SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISS	IONS	
Albert Talone	A1	Objects (A number of objectors submitted this same letter)	
		 Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (NVIA) from Arup is deficient as follows: No noise sensitive receptors within the area identified in the report as subject to construction and post construction noise List of construction activities not definitive Large proportion of work will be external not internal Internal works will still have significant noise impacts and have not been modelled No. of trucks significant in terms of noise impacts but not considered Statement that noise will be inaudible at nearby receivers not surprising given that chosen receivers outside area where events taking place No detail provided on nature of events, festivals, pop ups etc Modelling outdoor patron numbers set out in Appendix E1 of NVIA will clearly be exceeded and therefore noise modelling is flawed. Given significant deficiencies of NVIA, new assessment should be undertaken at applicant's expense. 	 Noise Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report regarding construction noise impacts. The number of these events, number of people, timing and controls surrounding the events are described in Section 5 – Event Noise of the NVIA. The SSDA only seeks approval for the Sydney Writer's Festival and the Biennale, described in Section 5.1 - Overview. The number of people forecast for these events are presented in Appendix E – Venue Patron Numbers. Timing of the events are described in Section 5.1 - Overview. Controls and mitigation measures are discussed in Section 5.4 – Results, and summarised in Section 7 – Summary of Mitigation Measures. Venue patron numbers have been provided by the client. 1700 patrons have been modelled along the precinct apron at any one time. This does not include indoor patrons who would not significantly contribute to noise at nearby receivers.
		Traffic	<u>Traffic</u>
		 Traffic report has not adequately addressed cumulative traffic impact during construction, particularly from works at Barangaroo and Circular Quay 	• Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions in relation to construction traffic and provision of public transport.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISSI	ONS	
		 Assertion that public transport in the area is adequate is incorrect given extensive distance of public transport facilities from the site Report states three lanes of traffic on Hickson Rd but there is only one each way Traffic report is inadequate. New traffic report should be prepared at applicant's expensive. 	 The Traffic Impact Assessment does not assume that Hickson Road has three lanes in each direction. The assessment is based on one lane in each direction, with two parking lanes within each carriageway. It is considered that the Traffic Impact Assessment adequately addresses the SEARs.
		 Building attenuation Despite assurances from applicant, SSDA has not cover attenuating owners/occupiers of Shore 2/3 during construction and post-construction Operational plan of management (OPM) OPM only sets out vague guidelines which do not address any of specific issues of concern. Also does not 	 Building attenuation The Applicant commits to providing upgrades to existing party walls between operating tenancies and areas where there are construction activities taking place. This will be in the form of additional plasterboard linings, sound absorptive finishes etc within the work area. Whilst this treatment will improve the sound insulation between the work areas and the tenancies, it is not practicable to make the partitions 'soundproof'.
		address the Applicant's proposal to use the area for art festivals, events and pop-up cafes.	 Operational plan of management It is considered that the OPM provides sufficient detail to guide the management and operation of the precinct. It will be supplemented by more detailed management strategies where required. It also puts in place a community consultation and complaints management regime to facilitate ongoing engagement with residents and businesses and ensure issues of concern are appropriately addressed. The Event mode is restricted to the Sydney Writer's Festival and Biennale only. The application does not seek approval for any other events, concerts, or festivals. Refer to discussion in section 2.4.1 in the Response to Submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISS	IONS	
			Report.
Brigid Kennedy Millers Point	A2	Objects Business relies on amenity of quiet waterfront location. Business will be extinguished because of the noise and traffic disruption during construction. 	 It is acknowledged that the proposed construction works will inevitably generate some noise, traffic and other impacts that may diminish the quiet enjoyment of the commercial premises located in the vicinity of the works for the period of construction. However, as is shown in the EIS and the Response to Submissions report, all measures to substantially understand and mitigate impacts from both the construction and operation of the precinct have been considered and every effort made to minimise those impacts to a level that is acceptable. The issue of construction noise is reviewed in depth in the noise assessment and the requirement in the official guidance to use 'all feasible and reasonable' noise control techniques has been implemented. A detailed construction noise mitigation proposal has been included in the noise assessment. Similarly, appropriate construction traffic management measures will be put in place. The principal contractor will be required to develop a detailed Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office, TfNSW, Roads and Maritime, Barangaroo Delivery Authority and the City of Sydney Council prior to construction commencing. This will address traffic construction hours, haulage routes, sequencing for traffic management, personnel management, monitoring and inspections, as well as measures to maintain safe access for pedestrians and cyclists throughout the construction period. Meetings will be held with tenants and landowners prior to works commencing outlining the program of works and how noise and traffic will be dealt with during construction.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE						
A. PUBLIC SU	PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS								
			Tenants will be encouraged to provide information regarding any events that are taking place within their tenancies so mitigations can be undertaken. This may include additional respite periods or reprogramming of works to avoid noisy works during sensitive events.						
Dieter Schafer North Sydney	A3	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	Refer responses to Submission A1						
John Dunn, Dawes Point	A4	 Objects Consideration should be given to the residents of Lower Fort Street affected by construction and truck noise Trucks should not be allowed to enter the precinct before 7am Not enough restrictions on commercial uses as opposed to cultural uses. Already considerable disruption caused by existing commercial uses. There needs to be greater restrictions on commercial uses and commitment to ongoing management. Introduction of new bus zone has already resulted in adverse noise impacts from idling buses. Increasing number of buses in this area will cause further disruption and is not supported. 	 Detailed assessment of the impact of the proposal on residents in surrounding areas has been undertaken in the EIS and supplementary reports. Trucks will not be allowed into the precinct until 7am Mondays to Fridays and 8am Saturdays. It is considered that there is a reasonable balance between proposed cultural and commercial uses. The proposed new commercial uses will support the precinct and ensure it is an active, vibrant and viable place for people to visit and enjoy. Appropriate mitigation measures are proposed to ensure impacts from those uses are minimised. The Operational Plan of Management provides a detailed management framework for the operation of the precinct. This includes management of new commercial uses. Hickson Road has been identified as a ""planned city centre key bus corridor" under the Sydney City Centre Access Strategy (Transport for NSW, 2013). As such, it is proposed that bus services will be increased over time to improve access to the area and reduce reliance on private vehicles. It is considered that disruption caused by the introduction of new bus services will be minimal and is outweighed by the 						

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISS	IONS	
			benefits of improved public transport in the area.
Ilkay & Ken Gurcan Erbas, Emre Erbas Millers Point	A5	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	Refer responses to Submission A1
Liz Talone	A6	Generally supports project but has some concerns as	
Millers Point		 follows: Potential significant cumulative traffic impacts from proposed Barangaroo, Crown Casino, City Metro Station, and subject development. This will create traffic gridlock and further exacerbate already inadequate situation. No additional parking facilities are proposed to support the crowds that will attend events to the precinct. Not clear how people will access the site. Consideration should be given to increasing the number of public toilets for the provision of crowds. 	 Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding construction traffic, parking and access to the site. The only events proposed are the Sydney Writers Festival and Biennale. The provision of toilet facilities will be in accordance with the existing arrangements for these events.
Margaret Goss Hickson Road	A7	 Objects Existing noise impacts from teaching/rehearsal/ performance spaces already significant. These impacts will be made worse if hours extended. Many of the assumptions in the NVIA are unrealistic. Assumption in NVIA that people visiting function/commercial spaces won't be affected by alcohol is incorrect. Notion that staff will be able to control patrons leaving the site is also flawed. Opportunity for outdoor spill areas will make situation worse. Detrimental impact on residents' sleep if hours of 	 Refer to discussion in Section 2.1 of the Response to Submissions Report and to the 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions Report regarding operational noise limits. Operational Plan of Management details specific requirements for future operators to abide by "responsible service of alcohol" obligations. In addition, organisers of functions would be required to have security staff on site for the duration of the event to manage patron behaviour.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISS	IONS	
		 operation extended from 22.00 to 01.00 Needs to be balanced between rights of visitors and residents. Noise impacts will have detrimental impact on quality of life of residents. 	
Peter Hourigan Millers Point	A8	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	Refer responses to Submission A1
Robert Hansen Dawes Point	A9	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1 Also raised concern that: • Pottinger St entirely residential street at very centre of WBACP • Precinct wide events will have adverse impact on residential amenity of the area • Traffic report is limited in scope and fails to address significant cumulative impacts from major construction activity in surrounding area	 Refer responses to Submission A1 Only events for which development approval is sought are the existing Sydney Writers Festival and the Biennale. No other precinct wide events are proposed. Appropriate management and mitigation measures, as detailed in the EIS, are proposed to ensure impact of the WBACP on surrounding residential areas is minimised (refer Response to Submissions Report for further detail). Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding construction traffic.
Ruth Colaguiri Millers Point	A10	 Generally supports project but particular care needs to be taken to protect heritage and natural beauty. Noise impact not adequately addressed especially in relation to noise receptors within the precinct. No details of noise attenuation plans. Construction truck impact will be significant but DA states that the impact is not significant Need to consider alternative means of managing construction traffic similar to approach used at Headland Park Congestion associated with delivery trucks, waste 	 Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report regarding construction noise impacts. The NVIA provides detailed information on noise attenuation measures The Traffic Impact Assessment has considered all traffic, including delivery and service vehicle impacts, in determining overall impacts Refer to discussion in Response to Submissions Report and Appendix 3 regarding parking, public transport and

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RE	SPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISSI	IONS		
		 removal etc not adequately assessed. Major concern that overall traffic impact not adequately considered. Cumulative impacts of traffic associated with Barangaroo Metro Station and increase in the number buses, taxis etc also not considered. Parking needs to be provided to meet additional demand generated by development. In particular, elderly visitors to the precinct cannot be expected to walk to Circular Quay. Remains strongly opposed to waterfront square (Note: Not included in this DA) 	•	cumulative traffic impacts SSDA does not seek approval to the waterfront square. The waterfront square component of the master plan will not be pursued at this time and remains subject to further design consideration.
Scott Evans Dawes Point	A11	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	•	Refer responses to Submission A1
Stephen Watts Newtown	A12	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	•	Refer responses to Submission A1
Name withheld Dawes Point (232592)	A13	 Issues as per Submission No A1 Not opposed to development but consideration needs to be given to fact that light rail and Barangaroo construction is already affecting residents. Need to adopt world's best practice so that residents always a consideration in the process. 	•	Refer responses to Submission A1 Applicant is committed to working closely with the local residential and business community throughout the construction and operation of the WBACP.
Name withheld Dawes Point (232582)	A14	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	•	Refer responses to Submission A1
Name withheld Dawes Point (232661)	A15	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	•	Refer responses to Submission A1
Name withheld Dawes Point (232781)	A16	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	•	Refer responses to Submission A1

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE			
A. PUBLIC SU	A. PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS					
Name withheld Walsh Bay (232639)	A17	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	Refer responses to Submission A1			
Name withheld Walsh Bay (232635)	A18	 Objects Extensive development activities occurring in and around Walsh Bay resulting in significant noise and traffic impacts. Lack of adequate public transport in the area. Cumulative impacts from development have the potential to severely impact on quality of life for residents. 	 Refer to the discussion in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the Response to Submissions Report as well as 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' and 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendices 2 and 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding cumulative noise and traffic impacts. 			
Name withheld Dawes Point (232614)	A19	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	Refer responses to Submission A1			
Caitlin Brass The Rocks	A20	SupportsStrongly supportive of project	Noted			
Carol Murray, Dawes Point	A21	 Objects Lack of thought has gone into project Insufficient public transport for large crowds. Adequate public transport link needs to be provided between Circular Quay and Wynyard Noise must be kept low and adequate soundproofing provided given proximity to residential areas Strongly against any outdoor performances Need clear plan as to how trucks will access the area. No heavy vehicles should be allowed on Pottinger Street as road cannot accommodate weight of heavy trucks. Trucks should not be permitted to sit on/block Hickson Rd/roundabout but rather should enter the site to load 	 Detailed and extensive design, heritage and environmental (noise, traffic etc) analyses underpin the WBACP project Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding access to the site and public transport Appropriate mitigation measures are proposed to ensure Noise Management Levels are within accepted levels for nearby sensitive residential receivers. No outdoor performances are proposed The principal contractor will be required to develop a detailed Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office, TfNSW, Roads and Maritime, Barangaroo Delivery Authority and the City of Sydney Council prior to construction 			

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISSI	IONS	
		 and unload. Barges should be used wherever possible for construction purposes. Construction hours need to have regard to residential nature of the area 	 commencing. This will address how construction trucks will access the area. The WBACP project is not proposing to use Pottinger Street for construction traffic. Barges will be used for delivery of materials where feasible Standard construction hours are proposed.
Charlotte Barrett The Rocks	A22	SupportsSupportive of project	Noted
Fiona Hulton The Rocks	A23	 Supports Supportive of project. Will be of great benefit to the arts industry and will drive a positive on-flow of economic benefit to the State of NSW 	• Noted
Helena Harris Millers Point	A24	 Objects Considered public display inadequate and requests a public forum with Q&A Questions whether project is worth the cost. Only significant benefit is the creation of Bell Theatre and having rehearsal spaces in the same building as theatre is an extravagance and generally does not occur elsewhere Significant adverse impacts during construction along with loss of valuable existing facilities not worth the outcome Consider splitting construction starting with Pier 2/3 and then followed by Wharf 4/5 so that area of impact is reduced (although acknowledges construction period will be longer) 	 It is considered that adequate consultation has been undertaken on the project to date - refer discussion in Section 2.3.2 of the Response to Submissions Report. The project will result in the transformation of the precinct as an arts and cultural hub. It involves the internal reconfiguration and upgrading of Pier 2/3, Wharf 4/5 and Shore Sheds 4/5 to provide for improved rehearsal spaces, and in some cases performance spaces, for the ACO, ATYP, SDC, Bell Shakespeare, BDT, Sydney Philharmonia Choir, Gondwana Choir and Song Company as well as improved back-of-house and administrative facilities. There will be some construction impacts but these will be managed to minimise disruption to residents and businesses in the area. The splitting of construction period unnecessarily. There are also considerable complexities in managing the decanting of existing arts organisations during the construction period and these complexities would be made

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISSI	ONS	
			considerably more difficult if the construction period was extended.
Ian Calcraft Dawes Point	A25	 Objects Concerned construction noise will affect tenants and that they may relocate during construction. Asks for compensation for rental loss during construction. Post-construction activities may also impact value of his property if traffic and venue controls are inadequate. 	Refer Response to Submission A2
Ian Higgins, Dawes Point	A26	 Objects No need for more commercial spaces in area. Project should not just be money making exercise. Asks for an arts centre as opposed to function venue. Requests low cost space be made available for artist studios, workshops and community arts classes. 	 The primary function of the WBACP is as an arts and cultural precinct. It is considered that there is a reasonable balance between proposed cultural and commercial uses. The proposed new commercial uses will support the precinct and ensure it is an active, vibrant and viable place for people to visit and enjoy. Appropriate mitigation measures are proposed to ensure impacts from those uses are minimised. Each of the venues contains varying sizes of rehearsal and performance spaces which can be shared with the community and arranged with each tenancy.
Jane Hall	A27	 Objects Issues as per Submission No A1 Welcomes development of Arts precinct but considers that insufficient attention has been paid to disruption during construction, and post construction noise, pedestrian and vehicle traffic. 	Refer responses to Submission A1
Jean-Claude Carcaillet	A28	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	Refer responses to Submission A1
Mat Humphry Arcadia (owner commercial space 13/13 in	A29	 Objects Noise and vibration during construction will make his space unleasable Intended use of space and noise will reduce his 	• The Applicant commits to providing upgrades to existing party walls between operating tenancies and areas where there are construction activities taking place. This will be in the form of additional plasterboard linings, sound absorptive

