

5 August 2020

218062

Anthony Witherdin
Director, Key Sites Assessment
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Level 22, 380 Pitt Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Attention: Lewis Demertzi,

Dear Mr Withderdin,

**RE: RESPONSE TO THE REJECTION OF RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS
Block 4B Central Park Adaptive Reuse (SSD-9374) + S75W CENTRAL PARK CONCEPT PLAN
MODIFICATION 16 (MP06_0171)**

This letter has been prepared by Ethos Urban on behalf of the proponent, IP Generation, in relation to the adaptive reuse of Block 4B within Central Park (SSD-9374) and Section 75W Modification Application (MOD 16) to Project Approval MP06_0171, relating to the adaptive reuse of Block 4B. The letter provides further information as requested by email on 10 June 2020 as set out in **Table 1**.

The letter also comprises a **formal amendment to MP06_0171 (Mod 16) in that it seeks to update the maximum GFA and Height permitted on Block 4B to reflect the development now proposed in SSD_9374**. Specifically, the following amendments are proposed:

- An reduction of the maximum permissible GFA on Block 4B to a total of 6,266m²,
- An increase in the maximum building height to RL45.05,
- Minor amendments to the public domain plan including updates to the stair and planter locations, and
- Minor amendment to the traffic, access and parking plan to remove the parking bay on the eastern side of Central Park Avenue.


The above amendments are minor in nature and do not affect the environmental assessment submitted with the original application.

Table 1 – Response to DPIE email dated 10 June 2020

DPIE Recommendation	Applicant Response
Clarify the following comments in table 1 of the 17 July 2020 response:	
a. Item 1.4 – Please provided a copy of the detailed visual analysis study prepared for the Panel which shows visibility of the hoppers from public domain, having regard to the proposed internal floors.	Please refer to Attachment 1 .
Clarify the following comments in table 2 of the 17 July 2020 response:	
a. Item 1 – confirm which DA included archival recording.	Archival recording was included in MP10_0217 approved on 15 May 2012. Please refer to the attached correspondence (Attachment 11).
b. Item 1.2 - update the Architectural Plans to show use of zinc mesh on the external stair tower.	Please refer to Attachment 2 .

<p>c. Item 1.6 - identify and justify the two windows that are proposed to be refurbished on the south heritage façade.</p>	<p>An initial review of the existing conditions of all windows was conducted during the early stages of the project. This review found that less than 5% of the windows were able to be refurbished due to the level of damage and hazardous mastic in the windows.</p> <p>While it is unclear whether any windows can be refurbished, at the meeting with City of Sydney Council on 20 May 2020, the owner and City of Sydney agreed that the owner would do everything reasonably possible to refurbish two windows.</p> <p>The southern façade is one of the most historical and important facades of the Brewery Buildings. Please refer to Attachment 3 nominating the two possible windows to be refurbished.</p> <p>Please note that the project is intending that the new windows will be contemporary bespoke aluminium window frames with high performance glazing to improve the environmental performance of the building as a whole.</p> <p>The new glazing is defined by a shadow detail separating the window from the surrounding brickwork and an expressed fine aluminium edge, referring to the existing steel window system. The finer grained patterning of the existing windows references the framing of the existing windows.</p> <p>There are also a number of windows which have been bricked up which will be reinstated to match those existing on the façade, including form, size and materials of glazing, sills, and lintels.</p>
<p>d. Item 3 - the documentation submitted has proposed varying NABERS energy ratings, including 4.5 star in the ESD report, 5.5 star in the RTS and 5 Star in the most recent information (July 2020). Council recommends at least a 5.5 star NABERS energy rating. Please clarify and provide any justification for proposing less than 5.5 stars.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment 4 which provides a detailed response by Santec on the issue of sustainability ratings.</p>
<p>e. Item 4.2 – please confirm which plan illustrates the bicycle parking and end of trip facilities.</p>	<p>Drawing 17007_DA1101 (E) Level B1 Plan shows the End of Trip Facilities and the 17007_DA1102 (F) Ground Floor Plan shows the bicycle parking.</p>
<p>f. Item 8 waste management – the updated WMP has addressed some of Council’s comments however the following inconsistencies are noted: i. Page 9 continues to advise ‘cleaning staff will transport the bins to the short term parking area on the Ground Level’ which is inconsistent with the WMP statement on page 8 that ‘waste will be serviced directly from the waste storage room’ ii. Provide further detail on how the 50+ waste bins will be moved from the storage point to the collection point, including identifying the distance, noting Council recommends a maximum of 10m iii. Basement 1 floor plan, DA 1101, issue E,</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment 5.</p>

