

# ATTACHMENT F

## ATTACHMENT F

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS  
HAROLD PARK - STAGE 1**

## Harold Park - Summary of submissions – Stage 1 DA

Traffic		
Issue	Summary	Response
Use of Ross St entry/exit from Wigram Rd to access site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will impact on surrounding narrow streets</li> <li>• Will impact on Wigram Rd which is steep and narrow, has frequent bus use and has parking on both sides. An increase in traffic will result in more prangs and car insurance will increase. It will become more dangerous to turn on to Wigram Rd from the side streets</li> <li>• Existing unsafe right turns at this intersection</li> <li>• Proposed street pocket park should be relocated to end of Ross St (southern end of MC01) making all vehicles use new intersection to provide more options for drivers and prevent “rat runs”</li> <li>• Improved pedestrian access needed</li> <li>• Existing “no left turn” signs on Wigram Rd disregarded, development will increase traffic risk to St Scholastica’s students and residents of Wigram Rd</li> <li>• Ross St should only be an entry for Precinct 2. All entry points should be off The Crescent. As less residents on that street, less amenity impacts</li> <li>• The use of Ross Street as the only entrance and exit once the Precinct 1 and 2 construction works are complete is unacceptable. Repositioning the Telstra communication facility in the area of the future main exit/entrance of The Crescent should not be used as a reason to direct all residential traffic onto Ross St until later Precincts are constructed.</li> </ul>	<p>The main entry into the site will be from the signalised intersection from The Crescent (road MC02).</p> <p>The Ross Street entry is a secondary access into the site. The required left in/left out arrangement and median at Wigram Road and the signalisation of The Crescent entry will ensure this is the case. The median on Wigram Rd will also prevent “rat runs”.</p> <p>The Crescent is part of the RMS classified road network and carries greater traffic flows than Wigram Road, this will also ensure Ross Street is a secondary access point.</p> <p>The development traffic exiting from Ross Street is unlikely to need to turn left before Glebe Point Road, so is unlikely to increase the number of illegal left turn movements.</p> <p>It is proposed to advance the delivery of the traffic signals from Precinct 3 to 12 months after the occupation of Precinct 1.</p>
Proposed median on Wigram Rd to ensure left-in/left-out only on/from on Ross St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support and objections</li> <li>• Impacts on existing access arrangements for 115 Wigram Rd residents (Centennial apartments): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will restrict access from both Ross St approaches to be left in/left out only:</li> <li>○ impact on residents’ ability to access Alfred Rd</li> <li>○ increased congestion, inconvenience and impractical impacts on other residents</li> <li>○ RTA correspondence states possibility of making Ross St two directional</li> <li>○ possibility of road changes on northern corner of Minogue and Ross to enable left hand turns off Minogue Crescent</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Will direct all vehicles up Wigram Rd causing traffic and noise impacts</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed median on Wigram Rd is essential to prevent additional traffic using the new roads in the development and Ross Street south as a “rat run” .</p> <p>Residents accessing Alfred Rd will be able to use Walsh Avenue and Wigram Lane. This will increase their travel distance by approximately 450m. Traffic volumes along the lane can be monitored and the option to convert Ross Street to two-way, between Hereford Street and Wigram Lane considered.</p> <p>Road changes to enable left hand turns off Minogue Crescent are not supported for safety reasons. This is a hairpin bend and allowing vehicle movements would</p>

Traffic		
Issue	Summary	Response
Traffic lights at Glebe Point Road / Wigram Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support and objections</li> <li>• For:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Glebe Point Rd/Wigram Rd intersection will become a bottleneck without lights</li> <li>○ Currently dangerous with heavy use by cars, trucks, buses and pedestrians. Poor visibility for turning into Glebe Point Rd because of location of bus stops. Situation will become more dangerous with Harold Park development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Against:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not having lights at either end of Wigram Road, makes right hand turns more difficult, discourages drivers from using Wigram Road as a through road</li> <li>○ Would further destroy charm of Glebe</li> <li>○ Current situation discourages drivers from shortcutting through Glebe</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>require vehicles to travel on the opposite lane of traffic.</p> <p>The proposed median is addressed in the report.</p> <p>The intersection of Glebe Point Road and Wigram Street will not meet the RMS warrants for traffic signals, therefore signals are not an option in this location.</p> <p>Installing traffic signals would attract additional (non-development related) traffic away from the state road network onto the local roads, which is not a desirable outcome. It would also result in the loss of parking on both Wigram Road and Glebe Point Road.</p> <p>The intersection will be reviewed by Council as the development progresses. The only option to improve the intersection performance by encroaching into the park to create an additional traffic lane is not a desirable. This is addressed in the report.</p>
Vehicle access from/to Maxwell Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicle access to Maxwell Road should be deleted.</li> <li>• Congestion on roads in Toxteth Estate</li> <li>• Toxteth Estate roads not suitable for heavy traffic as they are too narrow</li> <li>• Will result in "rat-runs"</li> <li>• Safety of children, pedestrians and students, including those that use light rail</li> <li>• Tight vehicle entry with poor visibility</li> <li>• Heritage impacts on Toxteth Estate</li> <li>• Impact of loading/trucks using access to deliver goods to Tram Sheds</li> <li>• If Building 4A increases in height from 3 to 5 storeys (as allowed by DCP) additional parking impacts</li> <li>• If access approved, necessary to strictly limit access and the amount of parking for 4A and prohibit vehicular access to any other part of the site from this building</li> <li>• If road does not include pedestrian access, separate pedestrian access should be provided to site</li> <li>• Compromises public open space</li> <li>• Conflicts with St Scholastica's traffic and school buses, particularly during peak hour</li> <li>• Maxwell Road access is proposed to be part of land that will be dedicated as open space, as such inappropriate that private vehicles drive through compromising the</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed vehicle access from Maxwell Road is for Building 4A only. There will be no connection to the rest of the road network within the development site, or to the Tram Sheds.</p> <p>While precise parking numbers will only be known at the Stage 2 DA for Building 4A, given the size of the proposed building envelope (3 storeys), the traffic generated by the Maxwell Rd access will be able to be accommodated within the capacity of existing local streets.</p> <p>The connection will be designed as a shared zone giving pedestrian priority over vehicles along the link, and reducing traffic speeds to 10km/h.</p> <p>It is not considered that the access would impact on the heritage character of the Toxteth Estate.</p>