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISSI	IONS	
Pier 2/3)		 property's commercial value. From consultations, had been advised that Pier 2/3 would be sound proofed but not evident in SSDA. Shore Shed 2/3 must be required to be soundproofed as a condition of consent 	 finishes etc within the work area. Whilst this treatment will improve the sound insulation between the work areas and the tenancies, it is not practicable to make the partitions 'soundproof'. Measures regarding management of noise are set out in the Noise and Vibration Management Plan that formed Appendix 19 of the Project EIS. Provision is made for a Responsible Person to be nominated from the contractor to liaise with surrounding tenants and land owners regarding construction noise. Meetings will be held with tenants and landowners prior to works commencing outlining the program of works and how noise will be dealt with during construction. Tenants will be encouraged to provide information regarding any events that are taking place within their tenancies so mitigations can be undertaken. This may include additional respite periods or reprogramming of works to avoid noisy works during sensitive events See also response to A2 re financial impact
Noel Webster Dawes Point	A30	 Objects Area is predominantly residential and low rise Existing arts facilities are low key and co-exist with surrounding residential area WBACP puts this existing harmonious relationship at risk if not executed properly Problem is not generally the proposed upgrading of the arts facilities but rather the commercial and operational extensions Commercial aspects of proposal will significantly change amenity of the area, particularly if the area evolves into an outdoor festival, larger event and entertainment precinct Proposed hours of operation to 1am are not supported 	 Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report regarding hours of operation and event noise. The area is predominantly mixed use, characterised by a range of cultural, commercial and residential uses. The proposed development will provide for the rejuvenation of the two wharves, which are State significant heritage buildings, to create a world class arts and cultural precinct. The EIS has assessed the impact of the project and concluded that, subject to appropriate management and mitigation measures, the development is appropriate having regard to the existing use of the site and surrounds Objection to waterfront square noted. SSDA does not seek

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE				
A. PUBLIC SU	PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS						
		 and hours should be subject to further public review and consultation Noise impact from external events and outdoor spill areas likely to be significant and will impact on residential amenity Any outdoor activities generally will have adverse impacts on surrounding residences NVIA is not adequate and has numerous concerning elements and shortcomings Strongly objects to Waterfront Square being added to the project at a later date Ambiguity and inconsistencies in SSDA and, timeframe of public display and review process for the SSDA inadequate due to its large size Limited capacity in road system to accommodate additional traffic. Project needs to adequately address this issue. Residents and Arts NSW need to develop mutually agreed principles regarding the nature of the precinct and highly prescriptive guidelines on how the precinct should operate Documentation generally inadequate with many inconsistencies and ambiguities Inadequate consultation and public given insufficient time to review documents and prepare submissions Given amount of other construction in the area, consideration should be given to delaying the project 	 approval to the waterfront square. The waterfront square component of the master plan will not be pursued at this time and remains subject to further design consideration. The SSDA has been prepared in accordance with the EP&A Act and complies with all relevant provisions. Matters to be addressed in the EIS have been set out in the environmental assessment requirements issued by the Secretary of the DP&E. Notification and exhibition are matters for the Department of Planning and Environment Refer to discussion in Section 2.2 of the Response to Submissions Report and Appendix 3 regarding traffic impacts Applicant is committed to working closely with the local residential and business community throughout the construction and operation of the WBACP. 				
Peter Canaway Walsh Bay	A31	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	Refer responses to Submission A1				
Tricia & Laurie Brereton, Sydney	A32	 Object Included submission from Walsh Bay Precinct Association as part of their submission 	Refer responses to Submission A1				

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISSI	IONS	
		 Strongly object to commercial component of submission including Pier 2/3 for large commercial events and hours of operation and impact this will have on surrounding residents. Traffic and noise studies are fundamentally flawed. 	
Victoria Pengilly, The Rocks	A33	 Supports Supportive of the project and benefit it will have for local economy 	Noted
Name withheld Carlton (232814)	A34	SupportsSupportive of project	Noted
Name withheld Rozelle (230815)	A35	 Comments More publicly available information needs to be provided on the staging of works and public pedestrian traffic. Wedding venues in area will be affected and lack of information may affect those with bookings during the construction phase from July 2018. Considers the lodgement of the October 2017 SSDA not adequate time for those with current bookings for weddings next year. Construction should be undertaken outside peak wedding season 	 Meetings will be held with tenants and landowners prior to works commencing outlining the program of works and how noise will be dealt with during construction. Tenants will be encouraged to provide information regarding any events that are taking place within their tenancies so mitigations can be undertaken. This may include additional respite periods or reprogramming of works to avoid noisy works during sensitive events. Access to existing premises will be maintained throughout construction. The contact details of the Responsible Person from the contractor will be provided to surrounding tenants and landowners in order to address any concerns promptly during construction.
Name withheld Sydney (232471)	A36	 Generally supportive of proposal However, important that the following issues are not neglected: Pedestrian access to the waterside Traffic management for deliveries and local residents Amenity for pedestrians Adequate public transport for visitors 	 Pedestrian access and amenity, local traffic management and public transport needs have been addressed in detail in the EIS and Traffic Impact Assessment Applicant is committed to working closely with the local residential and business community throughout the construction and operation of the WBACP.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISSI	IONS	
		Need to ensure adequate consultation with local residents during construction period so that they can feel optimistic about the completed project	
Name withheld Coogee (232846)	A37	 Supports Supportive of project Will be of great benefit to the arts industry and will help ensure a vibrant and prolific arts industry 	Noted
Name withheld Walsh Bay (232840)	A38	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	Refer responses to Submission A1
Name withheld Millers Point (232838)	A39	 Objects Issues as per Submission No A1 Additional issues: Concerned that the relationship between DA and previous 2013 master plan is not clear and not shown in the EIS Not clear from the DA whether the waterfront square, sliding bridge and floating walkways shown in the 2013 master plan are in or out of the project Documentation is inadequate, confusing and inconsistent and difficult to source Pre-lodgement engagement not satisfactory and questions the statement in DA that further meetings were not required. No explanation on how the new SSDA differs from the previous Queries why proposed hours/operating conditions of commercial spaces different from others in the precinct for which City of Sydney is the consent authority 	 Refer responses to Submission A1 Relationship between previous master plan and current SSDA discussed in section 1.1 of EIS SSDA does not seek approval to the waterfront square component of the master plan will not be pursued at this time and remains subject to further design consideration. The SSDA has been prepared in accordance with the EP&A Act and complies with all relevant provisions. Matters to be addressed in the EIS have been set out in the environmental assessment requirements issued by the Secretary of the DP&E. It is considered that adequate consultation has been undertaken to date. The Applicant is committed to ongoing engagement with local residents, businesses and other stakeholders as the project progresses. Explanation of how new SSDA differs from previous is provided in section 1.1 of Project EIS. City of Sydney is not the consent authority in this instance. The application has had regard to trading conditions of surrounding commercial premises in determining appropriate parameters for new commercial uses.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SU	BMISS	IONS	
Martin Simich Walsh Bay	A40	 Objects Issues as per Submission No A1 Additional points: Concerned about impact of development (noise and general disruption both during and after construction) on long term tenant. Likely that tenant will seek to terminate lease as a result of the project Direct experience in managing the precinct for events and therefore has particular insight into issues and likely impacts Shore Shed 2/3 must be required to be soundproofed as a condition of consent 	 Refer responses to Submission A1 The Applicant commits to providing upgrades to existing party walls between operating tenancies and areas where there are construction activities taking place. This will be in the form of additional plasterboard linings, sound absorptive finishes etc within the work area. Whilst this treatment will improve the sound insulation between the work areas and the tenancies, it is not practicable to make the partitions 'soundproof'. Measures regarding management of noise are set out in the Noise and Vibration Management Plan that formed Appendix 19 of the Project EIS. Provision is made for a Responsible Person to be nominated from the contractor to liaise with surrounding tenants and land owners regarding construction noise. Meetings will be held with tenants and landowners prior to works commencing outlining the program of works and how noise will be dealt with during construction. Tenants will be encouraged to provide information regarding any events that are taking place within their tenancies so mitigations can be undertaken. This may include additional respite periods or reprogramming of works to avoid noisy works during sensitive events See also response to A2 re financial impact
Lionel Goldberg Potts Point	A41	Objects Issues as per Submission No A1	Refer responses to Submission A1
Name withheld Dawes Point (232692)	A42	 Objects As a local resident, concerned about increased traffic congestion and noise pollution. Hickson Road is the main access road and is only one lane in each direction. Already significant cumulative construction impacts 	• Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding cumulative noise and traffic impacts and operation of Hickson Road.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
A. PUBLIC SUE	BMISSI	ONS	
		 from Barangaroo commercial and residential, Barangaroo Metro Alternative access routes along George St and surrounding roads in Northern CBD are also compromised by construction of light rail and associated traffic congestion 	

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	FROM 1	FENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVERI	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
Walsh Bay Precinct Association	B1a	 Traffic The TIA relies on traffic surveys carried out in August 2016. These surveys are outdated and do not reflect current conditions at Walsh Bay which have been impacted by major construction of projects including Barangaroo and Light Rail. 	 The August 2016 surveys are considered sufficiently recent and relevant for this assessment. The level of construction activities that occurred during the survey period are appropriate for providing a suitable base traffic level. Construction traffic volumes for surrounding developments are likely to vary significantly at various stages between 2016 and the completion of the proposed WBACP development. Therefore, it is difficult to select a "typical" traffic volume period.
	B1b	 TIA relies on high level of public transport use with only 8% visitors travelling by private vehicle and 4% by taxi. JTW data cited states 33% mode share by private vehicles 	JTW data is not reflective of the primary trips expected to be generated by the WBACP. JTW data represents how people who work in the area travel to the travel zone. The primary trips generated by the site are associated with people attending shows, exhibitions and events within the precinct.

SUBMISSION N FROM	0	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS F	ROM T	ENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 Barangaroo mode share is for 5% private vehicle, which is a target and based on employee travel in an area well serviced by public transport. A more accurate way to address mode split would be to base it on current mode split of patrons Assumption of 12% mode split by private vehicle and taxi is unrealistic given nearest train station and ferry terminal is 1.5km away 	Given the site is within a CBD location, it is reasonably expected that people would plan their journeys and travel by other modes of transport to private vehicle and would be willing to have a walking component to their journey using existing public transport services in the interim to the opening of the Metro. Additionally, the proposal does not include additional parking, which is consistent with the current operation of the site and generally accepted for CBD locations. As the demand for parking within the WBACP continually exceeds supply people will be required to use alternative modes of travel, justifying the lower private vehicle mode split. This mode share would be further supported by providing travel advice at the ticketing phase in accordance with the Green Travel Plan submitted as part of the application. Any existing paid parking incentives connected with ticketing for events would not be carried forward as part of the proposed development. The growth of ride share/ point to point travel (including Uber) is exponential. In April 2017, NewsCorp reported that 14 per cent of Sydney's residents had booked a ride share service in the preceding three months (source: https://www.perthnow.com.au/news/wa/uber-is-more- popular-than-taxis-in-perth-ng- 7d5d815579919da2b1eeec264b437ef0, accessed 9 January 2018). Across Australia, 3.8 million Uber trips were recorded in one month (early 2017), which equated to more than double the number of Uber trips recorded (1.5 million) in the corresponding period in the previous year (early 2016). Based on the trend of changing travel behaviour in the Sydney metropolitan area, this substantial growth is expected to continue in the future, reducing the reliance on private vehicles. This increasing trend in point to point travel

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	IS FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
			is likely to translate to the way patrons travel to the WBACP.
	B1c	 Train and ferry will only be an option for patrons with good mobility and comfortable shoes Ferry and train travel will not be an attractive option for travel from the venue late at night The bus services within the precinct will only be attractive to people coming from the direction of the two bus routes 	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding public transport
	B1d	 TIA states 41% of residents travel to and from Walsh Bay Residents will be negatively affected by increased congestion on Hickson Road Residents already experiencing long wait times at busy intersections and entering and leaving car parks at peak times associated with beginning and end of events Level of congestion likely to be worse with increased capacity of venues 	 Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding the operation of Hickson Road and surrounding road network
	B1e	 The Peak and Cumulative scenarios will cause high traffic generation Authors seek to minimise the significance of the cumulative scenario by saying it is unlikely to ever occur It would be wasteful to build and operate performance spaces in this location without expecting them to be fully utilised. The Peak and Cumulative scenarios will cause high traffic generation 	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding cumulative traffic impacts
	B1f	The event scenario is for Sydney Writer's Festival and Biennale only	 All scenarios include the use of the function space in Pier 2/3. The Applicant has clarified that the event scenario is

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 Application seeks approval for use of event space in Pier 2/3 for a wide range of commercial and artistic events with hours of operation 6am to 1am 7 days per week No warrant for the assessment to consider that future events will have the same operating hours as Sydney Writer's Festival and Biennale. Led to significant underestimation of potential cumulative impacts. 	 limited to the Sydney Writer's Festival and Biennale events only. These events may utilise the entire precinct and operate in the same format as they currently do. Where the entire precinct was being used by these events, no other events within the tenancies would occur (i.e. the function space in Pier 2/3 would be used entirely for either event and not for a separate private event). The cumulative impacts of the event scenario are considered to have been adequately covered in the assessment.
	B1g	 Authors state there will not be substantial impact in everyday and peak scenario while admitting there will be a 40% increase in traffic generation in the cumulative scenario. This is likely to be underestimated due to flawed assumptions about mode split If 33% of patrons travel to venues by car and taxi the impact would more than double 	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding transport modes and cumulative traffic impacts
	B1h	 In the cumulative scenario TIA attempts to deal with impact by saying that an event-specific transport management plan will be prepared This is unlikely to change the reality for residents of very high level of congestion for residents and unacceptably long delays in getting in leaving and returning home at night This is likely to have impacts to on-street parking restrictions 	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding traffic impacts and transport management
	B1i	 TIA relies on new transport infrastructure to improve access to the Precinct There seems to be implicit knowledge that the area is currently inadequately serviced by public transport New services will not become available until after 	 Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding interim access arrangements prior to construction of Metro station at Barangaroo A walking distance of 800 metres to a rail station is

