

Submissions on MP07_0144 Entertainment Quarter, Moore Park Showgrounds
Appendix 1A: Agency Submissions

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
1	[No DoP date stamp]	Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee	Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed vehicle access arrangements depicted are insufficient to undertake a detailed assessment. Reference to RTA requirements (19 Feb 2008) required. Discrepancies in SCATES analysis for intersections of Anzac Parade/Cleveland Street/Lang Road, Lang Road/Driver Avenue and Lang Road/Errol Flynn Boulevard. Intersections need to be remodelled and result submitted to the RTA proper to consideration of project application. No details of car parking areas, internal circulating roads, loading bays or service facilities. Details to be submitted with future applications for building works. Proposed bicycle parking provision caters for existing use only. 5-6% provision will promote greater use. Detailed traffic and car parking assessment to be submitted with future project applications for building works. Construction traffic management plans to be submitted for approval prior to issue of a construction certificate detailing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements, and traffic control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> insufficient information Information discrepancies bicycle parking parking traffic
2	5 Nov 2009	NSW Department of Transport & Infrastructure	Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports proposed cap on existing parking and commitment to preparation of work place travel plans for future development sites. Commitments should be reflected in conditions of consent with requirement for transport coordinator to ensure delivery and take up. Recommend condition requiring provision of secure employee bicycle parking, safe at ground bicycle parking for visitors and employee amenities to encourage walking and cycling. DoP Guide to Walking and Cycling should be referenced in the conditions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> bicycle parking parking
3	27 Nov 2009	City of Sydney (Monica Barone CEO)	objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans and proposed building envelopes not changed from scheme submitted in 2007. Concern that no information about use of buildings provided given extent of additional floorspace. No objection on heritage grounds for demolition of two buildings. Two new buildings will result in loss of recreational space and impact on functionality of site particularly when large events staged. These issues not addressed in documentation. Building A should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduced in width to match alignment of hall and neighbouring curved building, and set back. Spacing between buildings B and C should be increased to match building alignment to west and maintain view corridor along Chelmsford Avenue. Width and footprint of Building C should be pulled back to match alignment of Building E. Upper levels of southern building will block views of Clock Tower. Massing of Building B above RL49.5 should be setback from southern boundary. Careful design of Buildings B2 and C2 to ensure high quality relationship with Parade Ring. Building C1 should not exceed three levels in height as set out in Heritage Impact Statement. Building D should be reduced in width and realigned to match alignment of building to north to provide for openness and tree planting along street frontage. High quality relationship between Block D and Parade Ring required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> heritage loss of views loss of open space crowd management proposed use insufficient information design principles parking Landscaping Strategy character Height and massing setbacks and alignments

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development site E to be carefully designed to ensure high quality design relationship with Parade Ring. Concern with proposed erection of Building F due to impact on setting and views of Fox Hotel and Royal Hall of Industries. Building on Development Site F not supported but if approved should be reduced in height by two storeys to match parapet height of car park. Corner building element to reinforce corner location. Fig tree is in poor health and should be replaced with an advanced fig tree not transplanted. Location of Building G generally acceptable but should be setback from Lang Road boundary wall which is of exceptional significance. Recent wall to Errol Flynn Boulevard should be retained to provide enclosure of site and Entertainment Quarter. Detailed design of building G should compliment scale and character of adjoining stables. Building K needs to be sympathetic to minimise any impacts on Heritage Park. Support cap on parking levels. RTA should be consulted on functionality of intersection of Anzac Parade, Lang Road and Cleveland Street. Cumulative impact of proposal has potential to erode character and significance of the site in terms of loss of views, loss of open space and heritage impacts. Landscaping strategy covering use planning if public open space and circulation areas should be formulated before buildings are designed. Height and massing does not reflect controlling parapet height of buildings on Parade Ring. No clear requirement for vertical articulation in massing in response to context of individual buildings. Masterplan should include a series of clear objectives relating to height, massing, articulation. Building alignments, massing and setbacks above key RL levels should be specified and form part of controls within the masterplan including identification of key view corridors and means of preserving/reinforcing them. 	
4	9 Nov 2009	Clover Moore MP	objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal exploits original purpose of lease for the site as film studios turning it into a general development site for uses unrelated to film production. History, heritage, social significance and open space potential diminished. Proposal reduces available development potential for a working film studio by 6,000 sqm and transfers it to the Entertainment Quarter. Not possible to determine impact of development without further details about proposed uses. Extent of traffic and parking implications cannot be determined without greater detail of proposed uses. Proposal could potentially contribute to existing traffic and parking problems which affect surrounding residential areas. Proposed increase in developed floorspace from 20,000sqm to 144,000sqm consistent with SEPP47 but would be inconsistent with 1996 approved masterplan for film making and ancillary uses. Use of site for film studios is being progressively undermined. Proposed building heights are out of character and excessive for heritage precinct. Extent of loss of views cannot be determined based on information provided. Further details of properties affected and extent of loss of views should be made available. Scale of development proposed is not appropriate to site given heritage significance, open space value and surrounding residential areas. Proposal does not warrant loss of open space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> character use loss of space for film production insufficient information parking traffic height heritage loss of views scale residential amenity loss of open space Landscaping Strategy Legislation