<p>appears to indicate access to the heritage display area is through the waste room. Please clarify.</p>	
<p>g. Item 9 Public Domain: i. A response has not been provided regarding Council comments about the 15 minute zone between Blocks 4s and 1. Please indicate if the proposal intends to use this area.</p>	<p>The 15-minute zone between Blocks 4s and 1 will not be relied upon for loading activities associated with the development. However, the Response to Submissions (GTA, 3/2/2020) and subsequent Loading Zone Proposal for consideration at Local Pedestrian, Cycling and Traffic Calming Committee (GTA, 4/3/2020) acknowledge the proposed loading zone will be publicly available and that conflicts with deliveries to other nearby properties cannot be avoided. As such, couriers and postal activities associated with the development that typically use vans are more than likely to use any available 15-minute parking if the loading zone is occupied. This is due to the travel distance to/ from on-site loading docks in the precinct, their use considered as part of the loading options review.</p> <p>Given the 15-minute zone is also publicly available, such use cannot be prevented. However, delivery drivers can be advised to limit use of the zone during the childcare peak drop-off and pick-up periods.</p> <p>Outside business hours, delivery, waste collection and removalist vehicles will also be able to use of the forecourt area as documented by GTA. A layback proposed to be installed on the northern boundary of the site with removable bollards to restrict access times.</p> <p>These arrangements are considered adequate for the anticipated demand. As such, it is not proposed to pursue arrangements with other building owners/ management for the use of their on-site loading docks.</p>
<p>ii. The response indicates the pedestrian kerb ramps can be deleted, however they are shown on the submitted Landscape Plan in Attachment 4.</p>	<p>Council have noted in their letter that the proposed kerb ramps should be deleted. The response on 17 July 2020, notes that they can be deleted as requested by Council however we do not agree due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed pedestrian kerb ramps would be installed within the kerb extension section north of the proposed loading zone. It would not only provide a safe crossing point for delivery personnel but also for pedestrians (including persons with prams and/ or wheelchair) accessing the site to/ from Broadway/ Abercrombie Street via the pedestrian links on south and east sides of One Hundred Broadway. • Pedestrians along this desire line are unlikely to use the kerb ramps provided at the Central Park Avenue/ Irving Street intersection given the additional travel distance (illustrated in red below). Therefore, the proposed kerb ramps will benefit the general public and not considered only for private access across public land. • The proposed crossing point (path show in green) would also assist with reducing informal crossing activities through vehicles parked in the existing indented bays on the northwest corner of Central Park Avenue, which would be the natural desire line (shown in yellow). This presents a safer crossing opportunity noting the short-term parking results in high vehicle turnover.

	
<p>iii. While the new vehicle crossover is identified on the Landscape Plan in attachment 4, the following additional information should be provided: iii. I). turning circles, as requested by Council</p>	<p>Please find attached turning circles assessment in Attachment 6.</p>
<p>iii. II) proposed parking location of a vehicle in the forecourt and how this arrangement will be managed i.e. management of reversing vehicles in a pedestrian area, time of operation, responsibility for removal of bollards.</p>	<p>The new vehicle crossover proposed on the northern boundary of the site is shown in revised Public Domain plans issued as part of the response on 17 July 2020. This is intended for overflow loading requirements out of business hours should the amended loading zone spaces be occupied.</p> <p>Removable bollards will be installed to restrict vehicle access to the forecourt during business hours. Vehicles will be required to reverse into the forecourt in order to exit in a forward direction. Access to the forecourt will be restricted during business hours to avoid any pedestrian interaction.</p> <p>Deliveries will be scheduled and building management will remove the bollards ahead of time for the delivery.</p> <p>This is considered an appropriate arrangement out of business hours and common for low demand usage. This arrangement would be suitable for vehicles up to 8.8 metre medium rigid vehicles. Please note that allowing access on the forecourt permanently for loading on the site is not possible due to the easements in the forecourt for servicing the Central Thermal Plant nor is it desirable from a pedestrian amenity perspective.</p>
<p>h. Attachment 4 - Public Domain Plan – confirm the area of the forecourt as the foyer has been removed.</p>	<p>The foyer has been deleted as requested by Council.</p>
<p>SSD</p>	
<p>a. Provide a consolidated set of all proposed demolition and architectural plans including materials and finishes</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment 7.</p>

<p>b. Provide Attachment C and G from the December 2019 Response to Submissions package</p>	<p>Attachment C – Revised Architectural plans prepared by Tzannes and Associates dated 20 December 2019. Attachment G - Response to City of Sydney Submission, prepared by Tzannes and Associates dated 20 December 2019 Please refer to Attachment 8.</p>
<p>c. Provide updated photomontages of the proposal</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment 9.</p>
<p>Concept Plan Modification</p>	
<p>a. It appears the roof addition over Building 22 and 23 has increased from RL 44.783 to RL 45.050 as a result of the amended roof form following discussions with the DIP. Clarify if the amended building heights under the Concept Plan are to be amended to reflect this and provide updated documents and plans to support this.</p>	<p>We would like to confirm that the concept plan is to be amended to reflect the revised building heights refer to Attachment 10.</p>
<p>b. The most recent SSD floor plans indicate a GFA of 6,266 m2. The concept approval continues to seek a GFA of 6,396 m2. Clarify the GFA amendment sought to the concept approval and update documents and plans accordingly. Please note Mod 15 to the Concept Approval altered the GFA.</p>	<p>We would like to confirm that the concept plan is to be amended to reflect the revised GFA refer to Attachment 10.</p>
<p>c. Confirm if any amendments are sought to the 'A-1254 public domain' and 'A-1257 traffic access and parking' Concept Plan drawings.</p>	<p>Please refer to the amended plans at Attachment 10.</p>

We trust that this information is sufficient for the Department to finalise their assessment for determination. Should you have any additional queries please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely,



Julia Moiso
Urbanist
02 9956 6962
jmoiso@ethosurban.com



Jennie Buchanan
Director, Planning
02 9956 6962
jbuchanan@ethosurban.com