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 completion of the development- Sydney Metro will not become operational until 2024 Light rail will be 1.7km away and Sydney Metro station at Barangaroo will be 800m away Bus services leaving every 15-30 minutes in the evening is not sufficient for patrons arriving and leaving the site simultaneously Lack of public transport is likely to lead to high share of trips by car and taxi. 	 generally accepted as a reasonable catchment for public transport accessibility. Once constructed, the Metro station will provide a suitable public transport service to support the proposed development at WBACP Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions regarding public transport services
	B1j	 Construction Noise Construction noise exceedance of 11dB could have a major impact on commercial operators within the precinct. Only soft management measures are proposed The proponent should be required by enforceable conditions of consent to abide by project-specific construction noise targets. Where impacts in excess of Noise Management Levels are predicted, affected receivers should be compensated 	 Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report.
	B1k	 NVIA omitted to model unshielded noise from on water construction, in particular the proposal to use the vessel exclusion zone as a construction compound. There is no assessment of the visual impact of vessel exclusion zone and its impact upon patrons of the commercial uses in the Shore Sheds. 	 The vessel exclusion zone is not a construction compound. The Applicant has sought approval for the use of the water for materials deliveries. No construction will take place from the water. Any visual impacts would be limited to delivery by barge during the standard construction hours and would be temporary in nature. Noise from water-borne deliveries is not expected to exceed the ICNG Noise Management Level. However, <u>all noise</u> from construction activities will be closely monitored in accordance with the recommendations given in the NVIA.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	IS FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
	B1I	 Operational Noise Difficult to understand how the conclusion that the venue will operate in compliance with project specific noise goals at all sensitive receivers. NVIA assumes patrons will not be affected by alcohol and music will only be played at very low levels Assumptions are not realistic Other hospitality venues in Walsh Bay are subject to conditions that prevent the use of outdoor space late at night. 	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report.
	B1m	 Modelling of event noise based solely on Sydney Writer's Festival and Biennale is unlikely to reflect potential impact of other events The proponent has not said that it will not hold a concert or large festival 	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report.
	B1n	 It is unsafe to rely on soft management measures such as management plans and guidelines to ensure compliance with operational noise criteria. It will be impossible to enforce such measures Proposal should be subject to the requirement for noise logging and maximum noise limits. 	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	B10	 If vehicle traffic has been underestimated the road noise assessment is flawed and will have to be redone It should avoid averaging noise over lengthy periods as it will provide a misleading assessment of impact Traffic noise from entertainment venues should be assessed as operational noise even if generated on a public road or by relevance to criteria which asses the noise impact of traffic congestion when a major event or several venues disgorge patrons at the same time 1-15 minute criteria should have been adopted to reflect the peak noise period and the incidental noise 	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	IS FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
	В1р	 of car doors slamming, honking, loud shouts and hailing taxis should have been included in noise assessment measurements of noise from similar entertainment conurbations should have been considered for sound power levels, intermittency and so on. Congested traffic and free flowing traffic have different noise impacts and this should have been assessed Query whether late night noise has been correctly 	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at
		 Galery whether late hight holde has been correctly modelled as it was considered to be largely vocal noise With vehicle pick-ups the noise will be dominated by car braking and acceleration, slamming of car doors, hailing taxis and vehicle congestion It is the general hubbub interspersed with annoying noise that should have been assessed, not for sleep disturbance but for annoyance Hickson Road was classified as freeway arterial/subarterial for free flowing traffic and this does not account for stop-start traffic likely when events finish The most annoying evening to night noises have not been assessed 	Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	B1q	 People Management No adequate planning for the increased number of patrons No plans or conditions in place to manage the potentially thousands of people leaving the venues at once It is unsatisfactory to attempt to manage these impacts by conditions on individual venues, the 	 WBACP will contain nine tenants with largely varying operating models as well as the function space in Pier 2/3. It is unrealistic to conclude that the venues will operate at full capacity all of the time. A number of the companies tour throughout the year and additionally a number of the companies do not have audience-based performances. There is no expectation that thousands of people will be

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	5 FROM 1	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		greatest challenge will be managing the cumulative impact.	 leaving the precinct at any one time as this relies on the each performance-based tenancy as well as the function centre concluding functions at exactly the same time. Furthermore this negates that some patrons may choose to stay within the precinct for food and beverage options following a performance. Additionally it is not realistic to expect the entire population of the Pier 2/3 function space to leave at once, as these visitors are likely to leave over a period of time. Additionally, the Applicant notes that the maximum capacity of the Pier 2/3 Function Space has been reduced from 1,300 to 1,000 patrons which will reduce the overall number of people leaving the venue at any one time.
Dynamic Property Services on behalf of Strata Plans 66821, 70152, Bond 5/7 BMC	B2	 Concern regarding number of trucks to access Wharf 4/5 via Pottinger Street and the bridge to Wharf 4/5 Requests dilapidation report in order to protect properties located below Pottinger Street 	This application does not seek approval for the use of the Pottinger Street bridge during either construction or operation
Dynamic Property Services on behalf of Strata Plan 73989 – 13 Hickson Rd	В3	 Written undertaking required that Shore 2/3 will be sound proofed prior to the construction commencing. That the conditions of the DA will include the Rules of Engagement for the contractor and sub-contractors working on the redevelopment. That the conditions of the DA include, but not be limited to, that the contractor(s) need to work with the Stakeholders for "no-noise" dates and times. 	 The Applicant commits to providing upgrades to existing party walls between operating tenancies and areas where there are construction activities taking place. This will be in the form of additional plasterboard linings, sound absorptive finishes etc within the work area. Whilst this treatment will improve the sound insulation between the work areas and the tenancies, it is not practicable to make the partitions 'soundproof'. Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report regarding construction noise.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
Australian Theatre for Young People	B4	 The redevelopment of the WBACP incorporating ATYP's proposed new facility, represents a once in a generation opportunity to create world class performance facility just for young people For the first time, young Australians have the chance to enjoy a world class theatre and rehearsal spaces in which to learn and perform every day. ATYP strongly support the application 	Noted
Archer Capital	B5	 Heritage nature of structure means they are inadequately protected from noise intrusion Concerned the NVIA overstates the attenuation achieved by the existing building envelope 	 The Applicant commits to providing upgrades to existing party walls between operating tenancies and areas where there are construction activities taking place. This will be in the form of additional plasterboard linings, sound absorptive finishes etc within the work area. Whilst this treatment will improve the sound insulation between the work areas and the tenancies, it is not practicable to make the partitions 'soundproof'. The Applicant commits to make it mandatory that the Contractor prepare a full Noise and Vibration Management Plan prior to starting to work on site and to require that they (and their Sub-contractors) undertake the liaison and noise monitoring procedures outlined in the NVIA.
Australian Chamber Orchestra	B6	 ACO strongly support the application ACO is particularly supportive of the proposed refurbishment and expansion of facilities within the existing structure of Pier 2/3. New home will enable the ACO to stage public performances and accommodate a public access program which will bring first class musical and educational experiences to people of all ages The new performance space will offer excellent acoustics and other facilities. As well as providing for 	Noted

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	IS FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
View by Sydney	B7	a greatly improved rehearsal and performance experience, the ACO's new home will also welcome a broad range of other arts and creative artists and organisations who will be encouraged to hire our spaces when they are not in use by the Orchestra.	The Applicant has mot with representatives of View by
View by Sydney	Β7	 Interruption to business caused by noise and blocking of sight lines for functions and events held within View by Sydney. Request to be kept informed of management of site works, hoardings and the cleanliness of the site environs. If a management committee is being formed, would appreciate being part of it to gain information about the management of site works. 	 The Applicant has met with representatives of View by Sydney at the information session held on 15 November 2017. A commitment has been made to undertake a demonstration of the site hoardings prior to works commencing on site and to liaising with View by Sydney regarding the design of the hoarding on the eastern apron of Pier 2. The regime regarding construction noise is set out in the NVIA that formed Appendix 19 of the Project EIS. Provision is made for a Responsible Person to be nominated from the contractor to liaise with surrounding tenants and land owners regarding construction noise. Meetings will be held with tenants and landowners prior to works commencing outlining the program of works and how noise will be dealt with during construction. Tenants will be encouraged to provide information regarding any events that are taking place within their tenancies so mitigations can be undertaken. This may include additional respite periods or reprogramming of works to avoid noisy works during sensitive events. It is noted that piling works are currently being undertaken within the precinct and similar noise management measures are being undertaken, and this has been received well by existing tenants and landowners. No management committee will be established by the
			has been received well by existing tenants and

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	IS FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVERI	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
			details of the Responsible Person from the contractor will be provided to surrounding tenants and landowners.
Sydney Philharmonia Choirs	B8	 Supportive of project The proposed upgrades to Pier 2/3, Wharf 4/5 and the shore sheds are long overdue. The last meaningful renovations were carried out in the 1990's and the facilities are now in dire need of upgrading to allow a safer, more accessible and creative workspace for the tenants and visitors to the site. As a destination there is poor wayfinding, inadequate signage and no recreational space. The proposed upgrades will alleviate the confusion and uncertainty that visitors to the precinct experience. Proposal will deliver purpose built rehearsal space for the Choirs as well as new offices and facilities on site. The proposal will put Walsh Bay on the map as a performing arts hub. The facilities will keeps the standard of performance in both Sydney and Australia at the highest level. 	Noted
Adrivadi Pty Ltd	B9	Issues as per Submission No A1	 This form letter submission was received from various businesses as well as members of the community Refer to Submission A1 for response
Sydney Theatre Company	B10	 Supportive of project Creation of fit for purpose work spaces for arts companies resident in Walsh Bay will ensure these companies can continue to provide best work and experiences for their customers and provide opportunities for artists to perform and develop their work Proposal will ensure that Walsh Bay becomes even more of a hub for creative activity and a better work 	Noted

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 space and visitor experience. Will create a world class destination that will enhance Sydney's reputation as a world class city. 	
King & Wood Mallesons on behalf of Pier One	B11	 Submission on behalf of Pier One Developments Pty Ltd Pier One concerned about traffic and parking impacts associated with the development Requests extension of time to prepare submission 	Refer item B15 below
Tudor Capital	B12	 Soundproofing of the offices prior to construction at the cost of the applicant must be included in the DA and regular noise monitoring at the impacted offices is a pre-requisite. We also need to be able to negotiate any proposed significant noise periods to minimise disruption. The DA didn't see to address how the redundant materials will be removed from the site - by road, by water? Heavy traffic on the wharfs may create vibration within our office. Consultation and prior notification with us as tenants (and all the other tenants here) - Rules of Engagement - needs to be mandatory within the DA at every stage both pre and during construction. 	 The Applicant commits to providing upgrades to existing party walls between operating tenancies and areas where there are construction activities taking place. This will be in the form of additional plasterboard linings, sound absorptive finishes etc within the work area. Whilst this treatment will improve the sound insulation between the work areas and the tenancies, it is not practicable to make the partitions 'soundproof'. The updated Construction, Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan included at Appendix 4 to this Response to Submissions Report details the transport means by which material will be removed and assesses the associated impacts. Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
Walsh Bay Property Trust	B13	Issues as per Submission No A1	 This form letter submission was received from various businesses as well as members of the community Refer to Submission A1 for response
Fashion Gully	B14	 Requirement for privacy and limited noise for business operation Concerned about access and noise 	 Refer response to B13 Access to existing premises will be maintained throughout construction. The contact details of the

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 Screw piling will produce noise and there is no decibel lowering Report states that percussion will have to be used once rock is hit Truck movement report does not address volume 	 Responsible Person from the contractor will be provided to surrounding tenants and landowners in order to address any concerns during construction promptly. No screw piling is proposed as part of the project. The construction assessment has been updated based on the most recent available information for the construction traffic volumes generated by surrounding developments (based on traffic volumes provided in the Arup report dated 18 October 2017). Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions.
TMG Developments (Pier One, Sydney Harbour, Autograph Collection Hotel)	B15a	The parking occupancy survey, conducted by Matrix Traffic and referenced as justification for the conclusions made within the GTA reports, is not accompanied by any extensive investigation into the impacting environmental factors affecting parking demand and occupancy within the Walsh Bay area.	• The survey scope used to support the GTA reports was intended to assess a typical (everyday) demand for the precinct. The extent of the investigation of parking demand and occupancy is considered appropriate for the parking assessment carried out.
	B15b	 Insufficient investigation and analysis has been provided into the impact of The Sydney Theatre Company's Wharf 4/5 operations, Sydney Dance Company's Wharf 4/5 operations and the Roslyn Packer Theatre on local parking availability. No analysis has been completed of the event's, functions and classes conducted at the venues on the on Saturday 27th August 2016 and Wednesday 31st August 2016. No comparison has been conducted of the occupancy and patronage levels of the venues across an extended period of time in order to identify typical patronage levels for the site, with the intention of comparison to the patronage 	 The parking assessment considered Sydney Theatre Company's (STC) events and classes during a typical period. The survey days were scheduled to capture shows at STC and classes in Wharf 4/5. On 27 and 31 August, the events within the precinct attracted the following numbers: Sydney Theatre Company: 1,092 people Roslyn Packer Theatre: 2,369 people The remaining tenancies, including the Sydney Dance Company have confirmed that the classes held on these days reflect the patronage of standard days of operation.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 levels on days the parking occupancy surveys were conducted. No confidence can be had that the parking analysis was adequately conducted in a manner that would reflect, the average patronage effects of the venues on parking demand along Hickson Road. Data including the justification of identified average patronage levels at the venues have not been provided within the impact assessment No analysis has been conducted of large events, functions and shows at these venues, and what impact these high levels of patronage have on the parking occupancy levels in Walsh Bay. 	The survey scope was not intended to assess large events. During the study period the occurrence of large events and periods of the precinct being at full capacity was rare (if it occurred at all). High levels of patronage associated with existing large events (such as Sydney Writers' Festival and Biennale) are existing events and would not be further increased under the proposal. Therefore, it is not required to assess the parking arrangements and such events would operate under event-specific Traffic Management Plans as stated in GTA's TIA. Given the site is within a CBD location, it is reasonably expected that people would plan their journeys and travel by other modes of transport to private vehicle and would be willing to have a walking component to their journey using existing public transport services in the interim to the opening of the Metro. Additionally, the proposal does not include additional parking, which is consistent with the current operation of the site and generally accepted for CBD locations. As the demand for parking within the WBACP continually exceeds supply people will be required to use alternative modes of travel. Travel advice will be provided at the ticketing phase in accordance with the Green Travel Plan submitted as part of the application. Any existing paid parking incentives connected with ticketing for events would not be carried forward as part of the proposed development. The growth of ride share/ point to point travel (including Uber) is exponential. In April 2017, NewsCorp reported that 14 per cent of Sydney's residents had booked a ride share service in the preceding three months (source: https://www.perthnow.com.au/news/wa/uber-is-more- popular-than-taxis-in-perth-ng-

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	FROM T	ENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
			7d5d815579919da2b1eeec264b437ef0, accessed 9 January 2018). Across Australia, 3.8 million Uber trips were recorded in one month (early 2017), which equated to more than double the number of Uber trips recorded (1.5 million) in the corresponding period in the previous year (early 2016). Based on the trend of changing travel behaviour in the Sydney metropolitan area, this substantial growth is expected to continue in the future, reducing the reliance on private vehicles and the need for more parking. This increasing trend in point to point travel is likely to translate to the way patrons travel to the WBACP.
	B15c	 Insufficient investigation and analysis has been provided into the impact of the Pier One, Sydney Harbour, Autograph Collection Hotel on local parking availability. No analysis has been completed of the event's, functions and classes conducted at Pier One on the on Saturday 27th August 2016 and Wednesday 31st August 2016. No analysis has been completed of the hotel occupancy rates at Pier One on the on Saturday 27th August 2016 and Wednesday 31st August 2016 and the hotel occupancy rates at Pier One on the on Saturday 27th August 2016 and Wednesday 31st August 	It is understood that Pier One is seeking more dedicated off- street parking in the area and the submission to this SSDA is reflective of this intention. Although events at Pier One may not have been captured in the survey period, the primary use of Pier One is for the hotel, which generally results in long term parking requirements. Parking along Hickson Road is timed and longer-term parking demand generated by the hotel is not intended to use on-street public parking.
		 2016. No comparison has been conducted to the occupancy and patronage levels at Pier One across an extended period of time in order to identify typical patronage levels for the site's 	The survey periods are selected to capture the peaks for the existing use of the WBACP to assess the proposed development and are not required to consider the peak periods and uses for Pier One.
		 events, with the intention of comparison to the patronage levels and hotel occupancy on days the parking occupancy surveys were conducted. No confidence can be had that the parking analysis was adequately conducted in a manner that would reflect, the average patronage and 	As per response for item 2, the survey periods were selected to provide an assessment of a typical day and large events at Pier One were not considered. It is rare that large events would occur concurrently for all venues within the Walsh Bay Precinct (including Pier One). Should events occur concurrently, due to the CBD location and the modes of

