

20 December 2006

### CUB Site – Agency Submissions in response to Concept Plan Application

Agency Submissions		
City of Sydney		
1	<p><b>Character</b> The proposed buildings in terms of height, bulk and scale do not relate positively to the scale character of Chippendale. The character of the sites industrial history heritage significance will be lost.</p>	See previous comments in response to general submissions.
2	<p><b>Environmental</b> The proposed park location is not considered to integrate with the community of Chippendale. The new building towers proposed around the park will overshadow the park and do not provide appropriate scale for a neighbourhood park.</p>	See previous comments in response to general submissions.
3	<p><b>Site remediation</b> The site remediation strategy is not supported by the City of Sydney. By opting not to fully enclose and tank basements, the concept plan will place an onerous responsibility on the future Owners' Corporations, requiring that they maintain and replace groundwater collection and odour control equipment for the life of the development.</p>	The Geotechnical Investigations report by URS discusses basement drainage in general and notes that tanking of basements is an option but one that may not be warranted given the cost and complexity. Tanking is needed for certain hydro-geological conditions and is a matter for determination at the detailed design stage. In the case of Block 11, which is affected by PCE contamination migrating from across Wellington Street, the Remediation Strategy proposes a method of basement construction that is also discussed in the Geotechnical Investigations report. Tanking is an alternative option for Block 11 but, again, this should be determined at the detailed design stage. Tanking alone will not address the issue of further migration of contaminants from off-site.
4	<p><b>Amenity Height</b> Buildings along the majority of the southern boundary reach 17 metres height and quickly rise to approximately 48m. This does not relate to the</p>	The height proposed is generally consistent with the SLEP 2005 controls, the draft controls prepared by the city and

	scale of Chippendale buildings and does not achieve a sense of transition.	consistent with the recommendations of the EAP.
5	The proposed podium has an insufficient set back of 3m from Broadway frontage, this is inconsistent with surrounding set backs along Broadway.	The podium setback to Broadway is 3m at its closest point. However, the tower footprint occupies only approximately 50% of the podium. Therefore, in terms of mitigating adverse wind effects the setback is considered to be satisfactory and in terms of consistency with the prevailing setback in Broadway, the building pattern in Broadway is sufficiently disparate to absorb the proposed tower form orientation and setback above podium level.
6	The proposed towers do not meet the separation standard.	The towers meet separation standards contained in CSDCP 1996 and SEPP 65.
7	The proposed maximum height will be shut off views from Chippendale and will lead to a confronting lack of human scale in the development.	See previous comments in response to general submissions.
8	The proposed development does not provides a sensible transition in height from the CBD to Chippendale.	The proposed maximum height is generally consistent with that the height proposed by the city its draft LEP for the site.
9	Buildings on the western side of Kent Road, south of the proposed towers on Broadway are rising over the recommended height of 45m.	The height of the building envelopes are consistent with EAP recommendation 14.
10	<b>Density</b> The concept Plan has increased the FSR from 4:1 to 4.23:1. The proposed FSR based on GFA is excessive and will result in poor urban form and amenity.	See previous comments in response to general submissions.
11	<b>Traffic Tooth Avenue</b> Tooth Ave is extremely wide and surrounded by tall buildings which will place it in permanent shade. Its scale and location is not considered to integrate with the street layout of Chippendale or its role as a high street for the proposal.	The internal road network has been developed through a process of developing a suitable road hierarchy within the site. Tooth Avenue would provide a boulevard treatment with on street parking and wide pedestrian footpaths.
12	<b>Balfour Street</b> The Draft package prepared by the Council envisaged Balfour Street as the High Street. It has potential to provide strong connection with Chippendale Street layout.  The planning of narrow streets does not allow for sufficient footpaths,	Balfour Street is considered the main pedestrian spine through the site linking south Chippendale with Broadway and areas to the north. This connection is reinforced by the recent request by the University of Technology to close Jones Street between Thomas Street and Broadway

