## SICEEP, Residential Building W1 (Student Accommodation) (SSDA12) – Response to Department of Planning and Environment Submission

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| SSD 7133 - SSD Application, Building W1 | |
| A SEPP 1 Objection should be provided in relation to the proposed room sizes, which are less than required by the SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009. | This matter has been addressed in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| Further information and justification is required for the proposed use of the central courtyard. In particular:<br>▪ confirmation of mitigation measures to address the likely wind impacts on the central courtyard (currently noted as comfortable for 'walking' at Appendix X); and<br>▪ security and monitoring measures for the management of the space including further details on how general public access will be restricted. | Wind mitigation measures required for the central courtyard have been outlined in the Response to Submissions Report. Management of the central courtyard is to be coordinated by the operational staff of the Buildings W1 and W2. The reception area of Building W1 is immediately adjacent to the courtyard and will provide excellent surveillance. All external areas of the buildings are covered by CCTV with access to footage available in real time both on site and remotely in Urbanest's Sydney head office. Access to both W1 and W2 buildings is controlled by secure access card provisions with a single point of entry into both buildings. |
| Due to the height and location of the proposed building, one of the key views of the development would be looking west/south west along the Western Distributor. To facilitate the assessment of the built form of the development, a broad angle, west to south west facing computer generated image from the western distributor should be provided. | A broad angle, west to south west facing CGI as viewed from Pier Street is provided with the Response to Submissions Report. |
| Section 3.6 of the EIS states that signage zones are proposed on the parapet and lower levels. However, the elevations show detailed signs. Confirmation is required on whether the application proposes signage zones or detail signs. In addition, provide:<br>▪ confirmation of whether the proposed I future signs will be illuminated; and<br>▪ confirm whether seven or eight signage zone I signs are proposed (noting that the north east ground floor sign is not annotated on drawing DA3301 ). | It is clarified that detailed approval for signage is sought. This matter has been further addressed in the covering Response to Submissions Report and in the amended Architectural Drawings. |
| Consideration should be given to increasing the number of bicycle spaces to match the approved rate of provision for building W2 (i.e. 1 space per 6.5 students). | If additional bicycle spaces were to be provided, the bicycle storage area would encroach on the common area of the ground floor, impacting on the amenity of this space and the ability for the space to be used by residents. Additional bicycle spaces can be provided in the Northern Park, however these would not meet the requirements for visitor parking as they could not be enclosed. These spaces would also encroach on the open space provided within the Northern Park. The investigation which has been undertaken into providing additional bicycle parking is set out further in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| Further information should be provided demonstrating that one manager's apartment is adequate for both buildings. | Urbanest operate 24 hour facilities whereby an operational management structure is in place to respond to emergency matters as they arise. The live-in managers across all properties are available on an on-call basis and all areas (both internal and external) within Urbanest buildings have extensive CCTV coverage with footage available real time both on site and remotely in Urbanest's head office. Buildings W1 and W2 will become part of this broader Urbanest network of student accommodation buildings. A single manager is appropriate for these buildings given the approach of sharing facilities and enabling a direct connection between the buildings. With an operational staffing requirement of approx. 40, other support staff will be on-site at various times assisting the live-in manager in their duties. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| A response to the requirements of Section 4.4 of City of Sydney's Development Control Plan 2012 should be provided. | An assessment of the proposal against the provisions of Section 4.4 of the Sydney DCP 2012 is provided in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| A copy of the minutes for the final Design Review Panel meeting that was held prior to the submission of the application should be provided. | Only a single DRP meeting was undertaken in relation to Building W1 at the direction of the DRP. |
| A material sample board should be provided (this does not appear to have been provided with the W1 application). | A material sample board is provided under separate cover. |
| Confirmation is required on the size of the W1 site (in square metres). | The legal title to the proposed W1 site is approximately 988m$^2$. However, the DA approval site incorporates the northern park in addition to the W1 site and therefore the total site area to which this SSDA relates is 1328.8m$^2$. |
| An estimation of the likely construction and operation job numbers should be provided, relating specifically to the W1 application. | Building W1 will facilitate approximately 2,400 construction jobs over the life of the project. During operation, approximately 40 permanent staff will be generated for Building W1. |
| Both Applications | |
