. Additionally, without an electronic copy of the SIDRA files for Bennelong Parkway and New Road, TfNSW is not able to verify the intersection will perform as presented.

Bullet 4: "Detail the proposed access and parking provisions associated with the proposed development, including compliance with the requirements of the relevant parking codes and Australian Standards, and measures to mitigate any associated traffic impacts and impacts on public transport, pedestrian and cycle networks."

- Section 4 of the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030, details general controls and guidelines for bicycle access and servicing. Table 4.12 details the minimum bicycle parking rates that need to be provided, by land use type. Section 6 of the Traffic and Transport Assessment provides rationales as to why the proposed development should not have to conform to the controls and guidelines for bicycle access and servicing presented in the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030.
- TfNSW does not support the reduction of bicycle spaces from that specified in the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030.
- The Traffic and Transport Assessment does not address connections to existing and future walking and cycling routes, or end of trip facilities for the commercial element of the proposed development.
- Under Section 4: Design Considerations, it is noted in section 4.3, Sight triangles, that the current design does not have the required sight triangle on the western side of the driveway.

Attachment 1 Transport for NSW Comments (cont)

Bullet 6: "Detail the proposed service vehicle movements (including vehicle type and the likely arrival and departure times)."

- The Traffic and Transport Assessment does not appear to address this key issue.

Bullet 7: "Detail access and car parking arrangements at all stages of construction and measures to mitigate any associated pedestrian, cycleway, public transport or traffic impacts."

- Neither the Environmental Impact Statement nor the Traffic and Transport Assessment address all the requirements of this key issue.

Key Issue 11: Major Events

Bullet 1: "Adequately address the impact of major events in the precinct as it relates to the proposed development within the Town Centre (SOP Major Event Impact Assessment Guidelines)."

Bullet 2: "Demonstrate that the proposed development and future operation can work in major event mode."

- Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030; Section 5.6 of the Precinct Controls and Guidelines for Parkview Precinct states in 5.6.7 Events Controls "(1) The Parkview Precinct will be affected by major ANZ Stadium events, the Royal Easter Show and events requiring full use of P6, and (2) Ensure all development can accommodate the changes to access required as described in Section 4.4, Event Access and Closures of Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030."
- The documentation presented in support of the Exhibition of SSD 6603 does not address Key Issue 11 in the SEARs.