



**CONCEPT PLAN APPLICATION TO IDENTIFY
SITES FOR NINE (9) NEW BUILDINGS IN
THE ENTERTAINMENT QUARTER, AND
INCREASE IN THE MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE
FLOOR SPACE IN THE ENTERTAINMENT
QUARTER, A RE-ALLOCATION OF FLOOR
SPACE AREA BETWEEN THE
ENTERTAINMENT QUARTER AND THE
WORKING STUDIO PRECINCT, AND FOR THE
DEMOLITION OF BUILDINGS 17 AND 220**

PREFERRED PROJECT REPORT

**Prepared for
CFS Managed Property Ltd
on behalf of
CFS Retail Trust and the Direct Property Investment Fund**

**By
BBC Consulting Planners**

Job No. 06169
PPR - Final.doc
October 2010



Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	The Project as Exhibited	1
1.2	Submissions made during Exhibition of the Concept Plan Application	2
1.3	Modifications to the Project.....	2
1.4	Amended Statement of Commitments.....	4
1.5	Structure of this Preferred Project Report	4
2.	AMENDMENTS TO THE CONCEPT PLAN APPLICATION.....	5
2.1	Amended Plans.....	5
2.2	Description of Amendments.....	5
3.	AGENCY SUBMISSIONS.....	7
4.	RESPONSE TO KEY ISSUES RAISED BY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING	21
4.1	Issue 1.....	21
4.2	Issue 2.....	22
4.3	Issue 3.....	22
4.4	Issue 4.....	23
4.5	Issue 5.....	24
4.6	Issue 6.....	24
4.7	Issue 7.....	24
4.8	Other Matters	27
5.	REVISED STATEMENT OF COMMITMENTS	29
5.1	Introduction.....	29
5.2	General	29
5.3	Demolition Management	30
5.4	Heritage	31
5.5	Travel Demand Management	32
5.6	Staging.....	32
5.7	Use of New Buildings	32
5.8	Building Height	33



APPENDICES

Appendix 1A: Summary of Agency Submissions

Appendix 1B: Summary of Public Submissions

Appendix 2: Amended Plans prepared by Cox Architects and Elevations prepared by Colonial First State

Appendix 3: Response to SRDAC submission prepared by Halcrow

Appendix 4: Updated parking accumulation graphs

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Project as Exhibited

This Preferred Project Report relates to Major Project No. MP07_0144, for approval of a Concept Plan identifying the location of nine (9) new buildings in the Entertainment Quarter, being part of the former Moore Park Showground at Moore Park. Concept Plan approval is also sought for an increase in the permissible floor space within the Entertainment Quarter, a re-allocation of floor space area between the Entertainment Quarter and the Working Studio Precinct, and for the demolition of Buildings 17 and 125.

As exhibited, the Concept Plan application sought approval for the locations, massing and maximum heights of nine new buildings in the Entertainment Quarter, together comprising no more than 26,187m² of additional floor space, in the positions identified on the submitted plans. Pursuant to the submitted plans, as exhibited, the approved floor space area within the Entertainment Quarter (i.e. 50,313m²) would be increased to the limit referred to in the Deed of Agreement between the two lessees of the former Moore Park Showground, being CFS Managed Property Ltd for the Entertainment Quarter and Fox Studios Australia Pty Ltd for the Working Studio Precinct (i.e. 76,500m²). The Deed of Agreement allocates 67,500m² of floor space area to the Working Studio Precinct (being 6,000m² less than is permitted by the approved Master Plan), and 76,500m² to the Entertainment Quarter. Thus, the Concept Plan seeks approval for an additional 26,187m² of floor space area within the Entertainment Quarter and for a concomitant decrease in the approved floor space area for the Working Studio Precinct from 73,500m² to 67,500m².

The exhibited plans identified approximate floor areas, maximum building heights and building envelopes for each of the nine new buildings, identified as Buildings A to K on the submitted plans. Their locations, heights and envelopes, as exhibited, were the product of detailed urban design and heritage studies and each building envelope was configured to ensure that the additional floor space area would have minimal impact on the built form and heritage character of the former Moore Park Showground.

As noted in the Environmental Assessment forming part of the Concept Plan application, detailed uses of, and works for each of the nine additional buildings are to be the subject of a separate future project or development application (depending on whether the works have a Capital Investment Value of more than \$5 million) and will need to be consistent with the Concept Plan approval.

No physical works were sought to be approved by the Concept Plan application, except for the demolition of two existing buildings, Building 17 and Building 125, which occupy, respectively, the site of the proposed Buildings B and K. Neither of these two buildings to be demolished has sufficient heritage significance to warrant retention. Building 17 is identified as having low heritage significance in the Moore Park Showground Conservation Strategy 1995, whilst Building 125 is a purpose-built sound stage.

1.2 Submissions made during Exhibition of the Concept Plan Application

The Environmental Assessment Report was exhibited from 23 September 2009 until 23 October 2009. During that period, around 36 submissions were received by the Department of Planning from the public (including one from the Centennial Park Residents Association). A total of 5 submissions was received from agencies (including one from Clover Moore, MP). The agency submissions are summarised in Appendix 1A. Public submissions are summarised in Appendix 1B.

1.3 Modifications to the Project

The identification of the nine sites for new buildings, as shown on the submitted Concept Plan application drawings, was responsive and sensitive to the approved Master Plan, as already amended, and the existing built condition of the EQ precinct. The Concept Plan application included as appendices, a detailed Urban Design Report prepared by Cox Architects (see Appendix 4 of Environmental Assessment) and a Heritage Report prepared by Godden Mackay Logan, Heritage Consultants (see Appendix 5 of Environmental Assessment).

The detailed Urban Design Study demonstrated that particular care has been undertaken to reinforce the urban design framework, structure, and spatial organisation of the Entertainment Quarter. This was done through reference to the key urban design issues which had driven successive changes to the original Master Plan and which have resulted in the character of the Entertainment Quarter that one sees today. Furthermore, each of the nine sites for new buildings was selected to ensure that from heritage and urban design perspectives, adverse impacts on the heritage fabric of the former Moore Park Showground would be minimised.

