

## Attachment B: Modification of Concept Plan – Response to Agency Submissions

### Agency Submissions to Modification of Concept Plan

Item no.	Agency	Issue/comment	Response	Respondent
1.	City of Sydney	<p>The City of Sydney Council is generally supportive of the application, but raises the following points:</p> <p><b>Modifications to the Concept Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Modified Height</b> - no objection raised to modified height – subject to appropriate design and materiality, additional height can be accommodated on the site.</li> <li><b>Reduction in Building Separation</b> - proposed reduction in building separation between Building D4 (subject building) and future residential apartment Building D1 located to the south of the site from 14.8 metres to 9 metres. Raises potential privacy and amenity impacts from reduced separation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recommendation</b> - consideration to be given to placement of windows and balconies in the south west corner of the proposed development (units 115, 116, 215, 216, 315, 316, 415 &amp; 515) to ensure optimal future use and design of the northern elevation of Building D1.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The reduction in building separation between building D4 and future residential building D1 only occurs in a limited area along the south west portion of the building.</p> <p>The building footprint for building D1 shown as part of the concept plan is only indicative and approaches the boundary of the CWH land parcel and does not necessarily reflect the future built form. Detailed design of the future residential development would result in a built form capable of addressing privacy and amenity concerns with setbacks and articulation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the future building D1 would be built with minimal setback to the boundary only if the north façade is a blank wall. If the proposed design for building D1 is to contain north facing windows, then privacy controls and amenity considerations would result in a subsequent built-form design substantially set back from the boundary, ensuring adequate building separation with building D4.</p> <p>In addition, any potential for future privacy and amenity impacts from the reduced separation are minimised because the south elevation of building D4 mainly contains secondary windows, ensuring privacy is maintained within the primary living spaces.</p> <p><b>Response: No change to proposed design including building height and building separation.</b></p>	Architectus
2.	City of Sydney	<p><b>Draft Conditions</b></p> <p>The City of Sydney Council has provided draft conditions of consent for consideration by the Department.</p>	Refer to <b>Section 5</b> in the body of this report	Architectus
3.	NSW Police	<p><b>Macdonaldtown Train Station</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recommendations</b> - With new development occurring and increasing patronage of trains, it is of key importance to upgrade Macdonaldtown train station with centrally monitored CCTV systems, and improved service and lighting to the station.</li> </ul>	<p>Any proposal to upgrade Macdonaldtown train station would be outside the scope of the State Significant Development application and the proposed modification of the concept plan.</p> <p><b>Response: No further action required</b></p>	Architectus
4.	NSW Police	<p><b>Railway Corridor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure no capacity for individuals to access development from the railway corridor – Railcorp to monitor this through daily patrols where possible.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed modifications to the concept plan are limited to the CWH development parcel which does not adjoin the railway corridor.</p> <p>The railway corridor is currently fenced and the proposed modifications to the approved concept plan will not change those conditions.</p>	Architectus

Item no.	Agency	Issue/comment	Response	Respondent
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NSW Police to seek confirmation from Railcorp and CWH that the rail corridor is secure at all times during the demolition, building and occupation stages, and require information on the security contacts in charge of monitoring the site.</li> </ul>	<b>Response: No further action required</b>	
5.	NSW Police	<b>Way finding</b> In response to the potential for increased tourism in and around the site of the rail yards, it is recommended that signage is increased in and around the site to prevent people from getting lost and inadvertently accessing housing locations, allowing them to become potential victims of stealing crimes or robbery offences.	<b>Signage:</b> the proposed modifications to the concept plan are limited to the CWH development parcel. As such it is considered outside the scope of the proposed modification to address this matter.  <b>Crime:</b> the proposed development is for affordable housing with good amenity within the building and the associated public domain, providing clear sight lines according to CPTED principles. It is not envisaged that the subject site or development will be a threat to members of the public in terms of crime or robbery offences as it is a residential development that will provide affordable housing to tenants on a range of incomes with many of them being key workers, and not social housing or corrective services.  <b>Response: No further action required</b>	Architectus
6.	NSW Police	<b>Traffic Signage</b> Traffic signage at this location should identify access from the street into the site as a shared zone with pedestrian activity.	The proposed modification and the State Significant Development do not affect any land outside the CWH parcel. It is understood that UrbanGrowth Development Corporation (UGDC) will provide signage as part of the construction of the open spaces and road network. <b>Response: No further action required</b>	Architectus
7.	NSW Police	<b>Site Risk Rating</b> The current site risk rating is not comprehensive and hotspot analysis was not able to be conducted as the site is presently largely unoccupied.	Noted. <b>Response: No further action required</b>	Architectus
8.	NSW Police	<b>Traffic Management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All shared zones recommended to be 10 km/hour and to be negotiated with Railcorp to maximise safety to pedestrians and road users in access areas to residences.</li> <li>No parking to be made apparent in signage in shared zones to maximise safety to children in these shared zones near and around residences.</li> </ul>	The roads, which are outside of the subject site, are to be dedicated to the City of Sydney council who will assume responsibility for signage and management of the roads. <b>Response: No further action required</b>	Architectus
9.	OEH Heritage	On the whole, revitalisation of the site is a positive step provided the overall industrial character of the subject site is retained in the	No modifications are proposed to the approved general site layout, or public domain elements, as part of this application.	Architectus & GBA Pty Ltd