| All reports submitted as part of the modification application should be reviewed in light of any revisions made in the resolution of the issues noted above. | All reports have been reviewed and updated as necessary in light of the comments received and amendments proposed. |

## SICEEP, Residential Building W1 (Student Accommodation) (SSDA12) – Response to City of Sydney Council Submission

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| General Amenity | |
| The proposed separation distance between the two buildings is only 10m, which is likely to result in reduced acoustic and visual privacy between rooms that face on to one another. While it is noted that the building envelopes were approved under the Concept Plan Approval (SSD 13_5878), mitigation measures should incorporated to improve privacy for residents in the affected rooms. At a minimum, screening devices or angled windows which prevent overlooking should be incorporated into the design. | The proposed Building W1 design is contained within the approved Concept Proposal envelope. Further discussion on this matter is provided in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| It is noted that only 80 rooms out of 520 are naturally cross ventilated. The City does not accept the argument that this is acceptable because the rooms are small. It is recommended that the design be amended to improve natural cross ventilation. | Building W1 has 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.<br><br>Apartments located on corners of the 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. |
| Sections provided show floor-to-floor heights of 2.9m. A floor-to-ceiling height of 2.7m requires a minimum floor to floor height of approximately 3.1m. Given the low ceiling height and lack of natural cross ventilation the amenity of the rooms is considered quite poor, therefore amendments to the ceiling heights should be made. | Building W1 has been designed with a floor to floor height of 2920mm resulting in a general room ceiling height of 2720mm. The ceiling height has been raised a nominal 20mm to ensure the minimum ceiling height of 2700mm required by authority requirements and applicable construction codes (with additional buildability tolerance). |
| It is noted that communal kitchen facilities are not provided. It is recommended that communal kitchen facilities be provided in accordance with the Sydney DCP 2012 in order to give students the choice of cooking their own food, rather than being solely reliant on the canteen facility. | Buildings W1 and W2 are considered as one integrated facility. If students prefer self-catered accommodation, the adjacent Building W2 facility has ample accommodation. Building W1 is an innovative and pioneering reinvention of catered university dormitory style accommodation. Catering is fundamental to the proposal and the concept will only work with patronage through all inclusive offering. |
| The communal laundry proposes a total of 10 washing machines, which falls well short of the 58 required by Sydney DCP 2012. It is also unclear what drying facilities are available. The City recommends compliance with the DCP laundry facility requirements, including number of washing machines, washing tubs and clothing lines. | A response to this matter is provided in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| Internal common corridors on Levels 2 to 17 are between 1.1m and 1.3m in width, with areas in front of lifts being approximately 1.9m. Very little natural light is available to these spaces. Common corridors should be designed to provide a feeling of spaciousness and have access to daylight. | The internal corridors are a minimum of 1150mm wide which achieve minimum requirements. However, a larger width of 1550mm wide is achieved at approximately 44% of the length of corridor (to entry door recesses), and compliant turning circles for accessibility area provided at ends of corridors.<br><br>Windows at the ends of corridors to the west, east and south façade admit light and air for increased amenity. The lift lobby and common room on each level is a large double height space providing maximum light and ventilation. Corridor length and path of travel is functionally reduced through the use of double hold-open doors to the egress stairs, allowing a “short-cut” to the other side of the building. The corridors will have good amenity for residents due to the variation in widths, articulation of entries, access to light and air, and additional circulation paths. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| The room sizes of the single rooms also fall short of the minimum sizes required by the Sydney DCP 2012, however given the Affordable Housing SEPP is applicable to the application, this is discussed in the relevant section below. | A response to this matter is provided in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| Affordable Rental Housing SEPP | |
| The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) require the applicant to address the statutory provisions contained within State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental housing) 2009. Division 3 'Boarding Houses' outlines the development standards that apply to boarding houses, and separates them into 'standards that cannot be used to refuse consent', and 'standards for boarding houses'.<br><br>Accordingly, if room sizes do not comply with the minimum standards, that is sufficient grounds for refusal. | The provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental housing) 2009 have been appropriately addressed. Refer to the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| While the twin studios comply with the minimum requirement of 16m2, the single rooms do not comply with the minimum requirement of 12m2, falling short by 1.1m2. | Noted. The accommodation size specifications in State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental housing) 2009 are not development standards which must be strictly adhered to. |
