

2 November 2018

15879

## Appendix A

### Record and Response to Submissions

Extracts from Government agency and authority submissions and submissions from the general public received in relation to SSD 18\_9347, and a response to each of these matters, has been outlined in the table below.

**THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

## 1.0 Government, authority and agency submissions

Extract	Response
Department of Planning and Environment (the Department)	
<p>The exhibition of the Development Application (DA), including the environmental impact statement (EIS), for the above project ended on Wednesday 19 September 2019. All submissions received by the Department during the exhibition of the project are available on the Department's website at <a href="http://www.majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au">http://www.majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au</a></p> <p>The Department requires that you provide a response to the issues raised in those submissions, in accordance with clause 85A(2) of the Environment Planning and Assessment Regulations 2000. Please provide a response to the issues raised in these submissions within 60 days from the date of this letter.</p>	<p>This table, the covering Response to Submissions (RTS) report and accompanying consultants' reports have responded to the matters raised in the submissions.</p>
City of Sydney Council (the City)	
<p>The City made a submission to the Department regarding Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 Amendment No. 42 (submission dated 1 December 2017). The submission objected to the proposal and issues raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inconsistency with the Martin Place Special Character Area and long-term vision for Martin Place;</li> <li>• inconsistency with the proposed Central Sydney Planning Strategy;</li> <li>• the reduced setback intruding on Martin Place views including the prominences of the GPO clock tower;</li> <li>• the lack of side street building setbacks impacting on pedestrian amenity;</li> <li>• proposed floor space ratios (FSRs) not being supported by robust analysis; and</li> <li>• the proposal inappropriately using the 60 Martin Place development consent as a precedent for the South Site setbacks.</li> </ul>	<p>The amendment to the Sydney LEP was subject to a separate planning process, and was found to be supportable on merit and strategic significance, and consequently was approved by the Minister for Planning. The Stage 1 Amending DA is fully consistent with the recognised strategic merit of the site, and will maximise its potential within the appropriate environmental constraints.</p> <p>Each of the matters raised have been addressed in the amendment to the Sydney LEP (refer specifically to the Response to Submissions – dated 20 December 2017) which has now been approved and published and are equally applicable and upheld under the Stage 1 Amending DA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is consistent with the long-term vision for the Martin Place Special Character Area because it re-instates the desired built form along Martin Place. The Proposal strikes an appropriate balance between conserving and enhancing the significance of Martin Place as one of Central Sydney's grand civic and ceremonial spaces, and expanding on its role as a valued business and commercial location in the Sydney CBD with excellent access to public transport. Sydney Metro is Australia's biggest public transport project that will shape Sydney for generations to come. The Proposal is consistent with the objectives of the applicable FSR and height controls.</li> <li>• Whilst it is acknowledged that the Draft Central Sydney Planning Strategy has contemplated a change in circumstances which result from the construction of the Sydney Metro project, the proposed 8 metre setback appropriately balances the proposed threshold condition<sup>1</sup> arising from the station opportunity and the historic podium and setback arrangement to Martin Place. The proposal respects the 45 metre street frontage wall requirement and, as discussed in the Urban Design Report which supported the Planning Proposal, the position of the building is a response to the specific urban design context of the site and built form relationships with both surrounding buildings and public space. The Martin Place over station development presents a significant opportunity to create a new landmark CBD location and a world-class transport hub.</li> <li>• The envelope protects existing significant vistas to the east and west and ensures the South Tower will not detrimentally affect the silhouette of the GPO clock tower. The View Impact Analysis and in particular the view studies of Martin Place submitted with the Planning Proposal, Concept Proposal and Stage 1 Amending DA demonstrate that the GPO clock</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> As part of the approved Concept Proposal, Tzannes identified the opportunity to enhance the distinctive character of Martin Place by reinforcing defined street edges along the north/south streets that intersect Martin Place. The effect of this is to produce 'thresholds' – or the differentiation of one space to another – that create a clear sense of arrival to Martin Place by creating a break in the pattern of tower setbacks in the city. Refer to Section 2.1.3 of the main RTS report for further discussion.

