

Summary of issues raised at Community Information Sessions

APPENDIX N

Appendix N – Summary of issues raised at Community Information Sessions

During the community information sessions held by Sydney Metro (i.e. during the exhibition of the EIS), the following key issues were raised by the attendees:

- building form and public domain
- views from adjacent development
- accessibility
- amenity, facilities and open space
- station entries
- North Sydney Train station & Metro Station
- noise
- metro services
- submissions and consultation
- other transport projects
- integrated station development
- traffic, parking and pedestrianisation
- value capture
- development rights

The sentiments of the attendees in relation to these key issues have been captured in the table below.

Building form and public domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built form: Questions were raised regarding what the final built form is likely to include. However, positive feedback was received regarding the size, shape, appearance and setbacks of the development. • Size and scale: Issues were raised regarding the overall size and scale of the development. This was mainly in terms of the height of the proposed tower. However, some attendees considered the building height was appropriate for the site. • Public open space: Questions were asked as to why the adjoining development (65 Berry Street, North Sydney) had not been consolidated into the proposed development, particularly the metro station component. It was suggested this may have provided opportunity for a wider precinct outcome, through the possibility of green space or a public square immediately in front of the metro station. • Stepped façade: An issue was raised regarding the stepped façade detail to Miller Street (as conceptually illustrated in the SSD exhibition material), which was not supported. Comments were raised regarding the indicative OSD design not matching the artist impression i.e. in terms of alignment. • Setbacks: Concern was raised that the 18m setback to the MLC building is not enough. • Planning approval: Questions were asked regarding the next phase in the planning approval process, i.e. in terms of obtaining a further detailed State Significant Development
---------------------------------	--

	Application.
Views from adjacent developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of views: Comments were received from representatives of the adjacent residential development – <i>“you’ve taken into consideration our views which is good”</i>. • Adjacent development: Comments were made in respect to the proposed building ‘overhang’ on Miller Street and the relationship with the MLC building. Some comments were supportive of the tower separation to the MLC building. • View loss: Some comments were raised regarding view loss, however, only from adjacent residential occupiers of the Alexander Apartments building. The concerns were that views would be further diminished, particularly following the approval and construction of the 1 Denison Street development.
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved accessibility: Adjacent owners positively commented in respect to access to the metro station, including for people with a disability, prams and children. • Convenience: Comments were raised in respect to the convenience of the integrated station development for nearby residents and workers.
Amenity, facilities and open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and economic benefits: Positive feedback was received in respect to the social and economic benefits that the integrated station development will provide, particularly for local shops and businesses. • Use of development: Concerns were raised that the over station development should be a community building, such as a recital hall or similar. Other feedback received questioned whether the development would be either a residential or commercial use. • Amenity: Positive feedback was received regarding the possible inclusion of restaurants, bars and other entertainment uses that could contribute towards night-time activation. General support was expressed for retail uses at ground level. • Availability of public open space: Comments were raised regarding the lack of open space in the North Sydney CBD, particularly for workers to use at lunchtime. A request was put forth that Sydney Metro seek opportunities to include in its design the open space/plaza that was available for public use in the previous office building. Further comments expressed that the area surrounding the station and forecourt should be a public square with open space.
Station entries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern entrance: Concerns were raised regarding the northern station entrance and whether the capacity is sufficient to handle crowds from North Sydney Oval. Confirmation was also provided to residents that there would be access from the northern entrance to the concourse. • Further details of entrance: Representatives from Blues Points were interested in further details such as the width of the access-way. However, they were generally supportive of the project including the north and south entries. A local

	<p>resident requested further clarification on the station location and entry points.</p>
North Sydney Train station & Metro Station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interface: There was interest regarding the interface with the North Sydney Station and Victoria Cross metro station, and the potential for a direct interchange. Some questioned whether there should be a direct connection with the existing North Sydney Station. • Underground connections: Comments were raised regarding the possibility of the underground concourse connecting to Greenwood Plaza, i.e. near corner of Miller/Brett Whiteley Plaza.
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise impacts: General questions were asked regarding construction and operational noise, in particular how this will be addressed by the contractor and operator.
Metro services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro services: General questions were raised relating to the frequency and overall operation of the metro station and network. Some specific questions were raised regarding the frequency of services. Further specific questions were raised on the metro and how it differs from the existing rail system. • Bicycle facilities: Questions were raised regarding provision of bicycle facilities within the metro station. • Station box: Questions were asked regarding ventilation of the station box, completion dates for the overall metro and integration station development..
Submissions and consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process: Clarification was sought on how to make a submission on the Environmental Impact Statement. Some negative feedback was received regarding the length of the statutory consultation period. • Community consultation: Negative comments were received about the amount of community consultation for the over station development. Questions were also raised regarding consultation with council, namely the process.
Other transport projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider transport context: Clarification was requested in respect to transport planning and the coordination with other parts of the Transport for NSW cluster, especially in relation to the Northern Beaches Tunnel project.
Integrated Station Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staging: Questions were raised regarding the staging of the integrated station development i.e. relative to the delivery of the metro station. The community favoured the preferred option, which is to build the over station development at the same time as the station.
Traffic, parking and pedestrianisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miller Street pedestrianisation: It was suggested that Miller Street should be closed off to vehicle traffic and be pedestrianised. Details regarding the pedestrian space along the Miller Street frontage were also requested by attendees. • On-site parking: Attendees raised concerns regarding the provision of on-site parking and suggested this proposed development provides an opportunity to remove or limit car parking. • Bicycle parking: Comments were raised regarding bicycle

	parking, requesting that both the station and over station development provide sufficient capacity for bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities, for example change-rooms and showers
Value Capture	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Value capture: Comments were raised suggesting that the over station development is a financial mechanism for the government to extract value from the site and to fund the metro.
Development rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development rights: Comments were made suggesting that the development rights for the site had been transferred to another site in North Sydney.