	<p>signage and vehicle turning.</p> <p>The proposed north south streets may not be suitable for high activity uses.</p> <p>The street layout will allow for high of external vehicles through the site from Regent Street to Broadway.</p> <p>No analysis of design requirements for roads has been submitted.</p>	<p>All footpaths proposed throughout the site exceed standard minimum footpath widths. Some streets will have wide pedestrian pathways to promote outdoor dining.</p> <p>Sydney City Council has recently announced plans to better use laneways for active uses.</p> <p>The north south streets or shared laneways are identified as low volume 'shared zones'. It is envisage adjacent uses would reflect this proposed road environment.</p> <p>The potential rat run between Broadway and Regent Street has been identified and appropriate turning restrictions during peak periods at Regent Street / Kent Road will be put in place if excessive rat running did occur.</p>
13	<p>Poor standard of bicycle and walking accessibility through out the site. The concept plan does not reflect the City of Sydney's Cycling Strategy The concept plan does not take into consideration provision for cyclists and safety.</p>	<p>The proposed provision for cyclists reflects the City of Sydney' Bike Plan.</p> <p>Pedestrian pathways are provided on both sides of every street within the developments site. Shared zone laneways would be low speed environments with equal priority between pedestrians and vehicles. The desire to provide separate pedestrian and bicycle pathways needs to be balanced against providing adequate on street parking and maintain a number of heritage buildings on site.</p>
14	<p><b>Economic</b> Current planning controls prohibit public car park. Number of buildings. The number of tower buildings proposed and the in crease in height limit will overshadow open space and apartment buildings. Under the City of Sydney's Draft Package, tower buildings are limited to two structures between 70m and 100m. The proximity of so many tall buildings adjacent to the low rise area of Chippendale is not supported.</p>	<p>Clause 66 of SLEP 2005 does not prohibit public parking stations but it deems them permissible in certain circumstances.</p>
15	<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p>	

	<p><b>Tooth Ave</b>  The city is not supportive of Tooth Ave in its current form. The construction of Tooth Ave requires the removal of two significant heritage buildings  Design issues relating to Tooth Ave include:  The proposed street runs east west unlike the majority of shopping streets in Sydney that run north south to take advantage winter sunlight. The number of tall buildings proposed along the length of Tooth Ave is likely to suffer from poor solar amenity.  Respecting the site's heritage, a scaled version of Tooth Avenue should be considered.</p>	<p>See previous comments in response to general submissions.</p>
16	<p><b>Social Heritage</b>  The demolition of heritage buildings and character of the CUB site history make way for Tooth Ave and proposed new buildings is not considered a positive urban outcome. The concept plan is not consistent with the CMP prepared by the proponent and endorsed by the Council. The demolition of buildings 35A and 35b is not supported as both buildings are an integral part of the Irving Street complex. Buildings 35A and 35B should be considered to reuses.</p>	<p>See previous comments in response to general submissions.</p>
17	<p><b>Public Benefits</b>  The City is unclear as to what public benefits are proposed and quality of benefits proposed. No additional public benefits have been proposed as a result in the increase in the FSR. There should be a commensurate increase in public benefits.</p>	<p>The public benefits set out in the draft Statement of Commitments and voluntary planning agreements are over and above those normally required for development in Central Sydney. The benefits proposed are outlined in the draft Statement of Commitments in a more concise form and the attached schedule for responses to the City's recommendations in relation to the draft VPA addresses the question of standards.</p>
18	<p><b>Cumulative</b>  Wind impacts, residential amenity, loss of significant views, overshadowing, lack of human scale, small areas of open space, basements under the public domain.</p>	<p>Each item identified other than 'basement under public domain' and small areas of open space are already commented on above.</p> <p>The basement under the public domain offer the advantage</p>

		of reducing the number of vehicular access points to basement car parks. There is no requirement that land dedicated should be unlimited above and below ground although the City's concerns about dedication in stratum are noted.
19	<b>Technical procedural</b> There is no proposed development control plan or regulatory document for the site to support concept plan and to ensure consistency of outcome.	The Concept Plan is the control document for the site to guide future development. The SEPP amendment includes specific development standards. The site specific DCP proposed by city was generally repeating and including existing provisions contained in CSDCP 1996.
20	<b>Concept Plan Process and exhibition</b> State Significant Sites planning process for this site has not been transparent and does not seek meaningful input from the community and stakeholders.  Short period of exhibition time, amount of technical material provided and inconsistent notification of the proponent's information sessions in the community.	Noted
21	<b>Other VPA</b> Further negotiations and clarification is required. The City has made recommendations to amend the draft voluntary planning agreement to achieve the same public benefits as proposed in the City VPA.	The draft VPA and Statement of Commitments offer a package of development contributions that is at least equal to those previously discussed with the City. It also acknowledges that further documentation will be needed to provide for the City to take ownership of some of these benefits. It is not considered necessary to amend the VPA at this stage as the further documentation can address specific issues. In the meantime, some matters raised by the City have been addressed through changes to the draft Statement of Commitments. See the attached schedule for responses to the City's recommendations in relation to the draft VPA.
	<b>Railcorp</b>	

