

# Macquarie Park Commerce Centre

## Concept Plan – Response to Submissions

Issues Raised		Proponent Response
City of Ryde Council		
1	Inadequate community consultation and inappropriate timing of public exhibition.	Noted. The project was exhibited for the required statutory timeframe. This is a matter for the DOPI's consideration.
2	Issues associated with probity in the Part 3A process.	Noted.
3	The building form is consistent with Macquarie Park DCP and the as yet unrealised "Amendment 1" of RLEP 2010. It has the potential to provide a dramatic corner in the streetscape. Height and massing are appropriate to its immediate context and the wider Macquarie Park area in relation to the DCP but does not comply with the existing LEP.	It is noted that Council acknowledges that the proposed built form is both appropriate and consistent with Council's vision for the site despite its non-compliance with the LEP.
4	The smaller buildings have a very similar building form, footprint and separation along Waterloo Road. Whilst this is generally consistent with the DCP there is an opportunity to create a more dynamic group of buildings by varying the footprint and separation. This could also assist in providing different character to the landscape areas between the buildings.	The proposal seeks approval for a Concept Plan envelope. The detailed design, which will be the subject of a future Development Application to Council, will ensure that the design of the individual buildings will focus on creating a dynamic group of buildings that may interact or provide a point of difference. Bates Smart has prepared a series of examples of how the future envelopes could be designed to achieve Council's request (see <b>Attachment E</b> ).
5	<p>The articulation of the facades needs to be further developed. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Better definition of the top and middle of the building.</li> <li>▪ Stronger definition of the corner of Waterloo and Lane Cove Road.</li> <li>▪ Stronger articulation of the elevations.</li> </ul>	The proposal seeks approval for a Concept Plan envelope. The detailed design including articulation of the building will be subject of a future application. Bates Smart has prepared a series of examples of how the future envelopes could be designed to achieve Council's request (see <b>Attachment E</b> ).

6	The proposal encourages pedestrian activity and provides pedestrian links through the site.	Noted.
7	The area around the station forecourt needs to be contained to define the streetscape and separating it from the large landscape area.	A revised Landscape Concept has been prepared by Aspect (see <b>Attachment D</b> ). The revised Landscape Concept demonstrates that the station forecourt can be contained to define the streetscape.
8	The colonnade (or an awning) should extend between buildings to provide protected pedestrian access.	Noted. The proposal seeks approval for a Concept Plan. However, Bates Smart has prepared a series of examples of how the future envelopes could be connected by awnings in order to provide protected pedestrian access (see <b>Attachment E</b> ).
9	Each of the landscape areas should have its own character which should be reflected in their physical size.	A revised Landscape Concept has been prepared by Aspect (see <b>Attachment D</b> ). The Landscape Concept provides indicative examples of how the spaces could be designed to reflect its physical size. The detailed design of the landscape spaces will be subject of a future application.
10	<p>The DCP calls for active street fronts in the precinct. The proposal is largely compliant however it should further consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Having active uses on all building corners.</li> <li>▪ Placing the building lobbies away from corners.</li> <li>▪ Activating the internal 'streets' between buildings.</li> </ul>	Noted. The proposal seeks approval for a Concept Plan envelope. The detailed design including the design of the ground plane will be subject of a future application.
11	Council raises a range of issues with the traffic report.	Winten / Australand engaged new traffic consultants, Parsons Brinckerhoff and Colston Budd Hunt & Kafes, to undertake the Paramics modelling and analysis in accordance with Council's policy. The new Traffic Report is located at <b>Attachment B</b> .
<b>Sydney Water</b>		
1	Water: The existing water system has capacity to service the proposed development. The developer will need to design and construct an extension to the available 200mm water main on the western side of Lane Cove Road.	Noted. The proponent will continue to consult with Sydney Water regarding the necessary upgrades to water infrastructure servicing the site as part of the detailed design phase.
2	Waste Water: The waste water system has sufficient capacity.	Noted. The proponent will continue to consult with Sydney Water regarding the necessary upgrades to waste water as part of the detailed design phase.
3	Recycled Water: Sydney water has not committed to providing recycled water to development within the Macquarie Park area. The developer should not rely on the provision of a Sydney Water recycled water scheme to achieve any Green Star ratings. Any requirements for recycled water connection will be assessed when the developer applies for a	Noted. The proponent will continue to consult with Sydney Water regarding the necessary upgrades to recycled water as part of the detailed design phase.

