

# **Attachment A**

**Summary of Submissions  
2 Chifley Square, Sydney**

Summary of Submissions - 2 Chifley Square, Sydney – Planning Proposal

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
1.	Transport for NSW	<p>No objection raised to the proposal given the location of the proposal within Central Sydney and proximity to excellent public and active transport. Noted the intended reduction of future car parking by 50% despite increased development yield is consistent with the City's objectives of minimising vehicular traffic associated with development. This approach provides further incentives for future office workers to utilise existing and future public transport services around the site.</p>	Noted.
2	Sydney Metro	<p>Sydney Metro West tunnels and caverns are proposed to be located directly beneath the location of the proposed additional tower on the site. Sydney Metro considers it appropriate to engage in ongoing discussions with the proponent to gain a better understanding of the potential location and nature of substratum structure required for the development. Notes the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP gives Sydney Metro a concurrence role in respect to development within rail corridors</p> <p>Due to close proximity of the site to two future Sydney Metro stations and other public transport, Sydney Metro encourages minimum, or ideally no on-site parking be available for tenants or employees.</p> <p>The submissions stated that pedestrian modelling should consider pedestrian movements to/from nearby Metro Stations to the proposed building location. The pedestrian modelling report should consider the need for new infrastructure or if improvements to the existing infrastructure are required, which may include improvements to any zebra-crossing/refuge-island, any modification required to the pram-ramps, crossing width, signal phasing, signal cycle timing, signal coordination etc.</p>	<p>A development application using the proposed controls for the site will require concurrence from Sydney Metro under the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP</p> <p>The proposal includes a commitment to reduce the number of existing car parking spaces on the site.</p> <p>The City considered whether pedestrian modelling as suggested would be of benefit in this case. It was considered that the commitments in the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for Sydney Metro South West (Chatswood to Sydenham), and the Conditions of Approval to address traffic and pedestrian impacts from the Metro station would be more appropriate for addressing traffic impacts and required improvements resulting from the Metro station. These commitments and conditions require the relevant public authorities responsible for the road network, including the City, to coordinate the planning and implementation of any roadwork upgrades required to address safety and amenity in the vicinity of the stations.</p>
	Heritage	<p><b>State heritage items</b></p> <p>The proposal is unlikely to have a direct physical impact on any state heritage items, although there are potential visual impacts on the state heritage listed 'former Qantas</p>	Noted. The competition brief for the design competition is to consider the DCP controls, including provisions relating to heritage.

Summary of Submissions - 2 Chifley Square, Sydney – Planning Proposal

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p>House'. Noting the Heritage Impact Assessment submitted with the proposal and the draft Development Control Plan, Heritage NSW recommends that the City ensures the DCP provisions are taken into consideration in the architectural competition</p> <p>Support the proposed envelope not exceeding The Domain Sun Access Plane to protect sun access to the State Heritage Register listed 'The Royal Botanic Gardens and Domain'</p> <p><b>Local heritage items</b></p> <p>These are the responsibility of Council as the consent authority, no issues raised.</p>	<p>Noted. See comments below in relation to the submission from the Royal Botanic Gardens re protection of greenspace amenity</p> <p>Noted. Impacts on heritage items, including adjoining items fronting Macquarie Street, have been considered as part of the proposal.</p>
4	Sydney Airport	<p>Concurrence/consultation – At a proposed maximum height of 213.54 AHD, the proposed development would penetrate Sydney Airport's Obstacle Limit Surface (OLS) is 156m AHD, anything penetrating the protected airspace would be subject to assessment and approval under Federal legislation. Notes construction cranes required to operate at a height significantly higher than the proposed development may not be approved, and therefore approval to operate construction equipment should be obtained prior to any commitment to constructed.</p> <p>The current ANEF for which Council may use as the land use planning tool for Sydney Airport was endorsed by Airservices in December 2012 (Sydney Airport 2033 ANEF). If affected, land uses which have high population densities should be avoided</p>	<p>Noted. A development application will require concurrence from Sydney Airport as the proposed works penetrating the OLS. This is consistent with clause 7.16 of the LEP and under the Airports Act 1996.</p> <p>Noted. The site is not affected by the Sydney Airport 2033 ANEF</p>
5	Civil Aviation and Safety Authority (CASA)	<p>Sydney Airport controlled activity – CASA did not raise any objections to the proposed envelope, with CASA to assess a future development application for a new building on the site.</p>	<p>Noted. A development application will require concurrence from CASA.</p>
6	Sydney Water	<p>Note asset upgrades may be necessary to service the additional uplift. Recommends meeting with Sydney Water after a detailed concept servicing proposal for the site has been prepared</p> <p>The development should consider recycled water options in line with Council strategies</p>	<p>Noted, these issues will be addressed at the detailed design DA stage.</p>

