

## Macquarie University

### Concept Plan Modification MP 06\_0016 (MOD 1)

#### Appendix A - Response to Submissions

Issues Raised by Agencies and Organisations	Proponent's Response
<p><b>Government Architect NSW</b></p> <p>The Concept Plan does not appear to have any design excellence strategies in place e.g. competitive design process or design review programs. This is now considered common practice for any development of the scale and prominence proposed for Precincts D and E.</p>	<p>Macquarie University is committed to buildings that not only meet their specific functional requirements but are well designed, well resolved and appropriate to the site and location. The Design Excellence Strategy and Urban Design Guidelines were conceived in 2009, at a time when the term 'design excellence' as it is known today (i.e. to mean an architectural design competition) was not a commonly used term. It was never the intent of the Guidelines to stipulate a design competition process, rather the Guidelines in themselves outline the measures and controls which will ensure that good design is achieved for future development on the campus.</p> <p>Notwithstanding , in order to ensure some process around the delivery of good design, the University has developed a Campus Development Strategy - Design Procurement which outlines the principles and procedures that will be followed for the delivery of developments of varying scales.</p> <p>In relation to the level of competitive process relevant to the proposal, the Strategy outlines a process that includes an appropriate level of competitiveness without undertaking an 'architectural design competition'. Whilst it is acknowledged that the University occupies a prominent site in Macquarie Park, there is no requirement for design excellence in <i>Ryde Local Environmental Plan 2014</i>, and the imposition of a formal design competition process would stifle the ability to meet the objectives of the Campus Development Strategy, whilst diverting public funds away from the provision of social infrastructure. On this basis, the proposed approach is considered to be</p>

Issues Raised by Agencies and Organisations	Proponent's Response
	<p>appropriate for the nature of the proposed development and the locality, including the expectations of the local community and stakeholders.</p> <p>In lieu of a full architectural design competition, the Strategy includes a competitive procurement process that, together with consultation with design panels and assessment against design excellence criteria, inherently encourages good design as has been demonstrated with the recently constructed Macquarie University Incubator, which was awarded the Internationally renowned Green Good Design award in the research and technology category for 2018. With the new State Design Review Panel in place, the University is committed to liaising with the Panel and incorporating its recommendations as an additional safeguard to achieving good design.</p> <p>Further details around the proposed approach to achieving good design outcomes and the Campus Development Strategy - Design Procurement are provided at Section 2.1 of the Response to Submissions report.</p>
<p>Proposed adjustments to provide greater flexibility in the distribution of uses and additional GFA across the campus may result in disparity of scale and built form and incompatible typologies and uses.</p>	<p>As GA NSW has noted, a key objective of the Concept Plan Modification is to provide the opportunity to locate uses flexibly across the campus, in line with the site's B4 Mixed Use zoning. The recent rezoning of the campus recognises the changing nature of university campuses as dynamic mixed-use precincts, the philosophy of combining academic and non-academic uses and to provide flexibility to accommodate a range of uses, where opportunities arise. To try and segregate land uses would represent a move away from current urban design and planning thinking.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, new design principles have been inserted at Section 4.1 of the revised Design Excellence Strategy and Urban Design Guidelines to ensure conflicts do not arise between proposed land uses. The design principles recognise the changing character of the campus and the potential for mixed building typologies and uses and include provisions for transitional development, bulk and scale, amenity, land use mix and urban form.</p>
<p>Proposed built form controls are minimal, providing little guidance in relation to typology, building dimensions, separation, frontage controls etc. Of particular concern are the large footprints of the development lots with no requirement for a 'finer grain' to humanise the ground plane, enable through site linkages etc.</p>	<p>At the recent meeting between GA NSW and Macquarie University it was acknowledged that whilst an appropriate urban design and built form outcome needs to be achieved, the Guidelines also need to be flexible enough to enable a range of uses and building typologies to be located in various locations across the campus. It is considered that if the Guidelines are too rigid and numerically focused, they have the</p>