Extract	Response
	<p>tower remains unobstructed by the South Site envelope from all public spaces within Martin Place. The principal impact on the view of the clock tower from the public domain is through the design of the podium of the South Site, which meets all relevant planning controls and objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The zero setbacks to Elizabeth Street and Castlereagh Street play important roles in the urban morphology of this part of the city. These setbacks, in contrast to the typical setbacks of the city, provide distinctive thresholds into major public spaces in the City, Chifley Square and Martin Place. This is particularly important in the case of Martin Place which has a typical street morphology. Compared to the LEP/DCP Compliant Envelope, the modelling of the proposed envelope reveals there are negligible additional impacts with regards to shadows, wind and sky views.</li> <li>• The proposal is within the approved and now published FSR control. The FSR was considered at the Planning Proposal stage and determined to have strategic merit on the basis that it satisfied the assessment criteria in the Department of Planning and Environment's <i>A Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals</i> as it "responds to a change in circumstances, such as the investment in new infrastructure or changing demographic trends that have not been recognised by existing planning controls".</li> <li>• 60 Martin Place has been used as an element of the overall justification for the proposal. Precedents relate to the urban design outcome; the precedents are not specifically used to justify the environmental impacts. It is also noted that 60 Martin Place did not have a metro station beneath it contributing to its FSR allocation.</li> </ul>
<p>In lieu of incorporating the recommendations regarding street frontage conditions along Elizabeth and Castlereagh Streets as part of the existing concept approval (SSD 8351), it is recommended that in amending the concept envelope and increasing the building mass of the south tower, building returns be incorporated in the southern corners of the envelope as a transition to the adjoining development to the south above the podium height. This would in part assist in achieving the outcome of the Independent Planning Commission's advice of reinforcing the importance of the urban character and integrity of Martin Place and the associated city blocks. A return of 8m x 8m is recommended for each corner for the building above a nominal 45m podium height.</p>	<p>The returns suggested in the City's submission would undermine the creation of a successful transition to the adjoining development to the south. The returns suggested would also undermine the distinct threshold condition being created by the proposed development that reinforces the uniqueness and legibility of Martin Place within the urban fabric of the city. The introduction of recesses in the South Tower has been previously considered and reviewed by both the Sydney Metro and site-specific Design Review Panel, and was not supported as the desired or ultimate outcome for the South Site.</p> <p>The introduction of recesses is not an appropriate design response for the following reasons (as detailed further in the covering RtS report and supporting consultants' reports):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amended building envelope for the South Tower is consistent with the approved relationship between the South Site and the southern boundary. A zero setback to the southern boundary was approved under the Concept Proposal (SSD 17_8351) and formalised in the endorsed Consolidated Design Guidelines. The treatment of the building envelope to existing and future developments to the south was supported and remains unchanged in the Stage 1 Amending DA.</li> <li>• The introduction of 8m by 8m recesses at a height of 45m therefore does not relate to the existing development to the south, creating a potentially awkward built form relationship between the proposal and the adjoining and adjacent development. It creates a new setback and podium height that is not echoed in the existing development to the south, and limits the flexibility to redevelop land to the south with regards to podium height and pressures of the Sun Access Plane (SAP). This is detailed in the supplementary response prepared by Tzannes and included at Appendix B of the RtS.</li> <li>• The proposed zero setback to the southern boundary defines the edge of this threshold, and is important for reinforcing the legibility of Martin Place in the urban fabric. Including recesses in the façade would undermine this threshold condition and therefore undermine the ability of the development to provide a clear sense of arrival to Martin Place. This would have the effect of reducing Martin Place's differential or 'specialness' when moving through the city, and as such would not achieve the Council's desire to reinforce the 'importance' and 'integrity of Martin Place'.</li> <li>• The introduction of 8m x 8m recesses above the podium would reduce the area of usable floor space to 972m<sup>2</sup> of Net Lettable Area (NLA). This reduced floorplate impacts the ability of the South Tower to attract and accommodate large multi-floor occupants and premium global businesses, which in turn undermines the ability of the South Site to contribute to the long-term viability and competitiveness of the Sydney CBD.</li> </ul>