Traffic		Response
Issue	Summary	
Traffic Access over Johnston's Creek Bridge from Nelson St / Chapman Road	<p>public open space resulting in danger to park users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access should be discouraged, in accordance with DCP</li> <li>How will it be ensured that access will rarely be used, as proposed and as DCP requires.</li> <li>Access should be discouraged from Chapman Rd, as indicated by RTA. Access has not been discouraged. The route looks direct straight through the car park and onto Johnston's Creek Bridge with no traffic calming measures</li> <li>Safety impacts on pedestrians and park users and amenity of residents</li> <li>Does not prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements to parks further north and light rail station.</li> <li>Will isolate parklands from public open space on site</li> <li>Existing bridge was supposed to temporary and should be returned to parkland</li> <li>Bridge does not have safe crossings for pedestrians</li> <li>The applicant's traffic study shows that this access will have the greatest volume of traffic of all the entry points</li> <li>Should only be used in emergencies</li> <li>If the access must be used for the Tram Sheds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It should only be used for access to Tram Sheds and link to rest of precinct be removed</li> <li>Priority given to pedestrians and cyclists as per DCP, to enable safe crossing at 2 points (either end of bridge)</li> <li>Traffic calming needed on Chapman Road, Johnston's Creek entry</li> <li>Access be redesigned to conform with RTA and DCP that main access on The Crescent will carry vast majority of traffic</li> <li>Chapman Rd access only be considered after a DA is submitted for the Tram Sheds.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The possibility of reinstating the road that ran north from The Crescent on the east side of Johnston's Creek, providing original tram access to the sheds should be investigated. This will not impede community use of public open space.</li> </ul>	<p>The connection over the Johnston's Creek Bridge will be addressed as part of the DA for the adaptive reuse of the Tram Sheds.</p> <p>The development will either have restricted access to Chapman Road or traffic signals will be installed at the Nelson St roundabout or a combination of both. This has been addressed in the report and consent conditions. The City will ensure options proposed consider all modes of transport.</p> <p>The Johnston's Creek Bridge connection is not currently suitable for two lane traffic access and safe pedestrian and cycle access. The bridge will either need to be upgraded or the traffic volumes heavily constrained as part of future DAs.</p> <p>When a DA is submitted for the adaptive reuse of the Tram Sheds, precise traffic volumes will be known and matters such as traffic calming and prioritising pedestrian and cyclists movements will be addressed.</p>
Traffic Congestion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will make existing congestion worse: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>particularly along The Crescent and Wigram Road</li> <li>through the Toxteth Estate</li> <li>at Glebe Point Road</li> <li>at weekends</li> <li>unreasonable traffic impacts</li> <li>conservative estimates</li> <li>at Wigram Rd / Booth St</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>To date there have been multiple independent and expert traffic impact studies completed in relation to the redevelopment of Harold Park. While there will be additional traffic in the local area, it is considered that the impacts cause by the development will be acceptable when considering network efficiency and local amenity impacts.</p>

