

Response to Submissions and Amendments to Proposed Development



Sydney International Convention, Exhibition and Entertainment Precinct (SICEEP)

Darling Square - Residential Building W1 (Student Accommodation)

Submitted to Department of Planning and Environment
On Behalf of Urbanest Darling Harbour No. 2 Pty Ltd

January 2016 ■ 15420

Reproduction of this document or any part thereof is not permitted without prior written permission of JBA Urban Planning Consultants Pty Ltd.

JBA Urban Planning Consultants Pty Ltd operates under a Quality Management System. This report has been prepared and reviewed in accordance with that system. If the report is not signed below, it is a preliminary draft.

This has been prepared by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'B. Hoskins'.

Brendan Hoskins

27/01/2016

This report has been reviewed by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Alexis Cella'.

Alexis Cella

27/01/2016

Contents

Executive Summary	iii
1.0 Introduction	5
1.1 Amendments to Proposed Development	5
1.2 Development Stages Status	6
2.0 Key Issues and Proponent's Response	7
2.1 Planning Process	8
2.2 Amenity	9
2.3 Public Domain	10
2.4 Traffic, Transport and Access	11
3.0 Proposed Amended Development	13
3.1 Overview of Proposal (as amended)	13
3.2 Site Boundary	13
3.3 Access Doors	14
3.4 Signage	14
3.5 Public Domain	14
3.6 Drawing Schedule for Approval	15
3.7 Schedule of Design Changes	17
4.0 Additional Information and Assessment	18
4.1 Consistency with Original SSDA Scheme	19
4.2 View and Visual Impact	19
4.3 Wind	19
4.4 Sydney Development Control Plan 2012	20
5.0 Final Mitigation Measures	24
6.0 Conclusion	28

Figures

1 Amended central courtyard perspective	15
--	----

Tables

1 Status of initial SICEEP SSD DAs	6
2 Final Drawings Reference Schedule	15
3 Schedule of design changes	17
4 Overview of the proposal with the Sydney DCP 2012	20
5 Final Mitigation Measures	24

Contents

Appendices

- A** Response to Agency Submissions
JBA
- B** Supplementary Design Report and Revised Architectural Drawings
Allen Jack + Cottier
- C** Supplementary Public Domain Drawings
Aspect
- D** Revised Light Rail Assessment
Hyder
- E** Urbanest Laundry Usage Review
Urbanest
- F** Revised View and Visual Impact Photomontages
Virtual Ideas
- G** Wind Confirmation Letter
CPP

Executive Summary

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in support of the State Significant Development Application 12 (SSDA12) for the construction and use of a residential building (student accommodation) within the Western Plot (Darling Drive) of Darling Square and associated public domain works, which forms part of the overall Sydney International, Convention, Exhibition and Entertainment Precinct (SICEEP) Project at Darling Harbour, was publicly exhibited for a period of 30 days inclusive between 12 November 2015 and 11 December 2015.

Public exhibition occurred in accordance with the requirements of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act). Five (5) submissions were received in response to the public exhibition of the EIS comprising submissions made by government agencies and authorities.

The Department of Planning and Environment (the Department) has also prepared a letter setting out additional information or clarification required prior to the final assessment of the project.

The key issues raised in submissions can be broadly grouped into the following categories:

- Planning process;
- Amenity;
- Public Domain; and
- Traffic, Transport and Access.

The proponent Urbanest Darling Harbour No. 2 Pty Ltd (Urbanest) and its expert project team have considered all issues raised within the submissions made pursuant to the requirements of the EP&A Act.

A considered and detailed response to all submissions made has been provided within the accompanying documentation, with those key issues further expanded upon at **Section 2.0**.

In responding and addressing the range of matters raised by government agencies and authorities, Urbanest has sought to refine the proposal for the construction and use of a residential building (student accommodation) within the Western Plot (Darling Drive). The refined proposal also captures changes made by the project team post exhibition to enhance the design. The nature and range of changes made post public exhibition of the EIS are overall relatively minor and include:

- Realignment of the site boundary to reflect the removal of the approved shared pedestrian/cycle path from the DA site;
- 1.8 metre high screen provided to the northern, southern and western extent of the tiered seating within the central courtyard;
- Additional gates included along the western boundary to restrict access to the light rail corridor;
- Repositioning of the entry door at the south-east corner to provide clearance of the 'V' column;

- Repositioning of the egress door at the north-east corner to provide clearance of the 'V' column;
- Further development and refinement of signage details; and
- Addition of Building Management Unit (BMU) on the roof.

Section 3.0 and **Section 4.0** and the accompanying documentation provide an analysis and assessment of the proposed changes and the refined project more broadly. In summary, the nature of the changes is considered to result in a development that does not substantially differ from the original application that was publicly exhibited. Further, the refined proposal will deliver improvements with respect to the public domain experience and architectural design. All other environmental impacts of the amended development remain consistent with the original application. Overall, the changes that have occurred, on balance, result in an improved outcome.

Final measures to mitigate the impacts associated with the refined proposal are detailed at **Section 5.0**.

In conclusion, the proposal for the construction and use of a residential building (student accommodation) within the Western Plot (Darling Drive) of Darling Square represents a key part of the major SICEEP urban renewal project that will have significant and long lasting public benefits for Sydney and NSW more broadly. It will contribute to the overall aim of delivering Sydney new world class convention and exhibition facilities along with significant improvements to the public realm and pedestrian connectivity.

1.0 Introduction

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in support of the State Significant Development Application 12 (SSDA12) for the construction and use of a residential building (student accommodation) within the Western Plot (Darling Drive) of Darling Square and associated public domain works, which forms part of the overall Sydney International, Convention, Exhibition and Entertainment Precinct (SICEEP) Project at Darling Harbour, was publicly exhibited for a period of 30 days inclusive between 12 November 2015 and 11 December 2015 (SSD7133).

In total, five (5) submissions were received from government agencies and authorities in response to the public exhibition of the EIS. No submissions were received from independent bodies or the general public.

The Department of Planning and Environment (the Department) has prepared a letter setting out additional information or clarification required prior to final assessment of the project.

The proponent, Urbanest Darling Harbour No. 2 Pty Ltd (Urbanest) and its specialist consultant team have reviewed and considered all issues raised.

This report, prepared by JBA on behalf of the proponent, sets out the responses to the issues raised in accordance with Clause 85A of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* (EP&A Reg), and details the final project design and final mitigation measures for which approval is now sought. The final project design includes amendments made by Urbanest pursuant to Clause 55 of the EP&A Reg, including changes to address matters raised in the submissions.

The report provides a detailed response to all of the key issues raised by the various government agencies. The key issues raised in the submissions can be broadly grouped into the following categories:

- Planning process;
- Amenity;
- Public Domain; and
- Traffic, Transport and Access.

