

30 April 2015

File No: 2015/140129-46

Our Ref: R/2014/33/A

Ben Lusher
Manager Key Sites
NSW Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39,
Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Simon Truong
Email: simon.truong@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Simon,

RE: Modification to Concept Plan MP06_0171 (Mod 10) and State Significant Development Application (SSD) SSD 14_6673 for Block 4N, Central Park

I write in relation to the Department's email dated 30 March 2015 which referred for our comment a Response to Submissions report for SSD 14_6673. The Block 4N proposal is a residential mixed-use development including hotel and child care.

The city has reviewed the additional information provided and generally supports the application and the proponent's response to submissions commitments. However some aspects will require further attention including:

- design of the pick/up drop off and driveway areas requires modification.
- additional heritage details will need to be submitted.

Please find attached a table summarising the City's overall review of the Response to Submissions. The table nominates the issues raised within the City's original submission, discusses the Proponent's response to the issues raised and outlines the City's sustained contention in relation to the project.

Should the Department grant approval to the application, the City recommends a list of conditions for consideration (as attached to our original submission).

Should you wish to speak with a Council officer about the above, please contact Marie Ierufi, Planner, on 9246 7566 or at mierufi@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,



Graham Jahn AM
Director
City Planning | Development | Transport

Reconciliation of Issues

Issue	Applicant Response	Issue Addressed?	City's Contention
Parking			
<p><i>Car Spaces</i></p> <p>The total number of car spaces proposed for the hotel is considered excessive. The quantum of parking for the hotel use should be reduced in the order of 50% from 56 spaces to 28 spaces.</p>	<p>The car parking allocation proposed for the hotel use is consistent with the maximum permissible parking rate as set out within Sydney LEP 2005. It is also noted that consistent with Condition B5 of the Central Park Concept Plan.</p>	Acceptable	N/A
<p><i>Bike parking spaces and location of bike parking</i></p> <p>The bike parking provisions under Sydney DCP 2012 should be adopted for the proposal. The provisions of DCP 2012 require 48 spaces for residents, 54 for staff and 40 for visitors. A condition is recommended to cap the number of visitor bike parking spaces to 20.</p> <p>The plans indicate some visitor bike parking in the basement. The City recommends that visitor bike parking is provided at the ground floor level. Commercial bike parking is shown on Level B1. The location of these spaces</p>	<p>A total of 20 visitor bicycle parking spaces are provided on Basement Level B1. The reduction in visitor bicycle parking spaces and recommended condition by City of Sydney relating to the number of visitor spaces is agreed.</p> <p>A total of 20 visitor bike parking spaces are provided in one location on Basement Level B1.</p> <p>Staff bike parking spaces are also located in one area on Basement Level 1.</p>	<p>Acceptable</p> <p>Acceptable</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

should be on the Upper Basement Level in one secure facility.			
<p><i>Pick-up/drop off spaces</i></p> <p>Pick up/drop off spaces for the hotel, including coaches, is not discussed in the traffic report. It is recommended that a condition be imposed to encourage this parking to be provided off-street.</p>	<p>The proponent and civil engineer have reviewed the design of Central Park Avenue have looked at options for the inclusion of a lay back and pick-up/drop-off bays.</p> <p>The north western curb line on this corner is proposed to be amended to allow for vehicle set-down and pick-up spaces including taxis, buses, and private vehicles. This space is equivalent to three car parking spaces, with an approximate length of 21m.</p> <p>In addition to the kerb alignment amendments on the corner, revised street signage is also proposed adjacent to the existing approved parking spaces along the western side of Central Park Avenue. The proposed signage amendments to these three parking bays will provide additional drop-off bays during peak mornings and afternoons.</p>	No	<p>The City does not consider the proposal to place parking spaces on the curve of Central Park Avenue as a suitable or safe location.</p> <p>Before the City will consider parking in this location, turning path diagrams must be provided for garbage trucks (9.9m long) travelling around the bend to ensure safe access is available when parking bays are occupied by cars and/or buses – i.e. so that larger vehicles are not required to cross onto the wrong side of the road at the bend.</p> <p>The report states that proposed parking bays are for three car spaces, but that these bays could also be used by taxis and buses. A medium size bus would not be able to park “parallel to the kerb” around the bend as shown.</p> <p>The provision of indented parking bays must still maintain adequate footways (under public control) adjacent to the bays — the plans issues for the RTS are unclear on this issue.</p> <p>The proposal for 5 minute parking is not sufficient time for child care centres – 15 minute parking is the required time restriction. Also <u>all-day</u> 5 minute (or 15 minute) parking will need to be justified before it can be approved by the City.</p> <p>The report states that the off-street parking in</p>