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	MENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 occupancy effects of Pier One on parking demand along Hickson Road. Data including the justification of average patronage levels and occupancy at the Pier One have not been provided within the impact assessment. No analysis has been conducted of large events and functions at Pier One, and what impact these high levels of patronage has on the parking occupancy in Walsh Bay. 	travel available to the site it would be expected that people would travel by public transport and point-to-point options. It is to be noted that the proposed WBACP development does not only include the development of performance spaces. Therefore, the varying uses would have different peak times for access to and from the site, which will spread the traffic generated by the site. For this reason, the cumulative scenario represents a very worst-case, with the total number of people accessing the site in this scenario assumed to be arriving/ leaving within a condensed period, which is highly unlikely. Pier One was considered in the cumulative scenario assessment. However, this scenario is considered highly unlikely to occur.
	B15d	 Insufficient justification has been provided for the selection of the days on which the parking occupancy surveys were conducted. Traffic data collected from the automatic tube counts along Hickson Road are incomplete. The tubes were installed to determine the analysis traffic for a full week commencing the 22nd August 2016 but do not provide a complete data set for comparison. No data is provided for Thursday 1st of September 2016 and Friday 2nd September 2016. Due to the lack of data presented it is inappropriate to draw conclusions on when the local traffic peaks occurred during the week of observation. Due to the nature of the precinct, it can be expected that Thursdays and Fridays will typically 	The traffic survey periods were selected to provide a typical week. As per item B15b, parking survey dates were selected to coincide with shows at Roslyn Packer Theatre and STC.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
	B15e	 be the busier weekdays, and hence without supporting data no peak weekday analysis can appropriately be conducted and accurate conclusions cannot be drawn. The general scope of the parking surveys that were conducted and provided within the report are insufficient to identify any trends or demand peaks, and hence no weight should be given, due to the incompleteness of the data provided. Occupancy data from Pier One indicate lower than average occupancy rates during the days the parking assessment was conducted in 2016. Analysis of the occupancy levels at the Pier One Hotel shows that on Saturday 27th August 2016, indicate a total hotel occupancy rate of 67.2%, as provide by Pier One, which is considerably less than average occupancy levels for that time of year. Pier One has revealed that renovations were occurring at the hotel on the 27th August 2016, which lead to the reduction in occupancy rates on that day. Analysis of the occupancy levels at the Pier One Hotel shows that on Wednesday 31st August 2016, indicate a total hotel occupancy rate of 66.1%, as provide by Pier One, which is considerably less than average occupancy levels for that time of year. Pier One has identified that renovations were occurring at the hotel on the 31st August 2016, which lead to the reduction in occupancy rates on that day. 	Parking for Pier One during events would not be compromised compared with major events that are already held within the Walsh Bay Precinct (for example Biennale and Sydney Writers' Festival). Refer to response for item B15b. As per item B15c, although peak occupancy of Pier One may not have been captured in the survey period, the primary use of Pier One is for the hotel, which generally results in long term parking requirements. Parking along Hickson Road is timed and longer-term parking demand generated by the hotel is not intended to use on-street public parking.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	5 FROM	FENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVERI	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 Pier One's 2017 average occupancy levels are approximately 87%, with average occupancy levels for August 2017 of 88.4%. This is significantly greater than occupancy rates on the days the parking counts were conducted. The parking analysis conducted does not consider the average impact on parking demand generated by Pier One, let alone the worst case impact. 	
	B15f	 The InterPark operated Bond Store 1 Commercial Car Park, located at 26 Hickson Road, Walsh Bay, and adjacent to the Roslyn Packer Theatre was not adequately analysed within the assessment of parking conditions surrounding the proposed development. Parking occupancy surveys of this commercial car park were not conducted simultaneously with the parking surveys along Hickson Road. No assurance can be given that the parking occupancy levels at the Bond Store 1 car park are comparable to what would have been observed on the same day as the Hickson Road Surveys. The lack of simultaneous surveys of the Bond Store 1 Carpark in conjunction with the parking occupancy levels along Hickson Road and the other surrounding commercial car parks within Walsh Bay render the individual surveys inconclusive of the existing local parking demand. The parking occupancy analysis of this commercial carpark for a single half-hour period on Saturday 22nd October 2016 between 8:00 pm and 8:30 pm, is completely inadequate and inconclusive. It is inappropriate that conclusions on carpark 	During the period between 8pm and 8:30pm it is expected that people attending shows, events and other functions/ activities within the precinct represents a reasonable peak for parking that is relevant to this SSDA. All car parks assessed are considered to be within reasonable walking distance to the venues within the precinct. The measured walking distance between the Pier 2/3 entry and Bond Store 1 car park is about 370 metres (equating to about a five-minute walk). Given the site is within a CBD location, it is reasonably expected that people would plan their journeys and would be willing to have a walking component to their journey. People do not generally drive into the CBD expecting to easily find a parking space right next to their destination. Additionally, the proposal does not include additional parking, which is consistent with the current operation of the site and generally accepted for CBD locations.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	5 FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 occupancy demand can be derived from a single observation. No weight can be given to the results of this 'spot check' as they can in no way adequately represent the realistic parking demand within the Bond Store 1 car park. The occupancy levels observed at the Bond Store 1 car park of 94% at 8 pm on Saturday 22nd of October 2016, represent a high level of occupation, with minimal spare capacity within the commercial car park. The report notes within Section 2.3.3 that "This demand was generated by the adjacent Roslyn Packer Theatre where an event was being held at the time of the survey". While this event is acknowledged within the report, due to the lack of cumulative data over an extended period of time of the Bond Store 1 car parks occupancy, the impact of the individual event on car parking occupancy rates cannot be properly ascertained. Due to the survey times being identified as between 8:00 pm and 8:30 pm there is insufficient information to conclude that occupancy was not higher within the Bond Store 1 car park 3:0 pm on Saturday the 22nd of October 2016. While it is acknowledged that Saturday evening events are a regular occurrence at the Roslyn Packer Theatre there is no comparison or identification of the event or events held on Saturday the 22nd October 2016 and if their attendance levels for the resurt or wears held on Saturday the 22nd October 2016 and if their 	
		attendance levels for that event(s) were lower, average or greater than what is typically observed	

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 on a Saturday. There is no quantitative analysis of the impact of other major events within the Walsh Bay area on the parking occupancy levels with the Bond Store 1 commercial car park. Misleading and inaccurate information is presented identifying that the Bond Store 1 car park as within 200 metres of the proposed Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct. A direct straight line analysis to the southern edge of the proposed precinct places the car park marginally under 200 metres from the car park. Measurement of typical pedestrian travel routes to the southern edge of the precinct identifies the distance as over 200 metres and in some cases closer to 250 metres. Notwithstanding this the vast majority of the precinct is of a significantly greater distance than 200 metres from the car park, amplifying that this information is not only inaccurate but also misleading. 	
	B15g	 The Wilson Parking Australia operated Barangaroo Point Commercial Car Park, along Hickson Road, Walsh Bay, was not adequately analysed within the assessment of parking conditions surrounding the proposed development. Parking occupancy surveys of this commercial car park were not conducted simultaneously with the parking surveys along Hickson Road. No assurance can be given that the parking occupancy levels at the Barangaroo Point car park are comparable to what would have been observed on the same day as the Hickson Road 	Refer to response for items B15b and B15f. All car parks assessed are considered to be within reasonable walking distance to the venues within the precinct. The measured walking distance between the Pier 2/3 entry and Barangaroo Point car park is about 460 metres (equating to about a 6.5-minute walk). Given the site is within a CBD location, it is reasonably expected that people would plan their journeys and would be willing to have a walking component to their journey. People do not generally drive into the CBD expecting to easily find a parking space right next to their destination.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS FROM TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS			
		 surveys. The lack of simultaneous surveys of the Barangaroo Point Carpark in conjunction with the parking occupancy levels along Hickson Road and the other surrounding commercial car parks within Walsh Bay render the individual surveys inconclusive of the existing local parking demand. The parking occupancy analysis of this commercial carpark for a single half-hour period on Saturday 22nd of October 2016 between 8:00 pm and 8:30 pm, is completely inadequate and inconclusive. It is inappropriate that conclusions on carpark occupancy and demand can be derived from a single observation. No weight can be given to the results of this 'spot check' as they can in no way adequately represent the realistic parking demand within the Barangaroo Point car park. The occupancy levels observed at the Barangaroo Point car park of 20% at 8 pm on Saturday the 22nd October 2016 are not supported by quantitative evidence to indicate this is a typical occupancy level for this commercial car park. Due to the lack of cumulative data over an extended period of time of the Barangaroo Point car park occupancy levels, accurate car parking occupancy rates cannot be properly ascertained. Due to the survey times being identified as between 8:00 pm and 8:30 pm there is insufficient information to conclude that occupancy was not higher within the Barangaroo 	The walking distance is based on the proposed entry points for the venues and does not consider the far extents of Pier 2/3, which will not have a major pedestrian access.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	S FROM 1	FENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 Saturday the 22nd October 2016. There is no quantitative analysis of the impact of major events within the Walsh Bay Precinct on the parking occupancy levels within the Barangaroo Point commercial car park. Misleading and inaccurate information is presented identifying that the Barangaroo Point Car park is within 200 metres of the proposed Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct. The analysis shows that in fact, this commercial car park is approximately 300 metres walking distance from the edge of the precinct and approximately 650 metres walking distance from the far extents of the Pier 2/3. 	
	B15h	 The Wilson Parking Australia operated Barangaroo Reserve Commercial Car Park, at the end of Towns Place, Walsh Bay, was not adequately analysed within the assessment of parking conditions surrounding the proposed development. Parking occupancy surveys of this commercial car park were not conducted simultaneously with the parking surveys along Hickson Road. No assurance can be given that the parking occupancy levels at the Barangaroo Reserve car park are comparable to what would have been observed on the same day as the Hickson Road Surveys. The lack of simultaneous surveys of the Barangaroo Reserve Carpark in conjunction with the parking occupancy levels along Hickson Road and the other surrounding commercial car parks within Walsh Bay render the individual surveys 	The Barangaroo Reserve commercial car park is less likely to be used for the everyday scenario, with the parking areas closer to the venues used more frequently. The period of 8pm to 8:30pm is considered a reasonable peak for the precinct and its events that are the subject of this SSDA. Major events such as Biennale and Sydney Writers' Festival are existing events and would not experience increased parking demand.

SUBMISSION NO FROM	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS FROM	I TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
	 inconclusive of the existing local parking demand. The parking occupancy analysis of the Barangaroo Reserve commercial car park for a single half-hour period on Saturday 22nd of October 2016 between 8:00 pm and 8:30 pm, is completely inadequate and inconclusive. It is inappropriate that conclusions on carpark occupancy and demand can be derived from a single observation. No weight can be given to the results of this 'spot check' as they can in no way adequately represent the realistic parking demand for the Barangaroo Reserve car park. The occupancy levels observed at the Barangaroo Reserve car park of 14% at 8 pm on Saturday the 22nd of October 2016 are not supported by quantitative evidence to indicate this is a typical occupancy level for this commercial car park. Due to the lack of cumulative data over an extended period of time of the Barangaroo Reserve car park occupancy levels, accurate car parking occupancy rates cannot be properly ascertained. Due to the survey times being identified as between 8:00 pm and 8:30 pm there is insufficient information to conclude that occupancy the 22nd October 2016. There is no quantitative analysis of the impact of major events within the Walsh Bay Precinct on the parking occupancy levels with the Barangaroo 	

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVERI	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
	B15i	The observation that 'overall demand for parking in the surrounding area is low relative to supply' is an unsupported and an unjustified conclusion of the local parking supply across all three commercial car parks and on-street parking along Hickson Road.	The surveys carried out indicate there is currently spare capacity within the car parking provisions. As demonstrated above, these surveys were carried out during times that shows were on and classes were being held as per standard operation of the precinct.
	B15j	 Population and patronage scenarios identified within Section 3.2 of the GTA Traffic Impact Assessment are generally supportable and are important to note for this review of the GTA impact assessment. The site is expected to support a workforce of 650 staff and up to approximately 2,200 visitors on a typical day. Peak population levels (Scenario 1) are identified as a rare occasion and are expected to generate a weekday population of 4,441 people and a weekend population of 4,151 people. The assessment does not provide any evidence to justify the rarity of the Peak population scenario Everyday population levels (Scenario 2) is identified as the expected to generate a weekday population of 2,221 people and a weekend population of 2,076 people. Cumulative population levels (Scenario 3) are identified as a rare occasion and are expected to generate a weekday population of 6,947 people and a weekend population of 6,657 people. The assessment does not provide any evidence to justify the rarity of the Cumulative population scenario, especially seeing that the majority of other major population generators within the 	Refer to response to item B15b. The source of the population and patronage data is based on the proposed capacity of the WBACP venues and spaces. The scenarios developed based are on the highest population present within the precinct at any one time. It is rare that large events would occur concurrently for all venues within the Walsh Bay Precinct. Should events occur concurrently, due to the CBD location and the modes of travel available to the site it would be expected that people would travel by public transport and point-to-point options. It is to be noted that the proposed WBACP development does not only include the development of performance spaces. Therefore, the varying uses would have different peak times for access to and from the site, which will spread the traffic generated by the site. For this reason, the cumulative scenario represents a very worst-case, with the total number of people accessing the site in this scenario assumed to be arriving/ leaving within a condensed period, which is highly unlikely.

ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
 Walsh Bay area are considered to be of a similar nature in terms of art and performance centres, which would indicate similar peak periods, such as Friday evenings and typical similar performance times. No evidence is provided within the report to justify or correct this assumption. Event population levels (Scenario 4) is identified as a rare occasion and are expected to generate a weekend population of 4,250 people. It is extremely important to make note that in all cases, except for the event case (Scenario 4) the period identified as the peak for the population within the precinct is in the evening between 6 pm and 10 pm. The identified peak period between 6 pm till 10 pm is significant as it aligns with the current peak utilisation of parking along Hickson Road identified in the Matrix parking occupancy surveys conducted on Saturday 27th August 2016 and Wednesday 31st August 2016. The data identifies that from 7 pm on Wednesday 31st August 2016 Hickson Road parking occupancy rates are at a minimum 68%, reaching a maximum of 76%. Indicating a high level of parking utilisation with limited additional capacity. This limited capacity aligns with the expected weekend patronage peak for the site and hence the ability for this additional patronage to be accommodated within the current parking along Hickson road is questionable. The <i>GTA</i> report does not adequately assess this situation. 	
	 TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVERI Walsh Bay area are considered to be of a similar nature in terms of art and performance centres, which would indicate similar peak periods, such as Friday evenings and typical similar performance times. No evidence is provided within the report to justify or correct this assumption. Event population levels (Scenario 4) is identified as a rare occasion and are expected to generate a weekend population of 4,250 people. It is extremely important to make note that in all cases, except for the event case (Scenario 4) the period identified as the peak for the population within the precinct is in the evening between 6 pm and 10 pm. The identified peak period between 6 pm till 10 pm is significant as it aligns with the current peak utilisation of parking along Hickson Road identified in the Matrix parking occupancy surveys conducted on Saturday 27th August 2016 and Wednesday 31st August 2016. The data identifies that from 7 pm on Wednesday 31st August 2016 Hickson Road parking occupancy rates are at a minimum 68%, reaching a maximum of 76%. Indicating a high level of parking utilisation with limited additional capacity. This limited capacity aligns with the expected weekend patronage peak for the site and hence the ability for this additional patronage to be accommodated within the current parking along Hickson road is questionable. The <i>GTA</i> report does

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 27th August 2016 Hickson Road parking occupancy rates are at a minimum 79%, reaching a maximum of 87%. Indicating a very high level of parking utilisation with limited additional capacity. This limited capacity aligns with the expected weekday patronage peak for the site and hence the ability for this additional patronage to be accommodated within the current parking along Hickson road is questionable. The <i>GTA</i> report does not adequately assess this situation. There is no clear source identified for the population and patronage data provided in Section 3.2, and hence the reliability and accuracy of these estimations cannot be confirmed. 	
	B15k	 Insufficient analysis and emphasis has been placed on the 2011 ABS Journey to Work data that is provided within the GTA Transport Impact Assessment and accessed on the 6th of September 2016. The 2011 Journey to Work data provided within Table 24 of the assessment provides clear evidence that within the Walsh Bay area 30% of workers travel to work as the vehicle driver. This rate is on par with train travel as the most common method for employees to travel to work within the Walsh Bay area. The origins of workers within the Walsh Bay area primarily originated within either the Inner City or the Eastern Suburbs of Sydney. From this information, the GTA Transport Impact Assessment identifies that 19% of Inner City employees drive, while employees from the North 	Refer response to item B1b

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 and southern Eastern Suburbs, have identified that 35% and 32%, respectively, travel to work by car, with themselves as the driver. The rates of vehicle drivers are considerably high the observed for workplaces within the centre of the Sydney CBD. While the <i>GTA Transport Impact Assessment</i> correctly identifies this higher proportion of vehicle drivers than expected, it inappropriately states that this rate is 'significantly lower than the <u>overall</u> rate for Sydney' which is a significantly misleading statement. While correct in nature, no parallels should be drawn to the rates of vehicle usage across the entire Sydney metropolitan area. More appropriately the rate should be compared to Sydney CBD employee private vehicle rates, which are significantly lower than the 30% average outlined in the report for Walsh Bay. Critically, the report makes the assessment in <i>Section 2.7.1</i> that "Where there are visitors to the site, an assumption is made that the visitors will adopt comparable mode splits as the employees on site.' This clearly suggests that expected visitor patronage to the site via private car will be in the vicinity of the 30%. This 30% rate is not applied throughout the remainder of the <i>GTA Traffic Impact Assessment</i> providing a significant shortfall in the analysis conducted within the reports. 	
		The application of this 30% rate to determine vehicle trips to the site, with the assumption that	

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 all of these vehicles will require parking close to Walsh Bay, for at least some period of time, identify significant demands for parking throughout the day, which has not been adequately addressed. The application of this rate to the expected everyday population levels, of 2,221 individuals on weekdays which is outlined within <i>Table 3.1</i> of the <i>GTA Traffic Impact Assessment</i>, produces a daily parking demand of 666 spaces for the site. This is a significant parking demand on a typical weekday for the area. The application of this rate to the cumulative population levels, or 6,947 individuals on weekdays which is outlined within <i>Table 3.1</i> of the <i>GTA Traffic Impact Assessment</i>, produces a daily parking demand of 2,084 spaces for the site. This is a significant parking demand for the area, which has not been effectively analysed. There are significant and extensive shortfalls within the analysis due to the lack of application of the quoted 2011 Journey to Work data for the Walsh Bay area. 	
	B15I	 The assessment of future traffic demands within Section 7.1 of the GTA Traffic Impact Assessment provides a mode share rates without sufficient justification and supporting evidence. These rates are then inappropriately applied to generate the parking demand for the site. Table 7.1 of the GTA assessment outlines that the mode share rate of 8% has been applied to car trips made to the site. The identified 8% mode share is significantly 	Refer response to item B1b

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	IS FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 inconsistent with the previous 2011 Journey to Work data presented in earlier sections of this peer review letter, which provides an approximately 30% mode share rate for cars. No clear justification has been provided for the basis of the application of the 8% rate, while references are made to the "extrapolation" of the intentions within the Barangaroo Integrated Transport Plan released in 2012 in conjunction with the ABS Journey to Work data, the assessment makes no clear justification or explanation as to how supposed "extrapolation" has occurred. No clear correlation has been able to be made between the two identified sources for this 8% rate quoted within the GTA assessment that produces a similar result. Further investigation into the source of the 8% mode share rate for cars has determined that the likely source of this rate is within the GTA Consultants Traffic Management and Accessibility Report dated 14 January 2015, where within Section 5.4 of that report, it refers to pedestrian surveys undertaken within the previously identified site peak of 6 pm till 7 pm. It is within these one-hour surveys that the data identified that 8% of people accessed the site via car during that period. Though this cannot be verified as the source for the 8% rate applied within the mode split. 	
		surveys undertaken within the previously identified site peak of 6 pm till 7 pm. It is within these one-hour surveys that the data identified that 8% of people accessed the site via car during that period. Though this cannot be verified as the source for the 8% rate applied within the mode split.	

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	NS FROM T	ENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		for any weight to be held on this analysis.	
	B15m	 The GTA Traffic Impact Assessment inappropriate quotes the use of the Barangaroo Integrated Transport Plan released in 2012 as a basis for identifying mode split within the sites traffic generation. It is significant to note the differences between the Barangaroo Development, which is primarily commercial office space and some residential dwellings and the proposed Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct, which is primarily an entertainment land use. The mode share targets from Barangaroo are inappropriate to be applied directly as a reference to the expected mode share for the Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct. The information contained within the Barangaroo Integrated Transport Plan outlines 'Mode Share Targets', and as such is not necessarily reflective of the existing mode split exhibited for the area surrounding the site, or other areas of the Sydney CBD. It is not considered "appropriate" to base traffic generations off the Barangaroo Integrated Transport Plan, though despite the "proximity" of WBACP, significant differences in land use and public transport Plan as a source is inaccurate and does not reflect the reality of the Walsh Bay site. 	The intent of this item is the same as item B15I. Refer to the response for item B1b.
	B15n	The provided mode splits for transport access to the site contradicts other data provided within the report. The explanation of the applied mode splits is simplistic and	Refer to the response for item B1b.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 insufficient. The application of an 8% rate for visitors by car, is a significant contradiction to the currently exhibited 30% rate exhibited within the 2011 Journey to Work data for the Walsh Bay area applied within the report. The report does not satisfactorily justify why the 8% rate has been applied in preference to the observed 30% rate. 	
	B15o	The assessment references a range of public transport initiatives and developments proposed for the Sydney CBD in the general vicinity of Walsh Bay, though the application of these planned public transport improvements as justification for lower parking demand is seen as simplistic and the impact overestimated.	Refer to response to item B1b
	B15p	 The assessment of the impacts of the Sydney Centre Access Strategy concluding that the features of this strategy would 'contribute to improved access to the Walsh Bay Arts and Cultural Precinct' is questionable and unsupported. The identification of the Wynyard Walk as a key component of improving pedestrian access to the Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct is questionable. Wynyard Walk does provide significant access improvements from Wynyard Station to Barangaroo and does reduce the travel time and walking distance between the two areas of the CBD, but from the Sussex Street exit of the Wynyard Walk, it is still over 1.2 kilometres to reach the edge of the Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct. Insufficient analysis is provided to support the contribution of the Wynyard Walk to increasing access to the site, and hence no weight should be given to 	 Refer to response to item B1b Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions report.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 this observation. The new ferry Wharf at Barangaroo, while providing increased public transport access to the Barangaroo area provides limited improvements to access to the proposed Walsh Bay Arts and Culture precinct, with a considerable walking distance from the Wharf of over 1.2 kilometres. Insufficient analysis is provided to support the contribution of the Barangaroo Ferry Wharf in increasing access to the site, and hence no weight should be given to this observation New interchange precincts at various locations within the CBD including Wynyard and Circular key do not provide any significant direct access improvements to the Walsh Bay area, with a walking distance of approximately 1 kilometre still required in order to access the site directly from these interchanges. The new light rail route along George Street and to Circular Quay will not provide any significant direct access improvements to the site directly from any light rail stations. While it is agreed that the construction of the new Barangaroo Metro Station, as part of the greater Sydney Metro development, will provide some access improvements to the site, the station will still be at least a 500m walk from the site. In addition, the Metro Station will not be operational until at least 2024, a significant period of time after the opening of the Walsh Bay Arts and Culture precinct. 	
		While these public transport initiatives will	

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	S FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	IMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		considerably improve access to the CBD in general, there is limited evidence that they will provide any increases in access to the proposed Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct and hence no weight should be placed on these public transport improvements.	
	B15q	The assessment of the impacts of the Sydney's Bus Future (TfNSW, December 2013) concluding that the features of this strategy 'would contribute to improved access to the Walsh Bay Arts and Cultural Precinct' While the Sydney's Bus Future (TfNSW, December 2013) Hickson Road as one of many 'Planned city centre key bus corridors,' it is not supported by any further reference within this report to what the objectives and plans are for Hickson Road and whether this would increase direct bus services to the site.	 The details of the objectives and plans for Hickson Road as a planned city centre key bus corridor are unknown at this stage. However, the key bus corridors will be progressively improved to provide more direct routes and rationalised stops to improve bus travel times and reliability.
	B15r	 Inconclusive and unjustifiable public transport analysis has been conducted which does not adequately support the justification that the provision of public transport to the site is "sufficient to accommodate increased future demand associated with the development" While Hickson Road is identified as a key corridor, the proposed Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct is located at the end of this corridor and thorough investigation of 26th November 2017 Sydney CBD bus timetable only two bus routes currently service the site directly the 324 and 325 and one other service, the 311 bus route, is located nearby with its nearest stop 250m from the site. It is unclear if further services will be provided to the site, and that Bus access will increase. While the included public transport initiatives improve general CBD access, all major public 	 Refer to response to item B1b Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions report.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSION	IS FROM	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 transport access points are generally 1 kilometre or more from the site, and none of the currently proposed initiatives will significantly reduce this distance in the near future. The significant distance required to walk to the site from all major transport hubs within the CBD will cause public transport to not be the preferred option for many visitors to the site, and as reflected in the 2011 Journey to Work data, increase demand for vehicular access. 	
	B15s	Insufficient analysis has been conducted in regards to the regularity of the occurrence of simultaneous peak parking demand caused by the multiple different entertainment sites surrounding WBACP. It is expected, but not identified within the report, that peak parking demand for all of the entertainment uses in Walsh Bay including the WBACP, would regularly overlap, especially in the expected peak periods of Friday and Saturday nights. There is no meaningful analysis within the provided <i>GTA</i> assessments as to the regularity of this occurrence.	This item is a repeat of previous items in this submission. Refer to items B15a, B15b and B15c.
	B15t	 Insufficient explanation and evidence is provided to support the proposed parking demand of 64-84 vehicle spaces, outlined within the <i>GTA Traffic Impact Assessment</i>. The <i>GTA Traffic Impact Assessment</i> makes reference to the previously <i>GTA Traffic Management and Accessibility</i> dated 14 January 2015 report as the source and justification of the parking demand expected. The generation of the parking demand of 64-84 spaces is produced from the application of the 8% 	Refer to item B1b for response

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
B. SUBMISSIONS	FROM ⁻	TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVER	NMENT STAKEHOLDERS
		 mode share allocation to car parking being applied to the expected population of the site during the day. This can be found in <i>Section 5.5</i> of the <i>Management and Accessibility report</i>. The assumption is also made within <i>Section 5.5</i> of that report, that an average of 2 passengers will be in each vehicle, though no justification or source for this assumption is provided. The application of 8% is insufficient and inconsistent with the existing mode share rates for the Walsh Bay area which equate to approximately 30%, according to the <i>Journey to Work</i> data. An application of 30% to the same population numbers used previously within <i>Section 5.5</i> produces a parking demand of 255-314 spaces, which is considerably larger than the represented 8% rate previously applied. It is doubtful that the existing parking supply would sufficiently be able to absorb such a significant demand for parking. 	
	B15u	 Incomplete and insufficient justification has been provided on how the identified parking demand for the Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct can be accommodated within the local parking supply. With the application of a more reflective 30% rate for car users and an associated peak parking demand of 255-314 spaces, it is doubtful that the demand will be able to be supported by the current parking supply within the Walsh Bay area. Due to the significant shortfalls in research and quantitative data supporting the ability for the 	Refer to item B1b for response

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE			
B. SUBMISSIONS	B. SUBMISSIONS FROM TENANTS, LOCAL BUSINESSES AND OTHER NON GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS					
	B15v	 WBACP parking demand to be able to be accommodated within the current parking facilities surrounding the site, it is insufficient to make conclusions on the impact of the sites parking demand. Incomplete and insufficient justification has been provided on the capacity of the Walsh Bay area to accommodate for the impact of a peak parking demand caused by the cumulative impact of simultaneous events held across multiple venues within the Walsh Bay area. The likely occurrence of multiple events simultaneously at venues including the Sydney Theatre Company, Sydney Dance Company, Roslyn Packer Theatre, Pier One and at the proposed Walsh Bay Arts and Culture Precinct, would most likely produce significant parking demand for the Walsh Bay area, possibly far exceeding the available capacity. This scenario is not sufficiently analysed within any of the <i>GTA</i> assessments. The lack of analysis of the impact of multiple simultaneous events within Walsh Bay show a significant and detrimental shortfall within the analysis conducted. 	• This item is a repeat of previous items in this submission. Refer to items B15a, B15b and B15c.			