	Section 73 Certificate.	
3	Trade Waste: A trade waste permit must be obtained before any discharge can be made to the sewer system. The permit is also needed for site remediation processes.	Noted. The proponent will continue to consult with Sydney Water regarding the necessary upgrades to trade waste as part of the detailed design phase.
4	Sydney Water Servicing: Sydney Water requests the Department of Planning to continue to instruct proponents to obtain a Section 73 Certificate from Sydney Water.	Noted.
<b>Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee (14 March 2011)</b>		
1	The RTA is investigating a proposal to further improve bus network efficiency from Lane Cove Road across Waterloo Road. Therefore the proposed buildings or structure should be located clear of the land currently under investigation.	The RTA has since completed its planned extension to the existing section of the northbound bus-only lane (see Figure 1 of the PPR). Therefore no further consideration is required.
2	The traffic report uses Ryde Council's 2007 Base Paramics Model which is outdated and no longer accurate. Further analysis should have been undertaken of the intersections impacted by this development.	Noted. Winten / Australand has engaged new traffic consultants to undertake further Paramics Modelling using the most up to date model available at the time of the modelling. A broad response to the main traffic issues is located in Section 2.1.2 of the PPR. The revised modelling and analysis, which includes consideration of the G-Turn, is located at <b>Attachment B</b> .
3	The traffic report needs to provide more detail on the calibration process of the Paramics model.	
4	The Paramics modelling results show a minimal increase in delays on the signalised intersection of Lane Cove Road and Lane Cove Road/ Epping Road intersection, these figures are not supported considering the development will generate at least an additional 675 vehicles in the peak hour.	
5	The applicant is required to use Ryde Council's 2010 Base Paramics model and update it accordingly for the RTA to review. The RTA requires that the applicant model a G-Turn scenario around the intersection of Lane Cove Road / Waterloo Road.	
6	The traffic report states that the proposed traffic generation rates for the development would be lower due to the site's close proximity to good public transport. The RTA would support a reduction in parking on-site.	No reduction in car parking is proposed. A response to this matter is discussed in Section 2.1.2 of the Preferred Project Report.
7	All works associated with the proposed development shall be at no cost to the RTA.	Noted.

NSW Transport		
1	<p>TNSW has reviewed the EA and has identified the following positive aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provision for employment adjacent to mass transit and strategic bus corridors in the Macquarie Park Centre</li> <li>Provision of publicly accessible through site links for pedestrians</li> <li>Bicycle parking for staff provided in a secure and convenient location</li> <li>Provision of covered footpaths for pedestrians on Waterloo Road; and</li> <li>Use of ground floor retail to activate the pedestrian domain.</li> </ul>	Noted.
2	The proponent should identify the quantum and location of visitor bicycle parking. Further the proponent should justify the quantum of showers, changing rooms and lockers given the significant provision of spaces.	115 (111 commercial / 4 retail) visitor bicycle spaces will be provided at the ground level of the development. As the ground plane is still at the conceptual stage the location of the visitor spaces is currently not known at this time but will be provided as part of future Development Application(s) for the site. Provision has been made for change facilities for tenants within the share basement. The final location and design of the change facilities will also be provided as part of the future Development Application(s) for the site.
3	TNSW request that the Traffic and Accessibility Study specifically identify a suite of Travel Demand Measures that will be implemented prior to issuing the construction certificate.	The Transport Report (see <b>Attachment B</b> ) identifies travel demand measures which will be incorporated in to the Work Place Travel Plans prepared by the future occupants of the buildings.
4	TNSW requests that a bus shelter be required along the Lane Cove Road Frontage of the proposed building.	TNSW has (since this submission) located a bus shelter outside the adjoining Hyundai Building on the Lane Cove Road frontage.
NSW Office of Water		
1	The NOW strongly recommend that if the proposal encounters significant inflows of ground water, mitigation measures shall be undertaken to seal off the water bearing zones. The extraction of ground water from the basement areas needs to be minimised to the fullest practical extent.	Noted. The Statement of Commitments have been updated to reflect this submission.
Turnbull Group on behalf of the Hyundai Motor Company Australia		
1	The proposal involves a significant and unacceptable breach of the development standard, is contrary to the LEP objectives, inappropriate in the circumstances, has not been adequately justified and will have an overbearing effect on adjoining development.	Ryde Council has not raised any issues with the proposed breach of the development standard which is justified in Section 5.3.1 of the exhibited EAR. In its submission, Council acknowledges that the proposed built form is both appropriate and consistent with Council's vision for the site despite its non-compliance with the LEP.