This report provides a detailed response to each of the above issues and outlines the proposed amendments to the exhibited Environmental Impact Statement. Where individual issues are not discussed in this report, a detailed response can be found in the response table at **Appendix A**.

1.1 Amendments to Proposed Development

To reflect the design changes that have been made to the proposed development following public exhibition of the proposal and for which approval is now sought, and to address issues raised in the submissions, a range of updated plans and documentation have been prepared.

The revised plans include Architectural Drawings prepared by Allen Jack + Cottier and Public Domain Drawings prepared by Aspect. It is noted that not all of the originally submitted plans are proposed to be amended. A drawing schedule outlining the new amended plans for approval is provided at **Section 3.0**. Despite this, a complete set of Architectural Drawings and an updated Public Domain Drawing have been provided for approval (respectively **Appendix B** and **Appendix C**).

The following consultant reports and supporting information has been updated or further supplements the material originally submitted in support of the EIS:

- Supplementary Design Report prepared by Allen Jack + Cottier;
- Supplementary Public Domain Drawings prepared by Aspect;
- Revised Light Rail Assessment prepared by Hyder;
- Urbanest Laundry Usage Review;
- Additional View and Visual Impact Photomontage prepared by Virtual Ideas; and
- Wind Confirmation Letter prepared by CPP.

The revised supporting documentation enables the Department to undertake an informed assessment of the amended proposal. The findings of the revised supporting consultant documentation are summarised at **Section 4.0** of this report as relevant.

A final schedule of the mitigation measures proposed to mitigate the impacts associated with the proposed works is provided at **Section 5.0**.

This report should be read in conjunction with the EIS prepared by JBA, dated November 2015, as relevant.

1.2 Development Stages Status

The status of development within the SICEEP project as outlined within Section 1.5 of the exhibited EIS has remained largely unchanged. **Table 1** below reiterates the status of approvals for the various stages within the SICEEP project.

Table 1 – Status of initial SICEEP SSD DAs

DA No	Description of Application	Status
12_5752	SICEEP Core Facilities – Exhibition Centre, Convention Centre, The Theatre, Event Deck and Tumbalong Park	Approved: 22 August 2013
MOD 1	S96(1A) - various	Approved: 20 February 2014
MOD 2	S96(1A) – various	Approved: 18 July 2014
MOD 3	S96(1A) – various	Approved: 1 July 2015
13-5878	Darling Square Concept Proposal	Approved: 5 December 2013
MOD 1	S96(1A) – various	Approved: 26 November 2015
6010	Western Plot (Student Accommodation – Building W2)	Approved: 7 May 2014
MOD 1	S96(2) – various	<i>Under assessment</i>
6013	North-West Plot (Public car park/ commercial office building)	Approved: 7 May 2014
MOD 1	S96(2) – various	Approved: 20 July 2015
MOD 2	S96(1A) – various	Approved: 26 November 2015
6011	South-West Plot (Mixed Use Residential Development)	Approved: 21 May 2014
MOD 1	S96(1A) – various	Approved: 27 July 2015
6116	ICC Hotel	Approved: 15 June 2014
MOD 1	S96(1A) – various	Approved: 8 July 2015
6626	North-East Plot (Mixed Use Residential Development)	Approved: 16 April 2015
6831	ICC Hotel fit-out, façade lighting system and subdivision	Approved: 16 October 2015
7133	Western Plot (Student Accommodation – Building W1)	Subject of this application

2.0 Key Issues and Proponent's Response

This section of the report provides a detailed response to the following key issues raised by the Department and government agencies and authorities during the public exhibition of the SSDA:

- Planning process;
- Amenity;
- Public Domain; and
- Traffic, Transport and Access.

A response to each of the individual issues raised by the Department and submitters is provided in the response table at **Appendix A**.

An overview of the parties who made submissions, and their key issues/matters for consideration, is provided below. Other issues which require further assessment, such as detailed assessments against statutory policies and plans are considered at **Section 4.0**.

Government Authorities and Agencies

As highlighted earlier in this report five (5) submissions were received from government agencies and authorities in response to the exhibition of the EIS. Specifically, responses were received from:

- Transport for NSW – two (2) submissions;
- NSW Environmental Protection Authority;
- Office of Environment and Heritage – two (2) submissions;
- Sydney Water; and
- City of Sydney Council.

A number of these submissions comprised the agencies or authority confirming that they had no comment on the application or providing guidance on recommended conditions. These included the submissions from the Office of Environment and Heritage (two submissions), Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) and NSW Environmental Protection Agency.

The Department provided an overarching letter (as the assessment authority) summarising the key matters to be addressed and additional information to be provided. A response to the Department's correspondence is provided at **Appendix A**.

The remaining agencies and authorities made a variety of comments, and sought further clarification and information on a number of detailed technical matters as detailed throughout this section and further at **Appendix A**.

2.1 Planning Process

2.1.1 Issue

The Department has requested that an objection be made under *State Environmental Planning Policy No 1 - Development Standards* (SEPP 1) for the proposed accommodation sizes which do not meet the strict numerical figures provided under *State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009* (AH SEPP).

Council has also raised concern with the planning process, suggesting that a SEPP 1 Objection is required for a variation to the accommodation sizes. Council has also indicated that they would not support such a variation.

2.1.2 Proponent's Response

JBA do not consider a written objection is required for the proposed variation to accommodation sizes. Division 3 of the AH SEPP is structured in a way that provides two categories of standards, comprising:

- Standards that cannot be used to refuse consent
- Standards for boarding houses

The accommodation size component in the AH SEPP is located within the list of 'Standards that cannot be used to refuse consent'. The AH SEPP does not require these standards to be achieved, rather they are benchmarks which, if achieved, the consent authority cannot use as a reason for refusal.

These standards can be compared to the motorcycle/bicycle parking standard which are agreed to be development standards for the purposes of the EP&A Act. Under the AH SEPP, the motorcycle/bicycle parking standard falls under the list of 'Standards for boarding houses'.

Section 4(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act) specifies the following definition for development standards:

*development standards means provisions of an environmental planning instrument or the regulations in relation to the carrying out of development, being provisions by or under which **requirements are specified or standards are fixed** in respect of any aspect of that development, including, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, requirements or standards in respect of:*

...

(our emphasis)

Whilst the accommodation sizes stipulated in the AH SEPP are measurable standards, they are not 'development standards' in that they do not set a *strict requirement* or *fixed standards* for the development which must be achieved, rather they are a tool for consent authorities to determine the appropriateness of a proposal without need for further assessment. Given the above, it is considered that a SEPP 1 Objection is not required.

2.2 Amenity

2.2.1 Issue

The Department has not raised any specific concerns in regards to the amenity of the proposal.