			<p>the basement will be used for staff of the Centre only. Staff will have access to nearby public transport and should be encouraged to use these facilities.</p> <p>Past experience has shown that providing only three parking spaces for a medium sized child care centre is insufficient. There is currently is no “fall-back” arrangement if the three parking spaces are occupied. If this does happen, then it can cause queuing and congestion on Central Park Road at the bend (which will be a safety issue).</p> <p>The developer must justify how these drop-off and pick-up spaces will operate for the centre, especially taking note of the above as well as taxis and hotel buses and other people using these parking bays.</p> <p>Please note that any proposal for parking or indented bays in this location will need to be referred the LPCTCC (i.e. Traffic Committee) for endorsement.</p>
<p><i>Loading Dock</i></p> <p>Driveway access proposed to the site from Abercrombie Street is wider than the maximum permitted single crossing of 6m. If the driveway is required to have a width greater than 6m, then it must be separated into two crossovers with sufficient area between for a pedestrian refuge. A condition of consent has been</p>	<p>GTA were engaged to review the current arrangement, with the entry and exit lanes separate by a width of 0.8m.</p> <p>GTA notes that the extent of the driveway crossing has been minimised as far as practical, to ensure a Medium Rigid Vehicle (MRV) (8.8m Length) is still capable of entering and existing</p>	Partially	<p>Section 2.3.6 of the Response to Submissions, the report refers to the width of the driveway for a loading dock off Abercrombie Street. The City recommends that the driveway onto Abercrombie Street is redesigned to the satisfaction of the City to ensure there are two separate driveways (entry and exit) with a 2 metre gap to allow for these driveways to be built in accordance with</p>

provided to achieve this outcome.	the site, for deliveries and waste collection. The current design of the driveway is fully compliant with AS2890.0:2002. Additionally, the total width of the combined driveway being 8.3m is significant less than the maximum Australian Standard for acceptable distances for pedestrians to cross.		the City's standard specifications.
Public Domain (through-site link)			
<p>The proposed through site link between this site and Block 4S shows the boundary down the centre. As a consequence, the link will be delivered in two sections. This may result in problems with established planting if the through-site link is not delivered in a coordinated manner.</p> <p>To ensure the vision for the link can be delivered, the City recommends the boundary line is moved to the north or the south.</p>	<p>The delivery of the through site link between Block4N and 4S has been addressed in the report prepared by Foster + Partners. The staging diagrams show that whilst the delivery of the link is divided between Block 4S and Block 4N, temporary access will be maintained between Abercrombie Street and Central Park Avenue. This stair will be demolished at the completion of Block 1 and 4N, and permanent stair will be constructed.</p> <p>This arrangement is required to deliver both Blocks, given the timing and staging required. It is also noted that whilst the link is separated, the trees to be planted in this space form part of the Block 4S construction programs (which will precede Block 1 + 4N).</p>	Acceptable	<p>The main concern was the division between the two sites through the centre of the trees. This has now been removed to address this issue and the City is satisfied with the final resolution.</p> <p>The City does raise concerns about the temporary stairway to later be removed once the remainder of the link is built, however this is wholly within their site. The City's concerns have been addressed.</p>
Crime Prevention Through Urban Design			
<p>The CPTED Report provided relates to Block 11, not Block 4N. The City requests a copy of the CPTED Report for Block 4N for comment with the Response to Submissions Report.</p> <p>The City remains uneasy with the</p>	<p>A CPTED report for Block 4N has been prepared by Elton Consulting. In preparing the report, the consultants have sought to involve the Police as much as possible and are bound by the established and agreed CPTED strategies that were identified in the CPTED report that accompanied the approved Concept</p>	Partially	<p>As noted in the report, this block includes a number of visitors to the site. Access control measures such as (1) electronic card access, clear distinctions between private and public spaces (2) using suitable treatments and (3) signposting to reduce anonymity or excuse making are important.</p>