| While the minimum room size development standard is prescribed as a standard that cannot be used to refuse consent, in accordance with the definition provided in Clause 4(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 it is a development standard nonetheless. Accordingly, any variation to the minimum standards prescribed can only be considered by the consent authority if the application has been accompanied by a SEPP1 Objection seeking to vary the development standard. | A response to this matter is provided in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| The SEPP 1 Objection submitted with the application seeks to vary only the bicycle/motorcycle parking development standards, not room sizes, and therefore the consent authority is not able to consider the proposed variation.<br><br>Notwithstanding the above, the City strongly objects to any variance to the minimum room size development standard. The minimum standards provisions in the Affordable Housing SEPP are the bare minimum standards acceptable for human habitation, and therefore the consent authority should not permit any variation to this minimum standard. Taken into consideration with natural cross ventilation, and floor to ceiling heights, the rooms are considered to provide poor amenity. | As above, a response to this matter is provided in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| In light of the above, it is recommended that the applicant revise the scheme and increase the size of the single rooms in order to comply. While this will result in the loss of some rooms it is noted that this proposal provides 688 beds and 635 beds have already been approved in Building W2 (SSD 6010). This results in a total number of 1303 beds, which is far in excess of the 1,000 beds envisaged under the Concept Plan Approval (SSD 13_5878). | As above, a response to this matter is provided in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| Bicycle and Motorcycle Parking: The minimum bicycle and motorcycle parking requirements are contained within Clause 30 'standards for boarding houses'. The SEPP requires the provision of one (1) bicycle space and one (1) motorcycle space per five (5) boarding rooms. This would require a total provision of 104 bicycle spaces and 104 motorcycle spaces. This proposal seeks to provide 90 bicycle spaces and nil motorcycle spaces. | It is not considered practical to provide additional bicycle spaces. If additional bicycle spaces were to be provided, the bicycle storage area would encroach on the common area of the ground floor, impacting on the amenity of this space and the ability for the space to be used by residents. Additional bicycle spaces can be provided in the Northern Park, however these would not meet the requirements for visitor parking as they could not be enclosed. These spaces would also encroach on the open space provided within the Northern Park. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| Notwithstanding this, the City objects to the proposal to provide 14 bicycle spaces less than the minimum required by the SEPP. It is noted that, while the Sydney DCP 2012 does not apply, the DCP would require 165 bicycle spaces. While the provision of 165 bicycle spaces would be the preferred outcome, it is our view that 104 spaces should be provided as a minimum in line with the requirements of the SEPP. | The investigation which has been undertaken into providing additional bicycle parking is set out further in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| Bicycle parking for visitors is to provide in an accessible on-grade location near a major public entrance to the development and is to be sign posted. The layout, design and security of bicycle facilities must comply with the minimum requirements of Australian Standard AS 2890.3:2015 Parking Facilities Part 3: Bicycle Parking Facilities. The bicycle parking place should be located close to entry/exit points and subject to security camera surveillance where such security system exists. A safe path of travel from bike parking areas to entry/exit points is to be marked. | As above, the investigation which has been undertaken into providing additional bicycle parking is set out further in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| Building Design | |
| Western façade<br>It is unclear from the proposal how the facade which fronts the heavy rail corridor is proposed to be accessed for cleaning and maintenance. Further clarity is required to confirm that the use of the building maintenance unit on the south elevation will not impact on the operation of the heavy rail corridor. | Refer to DA2103, as amended.<br><br>The façade of Building W1 has been designed with a relationship to Building W2, with variation provided to the north eastern addressing the open corner site. Similarly to Building W2, all facades are accessed by a Building Maintenance Unit (BMU) located on the roof (BMU added to the Roof Plan for clarity). |
| V columns<br>The street wall façade concept of the 'V' columns at the lowest two levels is supported as an architectural concept, particularly as it extends from approved Building W2 to provide a consistent façade treatment along Darling Drive, reflecting the consistency of building use between the two buildings. However, along the north eastern corner of W1 an external balcony has been introduced at level 1 which effectively cuts the 'V' columns in half and reduces the strength of the concept. The City would support a smaller deck which does not extend past the internal line of the 'V' columns. | The balcony to Level 1 serves the dining facility and provides an outdoor space for students to use for dining and recreation. This element is designed as a long horizontal element to transition from the tall vertical expression of the building to the ground plane, and purposely intersects with the 'V' columns.<br><br>This element will be read as a light linear floating platform suspended by the 'V' column truss, rather than smaller discontinuous Juliet balconies. This overall scale of the building and the streetscape is considered to be more appropriate. |