Summary of Submissions - 2 Chifley Square, Sydney – Planning Proposal

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
7	Royal Botanic Gardens	<p>Support retention of The Domain Sun Access Plane as the maximum height control for the site.</p> <p>Glazing on the tower must not result in reflectivity into the Domain and Garden due to risk of reflected heat from eastern façade directed into the greenspace and creating heat stress on the trees and vegetation which forms part of the general greenspace amenity and the Living Scientific Collection of the Trust</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Section 3 of the Sydney DCP 2012 contains a control regarding reflectivity, and this would apply to future development on the site.</p>
8	Owner 175 Macquarie Street	<p>State they have reached agreement with the owners of 2 Chifley Square for a nil setback to the eastern boundary of their site which adjoins 2 Chifley Square, up to a height of 55m, including an easement for light and air in perpetuity</p>	<p>Noted, urban design and heritage considerations have informed the setback.</p>
9	Investa – 60 Martin Place	<p>Supports the principles of the CSPS to facilitate additional floor space to support economic growth, but needs to be carefully designed to not have unreasonable impacts on buildings or the public domain.</p> <p>The proposed eastern boundary setback will adversely impact on the Macquarie Street Special Character Area and exacerbate amenity loss to adjacent buildings due to a reduction in outlook to the north-east, due to minimum 2m setback to eastern boundary.</p> <p>Does not assess the visual impact of the envelope when looking north along Macquarie Street from outside Parliament House, the most sensitive view.</p> <p>The proposal adversely impacts views and outlook from the existing 60 Martin Place tower. It should have a better balance in terms of the built form on the site and impacts on 60 Martin Place and other assets including 126 Philip Street. The tower form should be further chamfered at a height around 55, equivalent to 167 Macquarie Street to reduce scale and bulk seen from Macquarie Street.</p>	<p>Noted. The CSPS allows for setbacks of planning envelopes to be reduced subject to no overall reduction in amenity, for wind and sky view, in public places, and that urban design considerations support the reduced setback. As the proposed envelope was able to demonstrate a better outcome for wind and sky view impacts, chamfering of corners was not required.</p> <p>The planning proposal relates to an envelope for a future building and not the final tower form which will be established through the architectural design competition</p> <p>Although a small portion of views from 60 Martin Place would be lost, views to the Sydney Opera House, Sydney Harbour, The Domain and distant views east are retained.</p>
	Charter Hall (proponent)	<p><b>Request an amendment to the planning envelope by reducing the eastern tower setback</b></p> <p>This request was supported by agreements from the landowner of 175-181 Macquarie Street to secure agreements for a nil setback and easement for light, air and maintenance. Reducing this setback would add a GFA of 1,206sqm to the planning envelope.</p>	<p>The eastern setback in the planning proposal was a result by consideration of a Design Advisory Panel subcommittee and endorsed by CSPC and Council, and considered urban design and heritage impacts, especially the significant heritage status and character of Macquarie Street.</p>

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p><b>Request the planning proposal include a clarification for the end of journey floor space</b></p> <p>Clarification was sought as to whether the maximum FSR for the site included the ability to utilise the additional floor space provisions of Clause 6.6 – End of Journey Floor Space as part of a future DA for the site.</p> <p><b>Ecologically Sustainable Development controls</b></p> <p>It was requested that amendments be made to the ecologically sustainable development provisions in the draft DCP. These include clarification of the building energy ratings to apply to the new development on the site, and that the controls are achievable while still meeting the ESD commitments.</p>	<p>Clause 6.6 allows for an equivalent of 0.3:1 of end of trip facilities to be provided as additional floor space. The City's testing of the GFA for the site assumed the inclusion of end of trip facilities in the basement, as detailed in the reference scheme design. The example clauses for the site in Appendix 1 of the Planning Proposal has been updated to provide clarification on the provision of end of trip facilities in the basement of the site.</p> <p>Most of the changes accepted relate to differentiating between the existing development and new development as proposed. The amendments to the controls clarify when the controls apply, refine the refrigeration requirements, and amend the net zero controls to be consistent with the City's draft net zero provisions for the whole council area.</p>