The Urban Design Study and Heritage Report submitted as part of the Environmental Assessment identified the opportunities and constraints which apply within the Entertainment Quarter. Heritage considerations were pre-eminent. The location, maximum height and building envelope of each new building was considered from a heritage perspective and related recommendations were reflected in the plans submitted with the Concept Plan application. On this basis, the Heritage Impact Statement included in the Environmental Assessment (as Appendix 5) concluded that the proposed Concept Plan would not have a negative impact on the former Moore Park Showground, provided the suggested mitigative measures identified in the Heritage Impact Statement were implemented. As set out in the Draft Statement of Commitments in Section 7 of the Environmental Assessment, the Proponent undertook to implement those measures.

Notwithstanding all of the foregoing, having received submissions from the public and from agencies, and having regard to the issues raised by the Department of Planning in its letter dated 28 January 2010, the Proponent considered the various matters raised and in response, identified a series of modifications which could be made to the configuration of the nine proposed new buildings. Details of these modifications were provided to the Department of Planning in early July 2010.

Subsequently, however, the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust, the owner of the land comprising the former Moore Park Showground, retained Hassell to examine how the additional floor space could be accommodated within the Entertainment Quarter. In many respects, the recommendations made by Hassell are, in effect, refinements of what was already proposed, except that they recommended the deletion of new buildings E, K and H and the relocation southwards of Building C to subsume existing Building 220.

The principles identified by Hassell for their alternative approach are as follows:-

“Principles for an alternative approach

- *Offer better address to the Show Ring, improving its visibility and attractiveness*
- *Focus on public amenity and quality public space*
- *Improve permeability and links connecting pedestrian streets and spaces*
- *Focus redevelopment on the primary public spaces to reinforce address”*

Hassell, on behalf of the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust, have suggested a widening of the “Chelmsford Avenue” corridor between Driver Avenue and the Show Ring, so that the northern alignment of Building C is consistent with the northern façade of the Hordern Pavilion, thereby allowing the southern elevation of Building B to move slightly southwards. As a consequence of the above widened corridor, Building E, the southernmost of the two new buildings facing the Show Ring, has been deleted.

Building C has been divided into two buildings: C1 and C2, with a north-south divide which will provide a fine-grain connection between the two primary east-west links into the Entertainment Quarter. In order to build Buildings C1 and C2, it will first be necessary to demolish Building 220. The Proponent accepts this consequence of adopting the Hassell recommendation and seeks to include the demolition of Building 220 as part of the Concept Plan proposal. Building 220 is a relatively new structure and has no heritage significance.

The Proponent has generally accepted the recommendations advanced by Hassell and has revised the Concept Drawings accordingly. In short, the Proponent and the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust are now in agreement on how to best accommodate the additional floor space on the site. Significantly, new Buildings E, H and K have been deleted.

Amendments which have been made to the Concept Plan application are described in Section 2 of this PPR.

The Proponent now seeks the Minister’s approval to the modified Concept Plans.

1.4 Amended Statement of Commitments

In response to the Department's key issues, the Proponent has made minor modifications to the Statement of Commitments as included in the Environmental Assessment Report. The modified Statement of Commitments is provided in Section 5 of this PPR (with modifications made since exhibition of the Environmental Assessment identified in bold type).

1.5 Structure of this Preferred Project Report

This PPR:-

- describes modifications to the Concept Plan arising out of the Proponent's consideration of the Department's key issues (see Section 2);
- responds to the issues raised in agency submissions (see Section 3), including the submission from the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust;
- responds to the key issues raised by the Department of Planning (see Section 4);
- responds to the urban design advice of Hassell received by the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust; and
- includes a revised Statement of Commitments (see Section 5).

Summaries of submissions received by the Department during the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment are provided in Appendix 1; Appendix 1A summarises the agency submissions; and Appendix 1B summarises public submissions. In general terms, the main issues raised in the public submissions are reflected in the key issues raised by the Department of Planning.

2. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONCEPT PLAN APPLICATION

2.1 Amended Plans

A set of amended architectural concept plans, for which the Proponent seeks the approval of the Minister for Planning, is contained in Appendix 2 of this PPR.

2.2 Description of Amendments

The following amendments have been made to the Concept Plan application drawings, as exhibited:-

- Building A has been setback 1.8 metres from the boundary wall and its southern façade setback in line with existing Building 14 (former Commonwealth Bank building);
- Building B has been modified so that its northern and western (triangular) corners are truncated and its southern boundary shifted slightly southwards;
- Building C has been repositioned further to the south (to provide a widened corridor extending from Driver Avenue through to the Show Ring), split into two separate buildings (C1 and C2) and now necessitates the demolition of existing Building 220 (a structure of no heritage significance);
- Building D has had its configuration slightly amended but otherwise remains much as originally proposed;
- Building E has been deleted;
- Building F has been modified by setting back its lower two floors along a line projected from the south-eastern edge of Building 126 (i.e. Fox and Lion) so as to open up the vista of that building from Errol Flynn Boulevard; and
- Buildings H and K have also been deleted.

All drawings other than A-CP-01, 02 and 03 have been amended. A set of the amended plans is provided in Appendix 2. Revised floor space and height details of the new buildings now proposed are shown on Drawings A-CP-04(c) and D-CP05(b).

Whilst new Buildings A, D, F and G remain either similar to or the same as in the Concept Plan as originally submitted, the areas and heights of Buildings B and C (now C1 and C2) have increased as a consequence of:-

- greater spatial flexibility brought about by the proposed demolition of Building 220;
- greater separation between Buildings B and C (now C1 and C2); and
- a reduced number of new buildings on the site.



The floor space area of Building B has increased from 4,900m² to 7,956m², reflecting the greater spatial flexibility brought about by the southward shift of Building C to encompass existing Building 220. Building C has increased in floor space area from 8,007m² to 16,660m² (in Buildings C1 and C2) but now requires the demolition of Building 220, one of the largest existing buildings in the Entertainment Quarter.

In relation to height, Building B had a stepped height envelope of 13.8 metres to 17.1 metres in the original Concept Plan, whilst Building C had a stepped height of 13.8 metres – 21.1 metres. In the modified scheme, Building B has a predominant height of 21.1 metres with a step down to 13.8 metres adjacent to Suttor Avenue. Buildings C1 and C2 have predominant heights of 21.1 metres stepping down to 9.9 metres adjacent to the westerly prolongation of Bent Street in the case of Building C1 and 13.8 metres in the case of Building C2.



3. AGENCY SUBMISSIONS

There were five submissions from agencies, one of which was from Clover Moore, MP. A summary of issues raised in the agency submissions is provided in Appendix 1A.

Provided overleaf is the Proponent's response to issues raised in submissions from public agencies (including the submission from Clover Moore, MP).