Council has identified a number of matters which it seeks further clarification and assessment. These matters include privacy between Building W1 and approved Building W2; the number of cross ventilated rooms; confirmation of ceiling heights; kitchen facilities; laundry facilities; and room sizes.

2.2.2 Proponent's Response

A detailed response to the concerns raised by the City of Sydney Council are provided at **Appendix A** together within supporting documentation accompanying this Response to Submissions (refer to Table of Contents). An overview of the key considerations is provided below.

Privacy

The proposed separation distance between Buildings W1 and W2 of ten metres is consistent with the approved parameter plan under the Stage 1 Concept Proposal (SSD 13_5878). Key design features have been incorporated into each building to ensure that sight lines from windows are distributed away from other apartments and any direct sightlines are avoided. Within Building W1, only a single apartment per level from Level 2 upwards has a single aspect orientation towards Building W2. All other apartments only have secondary windows on the southern façade fronting Building W2.

Additional design features such as a recessed window, screening devices and internal blinds have been adopted for these single aspect apartments, and all other windows on the southern façade of Building W1 to mitigate any potential privacy impacts. On balance, it is considered that an appropriate outcome has been achieved through careful design and limitation of single aspect apartments with an orientation to Building W2.

Cross Ventilation/Ceiling Heights

Consistent with the approved strategy for cross ventilation with Building W2, the proposed rooms have been designed to provide optimal cross ventilation in a cellular typology. Being a Class 3 building, cross-ventilation is a desired, rather than legislated, outcome. The common corridors on each floor are naturally ventilated through three (3) openings on west, east and south facades, and the two storey height common rooms in the centre of the plan, providing excellent opportunity for cross-ventilation.

Apartments located on corners of the building are provided with windows to two orientations ensuring cross-ventilation. An opening area of 5% of the floor area of each room is provided to every bedroom to ensure adequate ventilation, and are designed to have cross ventilation by utilizing windows of 1500mm high.

The ceiling heights to be achieved in all habitable spaces will be consistent with the Building Code of Australia. As such, the proposal is considered to be appropriate in these respects.

Kitchen Facilities/Laundry Facilities

Urbanest has undertaken a review of laundry facilities in two of their Melbourne based facilities (refer to **Appendix C**). This review has identified that on average, students will use a washing machine 0.45 times per week and dryers 0.4 times per week. If this figure was to be extrapolated to the proposed Building W1 development, a total of seven (7) washing machines and 5.4 drying machines would be required. The proposed provision of nine (9) washing machines and ten (10) drying machines satisfies this minimum requirement and ensures that students will be adequately serviced.

Room Sizes

Section 5.8.1 of the exhibited EIS provided a comprehensive analysis of the proposed room sizes and the significant communal open spaces being provided for residents through the delivery of Buildings W1 and W2. The room sizes proposed are generally consistent with those approved within Building W2 and other comparable student accommodation developments in major cities. Students will have direct access to a variety of different communal open spaces to fulfil all needs. Furthermore, the location of the proposed development is one of the most central in Sydney, with direct access to services and facilities in the new Darling Square development and the nearby Sydney CBD.

2.3 Public Domain

2.3.1 Issue

The Department requested the following additional information be provided in regards to the central courtyard:

- Confirmation of mitigation measures to address potential wind impacts; and
- Security and monitoring measures for the management of the space including details on restriction of access.

Council also raised a number of queries specific to the central courtyard. These comments largely related to privacy, activation, access and sightlines. Council questioned the ability for pedestrians to enter the light rail corridor and requested further clarification of the interface of the central courtyard with the light rail corridor.

2.3.2 Proponent's Response

A detailed response to each of the matters raised in the submissions is provided at **Appendix A**. Aspect Studios has amended the proposed central courtyard design in response to the queries raised by both the Department and Council. These amendments specifically relate to wind mitigation measures which are further discussed in Section 4.3 below.

It is clarified that pedestrian access from the central courtyard to the light rail corridor is proposed to be restricted. Secure gates have been included in the design of the proposal to allow for access if required.

It is also clarified that the central courtyard is not intended to be a private space, but a public domain area which is maximised for use by residents of the adjoining residential (student accommodation) buildings. The space will be semi-public/semi-private, with access not restricted to adjoining residents unless specific events are occurring (such as movie screenings, etc.). The management of this space will be coordinated by the operational staff of Buildings W1 and W2. The Building W1 reception area is immediately adjacent to the courtyard providing excellent surveillance and ensuring that staff are immediately accessible.

The design features incorporated into the space, such as planters along the eastern boundary to the shared Darling Drive footpath; the change in paving treatment; the provision of the linking bridge; and fencing/gates to the light rail corridor, ensures that there are visual cues of ownership. The direct accessibility of both Buildings W1 and W2 onto this space will further ensure that it is well utilised by residents and a feeling of ownership and activation is achieved. The constant use of this space, accompanied by design features and formal management will ensure that a balance of the space as semi-public/semi-private is achieved.

2.4 Traffic, Transport and Access

2.4.1 Issue

The Department has requested that further investigation be undertaken into the provision of additional bicycle parking to achieve a rate of a single bicycle spaces per 6.5 students.

Council has suggested that a total of 104 bicycle spaces should be achieved consistent with the AH SEPP. A number of detailed design features for this bicycle parking have also been recommended by Council. In addition to comments on bicycle parking, Council has suggested that there is a lack of safe pedestrian connectivity to the north of the site and queried whether pedestrian access is available to the light rail corridor from the site.

Council has also suggested that further details should be provided on the waste collection strategy. Recommendations have been provided by Council on the relocation of the waste storage area and collection of waste.

TfNSW provided comments regarding construction pedestrian and traffic management as well as recommended conditions of consent.

2.4.2 Proponent's Response

A detailed response to the matters above is provided at **Appendix A**. Hyder has also revised the Light Rail Assessment provided with the exhibited EIS to address comments provided by TfNSW (refer to **Appendix D**).

Matters requiring further discussion are outlined below.

Bicycle Parking

In response to the Department's and Council's request for further investigations into bicycle parking, Allen Jack + Cottier have identified two potential options for accommodating the additional 13 bicycle spaces required to achieve a rate of a single bicycle space per 6.5 students.

The first option relates to providing these spaces externally to the building within the northern park. The second option involves extending the proposed internal bicycle storage area into the general lobby area, reducing the breakout space available for students and decreasing the level of street level activation. Both of these options are considered to result in a sub-optimal outcome where communal open space is compromised for bicycle parking and street activation is diminished on a highly visible corner of the building and site.