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	COM AGENCIES	
Department of Planning and Environment	C1a	Built form, urban design and heritage Consideration should be given to reviewing the size and extent of external balconies and lift shafts, and the width (and location) of external stair landings, to ensure the potential impacts of these structures on the heritage character of the wharves and public access around the wharf aprons is minimised as much as reasonably practicable.	Refer to TZG Reports at Appendices 7 and 8
	C1b	Explore opportunities to remove the support standards from the external balconies to reduce potential for visual clutter on the wharf apron and reduce their visual prominence.	Refer to TZG Reports at Appendices 7 and 8
	C1c	As requested by the Heritage Council, provide further design details of all works to Pier 2/3, Wharf 4/5 and Shore Sheds 4/5 including building identification and wayfinding signage, external additions (new stairs, lifts and gantries), roof plant screening, structural strengthening works, internal partition walls, reuse of the dead house, upgrades to existing walls, flooring and new services to ensure they are sensitive to the industrial heritage character of the wharves.	Refer discussion in Section s.7 of Response to Submissions Report and in TZG Report at Appendix 8.
	C1d	Building Code of Australia The Building Code of Australia (BCA) report makes numerous references to further information being required. A final version of the document is required demonstrating that the proposed development complies with the BCA and where compliance cannot be achieved, an alternate solution is proposed. Where alternate solutions have the potential to impact on significant fabric of the buildings, these solutions need to be detailed and heritage impacts assessed upfront, prior to determination.	A final version of the BCA report cannot be provided until construction stage of the project. The project will be procured through an industry-standard Design and Construct contract, which will necessitate further design development of the design outlined in the SSDA by the contractor. The Applicant notes that the intent of the Crown Certification process pursuant to S109R of the Act (WBAP) is to ensure all matters of compliance are addressed at the relevant stage prior to construction of those items. This requires several months of design development and co-ordination which will be undertaken once a contract has been entered into.
			Nevertheless the Applicant understands that DPE wish

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
			 to ensure that elements of the heritage fabric are not impacted through any alternate solutions that will be developed in the detailed design phase. To ameliorate this the Applicant proposes the following condition: `Any alternate solutions developed as a result of the detailed design phase that have an impact on or potential to impact on any heritage elements of the structure will be required to be approved by the NSW Heritage Division. Confirmation of any alternate design solutions and NSW Heritage Division approval must be provided to the Secretary prior to construction.'
	C1e	Structural Integrity Provide advice from a structural engineer demonstrating the existing wharf structures can withstand additional loading from works proposed as part of the development.	Advice has been obtained from TTW that the additional load from the works can be withstood by the existing wharf structures. Refer to Appendix 11 of this Response to Submissions Report.
	C1f	Noise and Vibration Provide additional information addressing all noise and vibration issues raised in submissions in detail, particularly from the Walsh Bay Precinct Association.	Refer Response to Walsh Bay Precinct Association submission above (no. B1).
	C1g	Construction Provide an estimate of the time taken to complete each stage of construction works identified in Table 13 of the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (NVIA).	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C1h	Clarify instances if the construction stages in Table 13 of the NVIA would be undertaken sequentially or where they would be undertaken concurrently, provide a discussion of the resultant cumulative noise impacts. For example if scenario 1 and scenario 2 were to be undertaken concurrently, would there be a significant increase in noise levels?	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
	C1i	Operation Provide a more detailed description of each of the operating scenarios described in Section 4.3.1.2 of the NVIA and a summary of the key modelling assumptions/ patron inputs for each scenario. For example, no details appear to have been provided on the modelled indoor patron numbers for each scenario.	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C1j	Ensure the operational assessment in the NVIA aligns with the proposed hours of operation in Table 5 of the EIS. Consider reducing and rationalising the proposed hours of operation for all tenancies to align with existing facilities and uses within the precinct.	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C1k	Provide further information justifying the proposed operating hours up until 1am (all days) for performances, productions, internal events and functions as outlined in Table 5 of the EIS. Further consider adopting controls around the use of outdoor spill areas (e.g. closing all doors and louvres and no patrons in outdoor seating and balcony areas after 10pm).	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C1I	Ensure noise associated with vehicle pick-up and drop-offs (e.g. car doors slamming, car horns etc) is addressed in the operational noise assessment.	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C1m	Consider additional modelling of operational noise (i.e. indoor singing, music etc) against the relevant Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing noise criteria.	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C1n	Part 3 of the EIS indicates approval is sought for the use of the pier and wharf aprons for external events associated with the internal use of the facilities, however no assessment of cumulative noise from internal events and external events held in the public domain appears to have been undertaken (Section 4.3. of the NVIA). Clarification is needed on the scope of the application in this regard.	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C10	Provide further information regarding scope of approval sought for events associated parameters/ restrictions (event type, frequency, maximum patron numbers, finishing times and duration, restrictions on indoor activities/ uses, restrictions on use of outdoor amplified	Refer Section 2.4 of Response to Submissions Report and to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions Report

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	ROM AGENCIES	
		music etc) to ensure events would not result in adverse amenity impacts to nearby sensitive receivers.	
	C1p	Confirm the hours of operation sought for external events held in the public domain in associated with events within the buildings and provide further information justifying the proposed finishing time of 12 midnight for events (all days).	Refer Section 2.4 of Response to Submissions Report and to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C1q	Provide more detailed information around the nature and type of events to be held in the public domain and their associated impacts.	As above
	C1r	Clarify if the event noise modelling in Section 5.4 of the NVIA incorporates playing of amplified music outdoors and if proposed, update the noise modelling. Outline controls for playing amplified music outdoors (e.g. speaker number, type, arrangement and restrictions) during events to ensure compliance with the proposed event noise criteria and to protect the amenity of nearby residents.	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C1s	Clarify if the event noise modelling in Section 5.4 of the NVIA incorporates noise from the internal use of tenancies? Confirm any internal uses/ activities that would be undertaken in associated with events and ensure they are considered in the event noise modelling.	Refer to 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Report' at Appendix 2 of this Response to Submissions Report
	C1t	Traffic, transport, access and parking Provide additional information addressing all traffic, transport, access and parking issues raised in submissions in detail, particularly from Transport for NSW (TNSW) and the Walsh Bay Precinct Association.	Refer response to TfNSW submission at No. C3 and response to Walsh Bay Precinct Association submission at No. B1.
	C1u	Construction Update the construction assessment noting the estimate construction vehicle movements relies on outdated Arup data from 2015.	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions
	C1v	Quantify the cumulative impact of the construction vehicle movements associated with the proposal and key construction projects likely to occur at the same time on the capacity of Hickson Road and the level of service (LOS) of key intersections surrounding the site to support the findings on page 19 of the construction assessment (Section 3.6.4).	There is sufficient capacity on Hickson Road to accommodate the construction vehicles generated by the proposed WBACP development (refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 and updated Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan at Appendix 5 to this

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	·
			Response to Submissions Report).
	C1w	Provide an estimate of the number of barge/vessel movements resulting from the construction of the proposed development.	The Applicant anticipates that there could be up to 1 barge movement per week for the delivery of materials. This will be subject to the final construction methodology developed by the contractor and detailed in the final Environmental, Construction and Site Management Plan.
	C1x	Operation Provide a more detailed description of the peak operating scenario and the key modelling assumptions/ patron inputs for this scenario.	Further detail on modelled scenarios is provided in Appendix 9. Refer also discussion in Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Response to Submissions Report.
	C1y	Consult with TNSW to determine the appropriate proportion of trips for various modes of transport during operation of the proposal and update the TIA accordingly including any required mitigation measures. Consider undertaking additional surveys of users of the existing site (or similar facilities elsewhere) in this regard and provide sufficient justification in the event the surveys are not completed.	Consultation was carried out with TfNSW on 5 December 2017 and the survey requirements were discussed to address TfNSW's formal submission.
	C1z	Provide an assessment of traffic generated by each scenario on the LOS of key intersections surrounding the site to support the conclusions on pages 39 and 40 of the TIA regarding the operational traffic impact on the capacity of the surrounding road network.	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions.
	C1aa	Clarify the current LOS experienced by traffic on Hickson Road during peak times and the traffic volume at which it would reach its operational capacity.	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions.
	C1ab	Investigate opportunities and commit to providing coach/ bus shuttle pick-up and drop-off services between the site and nearby major public transport hubs in consultation with TfNSW to further reduce the potential operational traffic impacts of the development.	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions.
	C1ac	General Operational Impacts Ensure the modelled scenarios and key inputs (indoor/outdoor patron, expected site population/visitor numbers) are clearly explained and appropriately align between the technical studies accompanying the	Refer to Appendix 9 for discussion on scenarios.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIO	ONS FRO	OM AGENCIES	·
		EIS, in particular the NVIA and TIA to ensure an accurate assessment of potential impacts is undertaken. This is not clear at present and needs to be clearly demonstrated in the response to submissions report.	
	C1ad	Visual Impact Provide a copy of the Visual Impact Assessment in Appendix 18 of the EIS with high-resolution figures. Provide the Visual Impact Assessment report prepared by Richard Lamb and Associated in November 2016.	The Applicant understands that the existing report is sufficient to meet the needs of DPE.
	C1ae	Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No.16- Walsh Bay Provide floor spaces figures for existing commercial uses in Zone 1 and new commercial spaces (as defined in Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No.16- Walsh Bay) to confirm the development would not result in a floor area used for the purposes of commercial uses in Zone 1 greater than 30 per cent of the total floor area used in Zone 1 for any purpose.	Refer to Section 2.9.2 in Response to Submissions Report for discussion on this issue.
	C11af	Biodiversity On 25 August 2017, the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act) came in force. The BCA Act has implications for State Significant Development (SSD) applications in relation to the preparation of a biodiversity development assessment report. Provide an assessment of the proposal's biodiversity impacts in accordance with the requirement of the BC Act, including the preparation of a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report where required under the Act.	Further information is currently being collated in support of a request for a waiver under section 7.9(2) of the Biodiversity Conservation Act. This information will be submitted under separate cover as an addendum to the Response to Submissions.
City of Sydney	C2a	Heritage Concern is raised regarding the height of the proposed external lifts and their visual prominence from key vistas when viewed from Sydney Harbour, particularly at the northern end of Pier 2/3. Consideration should be given to a reduction in height of the lift over- runs and locating these lift shafts further south along each elevation. It is also recommended that lift shafts and balconies are aligned	A simple and modest design approach has been adopted for all external additions to ensure that they respect the industrial character of the wharves and to minimise their visual prominence. The lift shafts have been designed to be as small as possible to provide equitable access and efficient

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	ROM AGENCIES	
		symmetrically on the eastern and western elevations of the wharf buildings	goods movement within the Precinct. The height of the overall lift shaft structures has been carefully considered in terms of overrun, relationships to the original buildings and consistency within the Precinct. Further design rationale and detail is provided in the
	C2b	Given the heritage significance of the site and extent of works proposed, it is recommended that a single comprehensive Conservation Management Plan be prepared for the entire Arts Precinct, including Pier 2/3, Wharf 4/5 and Shore Sheds 4/5. The Conservation Management Plan should be prepared in in accordance with the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter) by a suitably qualified heritage practitioner prior to the commencement of works.	TZG Response at Appendix 8. The Applicant will undertake to prepare a single CMP for the entire Arts Precinct, including Pier 2/3, Wharf 4/5 and the Shore Sheds 4/5 within 5 years of completion of works. This is to ensure that any unexpected finds, discovered during construction, and the production of the Interpretation Strategy are incorporated into the consolidated CMP for the Arts Precinct.
	C2c	A detailed Heritage Interpretation Plan should also be prepared by a suitably qualified heritage practitioner, which is consistent with the goals and direction of the Walsh Bay Precinct Interpretation Plan 1999 and include moveable heritage and address any evidence arising from archaeological monitoring works. The Department is encouraged to require the heritage interpretation plan to be implemented prior to completion of the project.	The Applicant has committed to the development of an Interpretation Plan for the WBACP in the Project EIS, section 7.3.3. The Applicant suggests that the Interpretation Plan should be prepared and implemented prior to Occupation. This is to ensure that any `unexpected finds' made during construction are incorporated into the interpretation.
	C2d	The Department is strongly encouraged to ensure that an appropriately qualified heritage consultant, experienced in the conservation of similar structures, is commissioned to work with the consultant team throughout the design development, contract documentation and construction stages of the project. The heritage consultant should be involved in the resolution of all matters where existing significant fabric and spaces are to be subject to preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptive reuse, recording	The Applicant has included provision of a nominated heritage architect in the Environmental, Construction and Site Management Plan which formed Appendix 26 of the Project EIS.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	ROM AGENCIES	
		and demolition.	
	C2e	The heritage consultant should be provided with full access to the site and authorised by the applicant to respond directly where information or clarification is required regarding the resolution of heritage issues throughout the project. Should the application be approved, evidence of the above commission on the above terms should be provided to the consent authority prior to commencement of work on site. It is recommended that the nominated heritage consultant signs-off the completed project prior to occupation/completion.	The Applicant has included provision of a nominated heritage architect in the Environmental, Construction and Site Management Plan which formed Appendix 26 of the Project EIS.
	C2f	It is noted that awnings are not characteristic of the Hickson Road elevation of the Walsh Bay Shore Sheds. If the Department is minded to approve new awnings, they should be simply detailed, confined to entries and be sympathetic to the industrial character of the facades. The awnings should be designed with input from the applicant's heritage consultant.	The new awnings to Hickson Road will be simply detailed, confined to entries and sympathetic to the industrial character of the original façade. The design of the awnings will be further developed with input from the applicant's heritage consultant.
	C2g	Public Art Should the Department be minded to approve the application, it is recommended that a Public Art Strategy is prepared for submission in consultation with the City of Sydney and the Public Art Advisory Panel.	The project will include a significant component of heritage interpretation as well as a bespoke signage and wayfinding system within the precinct. The Applicant considers that given the historic significance of the precinct, emphasis should be placed on the development of interpretive displays in lieu of public art. The Applicant has committed to developing the interpretation plan in consultation with City of Sydney and the NSW Heritage Council.
	C2h	Signage The Department should satisfy itself in relation to the following: Details of the new proposed signs shown in Figure 27 (red lines marked as "signage location") are unclear. There are a substantial number of these signs and there is a potential for clutter depending	A revised signage plan is included in the TZG report at Appendix 8. It rationalises the number of tenant identification signs internal to the Precinct and shows the proposed signage locations and sizes. The signs have been sized to relate to the original fabric of the