Extract	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introducing recesses into the proposed South Tower building envelope will not result in any meaningful environmental benefits. This has been detailed in the technical studies that accompanied the EIS and approved Concept Proposal, and the RTS, which conclude there would be no recognisable improvement to wind conditions, overshadowing or views.</li> <li>The introduction of recesses to the building envelope would require a range of associated changes to the building and integrated station, as they impact on the structure of the building.</li> </ul>
<p>The Wind Environment Study prepared by CPP for the proposal indicates that locations around the site (17-19, 23-26) would experience increased wind speeds as compared to the existing concept envelope. As noted in previous submissions to the existing concept envelope, design options that retain the current comfort ratings (including the consideration of weather protection) should be considered.</p>	<p>The building envelope considered under the Stage 1 Amending DA does not preclude achieving a good pedestrian wind environment, and meeting the commitments of the Consolidated Urban Design Guidelines (as proposed to be amended) to create pedestrian standing environments at station entrances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All areas that were assessed remain suitable for their intended use in this section of the city, and as such the change to the comfort rating does not adversely impact the intended function of these spaces.</li> <li>The measured threshold wind speed is close to the boundary between two comfort categories in both locations, and as such even though the comfort rating has changed, the relative magnitude of the change is minor. CPP confirms that there is negligible difference in wind conditions between the approved and amended configuration.</li> <li>The results relate to the approved and amended maximum building envelopes and not the detailed design of the South Tower. Wind conditions are improved in the detailed design of the South Tower, as outlined in the Pedestrian Wind Environment Study accompanying the Stage 2 DA for the South Site (SSD 18_9326). This detailed analysis accompanying the Stage 2 DA confirms that the surrounding pedestrian environment complies with the relevant safety criteria, and that pedestrian comfort has been improved at every location when compared to the building envelope (other than one location, which still meets the desired 'pedestrian standing' criterion). Accordingly, the detailed design of the South Tower already largely achieves the objective of retaining or improving comfort ratings.</li> <li>The amended South Tower building envelope is also capable of achieving a 'pedestrian standing' criteria at the station entrance, which is identified in both the approved and amended Consolidated Design Guidelines as being a key aspiration for the development.</li> </ul>
Government Architect NSW (GANSW)	
<p>The DA relates to amending the concept approval building envelope for the south site. There is no change proposed to the building envelope for the north site. The DRP, of which Peter Poulet is the chair, has already seen the proposal for the south tower, the design of which is based on the revised envelope, the subject of this DA.</p> <p>No change is proposed to the design excellence strategy which formed part of the concept approval and was endorsed by GANSW and the Minister for Planning. The strategy being that a competitive design process is not required.</p> <p>Given the above, and that the DRP is still in operation and GANSW has committed to reviewing the EIS for the Stage 2 DAs (i.e. the north and south towers), we have no comments on this DA.</p>	<p>No response required.</p> <p>Macquarie and its design team have met with the specially configured Design Review Panel on six (6) occasions to discuss the range of applications developed for the Precinct, and specifically the Stage 2 DAs which the Panel was convened for. The DRP's advice has been important in improving the design of the development, ensuring the development exhibits design excellence and ensuring the Consolidated Design Guidelines for the project have been addressed by the design.</p> <p>Macquarie remains committed to continuing to work with the DRP through the design development phase on the Stage 2 DAs.</p> <p>It is worth noting the DRP did not raise any concerns or objections to bulk and scale, and specifically the setbacks now being sought for the South Tower.</p>