| Materials and Colours<br>The 'Building W1 Materials Board' sheet identifies colours only, and lists a variety of materials without being specific on their purpose and location. The southern and western elevations include earthy masonry colours to respond to the masonry character of Ultimo, but shows 'cladding panel' for all cladding which suggests a powder coated metal sandwich panel rather than actual masonry. As the design concept for this facade relies on references to masonry and to hit and miss brickwork, it is our view that actual masonry (or even off form concrete with oxide colouring) would provide a far superior outcome. | Materials and colours will closely reference those approved for Building W2 as the two buildings will be presented as "twins" with a strong aesthetic link. Some variation has been proposed to the north east corner façade utilising modulation in façade depth, height of openings and horizontal elements to respond to the city. The façade system will be a light weight curtain wall system similar to that used for Building W2 which was selected due to buildability.<br><br>The colours and articulation to the south and east facades makes reference to the existing context of brickwork without mimicking the materiality. |
| Insufficient information is provided on the proposed construction of the 'V' columns to assess the robustness of the material. The consent authority should ensure that the cladding for the 'V' columns is robust, durable and capable of withstanding impacts from its prominent position within the public domain. Materials are to be self-finished. | Construction using brick, precast panels or materials requiring scaffold and hoisting was investigated for Building W2 and determined to be unsuitable due to the proximity of the façades to the adjacent light rail corridor. The light weight curtain wall system proposed is able to be installed from inside the building structure, omitting the need for craning over the boundary and mitigating any safety risk to the light rail corridor. This approach has been adopted with the construction of Building W1. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| Central Courtyard | |
| Privacy<br>The central courtyard appears to be designed solely for student use, however is publically accessible. Given the limited activation and overlooking, and the sometimes awkward interface between doors and columns, this space could be better utilised if secured and made private. | Privatisation of the central courtyard is not in keeping with the objectives of the wider SICEEP precinct. Permeability of the courtyard is required to allow for waste removal and substation access as prescribed through easements. Design features, such as paving/ground treatments, planter boxes and the bridge link, have been included in the central courtyard to delineate the transition from public to semi-private/semi-public space. |
| Activation<br>The majority of frontage to the central courtyard is services, including garbage and substation. The entrance to building W1, and a possible exit from W2 is the only activation of the space. If the courtyard is secured as recommended above, the applicant should ensure clear and visible access to the space from both buildings. | These essential services are required to be provided in their current location due to access requirements and easements. The proposed use of the central courtyard space ensures that this otherwise neutralised space is optimised for use by the adjacent residents. |
| Interface between doors & columns: All doors leading to the ground level outdoor spaces appear to be positioned behind columns, further limiting the activation of the spaces, and possibly blocking direct views to the building entries. The applicant should ensure all building entries are clearly visible, and not blocked by columns. | These ingress/egress doors have been amended to allow for suitable clearance. |
| Boundary to light rail<br>The boundary between the central courtyard and light rail should be designed as an element that integrates with the built form, unifying the space. The applicant should consider designing an integrated element connecting the two buildings and forming the boundary to the light rail, removing the need for the chainlink fence. | A fence is required to be provided to this boundary to restrict access to the light rail corridor. The treatment of this fence has been determined in discussion with TfNSW. |
| Pedestrian safety | |
| There is a lack of safe pedestrian connectivity to the north of the site across Darling Drive. In recognition of a pedestrian desire line to the north east of the site (across Darling Drive), consideration should be given to reconfiguring the junction at this point to enable a safe pedestrian crossing. The applicant should also confirm the access restrictions to the light rail corridor behind the student housing, and whether the junction to the south of W2 is secured in any way. | The site-wide approach to pedestrian movements has been determined under the Concept Proposal by Lend lease in consultation with TfNSW and other relevant stakeholders. A detailed response to this matter is provided in the covering Response to Submissions Report. |
| Waste Collection | |