<p>potential for licensed venues at the site having adverse amenity impacts on Chippendale Green which continues to receive a number of reports to the NSW Police. Although the fit-out and use of the future retail tenancies is subject to separate development applications, the City puts the developer on notice that the trading hours and management of licenced premises near the Green will be carefully reviewed.</p>	<p>Plan. The design of stairwells and letterboxes are not considered to create opportunities for crime or safety concerns.</p> <p>It is noted that this application does not seek approval for the fit-out and use of these tenancies. The carrying out of detailed CPTED and/or Social Impact Assessment at the fit-out and use stage for any licensed premises is anticipated. Should any further CPTED or social impact assessment be required by CoS at this phase, it will be provided as part of the future applications, but does not form part of this application.</p>	<p>Blank walls between buildings 4N and 4S will require landscaping and/or public art to prevent graffiti.</p> <p>The waterfall at the main entrance will require suitable barriers to prevent unauthorised access.</p> <p>CCTV should involve consultation with Redfern Police including protocols for the exchange of any footage.</p> <p>The development should not take on a fortress-like appearance through the use of bars, grills, solid shutters, wire, or other security devices which can generate perceptions of vulnerability disproportionate to actual risks.</p> <p>Further clarification is required around who is responsible for restricting access to the heritage courtyard between 10pm and 7am and the role of security more generally across the different facilities.</p> <p>The City continues to have concerns with the potential for licensed venues at the site to creating adverse amenity impacts on Chippendale Green which continues to receive a number of reports to the NSW Police. Although the fit-out and use of the future retail tenancies is subject to separate DAs, the future trading hours and management of licenced premises near the Green will be carefully reviewed by the City.</p>
---	---	---

Childcare Centre			
<p>The EIS indicates 1,442m² of floor space to be allocated to the child care centre. However, other parts of the EIS state that 1,080m² will be used by the child care centre.</p> <p>If the intent is to provide 1,080m² floor space, the number of children will need to be decreased. Clarify the maximum floor space provided to the child care centre.</p> <p>For a 90-place child care centre, a minimum of 630m² of unencumbered outdoor play area and minimum of 292m² unencumbered indoor play area is required. If the child care centre is only allocated 1,080m² floor space over the two floors, then the centre must cater for less than 90 children to allow for the inclusion of ancillary play spaces.</p> <p>The plans show a safe haven on each floor. Safe havens must be centrally located within the child care centre and open directly on to a dedicated fire isolated stair. The floor area of each safe haven is to be calculated at 0.25m² per person (per child and per staff member). The plans show a 26m² safe haven on Levels 3 and 4.</p> <p>Investigate opportunities to connect the two floors with internal stairs to allow staff</p>	<p>Two indicative layout options of Level 3 and 4 (future childcare centre levels) were further developed by Future Space in conjunction with Foster + Partners, one of which includes an interconnecting stair.</p> <p>The space allocated for the childcare centre for both Level 3 and 4 combined is a total of 1442sqm (including Unencumbered indoor play space, indoor support space and outdoor areas).</p> <p>Both layouts demonstrate the Child Care levels can cater for 90 children. The installation of the connecting stair would be subject to the child care operator's preferred layout and operational requirements.</p> <p>Foster + Partners and Future Space worked together to develop the options to establish if a 90 children facility is viable and within the proposed base building footprint. The drawings provided demonstrate 90 place child care centre can be accommodated on Level 3 and Level 4 of Block 4N, Central Park.</p> <p>It is further reiterated that the detailed design and layout of the childcare centre is not the subject of this SSDA and will require separate approval by the future operator.</p>	Acceptable	<p>The RTS confirms that there is enough provision for a 90 place child care centre.</p> <p>Of the two options presented, the City's preference is Option 2 which includes the internal stairs.</p> <p>The City notes that a separate DA for the fit-out of the child care centre will be lodged. The plans provided at that stage need to more clearly designate the use of individual rooms to allow an accurate assessment against the required area requirements.</p>