Extract	Response
Heritage Council	
<p>The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) issued on 6 June 2018 for Amending Stage 1 Concept Proposal application required the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a heritage impact statement (HIS) that considers the potential impacts to heritage items on the site, the site curtilage and surrounding area, including any built and landscape items, conservation areas, views and settings, and in particular, heritage items at 38-46 Martin Place, 50 Martin Place, Martin Place Railway Station, Martin Place, Chifley Square and Richard Johnston Square</li> <li>• assessment against any endorsed conservation management plans prepared for these heritage items</li> <li>• identification of opportunities for heritage interpretation to reflect on the heritage character and significance of the site and surrounding area, including Martin Place.</li> </ul> <p>A Statement of Heritage Impact (SOHI) prepared by TKD Architects (June 2018) and revised Consolidated Design Guidelines (CDG) prepared by Tzannes (July 2018) have been provided to meet these requirements.</p>	<p>No response required.</p>
<p>The HIS assesses that the potential impacts of the enlarged envelope is negligible in comparison to the previously approved envelope; that the impact of a future building on the South Site on the significance of neighbouring heritage items are generally minor or neutral in relation to their streetscape presentation and setting; and that the proposed building has the potential to enhance the significant characteristics of the street through its architectural expression, scale, form and materials. The Heritage Council assessment is that the potential impacts are likely to be noticeable rather than negligible and the proposal will impact the established character of Martin Place by altering the established setback and scale.</p>	<p>As detailed in the statements prepared by TKD and Tzannes, the proposed Stage 1 Amending DA envelope in no way detrimentally impacts on the distinctive qualities of Martin Place. The proposed envelope has been developed from a site-specific study of the spatial qualities and built form of Martin Place as well as extensive research on the history of its design and development. The proposed building envelope responds to the context of the site and will deliver a development that addresses the scale and character of Martin Place.</p>
<p>The HIS does not adequately address the greater impacts arising from the reduced setback and enlarged building envelope on surrounding heritage items and the character of Martin Place. The HIS, CDG and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) do not assess the consistency of the amended concept design with the Heritage Development Guidelines (SOHI, Section 6) and the guidelines of the CGD, in particular Section 2.3 Built form (Guidelines nos. 8, 12, 13, 14 and 15).</p>	<p>Sections 5 and 6 of the Statement of Heritage Impact adequately address the impact of the proposed amended building envelope on neighbouring heritage items. The assessment concludes the proposed envelope has the potential for a new building which will relate purposefully to neighbouring heritage items through the scale, height and alignment of the podium element and through the set back of the tower component.</p> <p>The HIS and EIS also addressed the amendments to the Heritage Design Guidelines and Consolidated Design Guidelines under this application, which guide the detailed design of the Precinct. The consistency with the amended Guidelines is detailed in the Stage 2 DAs for the detailed design, construction and operation of the proposed integrated commercial towers.</p>

Extract	Response
<p>The HIS states that “replacement of the present building on the South Site at 39 Martin Place provides an opportunity for a new podium which better reinforces the strong lineal character and spatial enclosure of the street in its height, scale, materiality and architectural expression” (p.54).</p> <p>The Heritage Council considers that the future detailed design for the tower building and the podium will need to be articulated to ensure the podium is predominant and contributes to achieving the opportunity described in the HIS to reinforce the character of Martin Place, and in particular the relationship with 50 Martin Place.</p>	<p>The new podium for the South Site provides the opportunity to improve the strong lineal character and spatial enclosure of the street in its height, scale, materiality and architectural expression. The detailed design of the tower and the podium is communicated in the separate Stage 2 DA for the South Site (SSD 18_9326), which demonstrates that the South Site can achieve these objectives and reinforce the character of Martin Place and in particular its relationship with 50 Martin Place. This is in consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The South Tower reintroduces the dominant building form alignment of buildings in the area, reinforcing the strong linear character and spatial enclosure of Martin Place.</li> <li>• The podium reflects the height, composition, materiality and form of the 50 Martin Place building, to retain the landmark qualities and civic presence of the building within Martin Place and its environs.</li> <li>• The South Tower adopts the prevailing street frontage height established by 50 Martin Place, Qantas House, and Chifley Square, continuing this key height datum through the Precinct.</li> <li>• The tower is setback from Martin Place above the podium and protects views of the GPO Clock Tower along Martin Place.</li> <li>• The podium is divided into a base, shaft and termination that is similar to the composition of the facades of 50 Martin Place, retaining a human scale at the street as established by the 50 Martin Place building.</li> </ul> <p>It is noted that the National Trust of Australia (discussed below) is supportive of the podium’s potential to achieve a “well-enclosed and largely continuous building line combining to form a grand and imposing urban space for Martin Place”.</p>

