

Russell Hand

From: Roach, Sara <Sara.Roach@transport.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 October 2018 2:36 PM
To: Russell Hand
Cc: Cerone, Fil
Subject: HPE CM: FW: Victoria Cross OSD - Response to Submissions
Attachments: 160523 - Sydney Metro - Victoria Cross Station Development CIV QS Report....pdf; Vic Cross-DRP minutes and actions 7 August 2018 (final and endorsed).pdf; Updated Victoria_Cross_OSD_Design_Guidelines_October 2018 (issue to DPE)....pdf

Hi Russell

Further to your email below, please find attached the following documents:

1. **Sydney Metro Design Review Panel (DRP)**- an extract from the minutes of the DRP Meeting on 7 August 2018 in relation to the DRP's consideration of the articulation zone.
2. **Victoria Cross OSD Design Guidelines (Guidelines)**- the Guidelines have been amended to address dot points one and two in your email, as outlined below:
 - a. *Purpose of the articulation*- to incorporate new guidelines in section 4.0 (building design) to specifically guide the detailed design of the building within the articulation zone having regard to the Miller Street Special Area provisions; and
 - b. *Public Domain Integration between the Station and the OSD*- to expand Section 3.0 (station integration) to incorporate new design principles which specifically address the design integration of the OSD with the station and public domain.

A copy of the updated Guidelines are attached. I note that the changes made to the Guidelines to respond to the above matters are identified in red text. This is in addition to the blue text which responds to the amendments made previously and submitted with the Response to Submissions. A final version of the Guidelines removing the coloured text can be provided on request.

In respect to dot point three in your email (and as recently discussed), the response in section 5.5.1 of the Response to Submissions Report is a 'general reference' to the collective intent of the heritage guidelines in section 4.4 (heritage) of the Guidelines. For this reason, no amendments have been made to section 4.4 of the Guidelines.

Further to the above and as discussed, Sydney Metro is reluctant to update the Guidelines to reflect the look and feel of the Pitt Street OSD Design Guidelines at this stage in the DA assessment and tender process. It is considered that the detail in the Guidelines is now comprehensive, relevant and appropriate to their purpose. Should DPE consider that the Guidelines need to be further amendment, Sydney Metro would respectfully request that DPE consider imposing a condition to address this issue and to specifically require that the Guidelines be updated within 3 months of the determination of the concept SSD Application and furthermore, that the amended Guidelines be prepared in consultation with Sydney Metro's DRP.

3. **Capital Investment Value Quantity Surveyor's Report (CIV Report)**- a copy of the CIV Report prepared by WT Partnership for the Victoria Cross Over Station Development (7 March 2018) is attached. Sydney Metro specifically requests that this report be treated as a 'confidential' document and not be uploaded on the DPE's website with other project related information.

Russell, I trust the above information has addressed the issues raised in your email. I would be happy to discuss any of the above further with you if required and look forward to hearing from you once you have had an opportunity to review this email and the respective attachments.

Further to the above, Sydney Metro also looks forward to hearing from you as soon as possible regarding any feedback received from key stakeholders in respect to the Response to Submission Report.

Kind regards
Sara

Sara Roach
OSD Planning Advisor
Sydney Metro, City and Southwest
Transport for NSW

M 0417 464 670
World Square Level 39, 680 George Street, Sydney NSW 2000



Use public transport... plan your trip at transportnsw.info
Get on board with Opal at opal.com.au

From: Russell Hand [mailto:Russell.Hand@planning.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 19 September 2018 4:25 PM
To: Roach, Sara
Cc: Annie Leung
Subject: Victoria Cross OSD - Response to Submissions

Dear Sara,

We have carried out a preliminary review of the RtS for Victoria Cross and request further information and also clarifications to the Design Guidelines. Please note that DPE are awaiting comments from agencies and the public on the RtS and further requests for information may arise.

Supporting documentation for Sydney Metro DRP (DRP)

Please provide the advice from the Sydney Metro DRP and how the proposal responded to the advice particularly on the proposed Miller Street articulation zone.

Design Guidelines

Please consider updating the Design Guidelines as follows:

- Purpose of the Articulation Zone – clarify the intent / design objectives of the articulation zone within the Miller Street area to positively guide subsequent detailed design application. The guidelines should reflect on how the proposal can achieve the objectives of the Miller Street Setback Control. As it stands, Section 4.3(4) *Building Design* of the Design Guidelines speaks to consideration of adverse impacts and potential restriction on the use of the articulation zone only.

- Public domain SSI-SSD integration – Given the key concern of Council and the community relates to public domain and open space, we recommend the Applicant considers additional principles and parameters to support integration of the proposed over station development and the Station Design Precinct Plan under CSSI Approval 7400. I note Sydney Metro takes a different approach for the Pitt Street over station developments, which included design guidelines on public domain, movements, etc as discussed at the Coordination meeting last week.
- Section 5.5.1 response – at Paragraph 7 (Page 53 of the RtS) in the response to the Heritage Council submission, the RtS refers to design principles within the Design Guidelines which are said to include “*a requirement for the future composition, massing and materiality of the OSD to not visually dominate the low scale and form of the MLC Building or Rag and Famish Hotel.*” However, I cannot find any such design principle or principles in the Design Guidelines. Please review and either amend the response or supplement the Design Guidelines in response to the Heritage Council’s submission.

Capital Investment Value (CIV) confirmation

Please provide the estimated CIV for the concept as per the SEARs (as per EP&A Regulation). You can request confidentiality on the QS report and CIV letter.

Regards,

Russell Hand

Principal Planning Officer

Key Sites Assessments

NSW Planning & Environment | GPO Box 39 | Sydney NSW 2001

T 02 8275 1313 E russell.hand@planning.nsw.gov.au



Subscribe to our [newsletter](#)

This email is intended only for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you receive this email in error please delete it and any attachments and notify the sender immediately by reply email. Transport for NSW takes all care to ensure that attachments are free from viruses or other defects. Transport for NSW assume no liability for any loss, damage or other consequences which may arise from opening or using an attachment.

 **Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless really necessary.**

This email is intended only for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you receive this email in error please delete it and any attachments and notify the sender immediately by reply email. Transport for NSW takes all care to ensure that attachments are free from viruses or other defects. Transport for NSW assume no liability for any loss, damage or other consequences which may arise from opening or using an attachment.

 **Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless really necessary.**