Table 1: Response to issues raised in Agency submissions

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
1. SRDAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequacy of vehicle access arrangements. 	<p>All vehicular access into the EQ is via Errol Flynn Boulevard at the signalised intersection with Lang Road. The existing site access arrangements are to be maintained. Each individual building will be the subject of a separate future application as part of which vehicular access arrangements to each building (if proposed) will be assessed in detail. The site is served by a 2000-space structured car park. It is not intended that each new building would be self-sufficient in parking. Reliance will be placed on the public car park.</p>	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discrepancies in the SCATES analysis for intersection of Anzac Parade/Cleveland Street/Lang Road. 	<p>Given that each of the nine new buildings needs to be the subject of a future application, the appropriate time for further modelling of intersection capacity is when those individual applications are under consideration. They will be accompanied by travel demand management initiatives to reduce reliance on private vehicular usage.</p> <p>Nevertheless, Halcrow has addressed the SRDAC's concerns in a response dated 30 July 2010 (see Appendix 3).</p>	Nil. Undertake additional modelling as part of application for each future building.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate details of parking areas, etc. Details to be submitted with future applications. 	The future buildings are not yet designed. It is not anticipated that buildings will include any substantial parking component. Reliance will be placed on the public car park. It is agreed that details will be submitted of future applications..	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional bicycle parking required. 	This will be considered as part of each future application for individual buildings.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed traffic and parking assessment to be submitted with each future application. 	Agreed.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction traffic management plans needed prior to issue of CC's. 	Agreed.	Nil.
2. NSW Dept of Transport & Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports cap on existing parking. Supports commitment to prepare workplace travel plans for future buildings. Traffic co-ordinator to ensure delivery and take-up of workplace travel plans. 	<p>Noted. Noted.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Nil. Nil.</p> <p>Added to Statement of Commitments.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure employee and visitor bike parking to be provided and employee amenities. 	This can be a requirement for future individual buildings.	Added to Statement of Commitments.
3. City of Sydney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about use of buildings. 	Uses will be selected from the restricted range of uses permissible under SEPP 47. The EA is clear on what the <u>likely</u> uses will be for each building. All uses will be the subject of future applications. The Council will be consulted on each of these future applications.	Nil.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two buildings result in loss of recreational space. 	<p>Building E has been deleted. Building D completes the circle of perimeter buildings around the Show/Parade Ring. It does not encroach onto the former racing track around the Show/Parade Ring.</p> <p>The Show/Parade Ring remains a <u>massive</u> open grassed recreational space accessible to the public. Activities presently accommodated on the site of proposed Building D can be relocated.</p>	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building A to be modified to match alignment of adjacent Commonwealth Bank building. 	Agreed.	Plans modified, as suggested.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spacing between Buildings B and C to be increased and maintain view alignment along Chelmsford Avenue. 	Agreed.	Plans modified, as suggested.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footprint of Building C to be pulled back to match alignment of Building B. 	Not agreed.	Building C now shifted southwards and divided into two separate structures.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upper levels of Building C will block views of clock tower. 	Not agreed. However, Building C now moved southwards. Clock tower will remain a prominent element within EQ.	As above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upper level of Building B to be setback from southern alignment. 	The axis from Driver Avenue through to the Show Ring has been considerably widened in the amended plan, meaning that there is now no necessity to set back the upper level of Building B.	Plans modified to provide increased separation between Buildings B and C.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building C1 not to exceed 3 storeys in height. 	Not agreed. Height as now proposed (i.e. 21.1m) is supported by the CP&MPT. Also, Building C shifted southwards and split into two.	Plans modified to reposition Building C and divide into two.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building D to be reduced in width. 	Not agreed. Satisfactory relationship is achieved with existing Building 19. Detail to be provided as part of future application. NB: Building E now deleted.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building E to be carefully designed to ensure satisfactory relationship with Parade Ring. 	Agreed. However, Building E now deleted.	Nil. Building E deleted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with Building F and views to Fox and Lion and Royal Hall of Industries. 	Agreed. Lower two floors of Building F cut back to open up vistas, now shown on the modified plans.	Plans modified, as suggested.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building F to be reduced in height. 	Not agreed. Height of Building F is the subject of a detailed urban design and heritage design analysis.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fig tree not to be transplanted (in poor health). New tree needed. 	Noted. An arborist will investigate health of tree.	Requirement for arborist to inspect tree included in Statement of Commitments.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building G to be setback to retain boundary wall along Errol Flynn Boulevard. 	Boundary wall not original wall. Building G is behind wall but may result in some increased activation of this elevation.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building G to complement stables. 	Agreed. Will be a matter to address in future application.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building K to be sympathetic to minimise impact on Heritage Park. 	Agreed. However, Building K now deleted.	Nil. Building K deleted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support cap on parking levels. 	Noted.	Nil.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTA to be consulted on intersection on Anzac Parade/ Lang Road/Cleveland Street. 	This will be an essential part of any future application for the erection and use of any one of the new buildings (see Appendix 3).	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative impact of the proposal erodes character and significance of the site. 	Not agreed. The additional building locations and envelopes are the product of detailed urban design and heritage analysis to ensure that the impacts on character and significance of EQ are acceptable.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape strategy needed. 	There is an approved Landscape Plan for the site. New buildings are generally in areas/ locations where landscaping is distinctly absent. Landscaping of each building will form part and parcel of each application for future building works.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height and massing around Parade Ring inappropriate. 	Not agreed. Proposed height limits and envelopes are product of detailed urban design and heritage analysis. New Building D is of a lesser scale than adjoining Building 212. Building E deleted.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about vertical articulation in future buildings. 	Detailed design will be part of each future application for individual buildings.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives needed for height massing and articulation. 	<p>There are urban design guidelines and strategy for the site. The proposal is consistent with that strategy.</p> <p>These matters will be considered when each separate application is lodged.</p>	Nil.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignments, setbacks, and massing above nominated RL levels should be specified. 	Not agreed. These are matters for detailed design consideration and can reasonably and properly be addressed in each future application.	Nil.
4. Clover Moore, MP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal exploits lease for the site. 	Not agreed. All buildings and uses have to be consistent with the ground lease.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> History, heritage, social significance and open space potential diminished. 	Not agreed. The additional building envelopes are the product of detailed urban design and heritage analysis to minimise impact on significance. The Parade/Show Ring remains the central open space on the EQ site. It is larger than the playing field of the SCG.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Floor space transferred from working studios to EQ. 	Agreed. The proposal is to transfer 6,000m ² of unused (and unwanted) development potential from the working studios and allocate it to EQ. Film-related commercial premises are permissible in both EQ and the working studio. It is likely that a significant proportion of the transferred 6,000m ² will be used for film-related commercial premises.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further information needed on uses. 	Uses will be selected from the restricted range of uses permissible under SEPP 47. EA is clear on what the <u>likely</u> uses will be for each building. All uses will be the subject of future applications. The Council will be consulted on each of these future applications.	Nil.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and parking implications cannot be determined in absence of uses. 	The Traffic Impact Assessment submitted with the Concept Plan application examines various future land use scenarios. The range of possible land use is limited by SEPP 47. Detailed analysis can occur as part of future applications for individual buildings.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal could contribute to traffic and parking problems around the site. 	The site provides a 2,000-space car park which is largely under-utilised. It has the capacity to accommodate additional demand.