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FF	ROM AGENCIES	
		on the purpose, size, design and location of these signs.	wharves.
			The Applicant will further develop the detailed design of signage and wayfinding in consultation with the Heritage Council and City of Sydney.
	C2i	No details of the 'new digital walls' included in Figure 27 are provided. Details such as the size of these elements as well as their fixings to the wharf building fabric are required. Fixings should avoid significant heritage fabric and be reversible.	New 'digital walls' are proposed in the Shoreshed 4/5 Breezeway 1, adjacent the Visitor Portal and on the southern wall of the Pier 2/3 Colonnade. The final size of these digital elements will be developed in detailed design in consultation with the City of Sydney and Heritage Council, however, the TZG report at Appendix 8 provides some information regarding the design intent. The fixings will be developed in a manner to minimise any impacts on heritage fabric and be reversible.
	C2j	The proposed digital awning signs as shown in Figures 12 and 13 indicate they have a minimal projection however, Figures 19 and 20 show them as substantial projecting awnings, though dimensions are not annotated. The awnings should be sized to allow a margin around them, enabling a reading of the rendered surface on which they are affixed. They should be set in from each side by approximately 200mm for the same reason.	The Applicant will develop the detailed design of the signage and wayfinding in consultation with the Heritage Council and City of Sydney. This will include consultation in relation to the sizing of awnings. The Applicant commits to ensuring that the awnings will be designed to enable a reading of the rendered surface to which they are affixed.
	C2k	Figures 19 and 20 illustrate signage across the viaduct bridges akin to "The Goods Line" signage. This is supported for the 'Pier 2/3' and 'Wharf 4/5' signs as these are <i>place based</i> signs, as is The Goods Line sign. There is some concern that the other proposed bridge signs are for dance/theatre companies that may come and go to the precinct. The signage strategy should speak to the removal / replacement of these signs. The signage is designed for the present number of companies, with particular name lengths. Removal of parts of the sign over time due to the loss of a company should be addressed.	The Applicant confirms that these signs will be place based signs only.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
	C2I	Any proposal for signage should be subject to a comprehensive signage strategy prepared with the input of the nominated heritage consultant and subject to a separate development application to the City of Sydney Council.	The Applicant will develop the detailed design of signage and wayfinding in consultation with the project's heritage consultant, the NSW Heritage Council and City of Sydney.
			Refer to TZG report at Appendix 8 for further detail.
	C2m	Transport Approval by the City's Pedestrian Cycling and Traffic Calming Committee is required for any changes for street parking restrictions.	Noted- the proposal does not include any alterations for on street parking restrictions.
	C2n	Due to site constraints and difficulty in accommodating Medium Rigid Vehicles (MRV), all loading and unloading should be undertaken outside of scheduled event times and peak attendance periods, with service vehicles no larger than a MRV.	A Logistics Management Plan will be developed prior to occupation. This plan will detail management of loading dock areas within event times and during peak attendance periods.
	C20	35 bicycle spaces are to be provided on site with an additional 40 bicycle spaces to be provided within the Wharf 4/5 Shore Sheds. It is noted however that the drawings do not appear to show the additional 40 bicycle spaces in the Shore Sheds. Staff bicycle parking should be provided according to the security level B as specified in Australian Standard AS 2890.3:2015.	The project commits to the provision of 35 bicycle spaces for use by staff within the Wharf 4/5 Shore Sheds. The additional 40 bicycle spaces are to be provided within the public domain for use by visitors- refer to the Transport Impact Assessment that formed Appendix 15 of the Project EIS.
	C2p	Public Domain The existing asphaltic concrete surface of the footway fronting the development site is in poor condition and is likely to require resurfacing to support the significant increase in pedestrian traffic as a result of the subject redevelopment. Concurrently, the existing alignment levels can be improved as part of the foot way upgrade. Accordingly, it is recommended that the City's standard 'Alignment Level', 'Public Domain Plan', 'Protection of Stone Curb' and 'Public Domain Damage Deposit' conditions (attached) are imposed if the application is approved.	The Applicant commits to resurfacing of the adjacent footpath. It is noted that fees in association with these works are not applicable due to the project being Crown development.
	C2q	Recommended Conditions	It is considered that these conditions are not
	-	The City recommends that a number of conditions be imposed on the development.	applicable as no work is proposed in the public domain on Hickson Road.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	ROM AGENCIES	
Transport for NSW	C3a	It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to prepare Event Specific Traffic Management Plans and Operational Traffic Management Plans in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW and Roads and Maritime Services, prior to the issue of the occupation certificate.	The Applicant has committed to preparing these plans in consultation with TfNSW, Roads and Maritime Services, City of Sydney and Barangaroo Delivery Authority. This commitment is contained in section 8 of the Appendix 15- Transport Impact Assessment of the Project EIS.
	C3b	 It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to prepare a service and loading dock management plan, in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW, to minimise impact on the general traffic and bus operation within the CBD. The management plan needs to include, but not to be limited to, the following Confirm that the vehicle access and circulation areas are designed in accordance with the relevant Australian Standards, including for loading dock areas; Plans that show swept paths of the vehicles including simultaneous ingress and egress to the service and loading dock and location of passing bays; and Details of any infrastructure works required to the support the service and loading operations of the development. It is also requested that the applicant submits a copy of the final plans to the Coordinator General, Sydney Coordination Office for endorsement, prior to the prior to the issue of any construction certificate 	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions.
	C3c	It is noted that the proposed work zone is positioned after the Hickson Road/Pottinger Street roundabout. TfNSW advises that the route path to follow Hickson Road onto George Street is too narrow for heavy rigid vehicle movements and creates potential conflicts with cyclists and general traffic. TfNSW requests that the applicant consultants with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW with regards to the location of the proposed work zone and documents the outcome in the Response to Submissions.	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	·
	C3d	It is noted that any works zone established outside the site will have an impact on Transit Stop Number (TSN) 2000129 'Wharf Theatres, Hickson Road, Dawes Point.' Any changes in positioning of the dedicated TSN on Hickson Road will need to be coordinated wit the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW and State Transit Authority.	The Applicant commits to coordinating any changes to this TSN with TfNSW and State Transit Authority.
	C3e	 TfNSW requests that the applicant be conditioned to the following: TfNSW requests that the applicant be conditioned to prepare a Construction Pedestrian Transport Management Plan (CPTMP), in consultation with Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW and Sydney Metro Delivery Office. The CPTMP needs to specify, but not to be limited to, the following: Location of the proposed work zone; Haulage routes; Construction vehicle access arrangements; Proposed construction hours; Estimated number of construction vehicle movements; Construction program; Any potential impacts to general traffic, cyclists, pedestrians and bus services within the vicinity of the site from construction vehicles during the construction of the proposed works; Cumulative construction impacts of projects including Sydney Light Rail Project and Sydney Metro. Existing CPTMPs for developments within or around the development site should be referenced in the CPTMP to ensure that coordination of work activities are managed to minimise impacts on the road 	The Applicant has committed to preparing a final Construction, Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (TMP) in consultation with TfNSW, RMS, City of Sydney Council, Barangaroo Delivery Authority and the Sydney Coordination Office- refer to section 5 of Appendix 21- Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan of the Project EIS. The Applicant commits to also consulting with Sydney Metro Delivery Office during development of the CPTMP.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	ROM AGENCIES	
		 network; and Proposed mitigation measures. Should any impacts be identified, the duration of the impacts and measures proposed to mitigate any associated general traffic, public transport, pedestrian and cyclist impacts should be clearly identified and included in the CPTMP. 	
		Submit a copy of the final plan to the City of Sydney, prior to the commencement of any works on site.	
	C3f	 TfNSW requests that the Traffic Report includes the following: Hickson Road is classified as a 'planned city centre key bus corridor' in the Sydney City Centre Access Strategy 2013 and Sydney's Bus Future. 	The Transport Impact Assessment has been updated at Section 2 to address this comment. The revised TIA forms Appendix 4 of this report. The additional ferry service is noted.
		 TfNSW has added an additional cross harbour ferry route to Barangaroo, which has increased further services to the precinct. Details can be obtained at <u>https://www.nsw.gov.au/news-and-events/news/two-new- cross-harbour-ferry-routes-for-sydney/</u> 	
	C3g	 TfNSW requests that the applicant be conditioned to: Prepare a detailed Green Travel Plan in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW by proposing measures to increase the mode share of walking and cycling to the site; and Submit a copy of the final plan to the Coordinator General, Sydney Coordination Office for endorsement. 	A Green Travel Plan has been prepared by GTA and is included at Appendix 6 of this Response to Submissions Report. However, the Applicant has no objection to the suggested condition.
	C3h	It is suggested that additional surveys be undertaken of users of the existing site (or similar facilities elsewhere) in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW to determine the proportion of trips for various modes of transport during the preparation of Response to Submissions. These results should then be used to quantify any impacts associated with the point-to-point services. Any mitigation measures required to manage this aspect should be	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	ROM AGENCIES	
		discussed with TfNSW (Sydney Coordination Office) and the City of Sydney.	
	C3i	It is requested that the applicant investigate opportunities for coach pick up and drop off facilities in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW and the City of Sydney Council prior to the issue of the occupation certificate.	Refer to the 'Supplementary Traffic and Transport Report' at Appendix 3 of this Response to Submissions. The Applicant has no objection to the suggested condition.
Department of Industry	C4	 The Environmental Construction and Site Management Plan (ECSMP) should include details of the following: controls to contain spills and leakages during construction; inspection regime for erosion and sediment controls, including regular scheduled inspections and inspections pre/post heavy rainfall events; and water quality monitoring regime, including monitoring frequency. 	Further environmental controls to be included in the CEMP are contained in Appendix 10 to this Response to Submissions Report.
Environment Protection Authority	C5a	EPA requests that its previous EIS submissions by letter dated 15 August 2014 and 16 December 2016 be considered jointly as the EPA's EIS submission for this project	Addressed below.
	C5b	 <u>Contamination</u> EPA Letter dated 15 August 2014: EPA does not accept that site is suitable for proposed use and considers that a more detailed site investigation is warranted. Nature and extent of contamination of marine sediments in vicinity of piers and proposed development should be investigated. Former Millers Point gasworks is subject to ongoing EPA regulation. Site audit statement should be prepared and include a review of proposed Construction EMP 	A Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment was prepared by JBS&G (February 2017) for the Stage 2 SSDA. The Phase 2 ESA included the completed results of land-based soil sampling enabling the conclusion to be reached that the land-based portion of the site is suitable for the land uses as proposed. Additionally, potential contaminants in sediment and seawater at the site do not appear to represent a potential human health risk for continued commercial use of the site and the associated arts/cultural use. It should be noted that there are no works included in the subject SSDA involving seabed disturbance.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
		 Lead-based paint coatings that have been applied to existing structures should be identified and appropriate measures adopted for removal, handling, disposal of such coatings. 	The assessment recommends that standard unexpected find protocols should be implemented during any future development.
		 EPA Letter dated 16 December 2016: Unlikely to be any significant impact to adjacent sediments or water if discharge management measures provided in JBS&G report are followed Soil adjacent to the sea wall has yet to be characterised and thus site suitability cannot be determined Proponent should be required to undertake further assessment of soil contamination following demolition of existing structures and prior to undertaking any earthworks. If appropriate, remediation should be undertaken in accordance with RAP. Appropriate site audit statements are required to confirm the nature of any contamination and certify that the site is suitable for the proposed use An unexpected finds procedure is required in relation to contamination Appropriate measures required in relation to management and disposal of any asbestos waste in accordance with relevant statutory requirements 	A Site Audit Report and Site Audit Statement were prepared by an EPA accredited Site Auditor which certifies that the site is suitable for the proposed uses. Copies of the Site Audit Report and Site Audit Statement were included at Appendix 14 to the Stage 2 SSDA Response to Submissions Report. In relation to asbestos, lead-based paints and other hazardous materials, Hazardous Materials Assessments have been undertaken for both Wharf 4/5 and Pier 2/3, copies of which were included in Appendices 24 and 25 of the Project EIS. All works involving removal and disposal of asbestos will be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of these reports.
	C5c	Acid Sulphate Soils EPA Letter dated 15 August 2014: • Acid sulphate soils should be assessed and managed in accordance with relevant NSW policies	A review of the Prospect/Parramatta Acid Sulfate Soil Risk Map (Dept Land, Ed 2, 1997) indicates the potential for the site area behind the sea wall abutting Hickson Road to have historically been filled. Such areas have the potential to be underlain by marine/alluvial sediments with the potential to be characterised as acid sulfate soil.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
			The project does not involve significant disturbance of the area behind the sea wall that has been filled. As such, no further consideration is required of the potential occurrence of acid sulfate soils within the site portion underlain by soil or associated requirements for management of such conditions.
	C5d	Waste management EPA Letter dated 15 August 2014: • All waste should be assessed, classified and managed in accordance with relevant legislation and guidelines EPA Letter dated 16 December 2016: • Waste should be managed in accordance with waste management hierarchy and EPA Waste Classification Guidelines • No waste should be permitted to enter the harbour • All vehicles carrying waste, spoil etc should be appropriately	To address the waste impacts of the proposal both during construction and operation, a waste management plan (WMP) has been prepared by ARUP (September 2017) and is provided at Appendix 29. The WMP primarily relates to operational waste noting that a detailed Construction Waste Management Plan (CWMP) will be prepared by the Principal Contractor prior to the commencement of construction. However the WMP includes a guided framework for the classification, transportation and management of construction waste. The proposed waste management strategy for the site conforms to the EPA's requirements.
	C5e	covered to prevent escape of waste material Sedimentation, erosion and dust management	
		 EPA Letter dated 15 August 2014: Appropriate controls and management measures should be adopted for waste concrete and concrete rinse waters from concrete agitator and pump trucks. Appropriate controls and management measures should be adopted to minimise mud, splatter, dust and other material associated with vehicle movements during construction 	Sediment, erosion and dust management measures will be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the preliminary Environmental, Construction and Site Management Plan (refer Appendix 26 of Project EIS) as amended in more detailed environmental, site and construction management plans following appointment of the construction contractor. Refer section 7.12 of Project

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE				
C. SUBMISSIC	. SUBMISSIONS FROM AGENCIES						
		 Appropriate controls and management measures should be adopted to prevent and minimise dust emissions Appropriate runoff, spillage and sediment controls and management measures should be adopted having regard to sensitive harbour environment 	EIS for more detail. This SSDA does not involve any piling therefore the use of earthmoving and piling equipment and the installation of floating booms is not proposed.				
		EPA Letter dated 1 December 2016:					
		• Any mud, splatter, dust etc must be removed from vehicles before leaving premises					
		 Concrete waste and rinse water should not be disposed of on site and should not be allowed to go into harbour Appropriate measures should be put in place to minimise dust 					
		 Appropriate measures should be put in place to minimise dust emissions on site and prevent dust emissions from the site Earthmoving and piling operations should not commence until 					
		 appropriate erosion and sediment controls are in place Daily inspection of erosion and sediment controls and ongoing inspection of floating booms should be undertaken 					
	C5f	Noise and vibration (construction)	A comprehensive assessment of noise and vibration				
		EPA Letter dated 14 August 2014:	impacts of construction in accordance with relevant NSW noise guidelines has been undertaken and is				
		 Proponent should undertake comprehensive assessment of noise and vibration impacts of construction and comply with relevant NSW noise guidelines. Potential noise from reversing construction vehicles should be addressed. 	included in Appendix 19 to the Project EIS. The Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment has considered potential noise from reversing construction vehicles as well as the provision of respite periods.				
		EPA Letter dated 1 December 2016	Standard construction hours are proposed and no construction vehicles will be allowed to arrive at the site outside these hours.				
		Intra-day respite periods should be implemented at those times when noise with particularly annoying or intrusive	Further detailed regarding construction noise impacts				

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
		 characteristics is being generated Standard construction hours should be adhered to Proponent should undertake safety risk assessment to consider use of alternatives to traditional 'beeper' alarms for vehicle reversing. Construction vehicles should not arrive at project site or in surrounding residential precincts outside approved construction hours 	and management is included in the 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Impacts Report' at Appendix 2 to this Response to Submissions Report.
	C5g	 Noise and vibration (operation) EPA Letter dated 14 August 2014: Background noise monitoring at McMahons Point undertaken for noise impact assessment did not meet required minimum number of days for assessment Not clear whether wind effects have been adequately considered. Need to ensure that all mechanical plant and equipment is designed, installed and operated to meet Industrial Noise Policy (INP) criteria INP criteria not necessarily appropriate for outdoor events. Alternative criteria for assessing noise associated with outdoor events suggested. Various recommendations made regarding numbers and types of events, curfew times, community notification and public complaints management. 	 The NVIA provided at Appendix 19 to the Project EIS been undertaken in accordance with requirements outlined in EPA's previous submissions (as relevant). The proposal only seeks approval for the existing Sydney Writers Festival and Biennale events. No new outdoor events are proposed. Background noise monitoring has been completed in accordance with EPA requirements. Further detail regarding operational noise impacts and management is provided in the 'Supplementary Noise and Vibration Impacts Report' at Appendix 2 to this Response to Submissions Report.
		 EPA Letter dated 1 December 2016: Proposed facilities are likely to change the nature and intensity of noise impacts on sensitive noise receivers. Adequacy of background noise monitoring questioned 	

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE			
C. SUBMISSIC	. SUBMISSIONS FROM AGENCIES					
		 Concerned about noise impacts associated with outdoor events involving use of amplified sound and also from breakout noise from indoor events. Unable to properly assess noise impacts of outdoor events. EPA notes a number of anomalies/specific concerns regarding events, use of amplified sound, noise associated with sound checks and rehearsals, noise associated with set up and dismantle etc, community notification procedures Quantitative assessment of background noise levels should be provided in accordance with INP Noise compliance monitoring of mechanical plant noise should be undertaken during commissioning Noise generating mechanical services should be designed, selected and maintained to ensure that noise levels do not exceed background level by more than 5dB and that noise generated do not exhibit tonal or other annoying characteristics Waste collection areas should be designed to minimise activation of vehicle reversing alarms during use Waste collection services should be restricted to day-time as defined in INP 				
	C5h	Seawater-based air conditioning plant EPA Letter dated 14 August 2014:	Details regarding the seawater cooling system are provided in sections 5.18 and 7.14 of the Project EIS.			
		• Further information required regarding type of plant proposed and whether it will include seawater abstraction				
	C5i	Energy and water conservation				
		EPA Letter dated 14 August 2014:	Proposed sustainability measures are detailed in section 5.15 of the Project EIS and in the Sustainability Framework provided in Appendix 11 of			
		Energy efficiency, water conservation and water efficiency	the EIS.			