| On street garbage collection is proposed, contrary to the City's usual requirement to facilitate on-site collection. It is noted that the garbage storage room is currently located approximately 23m from the likely on-street collection point. The City is not supportive of this aspect of the proposal and encourages the provision of on-site collection. However, it is noted that there is no vehicular access to the site, nor any basement level proposed, therefore on-site collection is impossible under the parameters of the proposed design. | Urbanest uses private contractors for waste collection at all Urbanest properties. Contractors have access to garbage rooms which allows them access to remove waste on a needs basis, removing the need for large scale kerb side collections. Private contractors consulted during the design phase have not raised any issues with location of the bin store. |
| If on-street collection is to be supported by the consent authority, then the garbage storage area should be located in a way that it does not impede pedestrian access to the street and is within 10m of the street for easy access for staff during collection. | As above, private contractors consulted during the design phase have not raised any issues with location of the bin store. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| It is noted that the space between the building and columns, and also the columns and timber bleachers, may be too narrow for the bins to be wheeled out for collection. The applicant should confirm that adequate space is provided for bin collection. | Garbage collection is to be made by private contractor with bins directly taken from the garbage rooms via the central courtyard to Darling Drive. The sketch provided with the Architectural Drawings at Appendix A shows that the clearances are acceptable to manoeuvre bins to and from the garbage room. |
| Security | |
| A detailed operational and security management plan has been submitted with the application. City staff are broadly supportive of the plan, however consideration could be given to the following: | |
| ▪ Ensure that common entries are accessible by key card/pad or intercom system and should be self-closing and self-locking. | Secure access card technology will be implemented into Building W1 to ensure restricted access. |
| ▪ Ensure that individual dwellings incorporate solid core doors, security locks and one-way viewers. | Solid core doors and security locks will be implemented into each room. |
| ▪ Ensure that communal areas such as garbage storage areas and recreation areas are situated along well used clearly defined routes, are observable from private and semi-private areas and do not provide potential entrapment spots. | As illustrated in the proposed design, all communal areas such as garbage storage areas and recreation areas are situated along well used clearly defined routes with clear sightlines. |
| ▪ Ensure that lighting illuminates pedestrian routes, dwelling entries, internal and external communal areas such as hallways, foyers, lifts and stairwells. | All pedestrian routes, entries and internal and external communal areas will be well lit. |
| ▪ For CCTV installed into the public domain, consideration should be given to the types of cameras proposed, placement, management, monitoring and storage of data as well as a proposed protocol for sharing information. Consideration should be given to liaising with local police about placement in and around the development and its management. | Suitable CCTV cameras will be installed within and around Building W1 in appropriate locations with footage available in real time both site on site and remotely in Urbanest's Sydney head office. |
| Conditions of consent - Various | Council's recommended conditions of consent are noted. It is suggested that the recommended conditions of consent be qualified with the conditions provided with the Building W2 application. These conditions were more streamlined, focused, and enabled the development to proceed in an orderly manner. |

## SICEEP, Residential Building W1 (Student Accommodation) (SSDA12) – Response to Heritage Council Submission

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| No issues raised | Noted. |

## SICEEP, Residential Building W1 (Student Accommodation) (SSDA12) – Response to NSW Environmental Protection Authority

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| No issues raised | Noted. |

## SICEEP, Residential Building W1 (Student Accommodation) (SSDA12) – Response to RMS and Transport for NSW

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| RMS | |
| As several construction projects will be occurring within the CBD during this time, Construction Traffic Management Plans and details of detour/ directional signage should be forwarded to the CBD Coordination Office Transport Taskforce prior to any construction works taking place. | Noted. This will be actioned at the appropriate time. |
| A Road Occupancy Licence should be obtained from the Transport Management Centre for any lane / road closures on Darling Drive, or any works that may impact on traffic signals or traffic flows on the adjoining road network during construction activities. | Noted. A Road Occupancy Licence will be obtained at the appropriate stage of the development. |
| TfNSW | |
| Sydney Light Rail — Inner West Line | |
| The proposed construction activities are likely to interfere with the light rail operation (eg. craning over the corridor) | Discussions have been ongoing with TfNSW regarding potential impacts on the light rail operation. |
| Issues are related to noise and vibration, transport and access, safety, property, creation of easements and protection of services for light rail and EMF/Interference address these issues, TfNSW requests a Rail Safety Interface Agreement and relevant Conditions of Consent are in place prior to the commencement of works. | Noted. Documents and processes to be followed as agreed with TFNSW in relation to the W2 building. |