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in floor space inconsistent with original Master Plan. 	That is why this application has been lodged: as an amendment to the Master Plan. Proposal is, however, consistent with floor area limit of 144,000m ² in SEPP 47.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use for film studios being undermined. 	There is no proposed reduction in the precinct area of the working studios. The working studios still have the capacity to expand through the addition of new floor space up to a limit of 67,500m ² . The former Moore Park Showground is in two parts: EQ and the working studio precinct. It is not just a film studio.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building heights are out of character with a heritage precinct. 	Not agreed. The building heights nominated are the product of a detailed urban design and heritage analysis.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of loss of views cannot be determined. 	View impacts are examined in Section 6.4.1 of the EA. Potential view loss is limited to Building K. However, Building K now no longer proposed.	Nil.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale of development is inappropriate. 	Various modifications have been made to the proposed building envelopes having regard to issues raised by the Department, by Sydney City Council and by the CP&MPT.	Modified plans illustrate the modified scale of buildings.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of open space not warranted. 	No buildings are proposed on any of the significant green open spaces within EQ. No building encroaches onto the track around the Parade/Show Ring which is EQ's major open space.	Nil.
5. Centennial Parklands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support provision of additional floor space. 	Noted	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about location and configuration of new buildings. 	The sites for the new buildings have been selected following a detailed urban design and heritage analysis of the site. Building envelopes have been modified in response to issues raised.	Plans modified in response to design issues raised.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefer alterations/additions to Buildings 207, 215, 220 and 230 to prevent loss of open space. 	Not agreed. These are already some of the largest buildings on the site. The proposed buildings do not, by and large, displace "open space": they use the former coach car park, sites of existing buildings (i.e. No's 17 and 125), approved storage areas (i.e. Building G), and in the case of Building D, continues the circle of buildings around the Parade/Show Ring. The site of Building D was formerly the Coronation Stand when the site was used by the RAC. Building 220 is now proposed to be demolished to make way for the new Buildings C1 and C2.	Nil.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that future uses may not comply with SEPP 47. 	Future uses <u>must</u> comply with SEPP 47.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No audit of floor space provided. 	The audit previously requested relates to all of the former Moore Park Showground <u>including</u> Fox Studios. The Proponent has no power to enter into Fox Studios to audit its floor area. Approved floor area details of each building on the site have been submitted with the EA (see Appendices 9a and 9b).	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing maximum heights (RL's) needed. 	Maximum RL's are included in the tables in Appendices 9a and 9b. Elevations of existing and proposed buildings (with RL's) have been provided to the Department.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed urban design guidelines should be prepared for each site. 	<p>The urban design report submitted with the EA along with the Concept Plan drawings provided building envelopes for each site, defining a maximum footprint, required setbacks, and height. The envelopes took into account identified view lines, corridors, roads, pedestrian movements, overshadowing and heritage considerations.</p> <p>Together with the detailed heritage analysis submitted as part of the EA, all this provided a reasonable and appropriate context for a future detailed application for each of the nine new buildings.</p>	Nil.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
		Notwithstanding all of the above, the CP&MPT retained Hassell to provide an alternative distribution of additional floor space on the site. In large part, this is not greatly dissimilar to the exhibited proposal. The Proponent has accepted the Hassell recommendations.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant and rooftop features are excessive. 	<p>The nomination of controls of 6m maximum height and 25% maximum roof coverage define parameters for building elements above the nominated height level. However, the Statement of Commitments also states:-</p> <p><i>“C. Notwithstanding B. above, the height of any plant room above the main roof line is to be no greater than reasonably and practically required to accommodate the associated plant.”</i></p>	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building A not supported; scale to be reduced; views of Commonwealth Building to be retained. 	The building envelope for Building A has been modified in response to issues raised.	Plans modified.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings B and C obstruct sight lines to Parade Ring; upper levels to be setback. 	Building envelopes of Buildings B and C have been modified in response to the alternative massing arrangement proposed by Hassell on behalf of the CP&MPT. This has resulted in a widening of the corridor between Buildings B and C.	Plans modified.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings D and E obstruct sight lines from Driver Avenue; width of pedestrian corridor between these buildings a concern; consistency with height and scale of Building 212 	Building E has been deleted to satisfy concerns. Height of Building D is well below height of Building 212 (see Elevation 4 in Appendix 3b of EA). The urban design benefits of further	Amended plans provided.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	unclear; loss of open space.	enclosing/encircling the Parade/Show Ring outweigh the retention of this undeveloped space. The Parade/Show Ring and track around it are not encroached on by the proposed buildings.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports development of Site F except that alignment to be set back to provide views to Fox and Lion Hotel when travelling north on Errol Flynn Boulevard. 	The modified plans now show the lower two floors removed/setback at the corner to provide the vista referred to.	Plans modified as suggested.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building G to be behind boundary walls and have roof form complementary to the stables. 	This is consistent with the Heritage Impact Statement submitted with the EA, but in any event is a matter for consideration at the detailed design stage. (Note: the boundary wall referred to is a new wall and not the original wall.)	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building H to be setback to preserve consistent street wall height along Bent Street. 	Building H now deleted.	Plans modified. Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building on Site K supported, provided it does not exceed height of AFTRS and minimises view loss from dwellings on Cook Road. 	Noted. Although Building K was to have a similar height to the AFTRS building, it has now been deleted.	Plans modified. Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compensation for loss of open space required. 	Detailed building design will include provision for landscaping. Key open space areas on the site (i.e. the Parade Ring and Heritage Park) are unaffected by the proposal.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocation of children's playground to the Parade Ring will not be allowed. Temporary structures only on the 	An alternative location for the children's playground has yet to be identified. Children's playground would be	Nil.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
	Parade Ring.	appropriate for the Parade Ring as it is a use compatible with open space/parks everywhere and would better activate the vast, generally under-utilised space. It is unclear why Centennial Parklands considers a children's playground to be incompatible with an open space area. However, alternative locations are available.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capping of car parking not supported. 	This is contrary to other agency submissions.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking data is out of date. 	<p>Although the traffic assessment used 3-year-old data, Halcrow MWT authors of the traffic report included in the EA carried out observations of the car park in February 2009. Their report, at page 15, states:-</p> <p><i>“Observations of car parking demand were undertaken at the same time as the February 2009 traffic surveyed described above.</i></p> <p><i>These observations of typical weekday operating conditions with the recent developments in operation indicate that the multi storey car park continues to operate with substantial spare capacity during these periods with demand is relatively unchanged from those levels previously surveyed (Appendix C).”</i></p>	See Appendix 4 for up-to-date parking accumulation counts.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Mitigative Actions Required
		Notwithstanding the above, recent parking accumulation data is provided in Appendix 4. It demonstrates that the above observations remain relevant.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic data is out of date. 	The traffic data used by Halcrow MWT is adequate for the purposes of the assessment made. Each future application will need to be accompanied by up-to-date data available at the time of DA preparation. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Halcrow has responded to issues raised by the SRDAC (see Appendix 3).	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No assessment of loss of coach parking bay. 	The coach parking bay was provided to cater for tourists visiting the "Backlot", a film studio tour experience, when it was operational. It closed in 2001. it is no longer needed.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions reliability of Heritage report. 	The heritage report was prepared by Godden Mackay Logan. Their findings and recommendations were adopted by the Proponent in the EA.	Nil.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elevations do not assist understanding of compatibility of proposed buildings with existing context. 	The elevations which have been provided accurately illustrate the scale and location of proposed building envelopes in the context of existing buildings. Photo-montages in the EA also illustrate the building envelopes.	Nil.