Traffic	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o at peak times</li> <li>o for emergency vehicles</li> <li>• Traffic flow was worsened when traffic signals installed at Johnston Street to enable residents to access the park safely</li> <li>• Council should consider dedicating some of its land along The Crescent to create a more efficient road and honour its promise of providing open space along the Crescent</li> <li>• Local area can't sustain traffic that will be generated</li> <li>• Low vehicle usage assumed compared to local usage</li> <li>• Impact on cyclists</li> <li>• Impact on Operation on intersections:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The Crescent / City West Link</li> <li>o The Crescent / Johnston St</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Will worsen existing rat runs</li> <li>• Density should be reduced to deal with traffic impacts</li> <li>• Will affect the entire city traffic grid</li> <li>• This is very quiet and established area of Glebe.</li> <li>• Traffic and transport are already at capacity.</li> <li>• The development will see the villages change for the worse and lose its village feel, character and individuality as traffic worsens.</li> </ul>	<p>The City also engaged an independent consultant to complete a micro-simulation model of The Crescent corridor to better understand traffic patterns, queuing and travel time impacts as a result of the Harold Park development. The results of this study recommend that the development removes access to Chapman Road or new traffic signals be installed. Both options will minimise traffic impacts as a result of the development in the Glebe area, particularly in The Crescent corridor (between Bridge Rd and City West Link). This is addressed in the report and appropriate conditions are recommended.</p> <p>The increase in traffic through the Toxteth Estate will be minor as it will only provide vehicle access to building 4A only.</p>
<p>Micro-simulation traffic modelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous traffic studies inadequate, micro-simulation modelling should have been used</li> <li>• Micro-simulation traffic model required, and:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o be undertaken by a suitably qualified, experienced and independent consultant;</li> <li>o be interactive, allowing different parts of the road network and the development to be altered both individually and in combination with each other;</li> <li>o include the key intersections on Parramatta Road, The Crescent, Bridge Road, City West Link, Ross Street, Wigram Road, Glebe Point Road, Booth Street and other local streets in Glebe/Forest Lodge and Annandale to ensure that the impact on Forest Lodge, Annandale and Glebe can be accurately analysed;</li> <li>o include other adjacent major developments including the Super Yacht Marina and Cruise Passenger Terminal/White Bay Redevelopment and One Central Park (on Broadway), and the increase in traffic that will occur from those developments and M4 extension; and</li> <li>o include all development planned for the Harold Park complex, including the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Micro-simulation modelling has been done in accordance with the scope recommended by the independent traffic consultant, that is for The Crescent / Minogue Crescent linear corridor as this is the road most impacted by the development.</p> <p>While specific developments surrounding the site have not been individually accounted for in the modelling, growth in surrounding areas is captured into broader modelling done by the RMS. These developments are then accounted for in the background growth rates that the RMS provide, which is then used for future base model validation.</p> <p>Refer to response above to Traffic Congestion, report and conditions.</p>

Traffic	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>six proposed residential Precincts and the related commercial space, and the restoration of the Tram Sheds for commercial/retail purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• should cover wider effects on Annandale and Glebe etc as a whole – broad-based, extending beyond boundary, traffic study needed</li> <li>• This study should be commissioned by Council.</li> <li>• The DA should be postponed until an adequate study has been completed and examined by all stakeholders.</li> <li>• The inadequate traffic modelling is likely underestimating the traffic impacts to the north section of Ross St</li> </ul>	
<p>Access across The Crescent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional safe pedestrian and cycle access should be provided, ideally grade separated or signalised.</li> </ul>	<p>The options investigated through the micro-simulation process included signals at Nelson St intersection. This will be investigated further and conditions are recommended.</p>
<p>Green Travel Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate</li> <li>• No detail on how can reduce traffic generation</li> </ul>	<p>A Green Travel Plan (GTP) has been developed for the site to encourage the use of sustainable transport options. The GTP includes essential information on public transport, active transport and car share for the residents and employees of Harold Park. This is addressed in the report and conditions.</p>
<p>Car Share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No details provided</li> </ul>	<p>Car share is required by the DCP and will be provided as part of the redevelopment. This is addressed in the report and conditions.</p>
<p>Location and design of new intersection on The Crescent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is already congestion on The Crescent</li> <li>• Will increase traffic and congestion and impact on Minogue Crescent and Coneill Place</li> <li>• Impact on PCYC use: existing issues with child care and when exhibitions and events are held</li> <li>• Will reduce parking availability for users of centre</li> <li>• Design deficiencies in intersection</li> <li>• Development shouldn't rely on a single point of access, other access points should be used</li> </ul>	<p>The signals and Minogue Crescent / The Crescent are under the control of the RMS.</p> <p>Signals have been determined to be required by the RMS.</p> <p>The RMS has agreed in principle to the design of the signals.</p>
<p>Delivery of new intersection on The Crescent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be constructed now / to coincide with Precincts 1 and 2. If not, unreasonable pressure on the intersection of Wigram Road and Ross Street, which is already congested at peaks.</li> </ul>	<p>It is proposed to advance delivery of the signals from Precinct 3 to 12 months after occupation of Precinct 1. This is discussed in the report.</p>