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of open space will result in adverse heritage impacts. heritage Report recommends the preparation of an Open Space Strategy. Existing areas of public open space should be retained to support growing urban populations. Proposal is contrary to legislation intended to protect the site for recreational and open space needs. 	
5	[No DOP date stamp]	Centennial Parklands	Objection [detailed submission]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowners consent for application should not be construed as endorsement for the project. Support for provision of additional floorspace within parameters of SEPP47 within the Entertainment Quarter. Concern about location and configuration of new buildings with particular regard to heritage impacts, loss of open space and impact on views. Believe additional floorspace should arise through alterations and additions to existing buildings 207, 215, 220 and 230 to prevent loss of open space and impact on views. Concern that that proposed future uses comply with SEPP47. Some existing commercial land uses within the Entertainment Quarter have only a tenuous connection with the film, television and video industry. Director General's Requirements include an audit of existing floorspace. Schedule of floorspace provided does not constitute an audit which should include existing land use and clearly demonstrate compliance with land use restrictions of SEPP47. Details of maximum heights (RLs) of existing structures necessary to assess proposed building envelopes. Detailed urban design guidelines should be prepared for each site and included within the masterplan including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> building footprint setbacks street wall height building mass setback planes articulation requirements materials and finishes identify no-development zones to preserve view corridors and the setting of heritage items minimum width of pedestrian pathways/connections and streets requirement for awnings requirement for active street fronts maximum overall height Allowance of 6m additional height for plant and rooftop features over 25% of building envelope is excessive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of site A is not supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it would obscure views from Diver Avenue to the heritage listed Commonwealth Bank building. scale needs to be reduced and not be higher than Commonwealth Bank building. Clear views of Commonwealth Bank needed when approaching through gates on Driver Avenue. primacy of boundary wall must be retained, building should not incorporate wall. loss of green space / trees. Concerns with development of site B: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment appears to impeded sightlines from Driver Avenue to Parade Ground needs to be setback further to north to provide sightlines. Minimum width of pedestrian walkway/view corridor between Buildings B and C required to ensure attractive pedestrian connection and visual connectivity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of views heritage loss of open space insufficient information use height design principles parking setback and alignments traffic document inconsistencies

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upper Levels of Building B and C need to be setback from central pedestrian connection to provide view corridor through to Parade Ground. • Concerns with development of site C: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - alignment appears to impede sightlines from Driver Avenue to Parade Ground - building needs to be setback further to south to provide sightlines. - Minimum width of pedestrian walkway/view corridor between Buildings B and C required to ensure attractive pedestrian connection and visual connectivity. - Upper Levels of Building B and C need to be setback from central pedestrian connection to provide view corridor through to Parade Ground. - consistent with height and scale of adjacent Building 220 unclear (no RLs provided) - separation from Building 220 appears to be a fire exit – must comply with BCA requirements. Could be combined with redevelopment of Building 220 which is underutilised. • Concerns with development of sites D and E: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alignment appears to impede sightlines from Driver Avenue and Parade Ground. - separation of buildings needs to provide sightlines. - minimum width of pedestrian walkway/view corridor between buildings D and E to be provided to ensure attractive pedestrian connection and visual connectivity. - Consistency with height and scale of adjacent building 212 unclear (no RLs provided). - design guidelines should ensure height of buildings is consistent with height of buildings 212, 211 and 210. - loss of green space and children's playground. • Development of site F supported but should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alignment should be setback from road alignment consistent with setback to east along Park Road to provide landscape buffer and views to Fox and Lion hotel and Errol Flynn Boulevard when travelling north and reinforce historic street alignment of Park Road. - Site has potential to accommodate additional floorspace by increasing proposed height. • Development of site G should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - development must be setback behind boundary wall and must not be incorporated into building given heritage value. - Development behind boundary wall should have a roof form that is complementary to and does not compete with roof form of adjacent Stables roof and Royal Hall of Industries to west. • Building on development site H should be setback to preserve the consistent street wall height along Bent Street. • Building on Site K development support but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should not exceed height of adjacent AFTRS building. - Design guidelines should incorporate measures to minimise loss of views from dwellings on Cook Road. - design should minimise visual impacts on part to west. • compensation within site for loss of open site required. • relocation of Children's Playground to Parade Ground is not acceptable and will not be allowed. Only temporary structures are permitted on the Parade Ground. Alternatively, the hard stand area between Buildings 101 and 208 could be used and could similarly be used for open space. • Ministry of Transport submission not included in EA documentation. • Capping of car parking not supported at current levels. Provision of adequate parking critical to ongoing success and competitiveness of the site. • Access to site from south is poor, patrons must cross Anzac Parade. 	

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and Transport Report is inadequate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking data used is 3 years old and does not reflect recent developments. More up to date data required. - Traffic data is out of date. Assessment against current situation is critical. - No analysis of wider road network provided. - Traffic assessment does not breakdown varying uses within the site to determine peak demand. - No assessment of loss of existing coach parking bay. • Heritage Report refers to different version of Urban Design Report prepared by Cox Richardson (Feb 2009 not March 2009) and refers to information not included in submitted version of this report and contradicts aspects of proposed concept. Conclusions of report cannot therefore be relied upon. • Revised heritage assessment required. • Further urban design controls should be built into the Concept Plan to provide comfort in respect of heritage impacts. • Elevation drawings at scale of 1:1000 do not assist in understanding of proposed buildings compatibility with context. 	