In light of the detailed investigations undertaken by Urbanest which identified the substantially low real life usage of bicycle facilities in other Urbanest properties, it is not considered to be the most appropriate outcome to sacrifice communal space for private bicycle parking. The current provision of bicycle spaces proposed in association with Building W1 is in excess of the expected operational requirements based on evidence gained from other operational Urbanest facilities. On balance, whilst additional bicycle spaces could be incorporated into the development, this would be to the detriment of the amenity of all residents and visitors without any material benefit in terms of accommodating real demand for bicycle parking.

Given the above, no change is proposed to the provision of bicycle parking as part of Building W1.

Pedestrian Access and Safety

Urbanest is committed to achieving a pedestrian friendly environment at the ground levels of Buildings W1 and W2. The public domain to be provided at the base of these buildings is consistent with the concept public domain as set out in the approved Stage 1 Concept Proposal (SSD 13_5878).

A pedestrian crossing over Darling Drive was approved under SSDA3 with Building W2. This pedestrian crossing was identified as the key east-west desire line through Darling Square and Buildings W1 and W2 have been orientated to reflect this. The central courtyard between the two buildings has been developed to provide a celebrated entry to the buildings and focus pedestrian traffic in a central location which can maximise use of the approved Darling Drive pedestrian crossing. Lend lease, TfNSW and RMS have been in constant dialogue regarding the site-wide Darling Square transport movements for vehicles and pedestrians. These discussions have informed the proposed design which accords with the approved Concept Proposal. As such, it is not considered that an additional pedestrian crossing is required on the northern extent of Darling Drive.

3.0 Proposed Amended Development

Since public exhibition of the proposal, generally minor amendments have been made to the proposed development. The changes include those made in response to the issues and comments raised by the Department and Council, along with adjustments made to strengthen and enhance the design of the proposal.

The proposed changes are shown on the revised Architectural Drawings prepared by Allen Jack + Cottier Associates (**Appendix B**) and the Public Domain Drawings prepared by Aspect (**Appendix C**). It is noted that not all of the originally submitted plans are proposed to be amended, but a complete set of drawings has been provided for completeness.

A drawing schedule outlining a complete set of drawings has been provided at **Table 2** for completeness. Included at **Table 3** is a detailed schedule of the proposed changes, and where relevant the specific issue which has driven the amendment.

The following section presents a brief updated description (where relevant) of the modified development for which approval is sought. As illustrated within the list of refinements at **Table 3**, the changes overall are considered to be positive and aim to deliver an improved outcome. Accordingly, and as detailed in **Section 4.0**, the changes are not considered to give rise to any material alteration to the environmental assessment of the potential impacts considered as part of the original development application.

3.1 Overview of Proposal (as amended)

The proposal seeks approval for the following key development:

- Site preparation works including demolition of existing site improvements;
- Construction and use of one residential building (known as Building W1) within the Western (Darling Drive) Plot, to be used for student accommodation purposes;
- Public domain improvements, including:
 - provision of a new urban park (known as north park) located to the north of Building W1; and
 - provision of a central courtyard between Buildings W1 and W2;
- Provision of building identification signage; and
- Extension, realignment and augmentation of physical infrastructure / utilities as required.

The numerical parameters of the proposal sought within the exhibited EIS are not proposed to be amended.

3.2 Site Boundary

The site boundary has been modified in light of a review of the land on which development is sought in association with Building W1. Specifically, the site has been modified in the northern boundary to exclude the shared pedestrian and cycle pathway which has been approved under SSDA 3.

3.3 Access Doors

A number of minor amendments have been made to the building access doors on the lower levels of Building W1. The entry door on the south-east corner and the egress door on the ground floor have been repositioned to provide sufficient clearance to the V braces provided around the base of the building.

3.4 Signage

It is clarified that approval for detailed signage is sought with Building W1. Design development of the proposed signage has occurred concurrently with the development of signage for Building W2, resulting in a coherent branding approach.

The number of signs proposed for Building W1 has been reduced from the exhibited design. The following amendments to the exhibited signage scheme have been undertaken:

- Sign to north-western upper corner on east facade redesigned as a horizontal illuminated logo mounted on top of the parapet and associated linear illuminated strip to address the corner of the building;
- Sign to north-western upper corner on north facade redesigned as individual illuminated letters;
- Sign to north-western upper corner on west facade unchanged;
- Signage on north-eastern lower corner east facade (ground level and Level 2) removed;
- Sign on north-eastern lower corner of north facade (Level 2) removed;
- Sign on north-eastern lower corner of north facade (Level G) unchanged;
- Sign on south-eastern lower corner of south facade redesigned as individual illuminated letters; and
- Additional building identification supergraphics provided to east facade at the ground level and Level 1.

Full details of the proposed signage are provided on the Architectural Drawings at **Appendix A**. The changes proposed to the signage do not result in any alteration to the assessment against *State Environmental Planning Policy No 64—Advertising and Signage* provided in the exhibited EIS.

3.5 Public Domain

The central courtyard has been amended to respond directly to comments received from both the Department and Council. Specifically, a 1.8 metre high screening element has also been provided along the northern, southern and western extents of the tiered seating to provide localised screening from wind. The general arrangement of the central courtyard is illustrated in **Figure 1**.



Figure 1 – Amended central courtyard perspective

Source: Aspect Studios

3.6 Drawing Schedule for Approval

Table 2 identifies the Drawings that are proposed for Approval.

Table 2 – Final Drawings Reference Schedule

Drawing Number	Title	Revision
Architectural		
DA0000	COVER SHEET	04
DA0001	SITE PLAN	03
DA2100	GROUND & FIRST FLOOR PLANS	04
DA2101	TYPICAL FLOOR PLANS (LEVEL 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9)	03
DA2102	TYPICAL FLOOR PLANS (LEVEL 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 & 21)	03
DA2103	LEVEL 22 & UPPER ROOF LEVELS	04
DA2701	AREA PLANS	03
DA3100	NORTH & EAST ELEVATIONS	03
DA3010	WEST & SOUTH ELEVATIONS	03
DA3200	SECTIONS	02
DA3301	SIGNAGE	03
DA3302	SIGNAGE 2	01
DA5100	SOU LAYOUTS 1	04
SK3106	BIN CIRCULATION PLAN	01
Public Domain / Landscape Drawings		
15076-LA-SSDA12-01	Context Plan	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-02	Site Plan	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-03	Courtyard Landscape Plan	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-04	Courtyard Section 01	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-05	Courtyard Section 02	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-06	Courtyard Section 03 Detail of Fence	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-07	Courtyard Perspective 01	B