Traffic	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will improve safe access to the site from Forest Lodge.</li> </ul>	
<p>Road Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roads uncharacteristically wide for the area</li> <li>Creation of pocket parks and wide main roads waste of space. The space could be better utilised to reduce building heights</li> <li>Truck turning issues on MC03 and MC04 is unsafe as not enough room for vehicles.</li> </ul>	<p>The road widths provide the minimal traffic and parking lane widths. Central swales will help meet the Councils Water Sensitive Urban Design requirements, and cycleway and footway widths are considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>Turning areas have been provided to demonstrate safe turning movements at these dead end streets. This is addressed in the report and conditions.</p>
<p>Tramshed use and parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts from retail use of Tram Sheds</li> <li>May be used as overflow for visitors or for commuters using light rail</li> <li>Need traffic calming measures needed to ensure priority given to pedestrians/cyclists</li> <li>Should be no road connections with the residential precincts (only used for car parking for the Tram Sheds)</li> </ul>	<p>The car park and access roads will be approved as part of the DA for the adaptive reuse of the Tram Sheds. Traffic calming required to keep vehicle speeds low will also be assessed at that time.</p> <p>Following recommendations of the micro-simulation modelling, the development will either have restricted access to Chapman Road or traffic signals will be installed at the Nelson St roundabout or a combination of both. This has been addressed in the report and consent conditions. The City will ensure options proposed consider all modes of transport.</p> <p>When a DA is submitted for the adaptive reuse of the Tram Sheds, precise traffic volumes will be known and matters such as traffic calming and prioritising pedestrian and cyclists movements will be addressed.</p> <p>The car parking in the Tram Sheds will not be operated by Council. Notwithstanding, a Plan of Management will be required to be submitted with the DA for the adaptive reuse of the Tram Sheds and will need to address management and any proposed restrictions. Ensuring the carpark will not be used for commuters will be addressed at that time.</p>

Parking	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Insufficient parking</b></p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate resident and visitor parking</li> <li>DCP's car parking limits unrealistic as based on assumptions that most residents will use public transport: workers outside CBD rely on cars and CBD workers use cars on weekends/outside peak</li> <li>Parking impacts/overflow on surrounding streets</li> <li>Distance and topography from supermarkets will make it difficult for the elderly and people with disabilities to shop without a vehicle.</li> <li>Car washing facilities should be provided with recycled water</li> <li>Each car space should include a secure bicycle storage space</li> <li>More parking should be provided or the scale of the development reduced</li> <li>Parking impacts on Toxteth Estate through commuter parking (light rail) and tramshed development</li> <li>Retail workers parking in Toxteth Estate to access jobs in Tram Sheds</li> <li>Restrictive on-site parking policy may result in dispersal of overflow parking to surrounding streets</li> <li>New residents of the development should not be entitled to residential parking permits.</li> <li>Spaces should be provided with provisions for electrical charging of vehicles</li> </ul>	<p>Parking rates are based on City and State Government objectives to reduce private vehicle trips. The site is well served by public transport and there are suitable alternatives to private car travel. Parking rates are based on a City wide study for the City Plan LEP. The parking rates are generally consistent with those in South Sydney DCP 11 which has been applied to the medium and high density development throughout the former South Sydney Council area. Implementing constrained parking along with a resident parking scheme, to which residents of Harold Park will not have access, means less cars in the area and less traffic.</p> <p>Parking impact on the surrounding street will be managed in part by the residents of the Harold Park not being eligible for resident parking permits.</p> <p>Bicycle parking and storage will be provided in line with the rates set out in the Harold Park DCP. Along with car washing facilities, are matters for Stage 2 DAs</p> <p>The management of the Tram Sheds parking will be determined with the DA for the adaptive reuse of the Tram Sheds.</p> <p>New Harold Park residents will not be eligible to participate in the parking permit scheme.</p> <p>The use of electric vehicles is going to be a consideration for users of the vehicles, similar to the use of internal combustion engines (petrol stations). Private electric vehicles could be charged in a garage with a suitable power outlet. At this stage the City is monitoring the electric vehicle market and take-up rate in Sydney to make informed decision regarding electric vehicle infrastructure.</p>



