

ATTACHMENT A

ATTACHMENT A

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
1	Lend Lease for AMP Capital and Mirvac	Forwarded letters dated November 2015 from AMP Capital and Mirvac (joint owners of 200 George Street) supporting the building envelope, setback, interface of proposed public space, further articulation and sculpting of the proposed envelope at podium level. AMP and Mirvac will be providing further input in particular wind impacts, traffic management, geotechnical and structure impact and location of "Bridge Link".	Noted.
2	Gallagher Hotel Management Group	Gallagher Hotel management Group, current Licensee of Jacksons on George support the planning proposal in particular building envelopes and setbacks and adaptive reuse of Jacksons on George.	Support noted.
3	Grosvenor Place Pty Ltd	<p>Objects on behalf of the owners of the land at 225 George Street (Grosvenor Place), raising the following issues:</p> <p>Tower Crowding Introducing a fourth tall tower into the APDG Precinct is inconsistent with the original intent of the planning controls established for this precinct. The new tower will not result in high quality urban design outcomes as a consequence of tower crowding. Potential for adverse outcomes is further exacerbated by the uncertainty of the Mirvac proposal to the immediate south.</p>	<p>The planning proposal provides block 4 as an alternative to block 1. It allows for the relocation of a tall tower from one part of the APDG block to another. A proposal by Mirvac immediately to the south is being assessed in the context of this proposal.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with the objective of the APDG block "to provide for additional building height on parts of certain sites, if the development provides for publicly accessible open space, lanes and other links through the site." The urban design outcome of the proposal is an improved public square location with improved solar access.</p>
		<p>A key objective of the current DCP for the APDG precinct is clause 6.1.6.1 which requires new towers above 75 metres to have a minimum separation of 28 metres above the relevant street frontage heights. The proposal will not achieve this and will result in very narrow building separations between the new 200 George Street building (6 metres) and the approved Stage 1 development for Wanda One Pty Ltd (9 metres). The separation of the towers in the APDG precinct is inadequate to achieve reasonable view corridors between buildings and be respectful to the city skyline.</p>	<p>The location of the tower will result in buildings that are located closer together than in the original APDG controls. This revised Planning Proposal removes the minimum tower separation requirement from the APDG controls which was a reflection of assumed land amalgamation at the time of the original Master Plan. The location and separation of the tower to surrounding buildings will be subject to the same minimum building separation requirements and built form character controls as other buildings in Central Sydney. The proposed configuration of buildings and public domain will allow for views and sunlight access. The tower location is acceptable and consistent with proximity of other tall buildings in Central Sydney. Located at the heart of the financial district, the proposed tower is within a precinct of other tall towers, and will be viewed as a cluster of new buildings. Despite the proximity, the buildings will still be read as individual buildings in the skyline, and is consistent with the location and context of the site. The separate visual presence of the proposed tower is maintained by the adjoining towers of a similar, but lower and varied heights. The proposed tower would not significantly adversely affect corridors with a view of significant public buildings or places.</p>

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p>Height and bulk of the building envelope</p> <p>The proposed planning controls allow for a significant tower of up to 248 metres, not including a 15 metre roof articulation zone resulting in a building that is significantly higher than any other building within the precinct. The proposed tower is excessive in height and bulk and should be reduced in scale. The scale should be more akin to the height of 200 George Street and 1 Alfred Street. It will dominate and detract from the city skyline, dwarf other adjacent buildings and result in tower crowding and loss of visual amenity.</p>	<p>The highest tower in the existing APDG control is 200m, which is already greater than the approved and built heights of development at 1 Alfred Street and 200 George Street.</p> <p>The proposal will increase the maximum height of a tower in the block by 48 metres allowing one of the tallest towers in Central Sydney. As with other developments, the roof articulation zone is not included in the maximum height, however in assessing the impact, the roof articulation zone was included. The assessment shows the increase in height does not adversely impact on the surrounding development in terms of solar and wind impacts.</p>
		<p>There is no tapering of the built form at the higher levels of the building as encouraged in Sydney DCP 2012. The proposed building height has been unnecessarily inflated by the use of the lower levels for "GFA exempt" incubator commercial space of up to 4000m². The level of additional incentive floor space should be reduced in order to facilitate a built form that is more considerate to the established building scale in this precinct.</p>	<p>The planning proposal provides a building envelope within which tapering, as encouraged in Sydney DCP 2012, along with further detailed design can occur. The revised Planning Proposal does not increase the maximum floor space control and the envelope includes the potential design excellence bonus of up to 10 per cent gross floor area. The business innovation space is exempt from the calculation of gross floor area, however this has been capped at a maximum of 4000m². This responds to research of space requirement that would enable startups to connect, share ideas, mentor and partner with each other. Despite any exemptions in the calculation of gross floor area, the proposed height is considered acceptable in the context and location of the site.</p>