Drawing Number	Title	Revision
15076-LA-SSDA12-08	Courtyard Perspective 02	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-09	Northern Park Landscape Plan	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-10	Northern Park Section 03	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-11	Northern Park Section 04	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-12	Northern Park Perspective 03	B
15076-LA-SSDA12-13	Site wide planting plan	B
Civil Drawings		
PD-CI-1001	TITLE SHEET AND LOCALITY PLAN	04
PD-CI-1002	DRAWING LIST	04
PD-CI-1005	GENERAL NOTES	04
PD-CI-1006	GENERAL NOTES SHEET 2	04
PD-CI-1011	GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLAN	04
PD-CI-1021	SURVEY AND EXISTING SERVICES PLAN (DBYD)	04
PD-CI-1022	SURVEY AND EXISTING SERVICES PLAN (ROBERT BIRD GROUP)	04
PD-CI-1151	BULK EARTHWORKS PLAN	03
PD-CI-1201	SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN	05
PD-CI-1221	SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL DETAILS	04
PD-CI-1301	CIVIL AND STORMWATER PLAN	04
PD-CI-1541	STORMWATER DRAINAGE CATCHMENT PLAN	05
PD-CI-1902	COMBINED SERVICES PLAN (ROBERT BIRD GROUP)	04

3.7 Schedule of Design Changes

Table 3 – Schedule of design changes

Key Changes	Driver for Change
Site Plan	
Realignment of the site boundary to reflect the removal of the approved shared pedestrian/cycle path from the DA site.	Review of site boundary in determining site area
Public Domain/Ground Level	
1.8 metre high screen provided to the northern, southern and western extent of the tiered seating	Mitigate localised wind impacts
Ground Level	
Additional gates included along the western boundary to restrict access to the light rail corridor	Secure access has been provided to the light rail corridor as requested by Council.
Building W1 Façades	
Repositioning of the entry door at the south-east corner to provide clearance of the 'V' column	Response to City of Sydney Council recommendation for movement of doors.
Repositioning of the egress door at the north-east corner to provide clearance of the 'V' column	Response to City of Sydney Council recommendation for movement of doors.
Further development and refinement of signage details	Request for additional information and clarification from the Department has been addressed and further detail provided.
Signage amendments including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sign to north-western upper corner on east facade redesigned as a horizontal illuminated logo mounted on top of the parapet and associated linear illuminated strip to address the corner of the building; – Sign to north-western upper corner on north facade redesigned as individual illuminated letters; – Signage on north-eastern lower corner east facade (ground level and Level 2) removed; – Sign on north-eastern lower corner of north facade (Level 2) removed; – Sign on south-eastern lower corner of south facade redesigned as individual illuminated letters; and – Additional building identification supergraphics provided to east facade at the ground level and Level 1. 	Response to request from the Department to confirm signage details. Signage design developed and modified to have a consistent and complimentary branding approach with Building W2
Roof	
Addition of Building Management Unit (BMU) on the roof	Added to provide comprehensive level of detail to drawing

4.0 Additional Information and Assessment

The Department has requested that all reports submitted with the EIS be reviewed in light of any revisions made or to assist in the resolution of the issues. The exhibited EIS assessed the potential impacts of the overall development against a range of matters relevant to the development. Except where addressed in this report, the conclusions of the original assessment remain unchanged. In this regard, the assessment of the following matters remains unchanged:

- Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements
- Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979
- Compliance with Planning Policies
- Compliance with Environmental Planning Instruments
- Consistency with Darling Square Concept Proposal (SSD 13_5878)
- Design Excellence
- Built Form, Urban Design and Architecture
- Amenity
- Visual and View Analysis
- Public Domain and Landscaping
- Transport and Accessibility
- Accessibility
- Non-Indigenous Heritage
- Archaeology
- Noise and Vibration
- Infrastructure and Utilities
- Operational Waste Management
- Water Cycle Management
- Air Quality
- Reflectivity
- Geotechnical Issues
- Contamination
- Wind Impact
- BCA
- Light Rail Interface
- Environmental Sustainability
- Social and Economic Impacts
- Crime and Public Safety
- Environmental and Construction Management
- Ecologically Sustainable Development
- Development Contributions
- Site Suitability
- Public Interest

As identified at **Section 1.0**, the following consultants' reports and supporting information has been updated or further supplements the material originally submitted in support of the EIS:

- Supplementary Design Report prepared by Allen Jack + Cottier;
- Supplementary Public Domain Drawings prepared by Aspect;
- Revised Light Rail Assessment prepared by Hyder;
- Urbanest Laundry Usage Review;

- Additional View and Visual Impact Photomontage prepared by Virtual Ideas; and
- Wind Confirmation Letter prepared by CPP.

The updated supporting documentation and assessment information relating to the planning process; amenity; visual impact and view loss; public domain; and traffic, transport and access considerations have been addressed at **Section 2.0** of this report as relevant in responding to key issues raised in submissions.

The further information and assessment material that has not otherwise been addressed at **Section 2.0** of this report is summarised in the following sections.

4.1 Consistency with Original SSDA Scheme

All key elements of the proposed development have remained unchanged from originally submitted. The scheme remains generally consistent with, and does not substantially differ from, the development as originally proposed and exhibited.

4.2 View and Visual Impact

An additional view photomontage has been prepared by Virtual Ideas illustrating the view of Building W1 within the approved parameter plan envelope when driving west on Pier Street (refer to **Appendix E**). This view illustrates the positioning of Building W1 between the approved North-West Plot building and the Powerhouse Museum behind. The subject view is not considered to be significant as it offers limited potential for long duration views due to its position on Pier Street and it does not form any significant vista.

Whilst the building will sit in front of the Powerhouse Museum, a generous amount of the Powerhouse Museum will still be visible. Furthermore, as a vehicle moves west along Pier Street a greater proportion of the Powerhouse Museum building will be visible, ensuring that the building can continue to be acknowledged as contributing to the western fringe of Sydney's CBD.

Given the limited significance of this view, and the short duration the view is able to be appreciated, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and the findings of the exhibited View and Visual Impact Assessment remain valid.

4.3 Wind

Cermak Peterka Petersen Pty Ltd (CPP) has undertaken a further review of the central courtyard and potential wind impacts on users of this space (refer to **Appendix F**). CPP has noted that the central courtyard area can be divided into two distinct zones, being the portion to the west of the bridge and the area to the east of the bridge. Testing of these areas indicated that the western portion would be suitable for 'pedestrian walking' and the eastern portion would be suitable for 'pedestrian standing' under the Lawson criteria.

Given the intended use of these spaces, particularly the western portion where tiered seating is proposed, additional mitigation measures are necessary. CPP has worked closely with Aspect to identify solutions which will mitigate excessive wind speeds without impacting on the functionality and security of the space. Aspect has now included a 1.8 metre high solid timber balustrade to upper levels and sides of the amphitheatre.