| The applicant needs to enter a number of agreements with TfNSW, the light rail operator and Sydney Trains as the land owner. | Noted. |
| TfNSW recommends the current working group between TfNSW, the applicant, the light rail operator and the land owner continue to address the issues during the detailed design development and to facilitate approval of detailed designs and relevant management plans. | Noted. Documents and processes to be followed as agreed with TFNSW in relation to the W2 building. |
| Sydney Light Rail – Interference with Light Rail Operation | |
| The proposed construction activities are likely to interfere with the light rail operation. Therefore, the applicant shall enter into an Agreement(s) with TfNSW, the light rail operator, and if required, Sydney Trains as the land owner to protect assets, services etc. and to recover costs that TfNSW, Sydney Trains and the light rail operator incurs in the development. | Noted. Documents and processes to be followed as agreed with TFNSW in relation to the W2 building. |
| The Agreement(s) shall include, but not limited to:<br>▪ Pre and post construction dilapidation reports;<br>▪ The need for track possessions/isolation;<br>▪ Review of the machinery to be used during excavation/ground;<br>▪ Design and engineering assurance;<br>▪ Penetration/construction works;<br>▪ The need for track monitoring;<br>▪ Design and installation of lights, signs and reflective material;<br>▪ Endorsement of Risk Assessment/Management Plan and Safe Work Method<br>▪ Statements (SWMS);<br>▪ Endorsement of plans regarding proposed craneage and other aerial operations; | Noted. Documents and processes to be followed as agreed with TFNSW in relation to the W2 building. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| ▪ Erection of scaffolding/hoarding;<br>▪ Light rail operator's rules and procedures;<br>▪ Maintenance of the western facade — light rail corridor side - of the building in the operations phase;<br>▪ Compliance with guidelines for developments near rail corridors;<br>▪ Compliance with ASA standards, including but not limited to standards for external developments; collision loads and risk review etc.;<br>▪ Alteration of rail assets such as the OHW along of track and associated hoarding; and Demarcation system, if undertaken by the applicant. | |
| Protection of Sydney Trains' Land, Easements and TfNSW Infrastructure | |
| The proposed development is located immediately adjacent to the Sydney Trains' land, easements and TfNSW infrastructure. It is requested that the applicant provide all relevant documentation as requested by TfNSW and Sydney Trains for review and endorsement prior to issuing the relevant Construction Certificate. | Noted. Documents and processes to be followed as agreed with TFNSW in relation to the W2 building. |
| Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management | |
| Several construction projects, including the Sydney Light Rail project are likely to occur at the same time at this development within the CBD and Darling Harbour Precinct. The cumulative increase in construction vehicle movements from these projects could impact on bus services in the CBD, and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the CBD and Darling Harbour Precinct particularly during commuter peak periods. | The cumulative impact of the proposal has been considered in the Transport and Traffic Impact Assessment provided at Appendix S of the exhibited EIS. |
| TfNSW requests that the applicant prepares a detailed Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) prior to commencement of construction, which takes into account other construction projects in the CBD including Sydney Light Rail project and Darling Harbour Live precinct. The CPTMP should be prepared in consultation with CBD Coordination Office within TfNSW and City of Sydney. The final CPTMP needs to be endorsed by the CBD Coordination Office within TfNSW prior to the commencement of construction. | Noted, this recommendation can form a condition of consent. |
| TfNSW requests that pedestrian movements generated by the W1 student accommodation building be included in the pedestrian modelling that will be undertaken for the Darling Square precinct as committed by Lend Lease. | Noted, pedestrian movements from Building W1 are expected to be included in this modelling by Lend Lease as part of the Darling Square precinct works. |
| The occupants of the student accommodation buildings need to rely on-street loading/ parking / drop off and pick up area (parking area) on Darling Drive for their daily activities. The subject parking area located in the public area would also be used by others in the precinct and would not be readily available for residents whenever they need to use this parking area.<br>Most of the students will move in and out of the buildings at the same time. If the on- Street parking area is occupied by others in the precinct during this period, vehicles and taxis would need to park on travel lanes of Darling Drive. This would have the potential to cause traffic and safety issues at this location. To address the above issues, TfNSW requests that a loading zone for exclusive use of students be provided on site. This will enable student accommodation administration to manage the loading zone. | A loading zone on Darling Drive has been nominated under the approved Concept Proposal and was confirmed as a suitable outcome under the Building W2 SSDA. The location of this loading zone has been separately assessed and approved through consultation with RMS by Lend Lease under the SICEEP precinct wide assessments.<br><br>Building W1 will be fully furnished consistent with all Urbanest facilities. The majority of students are expected to arrive by public transport with minimal large items to be moved in/out of the facility. Students move typically into student accommodation buildings over a 3-4 month period and not specifically on a single day or within a certain week. Given the nature of the facility and its close proximity to public transport, it is not expected that significant traffic delays would occur through on-site loading activities. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| Students accessing the buildings need to use a shared path which has the potential to cause conflicts between pedestrian and cyclists. TfNSW requests that the applicant install signs along the shared path advising cyclists to reduce speed and look out for pedestrians. | Signage will be further investigated in the detailed design of the development. |