and children to travel in between two floors without having to access the fire stairs and lifts.			
Heritage			
<p>Request that the full conservation works to the buildings be undertaken, particularly terraces which are in extremely poor and derelict condition.</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plans submitted need to be developed further to include a detailed schedule of conservation works to be undertaken as part of the base building works. The plans need to be submitted prior to the issue of a CC and works undertaken prior to the issue of an OC.</p> <p><u>Heritage Interpretation Plan</u> The design, development and construction stages of the project should incorporate the outcomes of the Heritage Interpretation Plan prepared for Central Park (CUB) in 2009, particularly recommendations for the Hotel and terraces. The Heritage Interpretation Plan should also include recommendations for the display of findings of archaeological investigations.</p>	<p>Additional information has been prepared, including detailed heritage drawings and elevations, further analysis and perspectives of the Heritage Courtyard, and a Heritage Interpretation Plan.</p> <p>The intent of this Heritage Interpretation Strategy is to ensure the cultural and historic significance of the Brewery Buildings (Including the Australian Hotel and terraces) are readily apparent to all who visit or are involved with the site. The strategy details the built form interpretation, provision of historic makers, plaques and signage, images and graphics within the site for interpretation.</p> <p>Foster + Partners have considered the relationship and interface between the new and old building carefully. This relationship, as well as intended materials and finishes is described in details, and graphically displayed as part of the PPR Report. The rear of the Hotel and terraces has always been embraced as part of the design of this space of the Block 4N as a whole, forming the Heritage Courtyard. In their Report, Foster + Partners describe the rationale behind the design:</p>	Partially	<p>The revised Heritage Interpretation Strategy is supported.</p> <p>The Heritage Plans provided in Appendix J of the RTS are not detailed enough to constitute conservation works. These should be further developed at a 1:50 scale, with the addition of cross references to a detailed schedule of conservation works and co-ordinated with the structural and building services designs. They should include sections and reflected ceiling plans and elevations.</p> <p>The plans must be supported by a detailed schedule of conservation works detailing the conservation approach to all heritage fabric and supported by methodologies and specifications and architectural details. These should be co-ordinated with structural and building services designs.</p> <p>The Schedule should be comprehensive and include works to all significant fabric and elements, including as a minimum, wall tiling, floor tiling, brickwork, render, shopfront windows and doors, recessed entries, window and door joinery, timber roof structure, timber floors, sub floor ventilation, timber linings, internal plaster, pressed metal linings, roofing, roof plumbing, awnings and signage.</p>

<p><u>Heritage Asset Management Plan</u> A Heritage Assessment Management Plan to guide cyclic maintenance of the site should be submitted prior to the issue of an Occupation Certificate. The plan should also be submitted to the City for approval.</p> <p><u>Protection Methodology</u> All fabric and elements identified as significant in the Former Carlton and United Brewery Conservation Management Plan prepared by NBR SAP dated 2005 must be protected throughout all stages of the works. A protection methodology is to be submitted to the City's Heritage Specialist for approval prior to the issue of the Construction Certificate.</p>			<p>The City recommends an appropriate condition be included to address the asset management plan requirement.</p> <p>The City recommends an appropriate condition be included to address the protection methodology requirement.</p>