4. RESPONSE TO KEY ISSUES RAISED BY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

4.1 Issue 1

How the transfer of 6,000m² of allowable floor space from the Working Studio to the Entertainment Quarter would be consistent with 'furthering the development of Sydney as a world class film, television and video production centre' in SEPP 47.

CFS Managed Property Ltd for the Entertainment Quarter and Fox Studios Australia Pty Ltd for the Working Studio Precinct have entered into a Deed of Agreement as lessees of the former Moore Park Showground, whereby the rights of each party to the allocation of the remaining floor space potential within the former Moore Park Showground have been defined. The Deed of Agreement allocates 67,500m² to the Working Studio Precinct (being 6,000m² less than the 73,500m² permitted by the approved Master Plan, but still around 8,500m² in excess of what presently exists) and 76,500m² to the Entertainment Quarter.

The former Moore Park Showground is divided into two parts: the Working Film Studio and the Entertainment Quarter. The subdivision, approved by the NSW State Government, recognises that the two components are distinct, separately managed, separately owned and separately accessed, and each has its own role, function and character.

The transfer of 6,000m² of allowable floor space from the Working Studio to the Entertainment Quarter, still leaves additional development potential within the Working Studio Precinct, should Fox Studios seek to construct additional floor space. In this regard, the Working Studio Precinct presently contains around 58,838m² of floor area. Accordingly, the proposal does not undermine the role and function of the working studio as a world-class centre for film production. Thus, there remains additional development potential within the Working Studio Precinct.

The intent of the 1996 Master Plan for the former Moore Park Showground was for the co-location of a professional film and television studio encompassing sound stages, post-production facilities, storage facilities, car parking and related land uses with a Family Entertainment Precinct incorporating restaurants, cinemas, cafes, shops, film-related commercial activities, open spaces and car parking. The intent was also that the Family Entertainment Precinct would be available for use by the general public and that its principal vehicular entry and exit point would be from Lang Road, with pedestrian access also available from Driver Avenue. The Concept Plan amendment now proposed does not undermine this original intent, nor does it diminish the prospects of, nor is it inconsistent with, furthering the development of Sydney as a world-class film, television and video production centre.

4.2 Issue 2

The conformity of the proposed uses to SEPP 47. Some of the existing uses have a tenuous link to the uses permitted under SEPP 47, so a proportional expansion of the floor area given to the current range of uses would need further justification in terms of both existing and proposed uses.

To the best of the author's knowledge, all existing uses of the former Moore Park Showground have been approved by the Department of Planning, by Sydney City Council, or by its predecessor, South Sydney Council. Therefore, there can be no proper assertion that existing uses have a "tenuous link" to the uses permitted under SEPP 47, because at all times, applications for new uses have been determined pursuant to the provisions of SEPP 47.

Under SEPP 47, the permitted uses are limited to:-

"advertisements; amusement and entertainment facilities; car and coach parking; catering facilities; child care facilities; commercial premises; demolition; drainage; external lighting; film and television studio; film-related development; fuel storage facilities; landscaping; public utilities; restaurants; roads; shops; subdivision; short-term accommodation."

The individual uses for each of the proposed buildings are not yet known and cannot be defined until future applications are made for detailed works and uses. Actual uses will be in response to tenant demand but will be limited to permissible uses under SEPP 47. These are most likely to comprise amusement and entertainment facilities, commercial premises (which need to be film industry-related), film-related development, restaurants, shops, and short-term accommodation, as described in the EA and in the accompanying Traffic Impact Assessment.

It is likely that the additional floor space within the nine new buildings will comprise a significant component of film-related office/commercial purposes, as is presently the case. Commercial premises have to be film-related. However, each and every use will require approval. If the consent authority considers that a particular proposed use is inconsistent with the land use regime imposed by SEPP 47, then consent will not be granted.

4.3 Issue 3

Justify the loss of open space, grass and recreation space to new buildings.

The intent of the original Master Plan was always that the Parade Ring would form the major area of open space, grass and recreation space within the former Moore Park Showground and it will continue to fulfil that role. Indeed, the original approved Master Plan set aside the vast majority of what is now the Entertainment Quarter as a parking lot (see **Appendix 2** of the EA).