| Information Required from the Applicant | |
| TfNSW requests that the applicant provide the information for TfNSW and Sydney Trains approval prior to issuing the relevant construction certificate, not limited to, the following:<br>▪ Final geo-technical and structural drawings;<br>▪ Final construction methodology;<br>▪ Final cross sectional drawings;<br>▪ Detailed survey plan;<br>▪ Acoustic assessment;<br>▪ Electrolysis report;<br>▪ Details of balconies/window openings;<br>▪ Risk assessment associated with possible light rail vehicle derailment;<br>▪ Details of fencing between the light rail corridor and the proposed development;<br>▪ Assessment on use of lights, signs and reflective materials which are visible from the rail corridor; and<br>▪ Details of insurances. | Noted. Documents and processes to be followed as agreed with TFNSW in relation to the W2 building. |
| Conditions of Consent | |
| TfNSW recommends that the relevant Conditions of Consent that were put in place for Student Accommodation Building W2 (SSD 6010) be adopted for the subject student accommodation building development application. | Noted. |
| TfNSW would be pleased to review the draft Conditions of Consent prior to determining the application. | Noted. |
| A separate response will be provided for the proposed modification to Student Accommodation Building W2. | Noted. |
| TfNSW requests that the applicant consults with the CBD Coordination Office within TfNSW and Sydney Trains to address the above issues. TfNSW would be pleased to consider any further material forwarded from the applicant. | Noted. |
| Consultation with TfNSW | |
| TfNSW requests that the applicant engages in ongoing consultation with TfNSW, the rail operator and Sydney Trains throughout the detailed design and construction of the Project and that relevant designs and management plans be submitted to TfNSW for approval prior works commencing. | Noted. Documents and processes to be followed as agreed with TFNSW in relation to the W2 building. |
| Relocation of Sydney Trains Services/Infrastructure | |
| The relocation of any Sydney Trains services or infrastructure are to be at the applicants cost and to Sydney Trains Requirements and Standards. | Noted. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| Cost of Works and Signage | |
| All works/regulatory signage associated with the proposed development are to be at no cost to TfNSW/Roads and Maritime Services. | Noted. |
| Protection of Sydney Trains' Land, Easements and TfNSW's Infrastructure | |
| Prior to the issuing of a Construction Certificate or the commencement of works (whichever occurs first) the applicant need to liaise with Sydney Trains to ascertain its requirements in relation to the protection of Sydney Trains' land, easements and TfNSW's infrastructure. | Noted. Documents and processes to be followed as agreed with TFNSW in relation to the W2 building. |
| The applicant is to submit to Sydney Trains all relevant documentation as requested by Sydney Trains and obtain Sydney Trains' written endorsement. | Noted. |

## SICEEP, Residential Building W1 (Student Accommodation) (SSDA12) – Response to Sydney Water Submission

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| Building over and adjacent to stormwater assets | |
| No building or permanent structure is to be constructed within 1 m from the outside wall of the stormwater asset. Permanent structures include (but are not limited to) basement car park, hanging balcony, roof eves, hanging stairs, stormwater pits, stormwater pipes (excludes simple pavements and lightweight readily removable structures independent of the asset). This clearance requirement would apply for unlimited depth and height. | Refer to the Sydney Water Feasibility Letter which outlines Sydney Water requirements for building over the DN1000 GRP sewer traversing the property. The design will be completed in accordance with these requirements and it is assumed that a Building Plan Approval will be required from Sydney Water prior to construction certification. |
| The applicant is required to submit the elevation drawings with the stormwater channel, to ensure that the proposed buildings and permanent structures are below the zone of influence. | |
| Flood Impact Assessment | |
| Sydney Water needs to ensure that the developments do not adversely impact on people, properties and infrastructure. The applicant is required to comply with the Flood Impact Assessment report for this area and must prevent adverse flood impacts. | Noted. |
| The FIA must:<br>▪ demonstrate that there are no potential adverse flood impacts offsite due to the development; and<br>▪ evaluate the impacts of flooding on the proposed development. | Noted. |
| For State Significant Developments, the applicant is also required to submit a Flood Hazard Management Plan as per the Floodplain Development Manual. The flood models need to assess 5, 20, 100 and 1 00+ year climate change year storm events. | Noted. |