Issues Raised by Agencies and Organisations	Proponent's Response
	<p>potential to inhibit the ability to achieve good design once more is known about the future use and building typology for a particular lot.</p> <p>In this regard, GA NSW noted that it was not their intention for each lot to be amended to include prescriptive metrics around building depth, horizontal dimensions or building separation, rather general principles should be included to address these matters. A series of design principles have been included at Section 4.1 of the Guidelines to address GA NSW's concerns. In addition to the more specific lot controls, these overarching principles are intended to guide the design of all development across the campus to ensure buildings achieve good design, collectively. Elements required to be considered include building length and depth, active ground floor plane, solar access, transitional heights and forms, solar access, environmental amenity, public space and land use mix.</p>
<p>No consideration of the environmental impact of proposed increases to height and building bulk, particularly on Herring Road frontages or the railway station forecourt i.e. overshadowing, wind turbulence etc.</p>	<p>Along the campus' Herring Road frontage, the Concept Plan amendment simply seeks to replicate the height and floor space standards that have been established for this part of the campus under Ryde Local Environmental Plan 2014, as part of the Herring Road Priority Precinct process.</p> <p>In preparing and assessing the Herring Road Priority Precinct, the Department considered the impacts of bulk and scale, wind and overshadowing. Further consideration will be given to these matters as part of any future DA for the sites along Herring Road.</p>
<p>Sustainability measures in the Guidelines are generally discretionary. Of concern are the proposed changes to the few 'hard' environmental standards such as water re-use storage.</p>	<p>There are a number of detailed requirements around sustainability in the Statement of Commitments, which must be addressed as part of each development application on the campus.</p>
<p>On the basis of the materials submitted, our design recommendations are:</p> <p>Specific Design Excellence requirements for Lots D01 to D03 and E09 to E11, both at masterplan level as well as the design of individual buildings. A combination of Competitive Design selection processes and formal Design Review is recommended.</p>	<p>Refer to response above. The Design Excellence Strategy and Urban Design Guidelines, together with the Campus Development Strategy - Design Procurement for major projects (i.e. projects with a CIV of over \$30million) and ongoing consultation with the State Design Review Panel and Macquarie University Design Review Committee will ensure that good design outcomes are achieved for these key sites.</p>
<p>Amend Part 2 of the Guidelines (Precinct Planning Framework) to include an indicative Land Use Plan, identifying areas best suited for particular uses. Principles</p>	<p>Refer to above. Whilst the University maintains that it is appropriate to locate uses flexibly across the campus, in line with the site's B4 Mixed Use zoning, principles have</p>

Issues Raised by Agencies and Organisations	Proponent's Response
to guide distribution of uses, particularly areas of potential incompatibility should also be included.	been inserted at Section 4.1 of the revised Design Excellence Strategy and Urban Design Guidelines to ensure new development is responsive to its topography, setting and context, particularly where there are a mix of land uses, to ensure compatibility and vitality across the campus and along its edges.
<p>Amend Part 4 of the Guidelines (Built Form) to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Metrics for building envelopes including, but not limited to, building depth (a range to suit different typologies), building separation and maximum horizontal dimensions (block length).</li> <li>Provisions for mitigating environmental impacts of large scaled development in the Guidelines including, but not limited to, wind turbulence, overshadowing and noise management.</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to above. General principles have been included in Section 4.1 of the Guidelines to address GA NSW's concerns.</p> <p>With respect to the environmental impacts of large scale buildings on Herring Road, it is noted that the Concept Plan amendment simply seeks to replicate the height and floor space standards that have been established for this part of the campus under <i>Ryde Local Environmental Plan 2014</i>, as part of the Herring Road Priority Precinct process.</p>
Amend Part 5 of the Guidelines (Lot Controls) to include opportunities for through site links, particularly where lot dimensions exceed 70m.	In preparing and assessing the Herring Road Priority Precinct, the Department considered the impacts of bulk and scale, wind and overshadowing. Further consideration will be given to these matters as part of any future DA for the sites along Herring Road, including to the north of the railway station.
Provisions of water detention, water re-use and water re-use storage as detailed in the Statement of Commitments should remain mandatory.	<p>Noted. The requirements for water detention, water re-use and water re-use storage form part of the Concept Plan approval Statement of Commitments, and are therefore a mandatory requirement. Currently, these Commitments apply to all development on the campus, irrespective of their scale.</p> <p>Whilst minor changes are proposed to the wording of the Commitments, the change in wording seeks to reflect the varying scale of development across the campus, and do not represent an intention to diminish the University's commitment to water detention, water re-use and water re-use storage for larger developments.</p>
<b>City of Ryde Council</b>	
Provided the amendment does not result in any increase in commercial floor space or increase in student housing to be provided on the site then the proposal appears to be consistent with the existing VPA between Council and Macquarie University required under the Concept Approval (executed February 2013).	Noted. The proposed development does not seek to increase commercial floor space or student housing.