Although proposed Buildings A and D occupy what might be termed “open spaces”, the other proposed buildings relate to areas now actively used. The site of Building B is presently largely occupied by Building 17; the site of Building C relates to the coach car park (which is now no longer needed) and Building 220; and the site of Building G relates to a back-of-house storage area adjacent to the stables. The site of Building F is in part occupied by the access to the multi-storey car park, public amenities, and hard-paved areas. The site of Building D was once occupied by the Coronation Stand when the Moore Park Showground was owned by the RAS.

In the submissions, principal concern appears to revolve around the sites of Buildings D and E, which were to be located on the western side of the Parade Ring but beyond the peripheral track which forms part of the Parade Ring's heritage significance. Building E has now been deleted. The Parade Ring is characterised by a large expanse of open space surrounded by a track with buildings around its periphery. Building D complements this built arrangement. The vast expanse of the Parade Ring remains unbuilt-upon and as grassed, open recreation space. An alternative location will be found for the children's play equipment, which the lessee of EQ has installed in this particular location. The playground was never installed as a permanent facility and children's play equipment can readily be removed, relocated or re-established elsewhere within EQ.

In relation to the site of Building A, it stands behind the Driver Avenue boundary wall and between the vehicular access into Fox Studios and the pedestrian access into EQ off Driver Avenue (i.e. Chelmsford Avenue). The pedestrian access runs parallel with the adjoining vehicular access into the surrounds of the Hordern Pavilion. Arising out of issues raised by the Department, the building envelope for Building A has been modified so that its southern edge aligns with that of the former Commonwealth Bank building to the east. This will improve the relationship of any new structure on the Building A site with its surrounds and will complement pedestrian access into EQ.

4.4 Issue 4

Building configuration – capacity to cut back the volumes of:

- ***Building A away from the boundary wall, the Chelmsford Avenue vista and Building 14;***
- ***Building B to allow safe sightlines from Suttor Avenue and Park Road;***
- ***Buildings B, C, D and E to widen the vista between them and set back the upper floors;***
- ***Building F to retain significant views of the Fox and Lion Hotel.***

Each of these suggested modifications has been made by the Proponent, except that:-

- Building E has been deleted; and
- the corridor between Buildings B and C (now C1 and C2) has been significantly widened, removing the need to set back the upper floors.

The amendments which have been made are described in Section 2 of this PPR. Amended plans are provided in Appendix 2. Provided in Appendix 2B are photographs of the revised model, showing the modified building envelopes.

4.5 Issue 5

Heritage impact of Building D on Building 19 within the Working Studio.

This issue has been specifically addressed by Godden Mackay Logan. They advised as follows:-

Key aspects of the significance of Building 19 are the architectural form of the deep verandah stand facing the Parade ground and its elegant clock tower. While of historical interest, the remnant of the Coronation Stand attached to the southern end of Building 19 adjacent to the Building D site is a relatively intrusive element on the architectural form of Building 19.

Key views to Building 19 are from the east along the exceptionally significant John Hargreaves Avenue (formerly Presidents Avenue) beside the SCG and views from the Parade Ground – View 4 noted above. View 4 indicates that in addition to the scale of Site D being consistent with Building 19, the tower on Building 19 would remain as a dominant element in that view. Site D would not be visible down John Hargreaves Avenue until very close to the front of Building 19, and then only obliquely.

Site D development will not physically impact Building 19 and its set back from the southern façade of Building 19 would allow Building 19 to be appreciated ‘in-the-round’.

In our opinion, the Site D development is of an appropriate scale within the setting of Building 19, such that it will have no adverse heritage impact on Building 19. As noted in our Concept Plan HIS report, the Site D development would have some positive heritage impacts by reinforcing the alignment of Suttor Avenue and the Parade Ring.

4.6 Issue 6

Strategies to minimise adverse amenity impacts from Building K on residents across Cook Road.

Building K is no longer proposed.

4.7 Issue 7

A range of parking and traffic strategies for the conceivable range of site uses, using updated traffic and parking data.

The EA, on pages 32 and 33, makes observations in relation to the likely uses of the nine new buildings. The EA states, however (on page 33), that actual uses of each of the nine new buildings will be a matter for determination as part of future detailed applications, just as future detailed works and uses have been pursued by way of individual development applications since the Master Plan consent was first granted.

However, in order to facilitate the preparation of a meaningful traffic and transport analysis, in circumstances where actual uses are not known and cannot be determined, assumptions were made in the EA of the types of uses likely to be accommodated across the nine new buildings. In this regard, the existing distribution of uses across EQ was extrapolated for the purposes of the traffic analysis included in Appendix 6 of the EA.

The existing distribution of uses across EQ is as follows:-

- Retail: 8.6%;
- Food and drink: 7.7%;
- Office/commercial (including Bent Street studios and AFTRS): 49.2%;
- Cinema/entertainment/recreational: 31.5%; and
- Special uses (i.e. Byron Kennedy Hall): 3.0%.

The traffic assessment submitted with the EA took this existing distribution of land uses and assumed a pro-rata increase in existing traffic rates in line with a proportional increase in floor area, to determine the likely traffic generation from the proposal. In order to assess the potential implications of higher-than-expected traffic generation resulting from variations to expected land uses, a sensitivity analysis was undertaken. A SCATES analysis of the surrounding road network was also undertaken, taking into account the anticipated traffic generation from the proposal. Two scenarios were examined: Scenario 1 being a proportional increase of existing uses; and Scenario 2 being a commercial-oriented development whereby the additional floor space proposed within EQ was:-

- Retail/food and drink: 15%;
- Commercial/office: 70%;
- Cinema/entertainment/recreational: 15%; and
- Special uses (Byron Kennedy Hall): 0%.

The traffic report then analysed the results of the SCATES analysis and stated as follows:-

“The SCATES model results indicate that the likely development scenario for the additional floor space on the Entertainment Quarter site (Scenario 1) would not generate a significant adverse impact on road network operation compared to existing (2009) conditions, with only minor increases to average vehicle delays and similar levels of service.

With the exception of the Anzac Parade/Lang Road/Cleveland Street intersection, all intersections will continue to operate at LoSA, with the proposed additional floor space area on the Entertainment Quarter site (Scenario 1). For the Anzac Parade/Lang Road/Cleveland Street intersection, the level of service will continue to be on the cusp of LoSC/D.

For Scenario 2, it is noted that the Anzac Parade/Lang Road/Cleveland Street intersection will continue to operate satisfactorily (LoSD), albeit with an increase in average vehicle delay from 41 seconds to 52 seconds in the pm peak period.”