22	<p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>Rail noise and vibration should be addressed early in the development process. Railcorp has published the following documents aimed at managing noise and vibration impacts associated with planning and development.</p>	<p>This is a project application assessment matter, to be dealt with at subsequent stage of development process.</p>
23	<p>Interim Guidelines for Councils – consideration of rail noise and vibration in the planning process and 2 Interim Guidelines for applicant’s consideration of the rail noise and vibration in the planning process</p> <p>Stray Currents and electrolysis from Rail Operations</p> <p>An expert consultant should be engaged when designing buildings in close proximity to rail way lines.</p>	<p>This is a project application assessment matter, to be dealt with at subsequent stage of development process.</p>
24	<p>Railcorp requests that electrolysis risk reports be submitted for Blocks 9, 10, 11 at the development application stage.</p>	<p>Noted. This is a project application assessment matter, to be dealt with at subsequent stage of development process.</p>
25	<p>Car parking</p> <p>2754 Car spaces proposed for the site is considered excessive given close proximity to Sydney’ man public transport services node.</p>	<p>See previous comments in response to general submissions.</p>
26	<p>Accessibility</p> <p>Railcorp suggests that a second pedestrian route be considered along Regent Street/Outram Street and Lee Street where the distance to Central Station and Railway Square bus interchange is shorter than via Broadway.</p>	<p>Kensington Street and a portion of Outram Street would be subject to pedestrian path improvements with the redevelopment of adjacent sites as part of this project. We would expect improvements on the remaining pathways would occur through redevelopment of adjacent sites.</p> <p>We are aware Council is looking at key pedestrian routes through the surrounding areas and this site and would recommend this request be forwarded to Council for consideration.</p>
<p><b>Energy Australia</b></p>		
27	<p>Site falls within SEPP 69 Major Electricity Supply Projects.</p>	<p>Noted. Advice previously forwarded to DOP in response to Energy Australia’s advice</p>
<p><b>Heritage Office</b></p>		
28	<p>The Heritage Office consistent with the findings of the HIS recognises that</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	the proposal will have positive and negative impacts on the specific items and on the site as a whole. The Heritage Council notes that a number of the adverse impacts are based on the need to achieve improved urban design objectives. The heritage Council would therefore be supportive of any further feasible improvements that can be made to achieve further heritage outcomes.	
	<b>Sydney Buses</b>	
29	An analysis of traffic volumes is required to compare total delay on Broadway for bus passengers, in each direction, for current situation and future intersection arrangements.	Traffic volumes should be sourced from the RTA model.
30	The existing Route 449 stop on Broadway east of Jones Street will not be able to be used and new stop will be required in Thomas Street.	Noted
31	The existing Route 501 stop in Jones Street will have to be closed and a new stop will be required in Thomas Street.	Noted and subject to the closure of Jones Street.
32	A combined stop for routes 449 and 501 will be required in Thomas Street east of Jones Street.	Noted
33	A right turn bay from Broadway westbound into Wattle Street northbound will be required to replace the existing turn bay at Jones Street.	Noted
34	It appears from documentation that the provision of the right turn bay has not been taken into account when calculating the level of service at the intersection of Broadway and Wattle Street.	The proposal to close Jones Street was submitted by the university after the modelling by the proponent had been completed. However, we can confirm that a right turn bay from Broadway into Wattle Street for buses was included in the RTA modelling.
35	The intersection control at the intersection of Wattle Street and Thomas Street needs to be reviewed in consultation with State Transit.	Noted
	<b>RTA</b>	
36	The road network is conducive to through trips as it facilitates shorter rat runs between Wattle Street and Broadway, Abercrombie Street and Regent Street.	The potential rat run between Broadway and Regent Street has been identified and appropriate turning restrictions during peak periods at Regent Street / Kent Road will be put in place if excessive rat running did occur.
37	The Regent Street /Kensington Street intersection may have geometric constraints and road safety issues and should be subject to a formal safety audit before concurrence. It is likely that the right turn from Regent Street will be banned.	See Comments above
38	Consideration should be given to grade separated pedestrian crossing at Broadway.	There does not appear to be any justification for grade separation at this stage.