Parking	
Issue	Response
<p>No/less parking should be provided</p>	<p>While it is not agreed that no parking should be provided, the reasons provided in the submission are factors that are likely to contribute to reduced private transport trips on the site.</p> <p>Car parking is provided at a reduced rate for the reasons outlined above in response to concerns that insufficient car parking is proposed.</p>
<p>77-91 Ross St residents</p>	<p>Parking will be provide along the realigned Ross Street.</p> <p>It is intended to introduce parking restrictions and Harold Park residents will not be eligible for parking permits. However, it is noted that all changes to parking restrictions need to be endorsed by the Local Pedestrian, Cycling and Traffic Calming Committee first.</p> <p>The proposal for the indented parking is not supported. This issue is discussed in the report.</p>
<p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inner-city location close to employment, schools, shops etc</li> <li>Well served by public transport</li> <li>Walking and cycling links to CBD</li> <li>35% of Glebe household do not own a car (2006 census, ABS)</li> <li>Car share increasing in use</li> <li>Resident parking schemes used to prevent car parking on surrounding streets</li> <li>Off-street parking increase costs, if not provided, more affordable housing Sydney 2030</li> <li>Only way to reduce vehicle impacts</li> <li>Sections of the development should have no parking or carparking should be reduced to 500. It should be a condition of purchase of the units that you don't own a car.</li> </ul>	<p>Loss of car parking following realignment of Ross St</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8 car spaces requested for residents</li> <li>Distance of likely spaces on Ross St (over 100m from residents) unacceptable</li> <li>Request indented parking bays in Ross St open space/realigned Ross St to be created</li> <li>The additional parking bays on the realigned Ross Street should have parking restrictions to prevent unpermitted parking for more than 1 hour between 6pm and 10pm to prevent non-residential, long-term parkers using the street</li> <li>Residential parking permits should be provided for Ross St residents</li> </ul>
Public Transport	
Issue	Response
<p>Existing services inadequate</p>	<p>Bus capacity in Glebe, Forest Lodge and Annandale has been increased significantly in the past two years. Last year, articulated buses were introduced on the 470 route, which is now the single most frequent bus route in Sydney, with typical frequencies of every 2.5 min in the peak. The closest 470 bus stop is about 300m from the site. Bus planners at Transport for NSW have confirmed there is scope to increase the 433 frequency in line with demand. There are three 433 stops along the site's frontage on Minogue Crescent / The Crescent. Harold Park has unusually good access to a large number of</p>
<p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing public transport inadequate</li> <li>There would be an extra load on public transport that (buses and light rail) that has not been taken in to consideration</li> <li>Adding thousands of new residents without adequate facilities is unacceptable</li> <li>Need detailed studies of the impact and needs of public transport</li> <li>Use of public transport can only be encouraged if it's regular, appropriate to needs and close</li> <li>Better public transport to CBD needed</li> <li>Access to Jubilee station should be provided</li> <li>Buses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local buses are full at peak periods, frequency is poor, service unreliable</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Bus capacity in Glebe, Forest Lodge and Annandale has been increased significantly in the past two years. Last year, articulated buses were introduced on the 470 route, which is now the single most frequent bus route in Sydney, with typical frequencies of every 2.5 min in the peak. The closest 470 bus stop is about 300m from the site. Bus planners at Transport for NSW have confirmed there is scope to increase the 433 frequency in line with demand. There are three 433 stops along the site's frontage on Minogue Crescent / The Crescent. Harold Park has unusually good access to a large number of</p>

Public Transport	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Off peak services are inadequate</li> <li>○ Commitment with State government to increase bus services during peak and off-peak times for 431, 432, 433, 434 and 370</li> <li>○ New bus route with fast access to City should be considered</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Light rail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Light rail to Dulwich Hill not yet built. When built may mean once tram arrives at Glebe will be full</li> <li>○ Light rail to CBD needed</li> <li>○ Council should lobby State Government to have light rail extension built immediately</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bus Stop on Minogue Crescent near corner of Wigram Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Relocation further down to Minogue Crescent unsupported – impact on Forest Lodge and Annandale residents</li> <li>○ Proposed bus shelter would not be useful, could not see or signal driver from it</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Precinct 1 and 2 residents won't have access to the light rail while site is used for construction – will make buses overcrowded</li> </ul>	<p>The site is also serviced by the 370 which provides direct access to Newtown, Green Square and Coogee, while the 433 also provides access to Rozelle and Balmain.</p> <p>The proposed relocation of the bus shelter/stop on Minogue no longer forms part of the proposal. It would require the approval of the RMS and State Transit. A condition has been recommended.</p> <p>Public transport is addressed in the report.</p> <p>The DA includes a new access from Maxwell Road connecting pedestrians and cyclists to the light rail station. The design of pathways and the like will be subject to Council's embellishment works for the 3.8ha of public open space.</p>

Built From	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too high</li> <li>• Too high for Precinct 2, opposite cliff</li> <li>• Too high along Wigram Rd - will dominate existing buildings</li> <li>• Predominant 8 storeys is excessive and incompatible with the topography and surrounding development in Annandale, Forest Lodge and Toxteth Estate conservation areas, historic streetscape and residences</li> <li>• 8 storey buildings are proposed for more than 2/3 the site with no attempt to soften the edges with lower buildings on the perimeter. This is particularly a concern on the east edge. This is against the recommendations of the Urban Design Study</li> <li>• The building heights should be kept to the height of the existing cliff face to the east of the site and lower on the Minogue Crescent side</li> <li>• The buildings should be lower around the perimeter</li> <li>• Should not exceed 2-3 storeys around south, west and east perimeter</li> <li>• Should not exceed 5 storeys</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal complies with the LEP height controls and conditions are recommended in relation to DCP height compliance. No buildings are proposed to be over 8 storeys, the DCP maximum. This is addressed in the report and conditions.</p> <p>The height controls were determined at the rezoning stage having regard to the compatibility with the scale and character of the surrounding area. Consideration was also given to meeting housing targets and the public benefits to be provided as part of the redevelopment. The height controls have been designed so that future buildings are equivalent to the height of buildings above the surrounding cliffs. The intent of the height controls is also</p>

