UTS – Detailed Response to Submissions Table November 2015



Issue	Response
Department of Planning and Environment	
Gross Floor Area	
Clarification regarding whether existing podium of Building 2 is to be demolished and the gross floor area calculations of the existing podium	It is confirmed that the building 2 podium building will be demolished (down to ground level, i.e. excluding basement levels). The existing GFA of this building (including GFA attributed to basement levels) is 22,096m ² .
Building Separation	
Further analysis of the separation of the envelope from the existing Building 1 tower	Noted. Design development of the project (as reflected within the indicative design scheme) has resulted in an increased setback to Building 1 tower. No change proposed to amended Building 2 envelope.
	New Design Quality Control proposed:
	Establish an appropriate relationship and setback to Building 1 tower to support its appreciation and setting from wider viewpoints. Minimum setbacks of approximately 10.5m - 13m at Level 9 and approximately 14m - 19m at Level 17 to be provided to Building 1 tower.
Setbacks	
Consider providing a setback to Jones Street to address the visual prominence of the building from the street level.	Noted. Design development of the project (as reflected within the indicative design scheme) has resulted in an increased setback of Building 2 above Jones Street (street wall). No change proposed to amended building 2 envelope.
	New Design Quality Control proposed:
	Respond to the scale of existing buildings along Jones Street through progressively stepping the building form away from the street wall.

Response
Noted. Design development of the project has resulted in an increased setback to Building 1 tower. No change proposed to amended building 2 envelope.
New Design Quality Control proposed:
Establish an appropriate relationship and setback to Building 1 tower to support its appreciation and setting from wider viewpoints. Minimum setbacks of approximately 10.5m - 13m at Level 9 and approximately 14m - 19m at Level 17 to be provided to Building 1 tower.
Noted. Design development of the project (as reflected within the indicative design scheme) has resulted in an increased setback of Building 2 above Jones Street (street wall). No change proposed to amended building 2 envelope.
New Design Quality Control proposed:
Respond to the scale of existing buildings along Jones Street through progressively stepping the building form away from the street wall.
Noted. Such detailed wind studies will be undertaken as part of the detailed design phase and will inform the final design/future state significant development application. Refer to Appendix C, Addendum Wind Assessment for further details.

Issue	Response
Public domain visual impacts	
The proposed modification to the approved Concept Plan envelope should be modified to acknowledge the eastern alignment of Balfour Street, and to retain a greater extent of sky above the approved Building 2 podium.	Noted. Design development of the project (as reflected within the indicative design scheme) has resulted in a greater emphasis to the importance of the Balfour Street view corridor. It needs to be recognised that there are broader considerations (e.g. wind - refer to Addendum Wind Assessment prepared by CPP, Appendix C) that may influence how this urban design principle is addressed in the final design. No change proposed to amended building 2 envelope.
	New Design Quality Control proposed:
	 Respond to the importance of the Balfour Street view corridor (within the context of addressing environmental factors, such as wind conditions) through: preserving the openness of the corner of Broadway and Jones Street; materiality; and progressively stepping the building away from Jones Street above the podium.
Overshadowing	
Additional information in the form of solar access elevations should be submitted in order to assess the extent of overshadowing on One Central Park.	Extensive studies and investigations into the potential overshadowing impacts associated with the modification to the Building 2 envelope were undertaken and submitted in support of the modification application. This work included solar access elevations.
	The approval of One Central Park was based on the acceptance that more than 70% of apartments received solar access on June 21, utilising the Cox/Tzannes method. The carefully considered design approach for the Building 2 above podium envelope ensures solar access to residential dwellings is maximised at One Central Park and that there is no change to the approved level of solar access that this building (residential dwellings) receives.
	No further additional information is considered necessary to be provided. The modification application clearly demonstrates that overshadowing impacts are acceptable. It is also noted that the future detailed state significant development application for Building 1 (podium) and Building 2 will include further solar and overshadowing studies.

Issue	Response
Bicycle parking	
It is recommended that a commitment be included to provide integrated, visible and accessible bicycle parking facilities.	Council may not be aware that a site wide approach to the provision of bicycle parking and end of trip facilities has been adopted by UTS for its Broadway Precinct campus. In this regard, extensive facilities are provided within Building 10 in order to meet all the expected needs and demands of staff and students (existing and future). Within Building 10, staff and students from across the precinct have access to: 288 bicycle spaces 14 toilets and 28 showers (both male and female) 260 lockers
	Accordingly, it is not considered warranted that further provision of bicycle facilities is accommodated across Building 1 or Building 2.
Design Excellence	
The city objects to the removal of the design competition process from the Urban design Principles.	Noted. No change proposed to design excellence strategy for Building 1 (podium) and Building 2. Refer to modification application for justification regarding design excellence strategy.
Transport for New South Wales	
The proposal fronts the alignment of the future CBD Metro rail corridor. The modification is unlikely to have an	Noted.

Issue	Response
impact on the future rail corridor.	
It is requested the applicant consult with TfNSW in	Noted. UTS and its consultants will engage with TfNSW as part of the preparation of the
relation to any future DAs.	future detailed state significant development application for Building 1 (podium) and Building
	2.
Bicycle parking should be provided in accordance with CoS	Refer to CoS response above.
requirements.	
Bicycle facilities should be provided that are secure,	
convenient and accessible and incorporate adequate	
lighting and surveillance in accordance with Austroads	
guidelines.	
Sydney Water	
The current drinking water system has capacity to serve	Noted
the proposed development.	
The subject site has frontage to multiple 150mm mains	
and a 200mm main which are available for connection.	
Detailed drinking water requirements will be provided at	
the Section 73 application phase.	Notod
The current wastewater system does have sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development.	Noted
The wastewater main available for connection is the	
225mm main located in Thomas Street with an existing	
connection point traversing the property.	
Where proposed works are in close proximity to a Sydney	
Water asset, the developer may be required to carry out	
additional works to facilitate their development and	
protect the wastewater main. Subject to the scope of	
development, servicing options may involve	
adjustment/deviation and or compliance with the	
Guidelines for building over/adjacent to Sydney Water	
assets. Refer to your WSC for details of requirements.	
Detailed wastewater requirements will be provided at the	
Section 73 application phase.	

Issue	Response
Heritage Council	
OEH consider that nearby State Heritage Items are sufficiently far away from the proposal to be affected. The proposal will also not have a direct impact on views of the Glebe Harbour Bridge from One Central Park.	Noted.
Locally listed heritage items are also in close proximity to	Noted.
the proposal.	
Views of the proposal from local listed heritage item 12047 (Former Sydney Technical College building) will be available.	Noted. View considerations will be considered as part of the future detailed development application.
Environmental Protection Agency	
 The EPA raises the following site specific concerns: potential site contamination; noise and vibration impacts dust control and management runoff and sediment control air quality impacts operational noise and vibration impacts operational waste management operational radiation control operational energy efficiency and water conservation 	Noted. All these detailed aspects will be addressed at the appropriate time (i.e. within the future detailed state significant development application for Building 1 (podium) and Building 2).