CPP has confirmed that this mitigation measure will likely result in localised improvements for the tiered seating, with the area reduced to the Pedestrian Standing to Pedestrian Sitting criteria. As the intended use of the space is to be for pedestrian sitting and standing at various times, the proposed mitigation measure is suitable to allow for a reasonable amenity.

4.4 Sydney Development Control Plan 2012

As the proposal constitutes State Significant Development, the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (Sydney DCP 2012) does not apply. Nonetheless, the Department has requested that an assessment be undertaken against the student housing related provisions in Section 4.4 of the Sydney DCP 2012. **Table 4** below provides an overview of the proposal against the provisions of Section 4.4 of the Sydney DCP 2012.

Table 4 – Overview of the proposal with the Sydney DCP 2012

Provision	Response
4.4.1.1 Subdivision	The strata subdivision or community title subdivision of boarding houses or student accommodation is not permitted. The strata subdivision of the proposed Building W1 is not proposed.
4.4.1.2 Bedrooms	<p>(1) The gross floor area of a bedroom is to be at least: (a) 12sqm (including 1.5sqm required for wardrobe space); plus (b) 4sqm when a second adult occupant is intended, which must be clearly shown on plans; plus (c) 2.1sqm for any ensuite, which must comprise a hand basin and toilet; plus (d) 0.8sqm for any shower in the ensuite; plus (e) 1.1sqm for any laundry, which must comprise a wash tub and washing machine; plus (f) 2sqm for any kitchenette, which must comprise a small fridge, cupboards and shelves and a microwave.</p> <p>(2) Each bedroom must have access to natural light, from a window or door with a minimum aggregate area of 10% of the floor area of the room. Skylights are not to be the sole source of light.</p> <p>(3) Ensure the ceiling height in any bedroom containing double bunks is 2.7m. Triple bunks are not permitted.</p> <p>(4) In boarding houses classified as Class 3 by the BCA, each bedroom is to meet the fire safety standards of a sole occupancy unit for a Class 3 building in the BCA, whether it is provided as a sole occupancy or not.</p> <p>The matter of room sizes has been addressed at Section 5.8.1 of the exhibited EIS.</p>
4.4.1.3 Communal kitchen areas	<p>(1) A communal kitchen area is to be provided with a minimum area that is the greater of 6.5sqm in total or 1.2sqm for each resident occupying a bedroom without a kitchenette.</p> <p>(2) The communal kitchen is to contain: (a) one sink for every 6 people, or part thereof, with running hot and cold water; and (b) one stove top cooker for every 6 people, or part thereof, with appropriate exhaust ventilation.</p> <p>(3) The communal kitchen is to contain, for each resident occupying a bedroom without a kitchenette: (a) 0.13 cubic metres of refrigerator storage space; (b) 0.05 cubic metres of freezer storage space; and (c) 0.30 cubic metres of lockable drawer or cupboard storage space.</p> <p>A substantial communal kitchen has been provided.</p> <p>The proposed communal kitchen will be a catered facility, with residents having access to this facility as part of their rental agreement.</p> <p>As above, the proposed communal kitchen will be a catered facility.</p>

Provision		Response
4.4.1.4 Communal living areas and open space	(1) Provide indoor communal living areas with a minimum area of 12.5sqm or 1.25sqm per resident and a width of 3 metres. The communal living area can include any dining area, but cannot include bedrooms, bathrooms, laundries, reception area, storage, kitchens, car parking, loading docks, driveways, clothes drying areas, corridors and the like.	A range of indoor communal living areas have been provided throughout Building W1.
	(2) Indoor communal living areas are to be located: (a) near commonly used spaces, such as kitchen, laundry, lobby entry area, or manager's office, with transparent internal doors, to enable natural surveillance from resident circulation; (b) adjacent to the communal open space; (c) to receive a minimum 2 hours solar access to at least 50% of the windows during 9am and 3pm on 21 June; (d) on each level of a multi-storey boarding house, where appropriate; and (e) where they will have minimal impact on bedrooms and adjoining properties.	As above, a range of indoor communal living areas have been provided throughout Building W1. These communal areas are well proportioned and receive approximately three (3) hours of solar access on 21 June.
	(3) Communal open space is to be provided with a minimum area of 20sqm and a minimum dimension of 3m.	The proposed rooftop communal open space on Building W2 satisfies these size requirements (subject of a separate application).
	(4) Communal outdoor open space is to be located and designed to: (a) generally be north-facing to receive a minimum 2 hours solar access to at least 50% of the area during 9am and 3pm on 21 June; (b) be provided at ground level in a courtyard or terrace area, where possible; (c) provide partial cover from weather; (d) incorporate soft or porous surfaces for 50% of the area; (e) be connected to communal indoor spaces, such as kitchens or living areas; (f) contain communal facilities such as barbecues, seating and pergolas where appropriate; and (g) be screened from adjoining properties and the public domain with plantings, such as a trellis with climbing vines.	The proposed rooftop communal open space on Building W2 satisfies these requirements (subject of a separate application).
	(5) 30% of all bedrooms are to have access to private open space with a minimum area of 4sqm in the form of a balcony or terrace area.	No balconies are provided to rooms, consistent with the approach approved for Building W2. Residents have ample access to communal open space which will be delivered with Buildings W1 and W2.
4.4.1.5 Bathroom, laundry and drying facilities	(1) Communal bathroom facilities accessible to all residents 24 hours per day are to be provided with at least: (a) one wash basin, with hot and cold water, and one toilet for every 10 residents, or part thereof, for each occupant of a room that does not contain an ensuite; and (b) one shower or bath for every 10 residents, or part thereof, for each occupant of a room that does not contain a shower.	All rooms are provided with bathroom facilities.
	(2) Laundry facilities are to be provided and include: (a) one 5kg capacity automatic washing machine and one domestic dryer for every 12 residents or part thereof; and (b) at least one large laundry tub with hot and cold running water.	Laundry facilities will be appropriately provided in the proposal. Further discussion on the proposed laundry provision is provided at Section 2.2.2.
	(3) Drying facilities, such as clotheslines located in a communal open space, are to be located to maximise solar access and ensure that the usability of the space is not comprised.	Drying facilities will be appropriately provided in the proposal. Further discussion on the proposed drying facility provision is provided at Section 2.2.2.