Extract	Response
<p>National Trust of Australia (NSW)</p> <p>In November, 1981, the “Martin Place Urban Conservation Area” was listed on the National Trust Register as Sydney’s grand civic place. The Listing Report notes that:</p> <p><i>“Despite its mixture of building ages, styles, heights and textures, it maintains a coherence, a harmony and an elegant character. A score of important public and private buildings from the early nineteenth to the mid twentieth centuries remain in the conservation area, together giving a fine, harmonious streetscape emphasised by the topography. The predominant character, despite the variety, is one of a formal Victorian street, terminated at each end by elegant buildings. Despite the busy cross streets, the continuity of the pedestrian space is maintained by consistency in the kind of paving and street furniture installed during the 1970s conversion to a mall. It is a street where the harmony of the ochres of sandstone and granite, the gentle sweep of the hill, and the wide but well-enclosed and largely continuous building line combine to form a grand and imposing, but still very human, urban space.”</i></p> <p><i>The key element in the reasons for listing is “the wide but well-enclosed and largely continuous building line combine to form a grand and imposing, but still very human, urban space.”</i></p> <p>In the Trust’s view, the podium of the proposed building does meet the “well-enclosed and largely continuous building line combining to form a grand and imposing urban space” for Martin Place.</p> <p>However, the reduction of the tower setback to Martin Place from 25 metres to 8 metres, is contrary to the provisions of the Sydney City Council Development Control Plan for this site and will impact adversely on the maintenance of the “very human, urban space” so vital to the public’s use and enjoyment of Sydney’s grand civic space.</p>	<p>Development Control Plans (DCPs) are specifically excluded from being applicable to SSD (Clause 11 SEPP SRD). Further, it is emphasised that the proposed setback for the South Tower is entirely consistent with the Sydney LEP.</p> <p>With regard to the creation of a “very human, urban space”, the detailed design of the podium achieves a human scale and fine-grain articulation and design response that contributes to the public’s use and enjoyment of Martin Place. The articulation and materiality of the podium, and the introduction of active ground floor uses with individual entries, breaks up the proposed building envelope, creates a human scale, and benefits the vibrant urban space that is Martin Place. This is detailed further in the responses by Tzannes and TKD (Appendix F of the RtS).</p>
<p>Transport for NSW (TfNSW)</p> <p><u>Suggested conditions of consent:</u> It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to the following as included in the Consent for the SSD8351:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing and future rail corridors;</li> <li>• Development near rail corridors and busy roads;</li> <li>• Traffic and Transport;</li> <li>• Vehicular site access and loading dock;</li> <li>• Security assessment; and</li> <li>• Construction pedestrian and traffic management.</li> </ul> <p>TfNSW requests that the applicant consults with the Sydney Coordination Office to address the above issues. TfNSW would be pleased to consider any further material forwarded from the applicant.</p>	<p>This outcome as suggested by Transport for NSW is consistent with the proposed changes to the conditions outlined in V of the EIS, and are accepted.</p> <p>Macquarie has undertaken regular consultation with both Sydney Metro and Transport for NSW’s Sydney Coordination Office prior to lodgement of the Stage 1 Amending DA and Stage 2 DAs for both the North Site and South Site. Macquarie will continue to consult with these key stakeholders through the detailed design and delivery of the Precinct.</p>