Built From	Issue	Summary	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not exceed 6 storeys</li> <li>• Inconsistent with planning proposal which shows mostly 5-7 storeys</li> <li>• Existing residents to the south will bear the bulk of the impact as those dwellings are level with the site (not above like on east and west)</li> <li>• Will look like Children's Hospital site in Camperdown – too high and not in keeping with area</li> <li>• Houses at the end of Arcadia Road very close to proposed Building 4A. Potential noise and privacy issues for both existing and new residents. Also presents health issue of cooling towers (noise and legionnaires) for Arcadia Road residents.</li> <li>• Height of buildings 5A and 4B (8 storeys) will impact privacy of residents on Rose and Nelson St</li> <li>• 5A and 4B should be lower as most visible from parks. At the least, setbacks should be imposed.</li> <li>• Height of buildings close to cliff (precinct 4) height was supposed to be restricted to only be to the height of cliff face – impact on privacy, amenity and views and exacerbated by close proximity of 4A</li> <li>• Privacy impacts as a result of height</li> <li>• View loss</li> <li>• The height will bring more people and more cars.</li> <li>• Buildings should not exceed height of cliff on Minogue Crescent (south of site)(terraces on 5-23 Albert St)(about RL 23 at end of Albert St). will impact on outlook from properties and detract from Albert St properties</li> <li>• Does not comply with Government Architect's Office urban design study ( Buildings will be visually prominent, contrary to DCP/planning principle no 12 from UDS</li> <li>• Impact on surrounding property prices</li> <li>• Heights are not sympathetic with surrounding character. Particularly, the height will tower over the village streets of Nelson/Rose Sts which are not elevated.</li> </ul>	<p>that buildings along the western and southern edge of the site present as lower scale buildings.</p> <p>The proposed building heights are lower than "Trio" / Camperdown Children's Hospital (17 storeys compared to 8 storeys at Harold Park).</p> <p>Privacy impacts will be addressed with future DAs when locations of openings, windows and balconies is known.</p> <p>Height and built form is addressed in the report and by conditions.</p> <p>Building envelopes comply with height controls and conditions are recommended to address variations. Some private outlooks will be affected by the development.</p> <p>Views to heritage items on the cliff will be opened up to the public from the future park with new outlooks opened up from the new streets to be created as part of the redevelopment. The detailed assessment of views will be made with Stage 2 DAs.</p> <p>Property prices are not a matter for consideration under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act</i>.</p>
Character, scale and massing		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed scale is an overdevelopment.</li> <li>• The scale exceeds the masterplan</li> <li>• Does not respond to character of surrounding buildings (115-121 Wigram Rd) which has varied building setbacks</li> <li>• Wigram Rd development should be designed as terraces in keeping with Glebe and Forest Lodge</li> <li>• Should look to 'Glebe Gardens' as a good example of new development. This would ensure compliance with building facades, entrances and circulation controls (new development defines and enhances the public domain)</li> <li>• Does not provide a diversity of building characters within same street block –</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal is for Stage 1 envelopes that generally comply with height and setback controls. Conditions have been included to address non-compliances with height in storeys and some setbacks. Height and built form is addressed in the report and by conditions.</p> <p>Conditions have been recommended to address the relationship of future buildings with the street and to minimise exposed basements. This would improve the appearance of buildings in the public domain.</p>

Built From	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>uniform built edge, height and massing along Wigram Rd. Impact on character of Wigram Rd.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information/no certainty that development at the south end of the site should be predominantly lower in scale and be of maisonette and townhouse typologies. Residents told at information night that this style of building will not apply to that end of the development (Wigram Rd)</li> <li>More variety is needed in the height of buildings – 5 of the 6 buildings in Precincts 1 and 2 will be 8 storeys – appears as one great monolith and not in keeping with design principles</li> <li>Should be more green space between buildings</li> <li>Building 4A located very close to existing dwellings above cliff. Noise and privacy impacts</li> <li>Buildings on The Crescent should be set back and screened with greenery and trees</li> <li>Support the lesser scale of building 4A</li> <li>Precinct 2 too close to cliff and terraces</li> <li>Building 1D presents as a wall on Minogue Crescent because of carpark level beneath which extends above street level – unfriendly face to Minogue Crescent and existing residents – better more creative solution needed</li> </ul>	<p>The detailed design of buildings and the provision of open space for buildings will be the subject of Stage 2 DAs.</p> <p>The detailed design of Building 4A, including setbacks from the cliff, will be assessed when a Stage 2 DA is submitted.</p>
<p><b>Density</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be reduced / reduced to half the number of proposed dwellings</li> <li>The development is too large</li> <li>The density will create social disharmony and lack of community and environmental disasters (parking and traffic congestion)</li> <li>Impact of this density on existing local schools, preschools, hospitals, health services, service stations etc.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed density complies with the controls.</p> <p>Reducing the density of the development would adversely affect meeting housing targets, fail to promote the significant public transport opportunities afforded by the site, risk the conservation of heritage items and reduce material public benefits, such as open space, affordable housing and community facilities.</p>
<p><b>Setbacks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 metre setback along The Crescent is inadequate and is not wide enough to allow for replacement trees along Minogue Crescent</li> <li>Increased setbacks to address close proximity to Centennial Apartments (115 Wigram Rd)</li> <li>Reduced setbacks for terraces at ground levels will reduce privacy for future occupants.</li> </ul>	<p>3m setbacks are proposed at the lower levels along The Crescent and Wigram Rd, in accordance with the DCP.</p> <p>The proposed built envelopes are capable of providing adequate privacy. This will be addressed at Stage 2.</p>
<p><b>Overshadowing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height of buildings will cause severe overshadowing on site and surrounding areas including footpaths.</li> <li>Loss of sunlight to Centennial Apartments (115 Wigram Rd)</li> </ul> <p>Overshadowing as a result of the 8 storey buildings against the cliff</p>	<p>Shadows cast by the proposed building envelopes are mainly contained within the site. Shadow impacts outside the site are minimal and comply with the DCP.</p>