Provision		Response
4.4.1.6 Amenity, safety and privacy	(1) Boarding houses are to maintain a high level of resident amenity, safety and privacy by ensuring: (a) communal spaces, including laundry, bathroom, kitchen and living areas are located in safe and accessible locations; (b) bedrooms are located so that they are separate from significant noise sources and incorporate adequate sound insulation to provide reasonable amenity between bedrooms and external noise sources; (c) structural fittings and fixtures for all internal rooms that enhance nonchemical pest management of the building, with all cracks and crevices sealed and insect screening to all openings; (d) all appliances achieve an energy star rating of 3.5 or higher, unless otherwise legislated; (e) where fewer than 12 occupants are accommodated, at least two bedrooms have north or east windows and at least one bedroom is adaptable for residents with a disability.	The proposal achieves an appropriate level of amenity.
	(2) Boarding houses are to be designed to minimise and mitigate any impacts on the visual and acoustic privacy of neighbouring buildings by locating: (a) the main entry point at the front of the site, away from side boundary areas near adjoining properties; (b) communal areas and bedroom windows away from the main living area or bedroom windows of any adjacent buildings; (c) screen fencing, plantings, and acoustic barriers in appropriate locations; and (d) double glazed windows where noise transmission affects neighbouring buildings.	The proposal has been designed to minimise and mitigate any impacts on the visual and acoustic privacy of nearby buildings.
	(3) The consent authority may request an acoustic report prepared by a suitably qualified acoustical consultant, if there is the potential for significant impacts from noise emissions. The investigation shall include, but not be limited to the following: (a) the identification of sensitive noise receivers potentially impacted by the proposal; (b) the quantification of the existing acoustic environment at the receiver locations; (c) the formulation of suitable assessment criteria; (d) details of any acoustic control measures that will be incorporated into the proposal; (e) the identification of all noise that is likely to emanate from the boarding house and the subsequent prediction of resultant noise at the identified sensitive receiver locations; and (f) a statement certifying that the development is capable of operating without causing a nuisance or result in an 'offensive noise' as defined in the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997.	A Noise and Vibration Assessment was provided at Appendix N of the exhibited EIS. This assessment addressed the relevant acoustic matters and provided mitigation measures to ensure an acceptable internal amenity in regards to noise is achieved.
	(4) Boarding Houses classified as Class 3 by the BCA are to make private contracting arrangements for garbage disposal.	A private contractor will be engaged for garbage collection.
	(5) An application for a boarding house incorporating 75 or more bedrooms is to be supported by a Traffic Report prepared by a suitably qualified person, addressing as a minimum the following factors: (a) the prevailing traffic conditions; (b) the likely impact of the proposed development on existing traffic flows and the surrounding street system; (c) pedestrian and traffic safety; and (d) an assessment of the impacts from any proposed on-site parking.	A traffic report was provided with the exhibited EIS.

Provision	Response
<p>4.4.1.7 Plan of Management</p> <p>(1) An operating 'Plan of Management' is to be submitted with a development application for demand for and new or existing boarding houses to ensure that it operates with minimal impact on adjoining owners and maintains a high level of amenity for residents. At a minimum, the Plan of Management is to include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the boarding house staffing arrangements, including the location or 24 hour contact details of any on-site manager, off-site manager or resident caretaker, who has overall responsibility for the operation, administration, cleanliness, maintenance and fire safety of the premises; (b) any house rules, including details of how they will be publicised to residents, that cover guest behaviour, activities and noise, visitor policy, and the use of alcohol or drugs and any other relevant rules; (c) plans outlining the occupancy rate for each sleeping room, room furnishings, provisions of communal areas and facilities, and access and facilities for people with a disability; (d) measures to minimise unreasonable impact to the habitable areas of adjoining properties, including the management of communal open spaces. For boarding houses located within residential areas or where adjoining sites contain residential activities this use of open space should be restricted to before 10pm; (e) waste minimisation, recycling and collection arrangements, including the servicing of 'sharps' and sanitary napkin receptacles; (f) professional cleaning and pest and vermin control arrangements, which, at a minimum, should include the weekly professional cleaning of shared facilities such as kitchens and bathrooms; (g) safety and security measures, including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) perimeter lighting; (ii) surveillance or security camera systems; (iii) fencing and secure gates; (iv) room and access key arrangements; and (v) a landline telephone for residents to ring emergency services; and (h) internal signage, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the name and contact number of the property caretaker or manager; (ii) emergency contact numbers for essential services; (iii) house rules; (iv) a copy of the annual fire safety statement and current fire safety schedule; and (v) floor plans that will be permanently fixed to the inside of the door of each bedroom to indicate the available emergency egress routes from the respective bedroom. 	<p>An Operational and Security Plan of Management was provided at Appendix K of the exhibited EIS. This plan addresses these matters.</p>

5.0 Final Mitigation Measures

The collective measures required to mitigate the impacts associated with the proposed works are detailed in **Table 5** below. These measures replace those outlined in the original EIS.

Table 5 – Final Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures

Traffic Generation

The following mitigation measures have been recommended by Hyder:

- Appropriate directional signage and traffic control should be provided to ensure vehicles enter and leave the site with minimal disturbance to other road users and so they are advised of any changes in road conditions.
- Temporary road closures, single lane access and relocations during the construction period will be subject to coordination with the appropriate authorities.
- All traffic related issues and changes shall also be presented to Stakeholders as part of the consultation process. These will, wherever and whenever possible, be carried out in non-peak periods.
- The traffic and pedestrian management plan outlined in the Construction Management Plan is generally aimed at mitigating any potential impacts that may be attributed to the construction works.
- Risks to the public and the construction crew could be minimised through the implementation of the construction management plans specifically prepared for the SICEEP construction works of the PPP and Darling Square. This Plan will be regularly updated to address any new outcomes identified through constant monitoring as the works progress.

It is noted that a detailed traffic and pedestrian traffic management plan will be prepared and provided prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate.

Accessibility

In order to ensure equal access is provided throughout the proposed development, the detailed design of the proposal will need to ensure compliance with the relevant accessibility provisions of the BCA 2015 and other applicable legislation.

Noise and Vibration

Light Rail

Based on the results of the light rail noise and vibration assessment, no additional acoustic or vibration treatments are required to the proposed development to ensure compliance with the relevant standards except for the provision of glazing in accordance with the specifications outlined in the Noise and Vibration Assessment (Appendix N).

Construction

- Proposed bored piling is the least noise and vibration generating piling option available and hence will result in the lowest potential impacts to surrounding receivers. This method should be considered.
- All transient plant should be selected to be wheeled (rubber wheels) not tracked.
- All plant/equipment should be maintained as per noise control methods and procedures outlined in the Noise and Vibration Assessment (Appendix N).
- The concrete pump should be located at a maximum distance from the

Mitigation Measures

southern and western boundaries of the SSDA12 Site.

