



Appendix M - Response to Public Submissions

The Sandstone Precinct – SSD 6751 MOD 2 and SSD 7484

Item raised	Proponent response
John Freeman (online submission)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overshadowing and visual prominence of the rooftop extensions and intensification of use. 	<p>The suitability of the additional floors proposed on the Education Building was considered at the Stage 1 development application stage. The additional floors have been designed to be respectful of the existing buildings and surrounding context.</p> <p>Assessment of overshadowing is provided at Section 5.6.2 and Appendix B of the EIS. The assessment found the proposal will not give rise to any additional overshadowing impacts from that identified by the Stage 1 approval.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with the SEARs concerning local community consultation. 	<p>In accordance with the SEARs the applicant consulted with relevant Government authorities, service providers, community groups and affected landowners. In addition, City of Sydney Council, Roads and Maritime Services, Heritage Council of NSW, and TfNSW were consulted.</p> <p>Three community consultation sessions were held at the Education Building on 23 and 29 August 2016. The sessions were promoted at stakeholder meetings, via public notices in the Sydney Morning Herald and the local Wentworth Courier, and through an invite distributed to approximately 1800 addresses within a defined distribution area, which was agreed prior with the Department of Planning & Environment officers.</p>
Objector – name withheld	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not agree with the buildings being converted into hotels. This will create extra noise, traffic and security risks, plus accelerate the deterioration of the buildings. 	<p>The decision to convert the buildings to hotels was made as part of the Stage 1 DA. The EIS demonstrates that the operation of the hotel is not expected to generate significant noise or traffic impacts to the local area. The proposed hotel will be iconic and of a level of luxury not seen in Sydney. Rather than deteriorating the buildings, the hotel will provide them with a new lease of life and will ensure they are maintained and enhanced to a manner befitting the historic and important sandstone buildings.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External appearance of the buildings should not be altered, particularly by adding extra floors and roof structures. Please reconsider these designs. 	<p>The suitability of the additional floors proposed on the Education Building was considered at the Stage 1 development application stage. The additional floors have been designed to be respectful of the existing buildings and surrounding context, and in consultation with the Design Review Panel and Heritage Office.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to how these latest Sandstone Precinct modifications have been proposed after the initial plans, meaning that less people will have a chance to assess them, and may not 	<p>The proposed modifications have been exhibited in conjunction with the proposed plans for an extended period of time to allow the public with greater opportunity to provide comments. All submissions have been responded to</p>

Item raised	Proponent response
realise the significance until too late.	and will be considered by the Department of Planning in the assessment of the proposal.
Bill Brennan	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the glass roofs and additions to the Lands and Education buildings. Preserve the historical form of the original buildings externally. 	<p>The modification of the buildings and the roof of the Education building was approved as part of the Stage 1 Da. The external built form of both the Lands and Education Buildings will largely be retained and only the roofscapes of both Buildings will be altered by the three storey extension to the Education Building and the replacement curved gridshell roof elements to the Lands Building.</p> <p>Both roofscapes exhibit a high architectural and design quality that not only will provide the sought-after 'fifth façade' to each Building to the benefit of surrounding developments, but also enables the Buildings to provide additional habitable space and display the fact that they have been revitalised.</p>
James Cosgrove	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive of the external/ roof top look of the Lands Department building. 	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extension to the Education Building is well outside of the character and heritage significance of the building. 	The design approach for the Education Building is based upon a detailed understanding of the original design concept and seeks to reconfigure the building in line with the first intent. The Education Building will be a 'Grand Hotel' that will engage with and take part in the life events and traditions of the city. The design principles of the Education Building is provided at Section 3.4.3 of the EIS and detailed explanation of the design rationale is provided in the Architectural Design Statement at Appendix B.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans showing exactly what will happen internally in the Lands Building. 	Plans for the internal arrangement of the Lands Building are provided at Appendix A of the EIS.
Trish Burt	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No consultation in accordance with the Secretary's requirements. There is no mention of Bridgeport, particularly in the proposed modification to the Stage 1 consent. 	<p>In accordance with the SEARs the applicant consulted with relevant Government authorities, service providers, community groups and affected landowners. In addition, City of Sydney Council, Roads and Maritime Services, Heritage Council of NSW, and TfNSW were consulted (refer to the Consultation report by KJA at Appendix J of the EIS).</p> <p>Three community consultation sessions were held at the Education Building on 23 and 29 August 2016. The sessions were promoted at stakeholder meetings, via public notices in the Sydney Morning Herald and the local Wentworth Courier, and through an invite distributed to approximately 1800 addresses within a defined distribution area (including the Bridgeport building), which was agreed prior with the Department of Planning & Environment officers.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increase in height to the top of the ladder would further limit the outlook from windows in Bridgeport. 	The upper limit for the envelope for the Education Building is considered to be the uppermost structure of the building. This is the top of the ladder, which was discovered during subsequent site survey of the building, following the Stage 1 approval. The increase in height is limited and will have negligible impact to the appreciation of views from surrounding receivers.
Sherry Cook	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please do not put any glass upper floors o the Education Department building or the Lands Building. 	The external built form of both the Lands and Education Buildings will largely be retained and only the roofscapes of both Buildings will be altered by the three storey extension to the Education Building and the replacement curved gridshell roof elements to the Lands Building.