39	The no right turn buses excepted on Broadway headed west to north will move from Jones Street to Wattle Street	Noted
40	Gateway treatments by the City of Sydney are incompatible with the proposed traffic arrangements.	Noted
41	Speed on Abercrombie between Cleveland Street and Broadway will be reduced to 50km/h in early 2007.	Noted
<b>DEC</b>		
42	The level of PCE contamination warrant's DEC's more detailed assessment with respect to its potential impact to human health and to the environment. Depending on the outcome of further assessment, this may recommend the remediation of the PCE plume be managed under the DOP's planning process.	Noted. The proponent will continue working with DEC on this matter.
43	Regardless of the administrative process. Particular focus must be given to the prevention of impacts in the basement car parks. This is best dealt with through site remediation. Concur on the likelihood for the need of long term ground water collection and proper disposal. The proposed remediation should not result in further migration of the PCE plume particularly along Wellington Street.	Noted
<b>Ministry of Transport</b>		
44	Funding for an additional 3 buses and their associated kilometres (120 000km/pa). This will amount to approximately \$2.1M for a 5 year period.	Before we can make comment on this request, we require clarification and more information on the matter covering items such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the basis of this request?</li> <li>2. How were the costs calculated?</li> <li>3. What is the approval process? Will it be subject to IPART approval / determination?</li> <li>4. What happens to the revenue from these new buses (both fare base and advertising)?</li> <li>5. How does the proponent know these new buses would be provided?</li> </ol>
45	Provision of bus priority measures, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposed intersection of Broadway and Balfour Street. Given the potential impact of this intersection on Broadway bus services, it will be essential that any new traffic signals are coordinated with other nearby intersections to minimize any delays to buses, and that bus priority measures are</li> </ul>	The operation of traffic signals is the responsibility of the RTA.  All new traffic signals would be coordinated into the SCATS system.

	installed as necessary. The Ministry would require assurance that there would be no detrimental affect to existing Broadway services.	
46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposed closure of Jones Street at Broadway to extend the pedestrian mall, with the existing right turn westbound in Broadway to be relocated to Wattle Street. This proposal will create an additional load at the Wattle Street intersection. It affects three route services and further consultation will need to occur with the Ministry, but the preference would be for Jones Street to be a transit mall with the existing right turn maintained. Pedestrian facilities are required.</li> </ul>	<p>The development of the CUB site is not predicated on this proposal. The closure of Jones Street is a matter for Council, the RTA, UTS and other relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>The proponent supports the closure of Jones Street for all traffic as it reinforces the pedestrian spine between Chippendale South and the TAFE.</p>
47	Provision of roadside bus infrastructure including signage and shelters, along with wayfinding signage located within a 500 metre radius.	Clarification required of what this means. Coordination required between Council and the MOT.
48	Adequate footpath capacity to accommodate pedestrian movement to/from rail and bus. Concerns are raised on the impact of shared pedestrian/vehicle laneways on pedestrian perceptions of safety. Active street frontages would also appear to be problematic given provision of service areas at ground level. Lighting levels are also a significant issue in terms of pedestrian safety.	<p>Pedestrian pathways are provided on both sides of every street within the developments site. Shared zone laneways would be low speed environments with equal priority between pedestrians and vehicles.</p> <p>Servicing of properties would occur at street level within off street loading docks.</p> <p>Lighting would be provided in accordance with relevant standards.</p>
49	To help ensure a high degree of self containment, an audit of pedestrian and cycle links to major trip sites outside the development should be undertaken e.g. to the Australian Technology Park.	<p>The pedestrian and bicycle routes within the site have been developed through consultation with Council. Internal pathways link with existing and proposed new pathways as recommended in Council's current Bicycle plan.</p> <p>New traffic signals are proposed on surrounding roads to provide safe crossing facilities to external trip attractors.</p> <p>An audit of pathways and cycleways outside the development site is a matter for Council.</p>
50	Separation of pedestrians and bicycles wherever possible.	The desire to provide separate pedestrian and bicycle pathways needs to be balanced against providing adequate on street parking and maintain a number of heritage buildings on site.

		Overall the site has been designed to be permeable for pedestrians and cyclists and a low speed traffic environment.
	<b>Energy Australia</b>	
	If there will be dedicated roads within the site. This will determine the type of tenure of Energy Australia assets.	Roads will be dedicated. Affect on tenure of Energy Australia noted.
	Energy Australia will require appropriate lease and easements for its proposed infrastructure.	Noted.
	Unimpeded access to all proposed assets within the site.	Noted
	A determination will need to be made concerning the type of 11kV network CBD triplex pit and duct type of system or the suburban type reticulation system.	Noted
	Close co-operation with various authorities will need to be made concerning the construction and installation of respective infrastructures.	Noted.
	Liaison and close co-operation will be required in the planning stages of the development to best co-ordinate works.	Noted.
	Energy Australia presently holds a free hold title on its existing substation and arrangements will be required to negotiate its sale or its incorporation into the proposed development.	Noted.