

24 August 2020

File No: 2020/367971
Our Ref: R/2018/13/C
Your Ref: SSD-9374

Lewis Demertzi
Student Para Planner – Key Sites Assessments
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Via Planning Portal

Dear Lewis

**Request for advice – Block 4B Central Park Adaptive Reuse (SSD-9374) –
Supplementary Response to Submissions**

Thank you for your correspondence dated 6 August 2020 which invites the City of Sydney Council (the City) to provide comments on the supplementary Response to Submissions (RtS) for the State Significant Development (SSD) for the adaptive reuse of the Brewery Yard buildings known as Block 4B within the Central Park redevelopment precinct.

The City has reviewed the supplementary RtS and provides the following comments for your consideration in addition to comments provided on 27 May 2020:

1 Heritage impacts

The City has conducted review of the amended proposal and supporting written documents and notes that some attempt to ameliorate the impacts of the loss of original fabric have been included in the supplementary RtS. Many recommendations raised by the City in previous correspondence have been considered and included in the amended design. Although it is noted that the proposed loss of original fabric is considered a great loss to the historic significance of the site.

The City provides additional comments to specific aspects of the proposal as raised in previous correspondence below.

1.1 Relationship with existing heritage building roof line

The current roof and soffit alignment were designed to integrate services below the Tri-Gen plant. Regardless if such services are no longer required due to the change of use, the original design of the bird's mouth recess is an important interpretation of the original structure. The removal of this feature is the result of an additional top mezzanine, inserted at the expense of the design integrity of the exterior.

Council does not accept the applicant's justification for the removal of this design feature and the design is not supported, as it delivers a detrimental impact.

1.2 Removal of one coal hopper in building 30

The submitted supplementary RtS still proposes the removal of the central coal hopper within Building 30. The impact is still considered as detrimental and a large part of the hoppers remain hidden from public domain views due to the additional floors slabs proposed. The cumulative impact of the removal of one coal hopper and the obstruction of views to the remaining hoppers is considered a detrimental heritage impact.

The Applicant's proposal to interpret the removal of the original hopper with a mesh that simulates the removed item is unsatisfactory and is not supported by Council. It is recommended that the Applicant reconsider its approach to the remaining 'exceptional' heritage fabric in this part of this building.

2 Impacts on northern façade

The City notes that the supplementary RtS has provided additional detailing in the northern glazed façade and further justification to amend the frontage to provide an opportunity for additional floor space within the building. The City maintains concern that the current constructed roof form and north façade design will be diluted as a result of the proposed design as per previous correspondence.

3 Ecologically Sustainable Development

The supplementary RtS confirms the development is designed to achieve an amended minimum NABERS Energy 5 Star base building rating. It is recommended that confirmation of this agreement and a copy of an independent energy assessment report be provided to the City prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. Further, the RtS suggests that sustainability measures will be implemented in the project and requests a condition of consent reflect this.

4 Waste Management

An insufficiently detailed waste management plan has been provided as part of the application documents. Floor plans to support the proposed WMP must be submitted, addressing the following:

- a) Bins should be shown on the plans along with the doors to demonstrate if there is adequate room for the required number of bins.
- b) The path of access for both users and collection vehicles must be highlighted on the plans
- c) Nomination of the waste collection point(s) for the site must be shown on the plans.
- d) The location of the bin storage room to the collection point needs to be clarified.

5 On-site loading and servicing

The amended proposal as submitted in the applicant's supplementary RtS still raises some concern in respect of the loading zone and overlap of service vehicle requirements and numbers. The amended proposal includes a loading space on-site within the central courtyard of the building proposed to be used outside standard business hours. The proposed loading space includes the creation of a new footway crossover and the installation of removable bollards.

City staff have reviewed the proposed loading modification and associated swept path analysis. The swept path for an MRV has demonstrated that a reversing manoeuvring at a bend section of Central Park Avenue is required for accessing the loading dock.

Although this space is proposed to be used only outside of standard daytime business hours, this precinct has predicted to be very busy and crowded with the night time economy once the area will be fully activated and in operation. Many pubs and restaurants are located in the precinct and the pedestrian and taxi operations are expected to be in very high volumes during daytime, evening and late-night hours. Therefore, vehicles reserving in/out in such a busy road has seen as a significant traffic issue. It should also be noted the location of the proposed loading space being opposite an existing carpark entrance where vehicle queues have been observed. The application has not considered the pedestrian/traffic safety issues as a result of the proposed location and operation of the on-site loading space and will not result in a successful outcome in terms of traffic and transport.

Loading and servicing will be very competitive in this area. The proposed kerbside loading proposal on western side of Central Avenue is also not ideally located and it will not be convenient to serve the site from the proposed loading spaces. As raised by the City is previous correspondence, the proposal of any kerbside restriction change application must need separate Traffic Committee approval. Having said this, the ideal solution will be providing a turntable within the site to achieve a forward-in and forward-out movements and accommodate most of the loading and service needs within the site.

The issue of vehicles accessing the central courtyard has been discussed between the City and a number of proponents for a number of years with the City reiterating concerns about pedestrian safety and securing public open space within the precinct. The City notes the courtyard area is one of the public open spaces to be delivered under the masterplan for the precinct. The use of part of the courtyard for loading and site servicing with associated bollards creates several obstructions is not consistent with the objectives of the masterplan in providing public open space.

The City recommends a reconsideration of the safety impacts of a reverse in/out operation particularly considering the strong night-time economy predicted for the area and the provision of the courtyard as public open space approved in the masterplan.

Should you wish to speak with a Council officer about the above, please contact Marie Burge, Planner, on 9265 9333 or at mburge@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,



ANDREW REES
Area Planning Manager