| Sydney Water requires the models to be 1 D/2D. Models should be simple and easy to read, illustrating in maps; flood levels, velocities and hazards. | Noted. |
| Stormwater connections to existing built assets | |
| If the proponent intends to make direct stormwater connection to Sydney Water's stormwater system, then the connection is to be carried out according to the Asset Creation Process). Further details regarding the process can be obtained from your nominated Water Servicing Coordinator. | Refer to the Sydney Water Feasibility Letter. Drawings will be submitted to the Water Servicing Coordinator in accordance with Sydney Water requirements. This will be a condition of construction certification. |
| The applicant is advised of the following:<br>▪ For pipes with a diameter 300mm or more the connection angle is to be no greater than 30 degrees in the direction of the channel flow.<br>▪ Proposed connections that are 300mm or more in diameter require a qualified structural engineer to design the connection. A structural engineer's certificate is to be attached with the design drawings.<br>▪ Proposed connections that are less than 300mm in diameter can use Sydney Water's standard drawings to design the connection drawings.<br>▪ All drawings are to be submitted in AutoCAD to the Water Servicing Coordinator. The title of the drawings shall be as follows: Case No. [#####] SW | Noted. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| [LGA] Drainage<br>[Sub-Catchment Name] SWC [##]<br>Drains to [Catchment Name] SWC [##] | |
| **Temporary or permanent diversion of stormwater assets** | |
| Prior to any further approvals the applicant must address the following Sydney Water requirements: | Noted. |
| Hydraulic Capacity Feasibility Study<br>This study must demonstrate that the existing stormwater system's hydraulic capacity and performance will not be impacted. This ensures the existing capacity of the stormwater system is maintained. | Noted. |
| Disconnection/connection methodology<br>Clearly describe and specify how disconnection/connection of Sydney Water's stormwater assets will take place | Noted. |
| Interim Operating Procedure<br>An Interim Operating Procedure (IOP) must be prepared by the proponent to own, operate and maintain temporary stormwater assets. The IOP will indicate that the proponent will own, operate and maintain the temporary stormwater assets and must address any impacts (including financial). Once Sydney Water's stormwater assets are disconnected, Sydney Water will have no responsibility on the operations and maintenance of the temporary stormwater asset. Sydney Water may resume to own, operate and maintain the permanent stormwater drainage system if it is constructed to Sydney Water's requirements. | Noted. |
| Risk management controls & emergency response plan<br>A risk workshop must be conducted with relevant design consultants, Water Servicing Coordinators and contractors to identify key risks, management controls and develop an emergency response plan to ensure safety of people and property in the event of asset and/or embankment failing or flooding. This plan is to be developed and approved by the relevant authorities. | Noted. |
| Backfilling<br>Plans must provide detail specifications for any redundant pipes that will be backfilled. | Noted. |
| **Discharged Stormwater Quality Targets** | |
| Stormwater run-off from the site should be of appropriate quality and quantity before discharged into a Sydney Water asset or system. Developments must demonstrate stormwater quality improvement measures that meet the following specified stormwater pollutant reductions:<br>Pollutant Pollutant load reduction objective (%)<br>Gross Pollutants (>5mm) 90<br>Total Suspended Solids 85<br>Total Phosphorus 65<br>Total Nitrogen 45 | Noted. |

| Key Issue | Response |
|---|---|
| Liaising with other agencies | |
| Sydney Water advises that the proponent closely liaise with Road and Maritime Services and local council regarding stormwater infrastructure works to ensure an integrated approach. | Noted. |
| Heritage | |
| This development may impact the Hay Street stormwater channel, which is State Heritage Listed on the Sydney Water Section 170 Register. | Noted. |
| The proponent will be required to Heritage Council approval for any work within close proximity to the stormwater channel. | Noted. |
| Easements in favour of Sydney Water | |
| The proposed development may impact on existing Sydney Water easements. Sydney Water have restrictions on proposed work within stormwater easement boundaries. | Noted. |
| The proponent is to ensure that the development does not encroach on the easements. | Noted. |
| Plans clearly showing Sydney Water assets and associated easements should be referred to Sydney Water's Group Property team to review and place conditions. | Noted. |
| Water | |
| There is sufficient trunk capacity in the Crown Street and Pyrmont Gravity networks to service the proposed development. | Refer to Sydney Water Feasibility Letter. All requirements of Sydney Water will be satisfied for construction and occupation certifications. |
| Water adjustments and amplifications will be required based on connection points and corresponding discharge. | Noted. |
| Detailed requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase. | Noted. |
| Recycled Water | |
| Recycled water will be provided to the site via rainwater capture only. | Noted. |
| Detailed requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase. | Noted. |
| Wastewater | |
| The wastewater system has sufficient trunk and reticulation capacity to service the proposed development. | Noted. |
| Minor reticulation extensions may be required. | Noted. |
| Detailed requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase. | Noted. |