2	The proposed breach of the height standard is excessive, uncharacteristic and environmentally detrimental in respect of the area and surrounding and nearby development.	Ryde Council has not raised any issues with the proposed breach of the development standard which is justified in Section 5.3.1 of the exhibited EAR. In their submission, Council acknowledges that the proposed built form is both appropriate and consistent with Council's vision for the site despite its non-compliance with the LEP.
3	<p>The proposed parking provision is excessive as a result of the non-compliance with the FSR development standard. The provision of this number of spaces will result in inappropriately increased traffic levels in a location where the road system is operating at peak capacity.</p> <p>Access points should be distributed around the site in suitable locations and not highly concentrated at the one location.</p>	<p>An assessment of the traffic impacts of the proposed development and parking provision is located at <b>Attachment B</b> and detailed in Section 2.0 of the PPR.</p> <p>In response to this request an additional vehicular access point has been provided on Coolinga Street to in order to manage the flow of vehicles entering and exiting the site and reduce the impacts on Giffnock Avenue.</p>
4	The proposed built form is inconsistent with the height, building separation and floor plate controls in the DCP.	<p>Justification for the proposed variations to the height, building separation and floor plate controls in the DCP are located in Table 9 of the EAR. In relation to these matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Council has not raised any concern with the proposed variations to the height control and acknowledges that the proposed built form is both appropriate and consistent with Council's vision for the site.</li> <li>▪ There is no building separation control in the DCP that applies to the subject site. The proposed separation is appropriate considering the urban context around the station.</li> <li>▪ Building 1 exceeds the maximum floorplate control by 10m<sup>2</sup>, this is a very minor non-compliance and is considered appropriate considering the building's prominent location at the corner of Lane Cove Road and Waterloo Road.</li> </ul>
5	The proposal is contrary to public interest because it's contrary to the planning controls and will undermined confidence in the NSW Planning System.	No other public submissions were made regarding the project, which would indicate that there is no public opposition or concerns regarding the proposed Concept Plan. The variation to the current controls will have little impact on undermining the confidence of the public in the NSW Planning System. Conversely, the project is in the public interest as it meets a range of strategic planning objectives, including supporting the long term viability of Macquarie Park Station. Furthermore the development will provide a range of other public benefits in the form of through-site links and other public domain upgrades.
6	The proposal will result in significant shadow impacts on the Hyundai property.	The overshadowing of a commercial building in a commercial area is not considered to be an adverse impact. The Hyundai site does not contain any areas of open space, therefore the proposal does not overshadow any areas which provide amenity to workers on the Hyundai site. Furthermore the development will provide high quality public open space areas for the employees of Hyundai to enjoy during all times of the year.
7	There will be significant visual impacts because of the breathtaking change in scale between the Hyundai building and the proposed Building A.	The proposed development is located on a corner at a key gateway site and transport node within the Macquarie Park centre where the scale of the proposed development is considered to be appropriate. The view analysis submitted with the exhibited EAR demonstrated that the scale

		between the two buildings will not result in a 'visual impact'.
8	The proposal does not assess the impact of the relocated helipad on the Hyundai building.	An existing approval exists for a helipad in the southern part of the site. The final location of the helipad will be decided as part of a future development application. If the helipad is to be relocated the proponent will undertake the appropriate assessment.
9	The proposed development will completely obscure the Hyundai building's sky sign when viewed from a northern direction.	Two existing Hyundai building sky signs will still be visible from the south. Preserving views to the sign from the north is not of greater planning importance than providing high quality floor space near a transport node.
10	There are no objections raised in respect of the proposed landscaping.	Noted.
<b>Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW</b>		
1	DECCW has no comments and no further interest in being involved.	Noted.
<b>Transport NSW Railcorp</b>		
1	<p>Noise and Vibration:</p> <p>The Department is requested that an acoustic assessment be submitted to the Principal Certifying Authority prior to the issue of a construction certificate demonstrating how the proposed development will comply with "Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads- Interim Guidelines".</p>	We note the submission considers this development to be of residential nature. If required, an acoustic assessment which considers "Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads- Interim Guidelines" will be submitted as part of the future Development Application(s) for the site.
2	<p>Stray Currents:</p> <p>Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate the Applicant is to engage an electrolysis expert to prepare a report on the electrolysis risk to the development from stray currents.</p>	An electrolysis risk report will be submitted as part of the future Development Application(s) for the site.
3	<p>Geotechnical and Structural Stability and Integrity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant shall provide a geotechnical engineering report to RailCorp for review by RailCorp prior to commencement of works. The report shall demonstrate that the development has no negative impact on the rail corridor or the integrity of infrastructure through its loading and ground deformation and shall contain structural design detail/analysis for review by RailCorp.</li> <li>A geotechnical report is needed to evaluate the impact of the development on the rail tunnel below the subject site. The</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Desktop Geotechnical Engineering Report was submitted with the EAR. A detailed geotechnical engineering report demonstrating that the development has no negative impact on the rail corridor or the integrity of infrastructure through its loading and ground deformation and shall contain structural design detail/analysis will be submitted to RailCorp for review following the detailed design stage.</li> <li>A Preliminary Geotechnical and Structural Impact Assessment of Proposed Development on ECRL Infrastructure was submitted with the EAR. A detailed Geotechnical and</li> </ul>

	Applicant shall submit a Geotechnical Report for review by RailCorp to ensure that the proposed development is structurally sound and will not jeopardise the structural integrity of the existing rail tunnel.	Structural Impact Assessment of Proposed Development on ECRL Infrastructure Report will be submitted prior to Rail Corp for review following the detailed design stage.
4	During demolition, excavation and construction, there is a need to ensure that there will be no adverse impact on the integrity of RailCorp's facilities, or the operation of the network.	Noted. The Concept Plan does not seek approval for demolition, excavation and construction. A detailed Geotechnical and Structural Impact Assessment of Proposed Development on ECRL Infrastructure Report will be submitted prior to Rail Corp for review following the detailed design stage.
5	During construction, the use of cranes and other equipment capable of intruding into airspace above the corridor and of operation over any overhead wiring or transmission lines must be strictly controlled. The developer must demonstrate to the satisfaction of RailCorp that all crane and other overhead operations are properly managed, and enter into an agreement with RailCorp for such operation.	Noted. The impact of cranes and other equipment will addressed prior to the issue of a construction certificate for the subsequent development applications.