

TOWER 2, LEVEL 23 DARLING PARK, 201 SUSSEX ST SYDNEY NSW 2000

URBIS.COM.AU Urbis Pty Ltd ABN 50 105 256 228

20 September 2018

Mr Cameron Sargent Acting Director Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Karl Fetterplace

Dear Cameron,

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS | SSD 7662 MOD 1 | SITE 53, 2 FIGTREE DRIVE, SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK

This response to submissions letter has been prepared by Urbis on behalf of the proponent and addresses the key issues raised by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) in correspondence dated 28 August 2018.

This letter is accompanied by:

- A response to submissions package including design verification statement, prepared by Mirvac Design (Attachment A)
- An amended letter describing modifications and confirming design principles of approved proposal are preserved, prepared by BVN the architect responsible for the approved design (Attachment B)
- A letter describing the height of roof top plant and equipment, prepared by JHA (Attachment C)
- A letter explaining the spatial adjustments to roof top service zones, prepared by Shelmerdines Consulting Engineers (Attachment D)

A response to each of the issues raised by the DPE is provided in **Table 1**.



Area	Issue	Response	Ref doc
Basement alterations	Clarify and justify amendment to basement outline. Provide assessment of impacts, including necessary adjustment to technical studies.	Mirvac Design has prepared a plan illustrating the proposed adjustments to the extent of the basement. The reason for adjusting basement extent largely relates to improving buildability by aligning the external walls of basement levels. The lower basement levels will correlate with the approved extent of Basement Level 1, therefore no reduction to deep soil, landscaped area or encroachment into tree protection zones. The southern extent of Basement Level 2 is proposed to be extended to align with Basement Level 1. This area is proposed to contain plant and OSD storage.	Attachment A
Design	Justify increased fence height and change in material to ground floor unit entrances.	Mirvac Design has prepared detailed elevations and sections to demonstrate the extent of the proposed fence at the permitter of ground floor units. The fence height is 1.85m for security and privacy. The palisade style fencing allows for a degree of visual permeability.	Attachment A

Table 1 – Response to submissions



Area	Issue	Response Entry portals are painted precast concrete and palisade fencing is powder coated aluminium.	Ref doc
	Provide details of the proposed materials for the awning over the gym entry.	Painted and rendered concrete awning is proposed over the entry to the gym area. The awning is necessary for weather protection.	Attachment A
Roof alterations	Justify the increased plant space.	 Shelmerdines Consulting Engineers has prepared a letter describing the factors that have led to the increase of rooftop service area. There are several reasons for adjusting the roof top service zones including: Condensing units relocated from balconies to roof top service zone. Retail plant requirements to be positioned on Building 3. Domestic hot water plant relocated to on floor plantroom in Building 2 requiring relocation of condensing units to roof top service zone. General coordination with other services. 	Attachment D



Area	Issue	Response	Ref doc
		 Resolution of plan area requirements not previously resolved or included in the DA scheme. 	
	Provide details of the height of the gas meter and storage tanks on the roof.	JHA have provided a letter detailing the anticipated height of roof top plant.	Attachment C
		The letter confirms that roof top plant is limited to a maximum of 2m in height. Screening at the perimeter of the service zones is designed to a height that will conceal the plant and equipment.	
	Consider incorporating green or cool roofs into the design as per OEH suggestion.	The applicant has committed to the delivery a series of sustainability initiatives in order to achieve a 4-star green star rating.	-
		The initiatives do not incorporate green roofs (service zones occupy most roof spaces) however includes several other initiatives contributing to the sustainability and energy efficiency of the development such as installing rainwater retention tanks and connecting to SOPA's recycled water system for irrigation, toilets and washing machines.	
Privacy screens	Justify the relocation of the privacy screens from the western	Mirvac Design has prepared an elevation and perspective of the northeast façade of Building 5 to demonstrate the anticipated	Attachment A



Area	Issue	Response	Ref doc
	elevation of Building 1 to the eastern elevation of Building 5.	appearance of this façade incorporating privacy screens.	
		The reasons for this adjustment are as follows:	
		 Avoids overwhelming the façade of the low-rise Building 1. 	
		 Screening relates to the vertical language of the colonnade directly below. 	
		 Fewer floors require privacy screens in the proposed arrangement. 	
		The adjustment will result in a superior design outcome, is more cost-effective in that fewer screens are required and privacy outcomes are not compromised.	
Design verification statements	Provide an explanation of how the design quality principles are addressed in the development.	A report explaining how the design quality principles prescribed in SEPP 65 are addressed in the development as modified has been prepared by Mirvac Design and accompanies this submission.	Attachment A
Architectural drawings	Address discrepancies between drawings, planning report and design verification statements including:		



Area	Issue	Response	Ref doc
	Drawings and planning report include a workshop for bicycle storage on Level 1 that are not included in the BVN or Mirvac design verification statements.	The design verification statements have been updated to include a reference to this aspect of the proposed modifications.	Attachment A, Attachment B
	Planning report includes amendments to elevations to correspond with the approved floor plan for Level 17 through Level 23 that are not included in the BVN or Mirvac design verification statements.	The design verification statements have been updated to include a reference to this aspect of the proposed modifications.	Attachment A, Attachment B
	The BVN and Mirvac design verification statements include a courtyard added to an apartment on Level 1 in Building 5 that is not shown on the drawings or in the planning report.	This adjustment is shown on the plans lodged with the modification application (refer to annotation 4h). A reference is also included in the planning report on page 8 and reads "awning added over substation at Level B01, subsequent expansion of unit balconies at Level 01."	-
	The BVN design verification statement includes the conversion of ten x 2 bed units to 1 bed units on Levels 12-21 in Building 2 that are not in the Mirvac design verification statement, on the drawings or in the planning report.	This reference related to an earlier iteration of the proposed modifications and has now been removed.	Attachment B



Area	Issue	Response	Ref doc
Property details	Confirm property details	The proponent has advised that the legal description of the subject site is Lot 22 in DP 787402 and Lot 10 in DP 1185060.	-

We trust the above summary and associated additional information adequately addresses the key issues raised in the additional information request and is sufficient to progress the assessment of the modification application.

If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me at (02) 8233 7621 or swilson @urbis.com.

Yours sincerely,

J.Win

Samantha Wilson Associate Director