Issues Raised by Agencies and Organisations	Proponent's Response
<p>Council has no objection to the proposed amendment of Condition C15 to enable separate agreements to deliver required public benefit to Council, specifically the missing cycleway link on Epping Rd.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The subject site contains a heritage item as identified in Schedule 5 of Ryde LEP 2014. The modification does not appear to be accompanied by any heritage impact statement or management plan with respect to the item and the proposed amendments. Council suggests that heritage statement regarding the impact of the proposed amendments be prepared, submitted, and assessed, prior to approval of the amendment.</p>	<p>The proposed modification does not seek to make any amendments which would impact the heritage item on the University campus. The heritage item is located in the north-west of the campus adjacent to Mars Creek, and is generally separated from areas of more intense development.</p> <p>It is noted that the original Concept Plan was not accompanied by a Heritage Impact Statement. Rather, it is considered more appropriate that heritage impacts are considered on a case-by-case basis, as part of each development application.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the controls for Lot B08 have been updated to reflect the presence of the heritage item, and will ensure its retention and preservation as part of any future development on this lot.</p>
<p>Council notes that design is underway for the delivery of an upgrade to the bus interchange at Herring Road. Council suggests that the amended design guidelines consider the proposed interchange requirements, particularly but not limited to, setbacks from Herring Road, and any vehicular access configuration requirements/limitations from Epping Road resulting from the configuration of the interchange upgrade.</p>	<p>The setbacks to Herring Road have been amended to reflect the most recent discussions with Council and Sydney Busses regarding the bus interchange at Herring Road.</p> <p>Given the current lack of detail around the design of the bus interchange, it is envisaged that the Guidelines may need to be updated in the future to reflect the final design of the bus interchange.</p>