Extract	Response
Civil Aviation Safety Authority Company	
CASA has reviewed the application and, in accordance with the civil aviation regulations, the proponent should seek the controlled activity approval through Sydney Airports Corporation Ltd (SACL). SACL will confirm the infringement and obtain comments from stakeholders, including CASA and Airservices Australia, and refer the application to the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities. CASA will assess the building from an obstacle perspective when a request for comment is received from SACL.	The necessary approvals are being sought from SACL as part of a separate concurrent process.
NSW Environmental Protection Agency	
On the basis of the information provided, the proposal does not constitute a Scheduled Activity under Schedule 1 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act). The EPA does not consider that the proposal will require an Environment Protection Licence (EPL) under the POEO Act. The EPA understands that the proposal is not being undertaken by or on behalf of a NSW public authority. The EPA is therefore not the appropriate regulatory authority for the proposal.	No response required.
Fire and Rescue NSW	
Fire + Rescue NSW will not at this time be providing comment on the Amending Stage 1 Concept Proposal (south site building envelope) Martin Place Station Precinct - Notice of Exhibition (SSD 9347) as there is currently insufficient information available regarding the fire safety and emergency response management aspects of the project.  We request that we be given the opportunity to review and provide comment once approvals have been granted and the project has progressed such that there is more relevant detailed information available.	No response required.  The detailed Stage 2 DA for the South Tower (SSD 18_9326) will be available for Fire and Rescue NSW to review as part of the public exhibition process.
Water NSW	
The subject site, is not nearby WaterNSW land or infrastructure and therefore WaterNSW has no particular requirements or comments regarding the proposal.	No response required.

## 2.0 Public submissions

Name	Extract	Response
John Freeman	<p>The applicant has not complied with item 8 of the SEARs (Public benefits, contributions and/or voluntary planning agreement.</p> <p>The EIS refers (page 29) to section 5.15 for this. However, 5.15 indicates that the authors of the EIS are completely ignorant of section 7.4 (planning agreements) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the EIS makes no mention of any "consultation with key stakeholders" regarding public benefits and/or a voluntary planning agreement as required by the SEARs.</p> <p>Worse still, the applicant is proposing a substantial quantum of additional floor space and variation from the prescribed setbacks without any offer under a voluntary planning agreement or other arrangement.</p> <p>I wouldn't object to the variation if there was a voluntary planning agreement that offered public benefits commensurate with the scale of the proposed variation. Other developers in the city centre have provided or offered significant public benefits on top of s61 contributions in return for far smaller additional floorspace or variations in planning controls.</p>	<p>The proposal achieves the requirements of the SEARs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIS (Section 5.15) confirms the relevant approach to contributions/agreements adopted by the Concept Proposal, that will be confirmed and conditioned in the subsequent detailed applications for the design, construction and operation of buildings on site (in the event that an approval is issued). The proposed development will be subject to the City of Sydney Council's contribution requirements under Section 61 of the <i>City of Sydney Act 1988</i>. These contributions will logically increase under this application to account for the increased capacity of the South Tower.</li> <li>It is emphasised that there is no requirement for the applicant to enter into or define the terms of any Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) at this stage, or in the future, in accordance with Section 7.4 of the EP&amp;A Act. As no VPA has been sought as part of the application, no further consultation was needed or is required.</li> <li>Consultation with key stakeholders, agencies and the general public was undertaken prior to the lodgement of the Stage 1 Amending DA, which included discussions with the Department, Council and Transport for NSW.</li> </ul> <p>It is further noted this project will deliver significant public benefits beyond the contributions associated with the proposed commercial towers. Macquarie has entered into a binding agreement with the NSW Government to deliver the new Martin Place metro station including public domain upgrades. These benefits as defined under the agreement between Macquarie and the NSW Government ensure greater direct benefits to the State are realised as a result.</p>
Name withheld	<p>We object to the potential loss of view from our unit to the south east. The amended height is too great on a significant and historic site like Martin Place. The application almost doubles the maximum floor area.</p>	<p>The Stage 1 Amending DA does not seek to amend the currently approved heights for the South Site.</p> <p>Both the North Tower and South Tower are consistent with the Sun Access Planes governing the maximum height of development on the site, and are of a scale that is appropriate for the site and can be accommodated on the site without resulting in adverse environmental impacts. The proposed development sits above, and is integrated with, the new Martin Place metro station that will deliver significant new public transport capacity directly connected to the proposed future buildings; and fronts Martin Place that is recognised as being the finance and banking heart of the CBD. The delivery of additional commercial floor space on these sites, beyond the existing situation, is appropriate and is consistent with established state, regional and local planning strategies for the growth and development of metropolitan Sydney.</p> <p>In terms of potential view loss, it is difficult to respond without knowing the objector's address. The original Concept Proposal assessed potential view loss from surrounding buildings, and concluded there will be a reduction in views and outlook from surrounding buildings, however this reduction will not adversely or unreasonably impact the amenity of these surrounding buildings.</p>