Notwithstanding the above findings, both the traffic analysis submitted with the EA, and the EA both state that further detailed traffic and parking assessments will be required as part of development or project applications, for the erection and use of each of the new buildings. As part of those applications, information will be submitted on travel demand management with a view to increasing mode share to public transport, cycling or pedestrian modes, with the overall aim of reducing the traffic generation potential of EQ, as assessed in the EA. It will, of course, be necessary as part of any future application for detailed works and uses to be accompanied by parking accumulation figures within the structured car park. However, the car park continues to be typically no more than one-half to two-thirds full at any time during a normal week, with peak usage occurring at weekends, but with substantial spare capacity on most week days. It remains the case that generally, the car park demand is significantly less than 1,000 cars during the day on a week day, but with intermittent increases in evening demand on Saturdays and Sundays, or if there is a special event at one of the stadiums or Hordern Pavilion/Hall of Industries. It should be noted that the Traffic Impact Assessment included with the EA included observations of car parking demand at February 2009. The Traffic Impact Assessment states (at pages 15 and 16):-

“Observations of car parking demand were undertaken at the same time as the February 2009 traffic survey described above.

These observations of typical week-day operating conditions with the recent developments in operation indicate that the multi-storey car park continues to operate with substantial spare capacity during these periods, with demand relatively unchanged from those levels previously surveyed (Appendix C).

During week-day events, car park demand increases significantly. It is interesting to note that during events, the demand for parking increases in total demand and duration of stay. This indicates a degree of dual activities is being undertaken such as eating dinner or having a few drinks in the Entertainment Quarter before attending an event at the SCG, Aussie Stadium, or the Hordern Pavilion.

In the month of analysis, there was only one occasion (Saturday, 20 May, around 8.00pm) when the car park was full. This was the result of a concert at the SCG.

It is understood that some 10 times a year (generally at weekends) an event at the SCG or Aussie Stadium will fill the car park."

As noted above, it will be necessary as and when future applications come forward, for each of such applications to be accompanied by a traffic analysis and parking analysis, to identify the circumstances which exist at the time of assessment of the applications for the construction and use of individual buildings.

The Revised Statement of Commitments (see Section 5.5A-C) deals with the Proponent's commitments to travel demand management. These include a requirement for a Travel Demand Management Plan to be prepared as part of any future application for each of the individual nine sites. An additional commitment has been included which requires the Proponent to nominate a traffic co-ordinator to ensure the delivery and take-up of workplace travel plans.

Notwithstanding all of the above, Halcrow has prepared a response to issues raised by the SRDAC in its submission to the Department (see Appendix 3). Furthermore, recent parking accumulation counts have been compiled to enable comparison with earlier information relied on in the traffic analysis submitted with the EA. These counts demonstrate that there is still substantial available parking capacity within the structured car park (see Appendix 4).

4.8 Other Matters

The Department's letter of 28 January 2010 states:-

"It is requested that the Preferred Project Report also include:

- An audit of the existing and proposed gross floor areas of the Working Studios and Entertainment Quarter in the former Moore Park Showgrounds site;*
- Three-dimensional views of the massing adjusted to show the incorporation of further planning advice; and*
- Roof plans and elevations to show the RLs of proposed and adjacent buildings."*

Provided in Appendices 9a and 9b of the EA are schedules setting out the existing floor space areas of existing buildings in the Entertainment Quarter and Working Studio Precinct, respectively. The floor space areas in the two schedules have all been drawn from approvals granted by the relevant consent authorities (i.e. the Department of Planning, Sydney City Council, and the former South Sydney Council) since the Master Plan was first approved. In the EA, the Proponent requested that the floor areas in Appendices 9a and 9b, along with the proposed additional floor area of 26,187m² (disaggregated across the individual nine buildings) be accepted by the Department as the "site audit of the existing and proposed GFA over the entire site".

All new buildings constructed subsequent to approval of the Master Plan have been approved by the relevant consent authorities and as part and parcel of each application for new building works, information has been provided to the relevant consent authority about the incremental additions in floor area within the individual precincts and overall on the site.



This information has been consolidated into the tables in Appendices 9a and 9b in the EA. Furthermore, it is not possible for the Proponent to undertake any floor space audit within that part of the former Moore Park Showground now occupied by Fox Studios.

The modified plans in Appendix 2 include altered photomontages showing the modified building envelopes for each of the proposed buildings. The modifications which have been made are in response to issues raised by the Department of Planning and by the CP&MPT.

Elevations showing the proposed buildings in their context were provided to the Department in the EA (see Appendix 3b of the EA). These elevations illustrated the proposed building envelopes. Elevations of the modified envelopes for Buildings A, B, C1, C2, D, F and G are provided in Appendix 2.

5. REVISED STATEMENT OF COMMITMENTS

5.1 Introduction

Under Section 75F(6) of the EP&A Act, a Proponent may be required to include a Statement of Commitments within the Environmental Assessment, outlining the measures that the Proponent is prepared to make in respect of environmental management and mitigation at the site. The Proponent's Environmental Assessment, in Section 7, included a Draft Statement of Commitments for the project which specified how the project would be managed to minimise potential impacts.

It must be noted that no new construction activity (other than the demolition of Buildings 17 and 220) is to be undertaken as a consequence of the Concept Plan approval. Each of the nine new buildings needs to be the subject of a future application for detailed works and uses. Draft Statements of Commitments tailored to the requirements of each individual building will be provided with each of those future applications.

Following receipt of submissions and identification of key issues by the Department of Planning during the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment, the Draft Statement of Commitments has been reviewed and various minor revisions made. Inserted text is identified in **bold** type and deleted text is identified by ~~strike through~~ (thus).