Built From	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Privacy impacts on Centennial Apartments (115 Wigram Rd)</li> </ul>	<p>The Stage 1 DA is limited to envelopes. Subject to compliance with setback and built form controls privacy adverse privacy impacts are unlikely and will be dealt with Stage 2 DAs.</p>
<p><b>Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development built predominantly hard up against The Crescent, creating streetscape impacts</li> <li>Architecture and detailing is unattractive and lacks quality</li> <li>Conventional, drab and uninteresting design</li> <li>Modern, bland uniform design</li> <li>Terrace house style apartments supported – front doors accessing the streets</li> <li>good means of creating sense of community</li> <li>Principles of Vedic Architecture should be considered</li> </ul>	<p>The Stage 1 DA is limited to building envelopes. Matters relating to design will be assessed with Stage 2 DAs.</p>

Heritage	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tram Sheds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment needed by Mirvac to restore and adapt the Tram Sheds in conjunction with the construction of the other Precinct buildings</li> </ul> </li> <li>Heritage interpretation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>should include appropriate naming of the features of the site</li> <li>should include reinstatement of gardens and war memorials</li> <li>The Diggers' Memorial for the Tram Sheds is currently at the Leichhardt Bus Depot. It stood formerly in the award-winning Tram Sheds garden, and every effort should be made to return it to this site</li> <li>Position of winning post of track should be interpreted / marked. Was near NE corner, near building 4B</li> </ul> </li> <li>Views <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heights will obscure enjoyment of views to heritage items on the cliff</li> <li>Cliff Terraces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Views to and from 'Cliff terraces' will be affected by development.</li> <li>Heritage Office considers both views to and from heritage items as contributing to their significance</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>Design</li> </ul>	<p>Mirvac have advised that the conservation and adaptive reuse of the Tram Sheds will be complete before Precinct 4 is occupied. Conditions have been imposed requiring same.</p> <p>The investigation of the Digger's Memorial is supported by Council's Heritage Officer. This could be done as part of future interpretation works of gardens as part of Council's embellishment works. Conditions address future interpretation works.</p> <p>Building envelopes comply with height controls and conditions are recommended to address variations. Some private views will be affected by the development. Views to heritage items on the cliff will be opened up to the public from new streets that will be created as part of the redevelopment and the future park. Views to Cliff Terraces will be maintained from public vantage points including Minogue Crescent. City skyline views from Cliff</p>

Heritage		
Issue	Summary	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The buildings should be 3 or 4 storeys and heritage design</li> </ul>	<p>Terraces should not be affected by the development. The detailed assessment of views will be made with Stage 2 DAs.</p>

Public open space		
Issue	Summary	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Entire site should be public open space</li> <li>o 35% inadequate</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Timing                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Park should be delivered early/now</li> <li>o Design and implementation of public open space should be done in conjunction with buildings as is a major design element in design of site</li> <li>o Public open space and sports facilities should be resolved at this stage before the DA process commences.</li> <li>o City should begin preparation of the new park as soon as possible. This will ameliorate the effects of development, and provide a valuable resource for both existing and new residents.</li> <li>o Condition should require that buildings cannot begin until a sports field is handed over to the community.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Connections to south of site                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Access to foreshore from Ross St needed now / early</li> <li>o Favours north side (where already sufficient parkland) over south side.</li> <li>o More park should be provided at the south</li> <li>o Lack of linkages from Ross Street / Wigram Rd to public open space</li> <li>o Government Architect should intervene and allocate parkland at southern end of site to ensure that residents to the south are not as affected by heights. Parkland should be spread from the north to the south</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Guarantees of delivery                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Concern that community facilities in public parkland will not be delivered</li> <li>o No guarantee will be delivered. Council should require some guarantee of performance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Public access                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Not clear what public access will be provided.</li> <li>o Community should have guaranteed access to the parks and facilities of the development</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The VPA secures the dedication of 3.8ha of public open space. The City is currently developing the Johnston's Creek Parklands masterplan which includes the new open space to be provided as part of the redevelopment. The open space is for a future public park, accessible to everyone.</p> <p>The open space to be dedicated can accommodate a sports field, in accordance with the VPA and DCP. The precise design and use will be determined as part of Council's masterplan.</p> <p>The land is to be dedicated to Council prior to the issue of the first residential occupation certificate.</p> <p>The location of the open space is consistent with the DCP. Amendments have been made to address the connectivity and to exclude the street closure parks from the 3.8ha of land to be dedicated. A sports field in accordance with the VPA requirements can be accommodated within the public open space.</p> <p>The future park design will ensure connections to the south are maximised.</p> <p>The VPA requires financial security to be provided against the embellishment of the park. This will be addressed in the Stage 2 DAs.</p> <p>The design of the future park will be subject to a future</p>