Item raised	Proponent response
	Both roofscapes exhibit a high architectural and design quality that not only will provide the sought-after 'fifth façade' to each Building to the benefit of surrounding developments, but also enables the Buildings to provide additional habitable space and display the fact that they have been revitalised.
Susan Morgan	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on consultation. 	Noted. Whilst the EIS may refer to the Bridgeport building, this is not at the exclusion of other residential development on Bridge Street, including 44 Bridge Street.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual Impact upon 44 Bridge Street. Additional stories to the Education Building have the potential to block out some of the views and this has not been addressed, the DA focusing on the allowable setback and views from other surrounding buildings and street level. 	<p>The suitability of the additional floors proposed on the Education Building was considered at the Stage 1 development application stage.</p> <p>An assessment of visual impact is provided at Section 5.7 and Appendix B of the EIS. This includes photo montages of the proposed rooftop additions viewed from a range of vantage points, consistent with that undertaken for the Stage 1 DA.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for reflective glare from the glass-fronted additions to the Education Building. Would like assurance that there will not be blinding light reflected into the property from the sun. 	<p>An assessment of solar reflectivity has been undertaken by CPP at Appendix W of the EIS. The assessment is consistent with the requirements of Sydney DCP 2012 for the assessment of specular and diffuse reflections emanating from proposed developments. The assessment includes consideration of diffuse reflection from the Lands Building which found:</p> <p><i>"The diffuse solar reflections that will emanate from the convex surfaces of the proposed rooftop glazing on the Lands Building will, by definition, diverge into different directions and continually shift throughout the day. The divergent natures of the solar reflections are considered less substantial than direct solar reflections from flat surfaces, or concave surfaces, since divergent solar reflections are not concentrated in one direction and do not last over a long period of time."</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction and noise concerns. The Da should be amended to acknowledge the separate existence of 44 Bridge Street and the need to include it in any consultation regarding the construction phase of this development. The dilapidation surveys needs to include 44 Bridge Street in its consideration. 	<p>The EIS has considered the impact to the closest residential receiver as the worst case scenario. The assessment of Bridgeport therefore includes assessment of all other residential development in the similar location, including 44 Bridge Street.</p> <p>As outlined in the Construction Management Plan a full dilapidation assessment will be carried out on any affected adjoining buildings.</p>
Objector – name withheld	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General objection, no specific points raised. 	Noted.
John Freeman (letter Dated 15 December 2016)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on Stage 1 consultation. 	Stage 1 consultation was assessed as part of the Stage 1. This application relates to Stage 2 of the proposal. Consultation undertaken as part of Stage 2 is addressed at Section 4.0 of the EIS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The S96 has not considered overshadowing implications of the additional 1.34m addition. 	Shadow studies were prepared and provided in the Architectural Design Statement prepared by MAKE Architects at Appendix B of the Stage 2 SSD DA. The shadow studies illustrate the proposed shadows cast by the Education