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p>View Loss</p> <p>The planning proposal will permit a development scale that will impact on the skyline and panoramic views enjoyed by Grosvenor Place including towards the heads of Sydney Harbour. The view impacts are unreasonable and excessive and should be ameliorated through reductions in building height and scale.</p>	<p>41. Visual impact modelling provided in the submission is shown in Figures 5 and 6. The proposed envelope, shown with dotted outline, would be peripheral to the view from the northern and eastern part of the floor plate. It would obstruct views of existing buildings as well as a small portion of an already fragmented harbour view. Views towards the heads of Sydney Harbour may also be affected, noting a large portion is already obstructed by the Gateway building. The views of the Harbour Bridge and Opera House are not obstructed by the proposed envelope.</p> <p>The modelling from the southern part of the floor plate in Figure 7, show a reasonable view impact. This view does not include iconic views to the Harbour Bridge or the Opera House and views to the Harbour and towards the heads are already affected by the Gateway building at 1 Macquarie Place. The proposed envelope affects a small portion of the fragmented harbour views, with parts of the harbour still visible. The view loss is reasonable.</p> <p>The proposed envelope controls are a theoretical maximum and a detailed assessment of view loss will be considered following detailed design.</p>
4	BBC on behalf of Lend Lease	<p>Requests the following changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP:</p> <p>Building height</p> <p>Maximum building height be expressed in RLs rather than metres because existing levels vary at the street edge and within existing basements. It is unclear from where the height of building is measured.</p> <p>Change site area covered by the lower tower from 12% to 12.2% to reflect a more accurate measurement of the building envelope. Subsequent email from submitter clarifies and confirms that no change is required.</p> <p>Reference 6.1.6.1(1) in height in metres or RL, not both and to adjust the heights in Figure 6.10A to provide consistency.</p> <p>Amend height in Figure 6.10A to reflect marginal encroachment by the Jacksons on George Site to allow for a 300mm facade zone.</p>	<p>SLEP2012 allows building heights to be expressed in metres or RLs. Whilst the height of buildings definition makes it clear it is to be measured from the natural ground level, the maximum tower height will be expressed in both metres and RL, being 248 metres (RL 250.8 metres) and 238 metres (RL 240.8 metres).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Section 6.1.6.1(1) will be amended to refer to a maximum height in metres or RL shown in Figure 6.10A.</p> <p>Facade treatment is considered an architectural element, which if marginal, may be permitted to extend into the public domain.</p>

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p>Floor Space Calculations</p> <p>Floor space in the community stratum building not be counted towards GFA for the purpose of FSR and not just community and retail uses to ensure future flexibility for Council to change use without impacting on the floor space available elsewhere on site.</p> <p>Reference to a maximum 4000m² of innovation space not to be counted towards GFA for the purpose of FSR be deleted as it serves no purpose with the principle being that whatever space that is provided, is excluded from calculation. The VPA requires the provision of nominally 3900m² of office space as business innovation space.</p>	<p>The intent has been to exclude the GFA of the space within the community stratum that forms part of the VPA from FSR calculations. The Planning Proposal adequately describes the space within the community stratum. No change is required.</p> <p>A maximum is expressed to provide clarity on the amount of GFA that can be excluded. To be consistent with the draft VPA, the maximum GFA to be excluded will be changed to 3900m².</p>
		<p>Business Innovation Space</p> <p>Business innovation space be provided in the podium or the tower in the event of podium design constraints and lobby height.</p>	<p>To allow flexibility and be consistent with the VPA, the planning proposal will be amended to provide the ability for the business innovation space to be located in the podium or the lower portions of the tower.</p>
		<p>Through Site Link</p> <p>Through site link be removed and identified as a potential through site link because the potential for this link and its dimensions are yet to be resolved as achievable. There is insufficient design resolutions to confirm or guarantee the through site link can be accommodated.</p>	<p>The through site link is a desired element for the redevelopment of the block. Objectives relating to through site links are existing and desired. The through site link is required to be provided unless the objective of the control can still be achieved via an alternative.</p>
		<p>Tank Stream Interpretation</p> <p>Delete reference to Tank Stream interpretation in draft DCP Section 6.1.5.4(4)(i) as public art is covered in the VPA.</p>	<p>The Tank Stream interpretation is related to heritage interpretation rather than public art. This is an existing requirement in the site specific DCP. In any event, public art offered in the VPA is an offer that is in addition to any requirement in the planning controls.</p>
		<p>Setbacks</p> <p>Reference setbacks to property boundaries and clarification of the 6 metres separation distance between the tower and the approved envelope as part of the Wanda One Pty Ltd development in Section 6.1.6.2(7)(d). The control requires the eastern tower on block 4 to be setback 6 metre to podium of approved building envelope for Tower B at 19-31 Pitt Street under development consent D/2015/1049. This lacks precision as the development consent D/2015/1049 can be modified with sequential adverse impact on the tower footprint size.</p> <p>Section 6.1.6.2(8) be amended to be consistent with the building envelope controls in the draft DCP. Lend Lease will take ownership of the Mirvac Triangle which will have a shared boundary with 200 George Street. The control requires the minimum setback for a wall with openings to be 3m from a shared boundary.</p>	<p>The intent of the control is to ensure appropriate minimum setbacks between buildings. 6 metres is appropriate for commercial buildings. The urban design report shows the minimum laneway width of 6 metres as required which is approximately 3.65 metres from the boundary at a certain point. It is also understood that the buildings are not necessarily parallel to the site boundary. As the exact location of the laneway has not been determined, the control will reflect the intent to separate the buildings by 6 metres.</p> <p>In addition to requiring a 6 metre separation from the building at 200 George Street and separation by a laneway, a 3m setback from a property boundary is considered reasonable where there are openings within a wall. This is an existing control that applies to the entire APDG block.</p>