Acoustic			
<p>The standard noise condition referenced in Part 5.2.1 of the assessment report is an out-dated condition. Mechanical noise should be assessed against the Council's current standard condition. The following amendments to the assessment report are recommended to address concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify the maximum number of children in each outdoor play area and consider any noise break out from internal portions of the child care centre. Verify there will be 200mm concrete separation and make any necessary adjustments to the assessment if the slab is less than 200mm in thickness. The consultant is to address any excavation works e.g. hydraulic hammers or saw cutting and any other processes associated with the excavation. Include a statement that ensures a mail-out to likely affected 	<p>Acoustic Logic have prepared a response to each of the specific items raised by the City of Sydney in their submission. The response provided by Acoustic Logic confirms that there is not requirement for a revised report to be prepared.</p> <p>The assessment has assumed that half the number of children which the centre could be shared within the external areas. 45 children using both of the external areas.</p> <p>As detailed in the assessment the floor slab is to be 200mm thick and no additional acoustic treatments are required.</p> <p>The report details the requirements for the management of noise and vibration during the construction stage of the project (including excavation and construction). The report details the noise goals and the plausible and possible mitigation methods which can be adopted. Details of the specific construction methodology will be provided by the contractors conducting the works.</p> <p>Community consultation and complaints handling is required during the construction stage of the project. This is to be implemented</p>	Yes	N/A

<p>occupants is done prior to works commencing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 7.8.2 should include wording such that additional respite periods will be provided if contingency plans cannot be satisfactorily implemented. Additional mitigations measures in relation to construction noise are required to achieve a better outcome for nearby occupants. Provide projected noise emission levels for each type of equipment and audibility of equipment at neighbouring premises so compliance with City of Sydney Construction Hours/Noise within the Central Business District Code of Practice 1992 may be determined. 	<p>and maintained by the building contractor.</p> <p>Respite periods are not specifically required to mitigate noise during the construction of the project. Respite periods may be implemented to mitigate noise from specified work equipment once the construction programme and activities are known. This will be implemented by the construction contractors.</p> <p>The report details the construction noise and vibration management and details the noise goals as well as the plausible and possible mitigation methods which can be adopted. Details of the specific construction methodology will be provided by the contractors conducting works.</p> <p>Section 7 of the report details noise goals of Background + 10 dB(A). Noise management will be implemented to mitigate noise levels to the neighbouring receivers.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Acid Sulfate Soils			
<p>A person or company qualified in geotechnical expertise on the assessment and remediation of Acid Sulfate Soil risks are to prepare a Preliminary Assessment of Acid Sulfate Soils in accordance with NSW Acid Sulfate Soils Management Advisory Committee, Acid Sulfate Soils Assessment Guidelines 1998 for the works located nearby a Class 1 Acid Sulfate Soils zone.</p> <p>The Preliminary Assessment must conclude that an Acid Sulfate Soils Management Plan (ASSMP) is not required in accordance with the guidelines otherwise a Plan must be submitted to Council.</p> <p>The ASSMP may be requested prior to an Occupation Certificate. The Preliminary Assessment should be provided prior to Construction Certificate approval.</p>	<p>JBS&G have undertaken a Review of Potential for Dewatering and Acid Sulfate Soil (ASS) Management Requirements. The review notes that Central Park site has been the subject of various site assessment activities requiring the documentation of an Acid Sulfate Soil Management Plan (ASSMP) for development activities. This work was undertaken as part of a site wide Project Application for remediation and transitional works.</p> <p>Site conditions reported during remediation of the Block 4N site documented in the JBS&G validation report confirmed this area was underlain by residual clay soils and shallow sandstone bedrock. No specific ASS management was required during the completed excavation works within the basement envelopment. It is also anticipated that limited additional soil disturbance/excavation works required to the west of the basement will encounter similar residual conditions, inconsistent with material requiring ASS management.</p>	Yes	N/A