Name	Extract	Response
Name withheld	<p>I feel that Sydney should have a few wide boulevards such as many other cities have. Two examples are The Mall in London and the Champs Elysee in Paris. Many people love the width of Martin Place and the fact that you can stand at one end and have an unhindered view of the other end. The current width of Martin Place should not be narrowed at any point as doing so will make it a "pokey" and mean looking laneway rather than a boulevard. Sydney also does not have any large public squares for special events like other cities around the world have which is a great shame. Martin Place is probably the nearest thing we have to a public square so narrowing it at any point will ruin it completely. Macquarie Street should remain a wide boulevard type thoroughfare as well. Many people approved of the ANZAC Day March proceeding down Macquarie Street and Martin Place rather than down pokey over-developed George Street and many hope that this will continue in future as there is a lot of room in Hyde Park for by-standers Also the War Memorial and the Cenotaph are located in Macquarie Street and Martin Place so it's very appropriate for the ANZAC Day March to take that route. People standing at either end of Martin Place can have an unhindered view of the veterans proceeding down into or out of Martin Place. Please, please do not give in to developers who don't give a damn about the resulting look of our city.</p>	<p><u>Width of Martin Place</u></p> <p>The Stage 1 Amending DA does not seek to amend the currently approved width of Martin Place at the ground plane.</p> <p>The proposed South Tower building envelope will reinstate the dominant ground level building line along Martin Place that the previous building (being demolished) did not respect. Adopting a zero setback to Martin Place at ground level will continue the distinct and strong built form edge that has been created by the existing and historic development along Martin Place, and is supported on both urban design and heritage grounds.</p> <p>It is noted that as part of the separate works being completed for the delivery of the Martin Place metro station, the station portal in the centre of Martin Place will be closed and paved over so that the amount of trafficable/usable space within Martin Place will actually increase at the completion of the Martin Place metro station precinct, and not narrowed.</p> <p><u>Views</u></p> <p>The proposed South Tower and North Tower will not restrict views within Martin Place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The North Tower is substantially setback from Martin Place behind the existing 50 Martin Place building, and the South Tower will be setback further from Martin Place above the podium than the existing building on the site (currently being demolished).</li> <li>• The proposed South Tower is consistent with the pattern of reduced tower setbacks to the eastern side of the break in Martin Place caused by the MLC Centre, and will not impact any key views along Martin Place of the GPO clock tower, western CBD skyline, or Sydney Hospital.</li> </ul> <p><u>Macquarie Street</u></p> <p>No works are proposed to Macquarie Street, which is located one block to the north of the development site.</p>