Issues Raised by Agencies and Organisations	Proponent's Response																		
<p>Council suggests that the Traffic and Parking Statement prepared by ARUP be reviewed on the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 1 MQU travel trends — will need to be updated to reflect the 2016 data to ensure consistent trends are occurring as per the statement made by the applicant.</li> <li>• The report needs to identify the increase of the Academic GFA and the associated increase in student numbers.</li> <li>• The report will need to identify where this proposal fits in with the total concept plan. I.e. the numbers being proposed to the total allowable and whether they are increasing above and beyond the maximum limit.</li> </ul>	<p>ARUP's report has been updated to reflect Council's comments. In summary the 2017 data shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of public transport usage (train and bus) has increased significantly from 13% in 2010 to 52% in 2017; and</li> <li>• Private vehicle travel to the University has decreased significantly from 51% in 2010 to 24% in 2017.</li> </ul> <p>Using this travel data, it has been confirmed that even with the proposed increase in students, the significant shift away from cars towards public transport will result in a reduction in the daily number of vehicle trips to the campus, as outlined in the table below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Variable</th> <th>Concept Plan Forecast</th> <th>Current Forecast</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>EFTSL (2031)</td> <td>25,200</td> <td>39,776</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Car mode share</td> <td>60%</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vehicle occupancy</td> <td>1.1</td> <td>1.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Daily attendance</td> <td>75%</td> <td>75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total daily cars</b></td> <td><b>10,309</b></td> <td><b>6,509</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Variable	Concept Plan Forecast	Current Forecast	EFTSL (2031)	25,200	39,776	Car mode share	60%	24%	Vehicle occupancy	1.1	1.1	Daily attendance	75%	75%	<b>Total daily cars</b>	<b>10,309</b>	<b>6,509</b>
Variable	Concept Plan Forecast	Current Forecast																	
EFTSL (2031)	25,200	39,776																	
Car mode share	60%	24%																	
Vehicle occupancy	1.1	1.1																	
Daily attendance	75%	75%																	
<b>Total daily cars</b>	<b>10,309</b>	<b>6,509</b>																	
<p>Council acknowledges the University's ongoing efforts to consult with Council on the realisation of its aspirations through the delivery of the concept plan and requests that this open, consultative approach continue.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>																		
Transport for NSW																			
<p>The Macquarie University Concept Plan 2009 was based on providing facilities for an Equivalent Full-Time Student Load (EFTSL) of 25,200 on the Campus by 2031. It is understood that the University has surpassed these figures, with a student load of 28,913 EFTSL in 2016. Projections have been revised to 39,776 EFTSL by 2036; approximately 14,500 EFTSL (50-60% additional student load) beyond initial projections. Although this would occur 5 years beyond the initial projection, student population growth would be a significant contributor to the need for additional academic floor space. In response, this modification seeks approval to increase the maximum floor space by 95,800m<sup>2</sup> GFA.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>																		

Issues Raised by Agencies and Organisations	Proponent's Response
<p>The Traffic and Parking Statement, prepared by Arup (Dec 2016), concludes that <i>"there are to be no additional traffic/transport impacts associated with the application beyond that previously assessed by Arup"</i> on the basis that there would be no additional on-site parking for the academic and commercial uses. This statement would only hold true should all increases in student population utilise non-car modes of transport.</p>	<p>Refer to response above. Analysis using current travel mode data shows that even with the proposed increase in student numbers, the total number of daily car trips to the campus will reduce from 10,309 (as forecast under the approved Concept Plan) to 6,509.</p>
<p>However, there is the potential that students will travel via private vehicle and park on-street (within the surrounding public road network) or utilise remaining car park capacity, if any. The initial concept plan committed to a target of 40% non-car modal split, which has been exceeded with 48% non-car modal split achieved in 2014.</p>	<p>On this basis, there is no need to revise the mode-share target in the Statement of Commitments.</p>
<p>Notwithstanding the above, the car modal split was measured at 30% in 2014. Should the 2014 trends remain constant as the student population increases, it is expected that the expansion of academic floor space would result in additional traffic movements to/from the university. The provision of no additional parking would likely reduce the proportion of car users; however additional measures may be required and new non-car modal split targets should be included within the modified Statement of Commitments.</p>	
<p>Macquarie University should undertake investigations to determine an appropriate target such that the estimated traffic generation as a result of the approved concept plan would be commensurate to that of the modified concept plan, albeit with an increased student population. This target should be incorporated into the University Travel Plan (UTP) and the commitments of the UTP would operate per the current commitments.</p>	
<p>Any data collected and/or studies undertaken regarding student/employee population travel behaviour to the university should be made available to TfNSW to assist with service provision and long-term strategic transport planning.</p>	
<b>NSW EPA</b>	
<p>The EPA understands that the modification application is not intended to weaken or otherwise modify environment protection measures required by the existing consent conditions and has no specific comments on the application.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>