- **Vehicle Noise:**
 - If possible, locate site loading and unloading point at the north-east corner of site, to reduce impact to surrounding residential receivers. Hence all excavation and construction traffic (including concrete trucks) will remain at maximum distance from the surrounding residential receivers.
 - Truck movements should not commence prior to 7:30am.
 - All vehicles (excavators, bobcats, trucks, concrete trucks etc.) must turn off their engines during idling, to reduce impacts on surrounding receivers (unless truck ignition needs to remain on during concrete pumping).
- For the duration of the excavation stage and for concrete pumping operations during the construction stage, appropriate notification to the surrounding identified sensitive receivers should be complete. This should include a detail description of the proposed works, equipment/machinery proposed for the phase of works, duration of this phase of works and respite periods during the day.
- A range of additional general recommendations for dealing with offensive noise levels has been provided in the Noise and Vibration Assessment (Appendix N).

Operational

- It is recommended that further assessment should be carried out during the detailed design phase once plant material and locations are selected to ensure that appropriate acoustic treatments are provided if necessary.

Infrastructure and Utilities

Infrastructure

In order to minimise potential impact on the Trunk Sewer Tunnel, the nearest piles should have toe levels at or below the invert level. It is further recommended that once the building design is more progressed and additional consultation has been undertaken with the relevant service providers, further analysis and modelling should be undertaken to confirm that the conclusions of PSM remain appropriate.

Utilities

In light of the location of existing utilities infrastructure over the site and the nature of the proposed development, Northrop has concluded that the proposed development can be adequately serviced.

Operational Waste Management

In order to appropriately manage and mitigate any adverse impacts arising from waste, the different components of the Waste Management Plan should be implemented into the operation of the proposed development.

Water Cycle Management

Flooding and Stormwater

It is recommended that the proposed stormwater modifications, amplification and connection works are carried out to ensure stormwater is adequately managed.

Water Quality

To appropriately manage and mitigate stormwater runoff on the SSDA12 Site and achieve the established water quality targets, Hyder have recommended the following measures:

- Provide a rainwater tank with first-flush device;

Mitigation Measures

- Pit inserts; and
- Bioretention / Rain Gardens.

Reflectivity

CPP have identified that there are not expected to be any adverse impacts subject to the following mitigation measures:

- All exterior façade elements should limit light reflectivity to 20% or less;
- Continued assessment of façade and roof elements should be undertaken in the detailed design of the development to ensure no potential nuisance reflections are generated; and
- Surface treatments on the angled façade panels on the east façade should be investigated further in the detailed design of development to minimise glare.

Contamination

It is recommended that if any odorous or discoloured soils are excavated during development (such as during piling), that they be replaced at depth or disposed offsite. An unexpected find protocol should be adopted during development. A suitable unexpected finds protocol is provided in the site-wide RAP for Darling Square.

Alluvial deposits in the Darling Square Site may contain potential or actual acid sulphate soils (PASS or AASS). Any PASS or AASS would need to be managed if disturbed during development.

BCA

The detailed design of the development must ensure that the proposal complies with the applicable requirements of the BCA 2015 or appropriate alternative solutions should be developed and verified by a qualified BCA Consultant or Fire Safety Engineer.

Light Rail Interface

In light of the above, Hyder have recommended the following mitigation measures to ensure that the existing light rail does not impact the future building, and to ensure the proposal does not adversely affect the operation of the light rail:

- A risk assessment workshop should be undertaken to identify and mitigate the risks regarding the impact protection of the buildings from the light rail vehicles in the event of derailment;
- Consultation should continue to occur with the relevant rail authority in regard to construction requirements including:
 - Static and climbing screen (consistent with Building W2).
 - Operation of tower cranes adjacent the live light rail corridor in accordance with established procedures (consistent with Building W2);
 - Window cleaning procedures and maintenance requirements based on the window opening design principle set out in this report (consistent with Building W2);
 - Routine and unscheduled building facade maintenance procedures (consistent with Building W2);
- The works within the light rail corridor should comply with the approach set out in the Light Rail Assessment (Appendix AA) and the procedures set out in the Transdev "Light Rail Contractors Document" March 2011 Doc. Number 10737 Rev 0 and Transdev "Light Rail Envelope Brief" March 2011 Doc.

Mitigation Measures

Crime and Public Safety

- Provide appropriate signage at the main access point of Building W1 to signify ownership of the space and reinforce the entry location.
- Provide electronic key card access (or the like) to regulate the entry/exit of the building.
- Consult a qualified lighting engineer to ensure the correct lighting is provided to meet minimum Australia and New Zealand Lighting Standards, to enable sufficient surveillance of the entire site and be vandal proof or resistant to limit breakage and minimise maintenance.
- Install and maintain suitable lighting.
- Use high quality materials for construction to lessen the likelihood of damage and help to reduce maintenance costs.

Environmental and Construction Management

In order to mitigate against any adverse impacts during the construction phase of the proposal, the management measures provided in the CMP (Appendix BB) should be implemented. Furthermore, a detailed final CMP should be submitted prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate.

6.0 Conclusion

The proponent Urbanest and its expert project team have considered all submissions made in relation to the public exhibition of the proposal. A considered and detailed response to all submissions made has been provided within this report and the accompanying documentation.

In responding and addressing the range of matters raised by the government agencies and authorities, Urbanest has sought to refine the project design. The refined proposal also captures changes made by the project team post exhibition.

As outlined within this report, the analysis of the amendments to the proposed development confirms that all key elements of the proposed development as originally proposed and exhibited have remained unchanged.

Further and more importantly, the refined development does not substantially differ from the original publicly exhibited development proposal. To the benefit of the overall project, the environmental impacts of the amended development remain consistent with the original application and on balance deliver a project that results in an overall improvement to the originally publicly exhibited development (particularly in relation to planning process; amenity; visual impact; public domain; and traffic, transport and access considerations). The proposal has significant planning merits as it will:

- be a key component which will contribute in making Darling Square into one of Sydney's most innovative residential and working districts;
- directly contribute to the provision of student housing in Sydney to meet the needs of students attending nearby educational institutions;
- improve the availability of student accommodation in close proximity to Sydney's CBD, as well as existing and future services and facilities and education institutions;
- create new jobs during construction and ongoing employment opportunities during the operational phase;
- encourage more sustainable travel behaviour by accommodating student accommodation in close proximity to Sydney's CBD and existing offerings of public transport;
- contribute to a new functional, vibrant, permeable and connected public domain;
- enhance the security and feeling of safety in the public domain around the new development;
- contribute to repairing the urban fabric of this part of the City, restoring street grain and connectivity.

In conclusion, the construction and use of a residential building (student accommodation) within the Western Plot (Darling Drive) of Darling Square and associated public domain works represents a key component of the SICEEP urban renewal project that will have significant and long lasting public benefits for Sydney and NSW more broadly. The proposal comprises an integral component of the Darling Square precinct which will deliver Sydney with a new vibrant mixed use neighbourhood along with significant improvements to the public realm, pedestrian connectivity and the delivery of housing.