Item no.	Agency	Issue/comment	Response	Respondent
	<b>Branch</b>	detailed site layout, public domain works and design of the individual buildings.	<p>The subject site is currently a vacant parcel of land within the State Heritage Register curtilage of the Eveleigh Railway Workshop and in the vicinity of the former Carriage Workshop and Blacksmith's Shop which epitomise the industrial character of the area.</p> <p>The detailed design of Building D4 has considered the massing of the adjacent industrial buildings and reflects the materiality and rhythmic form of the buildings in its vicinity without mimicking the composition and materials of the heritage items.</p> <p>Refer to <b>Attachment H</b> for GBA Pty Ltd.'s response to heritage issues raised in submissions.</p> <p>The design team has considered the submission and found that the proposed building's relationship with Carriage Workshop could be improved with some design changes at ground level. It is proposed to finish the north-east corner with a more solid, timber wall (with reduced gaps in between timber slats) and timber door to reflect the industrial character of the adjoining building.</p> <p><b>Response: Amend plans to provide a solid timber wall at ground level in the north-eastern corner, instead of glazing and timber.</b></p>	
10.	<b>OEH Heritage Branch</b>	<p><b>Continuity of Scale</b></p> <p>It is considered that the proposed modification is likely to have a detrimental impact on the continuity of scale expected by the Concept Plan and should be avoided if possible.</p>	<p>The proposed development includes a predominantly 6-storey building with a 7-storey element at the north east corner. This minor stepping up of the height was chosen as a design response to reflect a similar pattern exhibited by the Carriageworks building, which has a taller element along its western edge. As such, the design is considered to respond well to its context by reflecting the rhythm of scale exhibited by the Carriageworks building.</p> <p>In addition, the Carriageworks building and the proposed development (building D4) are physically and visually separated by the width of the alignment of Traverser No. 2 (in excess of 20 metres).</p> <p>The approved concept plan allows Building D4 to be slightly higher than the Carriageworks building as a transition between the lower scale buildings at the Wilson Street frontage and the taller development adjacent to the rail corridor.</p> <p>The variation proposed to the height of Building D4, to achieve closer conformity with the allowable floor space, retains the conceptual building hierarchy and is consistent with the continuity of scale envisaged in the approved Concept Plan.</p> <p>Refer to <b>Attachment H</b> for GBA Pty Ltd.'s response to heritage issues raised in submissions.</p> <p>It should be noted that the 2008 Concept Plan -approved building envelope is not large enough to achieve the GFA approved under the same plan. The envelopes do not allow for any space for circulation or plant, which typically comprise 25% of the floor area in residential development.</p> <p>As a result, the footprint of the building is proposed to be extended, and the height increased to achieve a GFA of 6000m<sup>2</sup>, which is still short of the maximum GFA of 6480m<sup>2</sup> approved for Building D4 under the Concept Plan.</p>	<b>Architectus &amp; GBA Pty Ltd</b>

Item no.	Agency	Issue/comment	Response	Respondent
			<b>Response: No change to proposed design.</b>	
11.	Railcorp	No objection.	Noted	Architectus
12.	RMS	No objection.  The traffic impacts of this development will <u>not be significant</u> .	Noted	Architectus
13.	Transport for NSW	No objection.	Noted	Architectus