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	ROM AGENCIES	
		measures should be incorporated at the design phase.	
		Letter dated 1 December 2016:	
		 EPA notes that a sustainable design approach is provided aimed at implementing practicable energy and water efficiency and conservation measures. 	
Fire and Rescue NSW	C6a	FRNSW recommend that the booster location/s be provided and approved to the satisfaction of FRNSW (as the authority required to use the system in the event of an emergency).	The Applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.
	C6b	FRNSW recommend that the consultant fire engineer engage FRNSW as a stakeholder through the Fire Engineering Brief Questionnaire process and that the proposed holistic strategy for the precinct be determined to the satisfaction of FRNSW.	The Applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.
	C6c	FRNSW were not engaged as a stakeholder with regards determinations made as part of the Risk & Security Assessment. FRNSW recommend that a fire scenario involving malicious ignition (arson) as a sensitivity analysis be considered with multiple fires occurring at once with the public areas of the development as previously recommended.	The Applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.
	C6d	With regards to the evacuation strategy of the precinct and the draft emergency management strategy, FRNSW have provided recommendations under the cover of the attached letter issued by FRNSW dated 22 September 2017 (Ref D17/66152) and anticipate a submission of the final emergency management strategy for review and approval by FRNSW.	The Applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.
	C6e	FRNSW recommend that the smoke hazard management system be provided to the satisfaction of FRNSW.	The Applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.
	C6f	FRNSW recommend that the proposal to isolate the smoke detection system in the performance space during theatrical performances identified in 'Table 3 – Table of non – compliances' be approved by	The Applicant has no objection to the proposed condition.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIO	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
5		FRNSW to ensure that the proposed isolation of the system addresses the significant safety to building occupants. (seehttp://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/~/media/Files/DPE/Other/letter- isolation-of-smoke-alarm-systems-for-theatrical-purposes-2012-06- 13.ashx?la=en)	
Foreshores & Waterways Planning and Development Advisory Committee	C7	The Committee suggests that the consent authority has regard to clauses 13-15, 21, 25, 26, 41, 59 and 63 of the SREP and, also considers the relevant clauses 5.4, 5.6 and 5.11 in addition to the relevant Landscape Character Type(s).	Matters addressed in Response to Submissions Report
Heritage Council	C8a	Detailed Design The detailed design of building identification and wayfinding signage must be visually consistent and specifically designed to respect the integrity of the industrial character of the Precinct.	Further detail on the proposed signage and wayfinding is provided in the TZG Response to Submissions – Heritage Council at Appendix 7. It includes an overview of the signage and wayfinding concepts in a revised Signage Plan. The number of tenant identification signs is proposed to be rationalised and signs sized to relate to the original fabric of the wharves. The Applicant will further develop the detailed design of signage and wayfinding in consultation with the Heritage Council and City of Sydney.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
	C8b	It is understood that the proposed new stairs, lifts and gantries are critical operationally and for accessibility and egress. However limited information has been provided regarding the proposed external additions including stairs and lift shafts at Piers 2/3 and 4/5. A sympathetic and modest design approach must be adopted for all external additions to minimise impacts to the visual prominence and industrial character of the Wharves. The size of lift shafts must be reduced as much as possible to reduce 'clutter' on the wharf apron. Further design details for all external additions must be provided to the Heritage Council for assessment prior to approval of this project.	A simple and modest design approach has been adopted for all external additions to ensure that they respect the industrial character of the wharves and to minimise their visual prominence. The lift shafts have been designed to be as small as possible to provide equitable access and efficient goods movement within the Precinct. The height of the overall lift shaft structures has been carefully considered in terms of overrun, relationships to the original buildings and consistency within the Precinct. Further design rationale and detail is provided in the TZG Response at Appendix 7.
	C8c	It is unclear if the proposed roof plant will be screened, in particular on Wharf 4/5. It is recommended that plant equipment is not visible from the public domain. Further design details for plant screening must be provided to the Heritage Council for assessment prior to approval of this project.	The external roof plant is proposed to be located on simple steel framed platforms set in the valleys, between the two ridge lines, to ensure that it will not be visible from the public domain. It is not proposed to be screened. Further design rationale and detail is provided in the TZG Response at Appendix 7.
	C8d	Limited information has been provided regarding the proposed strengthening of the structure to accommodate new performance spaces and mechanical services. The introduction of new structural members must be undertaken sensitively and with minimal impact to significant fabric and spaces. Further design details must be provided to the Heritage Council for assessment prior to approval of this project.	Refer Section 1d) of TZG at Appendix 7 for response. Structural Report provided at Appendix 11.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
	C8e	It is noted that the proposed new internal partition walls are generally setback from the external walls. However, it is unclear how these walls will be connected back to the structure. Further design details for all internal additions, including mezzanine floors, must be provided to the Heritage Council for assessment prior to approval of this project. In addition, details of materials and finishes should be submitted for assessment prior to approval of works to ensure that any adverse impacts to significant fabric.	The design of the interiors aims to retain the original fabric of the pier with minimal interventions into the external walls. A strategy of containing new uses within separate free standing 'boxes' has been employed where ever possible to reduce the need to line the original external walls. Further detail regarding all internal additions as well as materials and finishes is provided in the TZG report at Appendix 7.
	C8f	In areas where walls are proposed to be attached to external walls e.g. Bell Studio, consideration must be given to setting these walls back from external walls to minimise adverse impacts to significant fabric	New uses are generally proposed to be housed within discrete 'containers' within the wharf buildings in order to minimise the internal lining of external original walls. In the limited areas where original external walls form part of the enclosing walls of a conditioned space there is a requirement to meet Section J of the BCA. In these instances only, new studwork is proposed to span floor to ceiling, with insulation and internal linings to meet code. The new walls will be separated from the original walls to minimise adverse impacts on significant fabric. Further detail regarding all internal additions as well as materials and finishes is provided in the TZG report
	C8g	Solid partitions are proposed to be introduced on the upper deck of Wharf 2/3. This will change the space's large volume and adversely impact on the building's original and significant spatial configuration as a former goods warehouse. Consideration must be given to utilising glazing to the upper portion of the new partition walls to retain the appreciation of the structure and full height of the space.	at Appendix 7. Within the upper shed, the performance spaces are proposed to be clad in metal below the trusses, reminiscent of shipping containers, with mirrored cladding to the upper portion of the walls. The upper portion of the walls will 'disappear' by reflecting the original roof structure of the building and give the impression of the original volume of the upper shed.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
			Glazing is provided to the ACO Auditorium, Rehearsal 1 and Offices as illustrated in the internal elevations in the TZG Report at Appendix 7.
	C8h	The original 'dead house' is proposed to be reused as a box office/cloak room. Limited details have been provided regarding any changes required to house these functions with the existing space. Further design details of this space must be provided to the Heritage Council for assessment prior to approval of this project.	The original fabric, including the timber screen that surrounds the space will be retained and conserved with the existing sliding timber screens made operable. The fitout of the space is the subject of design development, however, the design intent is that the free standing joinery including serving counter and cloak storage units are contemporary and reversible, as illustrated in the drawings in section 1h) of the TZG Report at Appendix 7.
	C8i	It is noted that some existing walls are to be upgraded to meet requirements of Section J of the BCA. It is unclear what works will be undertaken. Further design details of this work must be provided to the Heritage Council for assessment prior to approval of this project.	Refer detailed discussion in section 1i) of the TZG Report at Appendix 7.
	C8j	It is unclear how proposed new external gantry/platforms features will be tied back to the wharf structure and if any additional strengthening of the wharf that is required. Further design details for these elements must be provided to the Heritage Council for assessment prior to approval of this project.	The external gantry platforms on Level 1 are an interpretation of the travelling gantries that once served large ships at Walsh Bay. The gantries are supported on steel columns and detailed in a robust, industrial manner, fixed back to the timber columns of the original buildings using simple steel plates with coach screws. These details will be further refined in design development.
	C8k	The original ironbark flooring in both Wharves is proposed to be retained in-situ. However, new flooring is required in areas such as kitchens and toilet facilities. Further design details of how the ironbark flooring will be retained and protected prior to the new flooring structure being installed above must be provided to the Heritage Council for assessment prior to approval of this project.	Where new finishes are proposed over the original flooring a double layer of 0.2mm thick plastic sheet, taped and sealed, will be installed to protect the original timber flooring from damage. Equitable access underpins the adaptive reuse of the

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
			pier. To comply with accessibility codes it is necessary to remove the top layer of the original timber flooring in limited areas such as to the accessible bathrooms and commercial kitchens. The extent of this intervention has been carefully considered to minimise heritage impact
			Further detail is provided in section 1k) of the TZG Report at Appendix 7.
	C8I	The introduction of new services must be undertaken sensitively and with minimal impact to significant fabric and spaces. This should be done in consultation with the nominated heritage consultant to ensure adverse impacts are minimised	The Applicant confirms that these works will be undertaken in consultation with the nominated Heritage Consultant. Further detail is provided in section 1I) of the TZG
			Report at Appendix 7.
	C8m	There is a significant amount of original fabric that is proposed to be removed including original timber columns, timber trusses, brace beams and steel strong backs to obtain completely open areas in the theatres and rehearsal rooms. In developing the further design details, the adviser impacts to these components must be minimised. Any significant fabric that is removed and not proposed to be reused must be recorded, tagged and securely stored on-site for future use. A removal and storage methodology must be provided prior to the commencement of works.	The Applicant has no objection to this suggested condition
	C8n	Significant elements are to be adequately protected during the works from potential damage. Protection systems must ensure historic fabric is not damaged or removed.	The Applicant has included protection of heritage as an important aspect required in the Environmental, Construction and Site Management Plan which formed Appendix 26 of the Project EIS.
	C80	Nominated heritage consultant A suitably qualified and experienced heritage consultant must be	The Applicant has included provision of a nominated heritage architect in the Environmental, Construction

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSIC	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
		nominated for this project. The nominated heritage consultant must provide input into the detailed design and shall inspect the demolition and removal of material to ensure that the heritage consultant must be briefed prior to the selection of appropriate tradespersons with experience in similar heritage structures, materials and methods, and must be satisfied that all work has been carried out in accordance with the conditions of this consent	and Site Management Plan which formed Appendix 26 of the Project EIS.
	C8p	The nominated heritage consultant is to provide ongoing advice to tradespeople undertaking the proposed works throughout the construction period. To ensure that significant fabric is not damaged during the works.	As above
	C8q	Archival recording A photographic archival recording of all areas of the wharves must be prepared prior to the commencement of works, and following completion of works, in accordance with the NSW Heritage Division publication <i>How to prepare archival records of heritage items and</i> <i>Photographic Recording of Heritage Items using Film or Digital</i> <i>Capture</i> . The original copy of the archival record must be deposited with the Heritage Division, Office of Environment and Heritage, and an additional copy provided to the City of Sydney to ensure that the existing spaces are properly documented prior to modification and that copies of the archival recordings are kept with the relevant authorities	The Applicant has no objection to the suggested condition.
	C8r	Future tenanciesTenancy Fitout Guidelines must be prepared to make future tenants aware of the cultural significance of the Wharves and their requirements for their ongoing conservation and management. The guidelines should be informed by the 'Conservation Management Plan', Design 5 Architects, 2014 and the 'Walsh Bay Arts and Cultural Precinct Heritage Impact Assessment Report', prepared by Tropman & Tropman Architects, October 2017.	The Applicant has committed to the development of Tenancy Fitout Guidelines in the Project EIS- section 5.15.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
	C8s	Interpretation An interpretation plan for Walsh Bay Arts and Cultural Precinct must be prepared by an interpretive specialist to outline the approach to Interpretation at Piers 2/3, 4/5 and surrounding public domain areas affected by this SSD. The Plan should include indicative designs and locations for interpretive devices, a strategy for the reuse, storage and/or display of the movable heritage items currently stored within Pier 2/3, and incorporate the results of the archaeological monitoring program and evidence of the maritime archaeological potential and archaeological evidence within the site. The Plan should be prepared with regard to the 'Walsh Bay Wharves Precinct Interpretation Plan', 1999, and the 'Interpretation Strategy for Movable Heritage Items Pier 2/3 Walsh Bay', November 2016.	The Applicant has committed to the development of an Interpretation Plan for the WBACP in the Project EIS, section 7.3.3.
	C8t	The interpretation plan shall be prepared as an integral component of the final detailed design process and be provided to the Heritage Council of NSW and to the Department of Planning and Environment prior to the commencement of works. The plan must be implemented within 12 months of the completion of the works	The Applicant has no objection to the development of an interpretation plan. The Applicant requests that any condition to this effect is made in relation to the construction of relevant works.
	C8u	Historical archaeology The excavation works for utilities as part of this project should be archaeologically monitored, recorded and appropriately documented including any relics or intact archaeological features identified during this work in accordance with Section 7.4.2 of the 'Walsh Bay Arts and Cultural Precinct, State Significant Development Application SSDA 8671, Appendix 17: Archaeological Assessment' prepared by Cultural Resources Management dated September 2017. The results of this investigation must be documented in a report provided within 12 months of the completion of the archaeological work to the Department of Planning and Environment and the Heritage Library of the Place Management Division, Property NSW. Archaeological works need to be undertaken by a suitably qualified nominated Excavation Director who satisfies the Heritage Council's Excavation Director	The Applicant has no objection to the suggested condition.

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
C. SUBMISSI	ONS FR	OM AGENCIES	
		Criteria for undertaking works at State Significant historical archaeological sites in NSW	
	C8v	MARITIME ARCHAEOLOGY If the scope of works is altered in any way that will directly impact the seafloor within this area, including piling and any other services, then an assessment of the impacts must be undertaken by a suitably qualified maritime archaeologist in accordance with the Heritage Division guidelines.	The Applicant has no objection to the suggested condition.
Office of Environment & Heritage	C9	After reviewing the relevant documents, OEH's Greater Sydney Planning Team has concluded that the matter does not contain biodiversity, natural hazards or Aboriginal cultural heritage issues that require a formal OEH response. We have no further need to be involved in the assessment of this project.	Noted
Roads & Maritime Services	C10a	The EIS submitted for the proposed development identifies the need for a maritime exclusion zone during construction activities. A Marine Notice for the exclusion zone is required to be published in the Government Gazette at least two weeks prior to the commencement of works.	The Applicant has no objection to the suggested condition.
		In this regard the applicant should contact Roads and Maritime at least four weeks prior to the commencement of construction, to provide details of the proposed start and end dates of construction. Details should be sent by email to <u>maritimeplanning@rms.nsw.gov.au</u>	
	C10b	A Construction Licence will be required for any occupation of Roads and Maritime land.	Noted
	C10c	A Construction Traffic Management detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to Council, TfNSW Sydney Coordination Office and Roads and Maritime prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.	A Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) was submitted as Appendix 21 of the Project EIS. Section 5 of the CPTMP details that principal contractor shall develop a detailed CPTMP in consultation with the Sydney Coordination Office, TfNSW, Roads and Maritime, Barangaroo Developmen

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE		
C. SUBMISSI	C. SUBMISSIONS FROM AGENCIES				
			Authority and the City of Sydney Council prior to construction commencing.		
Sydney Water Corporation	C11	 Sydney Water supports the proposed plan. Water services are available from the 200mm mains in Hickson Road. Wastewater services are available from the 225mm and 150mm mains in Hickson Road. Detailed requirements will be provided in response to the application for Section 73 Compliance Certificate prior to development commencement. 	Noted		