Item raised	Proponent response
	<p>and Lands Buildings post development and the potential impact to the surrounding public domain areas. The shadow studies indicate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed replacement roof on the Lands Building will not give rise to any significant shadow impacts to the public realm during the summer and winter solstice or during the equinox periods; and the proposed Education Building roof structure improves on the level of impact that was generated by the Stage 1 envelope and will not give rise to any additional overshadowing impacts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ladder should not be considered the upper most structure as per the Standard Instrument LEP definition of Building Height. 	<p>In accordance with Clause 4.3 of Sydney LEP 2012 (the LEP), the maximum permissible building height for the Education Building is the height of the building as at the commencement of the LEP. This is essentially the current height of the building. A building survey has confirmed the height of the existing Education building is RL60.03 to the top of the existing ladder structure.</p> <p>The existing ladder structure is considered part of the existing building and despite the wording of 'Building Height' as per the Standard Instrument LEP, the ladder structure is not considered to be a form of communication devices, antennae, satellite dishes, mast and the like.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The S96 has not assessed the visual impact of the additional 1.34m height 	<p>The Visual impact of the proposal is addressed at Section 5.3 and MAKE Architects prepared a Visual Impact Statement at Appendix D of the S96 application. Further, Section 5.7 and Appendix B of the Stage 2 SSD DA address the Visual Impact of the proposal as a result of the additional 1.34m height sought by the S96 application and the proposed built form that will be delivered within the amended envelope.</p> <p>The Visual Impact Statement demonstrate that the proposed modification to the Education roof envelope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retain the existing important views from the public domain at street level to the most significant and highly utilised public domain spaces in close proximity to the site; retain and do not affect existing public domain views to key places, such as Sydney Harbour; do not impact upon the visual connectivity to other buildings and heritage items within the vicinity of the site; and will frame existing public domain views and enclose Farrer Place in a manner that is consistent with the urban locality.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern of increased illumination on neighbouring residential buildings 	<p>A Concept Illumination Strategy has been prepared by Point of View at Appendix B of the Stage 2 EIS. The general approach to the strategy is to highlight the significant and interesting elements of the buildings through discrete lighting appropriate to the CBD and function of the Heritage significance of the buildings. Lighting is not proposed to be directed or spill outward from the buildings to the detriment of neighbouring buildings, particularly sensitive residential receivers.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and reflectivity on neighbouring residential buildings 	<p>Consideration of reflectivity is provided at Section 5.15 and Appendix W of the Stage 2 EIS. The Solar Reflectivity Assessment found that the additional three storeys proposed above the Education Building would generally produce reflectivity levels below the maximum required 20%. At certain locations and times of the year/day when the sun's altitude is low, reflectivity would be higher than 20%, however solar rays would be blocked by existing surrounding buildings meaning that solar rays are not expected to reach the site at those times. Therefore, the report concludes that the three additional levels proposed above the building are not expected to produce significant disability glare.</p>
<p>John Freeman (on Stage 2 Application) letter</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on Stage 1 consultation. 	<p>Stage 1 consultation was assessed as part of the Stage 1. This application relates to Stage 2 of the proposal.</p>

Item raised	Proponent response
	Consultation undertaken as part of Stage 2 is addressed at Section 4.0 of the EIS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on Stage 2 consultation. 	Three community consultation sessions were held at the Education Building on 23 and 29 August 2016. The sessions were promoted at stakeholder meetings, via public notices in the Sydney Morning Herald and the local Wentworth Courier, and through an invite distributed to approximately 1800 addresses within a defined distribution area (including the Bridgeport building), which was agreed prior with the Department of Planning & Environment officers. At these meetings design concepts and heritage considerations were presented to all attending. Further details of community consultation methodology and engagement are outlined in the Consultation Report prepared by KJA at Appendix N of the EIS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External Up lighting 	A conceptual Illumination Strategy has been prepared by Point of View and is appended to the Architectural Design Report at Appendix B of the EIS. The strategy will be considered by the Department of Planning in the assessment of the EIS. The City of Sydney will be consulted as part of the assessment of the EIS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Bar on Farrer Place 	The bar is ancillary to the proposed hotel. The bar backs onto the loading dock and service area and accordingly, there is no proposed internal link or walkway for patrons to access the bar from inside the hotel itself. The DCP requires active frontages along the Bent Street and Farrer Place frontages of the site. While this is difficult to fully achieve given the existing heritage fabric, the proposal will reinforce the sense of vitality and liveliness of the public domain – the bar will reinforce this objective. The SHI considers the proposed changes needed to accommodate the proposed bar, including removal of original fabric to and their acceptability.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Late night trading 	Licencing for new bars will be subject to obtaining a licence for late night trading consistent with any other bar licence. Approval for extended trading is sought for the Education Building bar as outlined in Section 5.3.3 of the EIS. A Plan of Management is provided at Appendix K, consistent with the requirements of City of Sydney.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bar signage 	Bar signage would be subject to a separate DA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction Impacts 	A Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been prepared by Built Pty Ltd (Appendix M of the EIS) which details the site construction and environmental management principles for the proposed development, including construction traffic and waste management.
The Astor (Elizabeth Gavey)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction noise out of hours 	Construction hours will accord with the City of Sydney’s standard requirements, which restrict all potentially noisy construction activities in the City Centre to between 7.00am and 7.00pm, Mondays to Fridays, and between 7.00am and 5.00pm Saturdays.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationship with future hotel manager 	Noted.
Objector – name withheld	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should be used for increased parking and public transport/services for future growth. 	The existing site is occupied by State Heritage Buildings. It is considered that the preservation of these buildings and adaptive re-use as a world class hotel is a more appropriate use than for the site to be used for a car park or railway terminus/bus station.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The modern glass ‘box’ is too large and the ‘modern’ ‘boxy’ look cheapens and overpowers the building (Education Building) sic. Recommend it be pitched and made shorter. 	The Education Building envelope was approved as part of the Stage 1 SSD DA. The proposal is consistent with the volume of the approved envelope (as proposed to be modified by the Section 96).