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p>Design Excellence Delete reference to Stage 2 development in Section 6.1.6.4 as it is not proposed that a staged development application would be lodged.</p>	Reference to Stage 2 development is replaced with reference to a detailed development application.
		<p>Vehicular Access remove grey tone over laneway adjacent to Jacksons on George to allow vehicular access to the rear of the Jacksons on George building.</p>	The intent is to allow for vehicular access to the rear of Jacksons on George. The part of the land shaded grey is proposed to be part of the laneway and should allow for vehicular access. The draft DCP will be amended accordingly.
5	Sydney Airport	Sydney Airport does not support the development of any structure that intrudes into the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces. Should the proposed development be approved, the following condition is recommended: "At the completion of the construction of the building, a certified surveyor is to notify in writing the airfield design manager of the finished height of the building."	Noted.
6	Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development (Airspace Protection)	The Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development requests that in the event a development including temporary intrusions by cranes, is likely to intrude into protected airspace, the proponent or building authority submits an application to the airport whose prescribed airspace is affected. The airport operator will seek advice from aviation agencies and forward applications to the Department for a decision.	Noted.
7	Air Services Australia	Airservices Australia raise no objections stating the proposed development will not affect any sector or circling altitude, nor any instrument approach or departure procedure at Sydney Airport and the redevelopment of the precinct including a high rise building to a maximum height of 265.8m (873ft) AHD at the provided location will not adversely impact the performance of any Airservices Precision/Non-Precision Navigational Aids, Anemometers, HF/VHF/UHF Comms, A-SMGCS, Radar, PRM, ADS-B, WAM or Satellite/Links..	Noted.

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
8	NSW Department of Environment and Heritage	<p>The NSW Department of Environment and Heritage raise no issues and support recommendations of the Built Heritage Assessment report:</p> <p>a) Crane Lane: "interpret the early 20th century laneway through paving and design and associated signage." In addition, ensure that the local associations reflected in the street names of Underwood Street and Crane Lane/Place is not lost in the new place making;</p> <p>b) Archaeological potential: that an application for an excavation permit under S140 of the NSW Heritage Act 1977 is required and no excavation or ground disturbance of the site is to be undertaken prior to the issuing of a s140 approval; and</p> <p>c) Aboriginal Archaeological potential: that an archaeological testing should be undertaken upon obtaining the An Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) to determine if aboriginal objects are located on the site and the nature and extent of those objects.</p>	Noted.
9	Transport for NSW	<p>Transport for NSW raises no issues with the Planning Proposal but requests that the applicant consider the following during the preparation of future development applications:</p> <p>a) Future Rail Corridor - refer future development applications to TfNSW for consideration of potential impacts including structural integrity, safe effective operation and maintenance of the CBD Rail Link;</p> <p>b) Sydney Light Rail Project - consult with TfNSW Light Rail Team in relation to construction access arrangement to the proposed development and applicant be conditioned to design and construct the development in accordance with the 'Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads - Interim Guideline' (2008 prepared by Department of Planning and Environment);</p> <p>c) Proposed Pitt Street Arrangement - consult with the CBD Coordination Office within TfNSW about the future configuration of Pitt Street;</p>	Noted.

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		d) Car Park and Loading Dock Access - a shared basement with reduced number of access points is preferred; on-site loading dock to be designed to accommodate all vehicles that will need to access the site in the future; the swept path for heavy vehicles entering the car park overlaps with cars exiting the car park - requests a traffic control system be in place to manage all vehicles not just heavy vehicles and a detailed queuing analysis be undertaken to assess whether queuing of vehicles waiting for traffic signal system extends to the road network.	Noted.