

## SICEEP, North East Plot (SSDA7) – Response to Department of Planning and Environment Submission

Key Issue	Response
<b>Design and Activation</b>	
<p>1. The Department considers that the design of the podium and Towers NE1 and NE3 should provide further contrast and differentiation. Further consideration should be given to alternative design options for the podium and/or the towers in this regard. Alternative solutions may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>narrowing of the vertical re-entrant feature within the podium to increase its visual solidity/primacy;</li> <li>enlargement of the horizontal re-entrant;</li> <li>increasing the contrast between podium and tower materials; and</li> <li>amending the approach to window/balcony design and treatment within the podium.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. This is discussed in detail in the Response to Submissions <b>Appendix C</b> – Supplementary Design Report for SSDA7. In response a number of design improvements/modifications are proposed which will positively strengthen the reading between the podium and tower.</p>
<p>2. Further justification is required for the level of activation along Harbour Street, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reasons why the inactive elements have not been more equitably distributed around the ground floor podium frontages;</li> <li>a ground floor Harbour Street elevation indicating materials and architectural treatments that add visual interest; and</li> <li>confirmation of what the two rooms located either side of the NE3 tower lobby entrance are likely to be used for and whether non-residential uses could be accommodated in either one or both of these locations.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Positive design changes have been made, as discussed within the Response to Submissions Appendix C – Supplementary Design Report for SSDA7, to improve the level of activation along Harbour Street. The amended proposal now achieves 83% of the North East Plot being active (76% active and 7% residential). Overall, the proposal is considered to have maximised the level of activation along each frontage, responding to the differing public domain contexts and the essential needs/requirements of a mixed use building.</p>
<b>Harbour Street Footpath and Layby Area</b>	
<p>3. Consideration should be given to the removal of the existing layby in Harbour Street to enable widening of the pedestrian footpath and upgrade of the public domain along this frontage. If the layby is to be retained, the following information/clarification is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>further justification for the retention of the vehicle layby area on Harbour Street given the removal of the SEC and provision of on-site servicing bays;</li> <li>plans detailing the existing and proposed vehicle layby designs, shown in context;</li> <li>confirmation of public domain treatment, including street tree planting, for the built out footpath between the proposed vehicle access and lobby of NE3;</li> <li>response to Council's comments on reducing the width of the layby area;</li> <li>confirmation of any consultation with Roads and Maritime Services; and</li> <li>confirmation of the existing layby's coach parking capacity.</li> </ul>	<p>Efforts have been made by the proponent to resolve this issue, including arranging meetings/consulting with Council (as the landowner and roads authority), Transport for NSW (including RMS) and the City Centre Transport Taskforce. The outcome from these discussions reveals that there is at present differing views (between principally Council and TfNSW) as to what the ultimate form of the layby on Harbour Street should be and the users (coach/bus vs vehicles).</p> <p>Lend Lease is committed to achieving a more pedestrian friendly environment on Harbour Street, with a draft Concept for that land along Harbour Street outside of the site boundary and owned by Council included within the Public Domain Drawing prepared by Hassell (see <b>Appendix D</b> of the Response to Submissions).</p>
<p>4. Consideration should also be given to the treatment / upgrade of finish of the western pavement of Harbour Street, from the building line to the kerb.</p>	<p>Ultimately, the final decision on the design, length, and width of the layby (which will influence the footpath width) and funding is the subject of further detailed discussion/resolution/collaboration with these key and other stakeholders (including the Central Sydney Traffic and Transport Committee) and is a matter that is able to be dealt with through the detailed design/construction phase of the project.</p>

Key Issue	Response
<b>Open Space</b>	
5. Condition B10 of the Stage 1 Darling Square Approval (SSD 5878) requires public domain / open spaces to be delivered in accordance with the sequence of the approved Illustrative Development Staging Diagram (IDSD). The IDSD indicates that the delivery of the Darling Square open space is linked to the North East Plot. However, the current application does not provide any information of that open space. Additional information, including the detailed design intent for the open space, should be provided. Alternatively, if the open space has been delayed and is to be linked to the delivery of a latter development plot, please provide justification and a revised IDSD.	<p>Noted. An amended Indicative Staging Plan has been prepared and is provided within the Response to Submissions <b>Appendix E</b>. Details of the Square will now be included within the future North Plot Development Application.</p> <p>The North Plot provides one of the most prominent frontages to the Square and one of the most important interfaces at the Square's main entry points. The North Plot is therefore the most relevant application to the Square, with the application planned to be lodged in mid-2015.</p>
<b>Traffic and Access</b>	
6. It is noted that an area for bicycle parking spaces is provided at ground floor level within the car parking / service area of the building. The following clarification and additional information is required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>confirmation of the total number and apportionment of bicycle parking noting inconsistencies in the EIS documentation (TTA, Appendix Z and EIS report);</li> <li>if visitor cycle parking, in particular retail, is proposed within the cycle parking area then details are required of how public access to the parking will be provided and managed and also of appropriate security measures; and</li> <li>the location of publicly accessible bicycle parking spaces within the surrounding public domain in visible easily accessible locations.</li> </ul>	This is discussed in detail in the Response to Submissions <b>Appendix C</b> – TTM Letter.
7. Confirmation of whether the proposed number of car parking spaces, when compared with the initial overall indicative number of car parking spaces of the Concept Proposal, results in a change in traffic generation or distribution and any associated impacts on the surrounding network.	This is discussed in detail in the Response to Submissions <b>Appendix C</b> – TTM Letter.
<b>Amenity</b>	
8. A compliance schedule is required that assesses the proposal against the draft Apartment Design Guide design/amenity requirements. Justification should be provided for any departures from the guidelines.	Noted. Included within the Response to Submissions is a compliance schedule addresses relevant considerations of the draft Apartment Design Guide.
9. A number of apartments have study rooms that are of a size that enables them to be occupied as a bedroom, but without access to a window for natural light or ventilation, resulting in unacceptably low levels of amenity for those rooms. Consideration should be given to revising the internal apartment layout in these locations.	Noted. In instances where habitable rooms (e.g. studies) do not have access/view to a window, this only occurs in spaces that will only occasionally be used by future occupants. Further, these spaces are close to openings. The sliding doors are also planned to be open so as to enable fresh air to circulate into the room on those expected rare occasions that the space may be used as a spare bedroom by visitors/relatives. Further, these spaces are not sold/marketed as bedrooms.
<b>IQ Hub</b>	
10. An update is required of the progress of the investigation into IQ Hub accommodation and the establishment of the 'working group'; as required by condition 836 of SSD 5878.	This is discussed in detail in the Response to Submissions, refer to Section 4.3.

Key Issue	Response
Clarification	
11. Please confirm the total land area (in square metres) of the North East Plot site.	The North-East Plot has an area of 5,248m <sup>2</sup> , with the DA/site works boundary having an area of 6,572m <sup>2</sup> .
12. All reports submitted as part of the modification application should be reviewed in light of any revisions made in the resolution of the issues noted.	Noted. All reports submitted with the EIS have been reviewed and the relevant reports and plans updated to reflect the resolution of matters raised. Refer to <b>Table of Contents</b> for a full list of revised supporting documentation.