5.2 General

- A. Each of the new buildings to which this Concept Plan application relates is to be the subject of a Future Application for Detailed Works and Uses.
- B. Each of the future applications referred to in A above is to be consistent with the set of plans provided in **Appendices 3a and 3b of the Environmental Assessment as amended by the revised plans submitted with the Preferred Project Report attached hereto, together** comprising:-

Drawing No's	Drawing Title	Date
A – CP01	Existing site survey plan	28 January 2009
A – CP02	Site analysis plan	28 January 2009
A – CP03 (C)	Locality/context plan	28 January 2009
A – CP-04	Proposed building floor space allocation	2 February 2009 16 September 2010
A – CP-05 (B)	Proposed building heights diagram	28 January 2009 16 September 2010
A – CP-06 (B)	View analysis – Location Plan	28 January 2009 16 September 2010
CP-07 (AC)	View analysis – photomontage, Views 1-4	2 February 2009 16 September 2010
CP-08 (AC)	View analysis – photomontage, Views 5-86	2 February 2009 16 September 2010

Drawing No's	Drawing Title	Date
A – CP-09(AC)	View analysis – photomontage, Views 9-11	16 September 2010 2 February 2009 16 September 2010 2 February 2009
A – CP-10(AC)	Shadow studies – summer solstice	16 September 2010 2 February 2009 16 September 2010
A – CP-11(AC)	Shadow studies – equinox	
A – CP-12(AC)	Shadow studies – winter solstice	
A – CP-13(C)	Landscape strategy plan	

Drawing No's	Drawing Title	Date
CPAR – 0905-01	CFSPM response to proposed building height	20 May 2009 20 September 2010 20 May 2009
CPAR – 0905-02	CFSPM response to proposed building height	20 September 2010 20 May 2009 20 September 2010
CPAR – 0905-03	CFSPM response to proposed building height	20 September 2010 20 May 2009 20 September 2010
CPAR – 0905-03	CFSPM response to proposed building height	

- C. The Proponent is committed to the principles of sustainability as defined in the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*.
- D. The Proponent will develop a program of informing key stakeholders including Sydney City Council, the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust, Fox Studios Australia Pty Ltd and the Centennial Park and Moore Park Residents Association, of its time-frame for the submission of separate detailed applications for each of the nine new buildings referred to in the Concept Plan application.

5.3 Demolition Management

- A. Demolition will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Australian Standard AS2601 – 2001: The demolition of structures which is incorporated into the *Occupational Health and Safety Act, 2000*, administered by WorkCover NSW.
- B. Measures to control soil erosion during demolition will be introduced in accordance with currently accepted principles, as described in Managing Urban Stormwater (EPA NSW) and Soil Erosion and Sediment Control (The Institute of Engineers, Australia).

- C. Any existing concrete of suitable volume which is not used as fill, will be taken to a concrete recycling works and evidence that this has occurred will be provided to the certifying Authority.

5.4 Heritage

- A. The Proponent will implement the archaeological recommendations in the Heritage Impact Statement in **Appendix 5 of the Environmental Assessment**, being:-
- In the event that an exception is not available under Section 139 of the *Heritage Act, 1977*, an application for an excavation permit must be made under Section 140 of the *Heritage Act* for any proposed excavation works in the vicinity of the Royal Agricultural Hall and Weeks Road. In such a circumstance, an appropriate on-site Investigation Strategy will be prepared and submitted to the Heritage Office, Department of Planning, with an archaeological assessment and research design as supporting documentation for the Section 140 Excavation Permit Application.
 - In the event of historical archaeological remains being exposed on the site, they will be appropriately documented, according to procedures outlined in the Investigation Strategy accompanying any applications for excavation permits.
 - Suitable clauses will be included in all contracts and sub-contracts to ensure that on-site personnel are aware of their obligations and requirements in relation to the relics provisions of the *Heritage Act, 1977* and their statutory protections of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974*.
- B. The Proponent commits to implementing the recommendations in Sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Heritage Impact Statement in **Appendix 5 of the Environmental Assessment, except for the recommendations in Sections 7.2 and 7.3 in relation to Buildings B and C respectively, which are to be reconfigured as per the drawings provided in the PPR.**
- C. The Proponent commits to preparing an Open Space Strategy to guide further landscape and use planning for the retention, public use and appreciation of public open space areas including the former Parade Ring, Heritage Park, roads and footpaths.
- D. The Proponent commits to ensuring that future development represents an appropriate design response to the heritage significance, setting and character of the Entertainment Quarter and that future development of the nine sites identified in the Concept Plan application give consideration to pedestrian access and the importance of heritage interpretation of the former Showground.
- E. **Subject to aboricultural advice**, the *Ficus hillii* on Site F upon separate approval having been granted for detailed works and uses associated with Building F will be relocated to an appropriate landscape setting within the Entertainment Quarter.

5.5 Travel Demand Management

- A. As part of any site-specific development or project application for any of the nine new buildings proposed in this Concept Plan application, a Travel Demand Management Plan will be prepared as part of the application documentation.
- B. Any Travel Demand Management Plan prepared pursuant to A above, will incorporate the following elements:-
- Maintain existing parking provision (to reflect a relative restriction in parking provision for the site's building floor area).
 - Provision of **secure** bicycle parking spaces equivalent to 3% of staff, **plus spaces for visitors**.
 - Installation of a taxi phone within the main entrance/reception.
 - Establish mechanisms to create a staff-operated car pooling system. This may include provision of space for displaying contact details of people willing to participate in a car pooling program.
 - Provision of space for displaying relevant transport information in the main entrance/reception area and communal staff areas. Information to include:-
 - bus timetables;
 - public transport information sources;
 - bicycle routes and on-site facilities;
 - preferred pedestrian routes;
 - taxi phone numbers.
- C. **The Proponent will nominate a traffic co-ordinator to ensure delivery and take-up of workplace travel plans.**

5.6 Staging

- A. A detailed staging plan for each new building will be provided as part of any future application for detailed works and uses relating to that building.

5.7 Use of New Buildings

- A. The Proponent commits to activation of the ground plane of any new building which is contiguous with existing retail or restaurant activities.
- B. The Proponent commits to ensuring that new buildings are capable of accommodating a variety of different uses.

- C. The Proponent commits to ensuring that shops do not become the dominant land use activity within the Entertainment Quarter.

5.8 Building Height

- A. The Proponent commits to ensuring that any new building will comply with the height limits shown on the concept plans and elevations, measured to the main roof line.
- B. Plant rooms and architectural roof features may extend above the main roof line but may not exceed an additional height of 6 metres or occupy more than 25% of the roof area.
- C. Notwithstanding B. above, the height of any plant room above the main roof line is to be no greater than reasonably and practically required to accommodate the associated plant.



APPENDICES



APPENDIX 1A

Summary of Agency Submissions



APPENDIX 1B

Summary of Public Submissions



APPENDIX 2

**Amended Plans prepared by Cox Architects and Elevations
prepared by Colonial First State**



APPENDIX 3

Response to SRDAC submission prepared by Halcrow



APPENDIX 4

Updated parking accumulation graphs