Public open space	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In practice will be a private park separated from surrounding parkland and not truly accessible to local residents.</li> <li>○ Private perception of some of the public open space – discrete nature and reduced accessibility to local residents</li> </ul> <p><b>Layout</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is narrowest at the northern end where the public would access it and blocked by the proposed car park which separates it physically from surrounding open space</li> <li>○ Unconnected street closure parks along The Crescent not appropriate and would be perceived as private open space</li> </ul> <p><b>Location</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Most of open space on Glebe and not Forest Lodge side.</li> <li>○ Access to proposed open space for Forest Lodge and Annandale residents needs improvement</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuity of green belt along The Crescent important for habitat for small animals and birds</li> <li>• Sports field needs to be confirmed as part of public open space</li> <li>• The pocket parks at the ends of roads between the Precinct buildings should be contiguous with the open space to avoid the de facto conversion of public open space to private open space. It will be important that the landscaping and connections ensure the public nature of these parts of the public open space.</li> <li>• The construction of a sports field as part of the public open space has previously been agreed by Council as part of the overall proposal. Council should reaffirm its commitment to this needed community facility by ensuring its construction is part of the early preparation of the new parklands.</li> <li>• Opportunity to clean up 'The Hill'</li> <li>• Needs a public road frontage to increase public access and guard against privatisation</li> <li>• Implementation of the open space further along The Crescent should be linked to redevelopment given need for open space in area</li> <li>• Forgo some of the thin strip of public space against the east cliffs for less intrusive buildings.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>DA Council is currently preparing the Johnston's Creek parklands Masterplan which includes the public open space at Harold Park. "The Hill" will also be addressed in that Masterplan.</p>

<b>Future Use of Tram Sheds</b>	
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p><b>Tram Sheds</b></p>	<p>The Tram Sheds are to be retained. Conservation works and the adaptive reuse of the Tram Sheds are subject to a future DA. Mirvac proposes that the adaptive reuse and refurbishment to the Tram Sheds will be delivered on practical completion of the fourth residential precinct. A condition has been imposed accordingly. A Conservation Management Plan (CMP) will be required with that DA. This is addressed in the report and conditions.</p> <p>The precise use will also be a matter for the future DA. This will be notified in accordance with DCP requirements.</p>
<p><b>Tram Sheds</b></p>	<p>The Tram Sheds are to be restored sympathetically</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents should have a say about what type of retail proposed in future</li> <li>• Tram Sheds have been meeting place for young people and space for street artists to express themselves. Graffiti and original signage within Tram Sheds have historical and cultural significance. Should be preserved and displayed.</li> <li>• 7,500sqm retail excessive. Should be used for more community type uses.</li> <li>• Restrict type of hospitality/restaurant type uses to minimise noise from late trading, parking impacts and safety.</li> <li>• Additional mix of small commercial offices should be incorporated into the site</li> <li>• Shops including a grocery store needed, including parking</li> <li>• Only local supermarket because of location and parking</li> <li>• Child care facilities should be included</li> <li>• Children's playground with adjacent coffee shop</li> <li>• Facilities for the elderly and people with disabilities</li> <li>• Should remain predominantly residential aside from some low-key community use in the Tram Sheds</li> <li>• Retail/commercial is not needed and the area cannot cope with the traffic that would be generated by the proposed retail/commercial space</li> <li>• What is to stop fast food retail in Tram Sheds</li> <li>• Excessive amount of retail</li> <li>• No indication of character/intensity of the commercial component and whether it will be serviced by articulated vehicles</li> <li>• There is no clear plan as to what retail is to be built on site as it is a very large space and may have a profound impact on traffic.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tram carpark (design)</b></p> <p>(traffic related issues under traffic heading)</p>	<p>The size and location of the Tram Sheds carpark has been amended since the original submission to address concern about connectivity to surrounding public open spaces.</p> <p>Alternative locations were considered for Tram Sheds car parking were considered, including underground but have been assessed as unsuitable.</p> <p>The car park design, layout and numbers is subject to a future DA for the adaptive reuse of the Tram Sheds.</p>
<p><b>Tram carpark (design)</b></p> <p>(traffic related issues under traffic heading)</p>	<p>Proposed car park separates public open space from surrounding open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visually unattractive.</li> <li>• Parking should be moved or placed underground.</li> <li>• Parking only serves the developer (shopkeepers of retail and unit owners)</li> <li>• Materials used in the construction of the car park should be sensitive to the character of the Tram Sheds, eg cobblestones as proposed for share way from Maxwell Road to building lot 4A</li> <li>• Trees be planted on the western side of the car park close to Johnston's Creek so that it is not visible from The Crescent</li> </ul>



Trees, Flora and Fauna		
Issue	Summary	Response
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flowering Stenocarpus trees (firewheel) along Minogue Crescent should not be replaced. Have just started flowering after 8-9 years since planting. Should not be replaced with Brush box trees</li> <li>Terrible that large trees (except Celtis) to be removed from edges of site.</li> <li>Trees at end of Toxteth Road and bottom of cliff provide important buffer – should be retained</li> <li>Concern about trees between 70A Toxteth and Harold Park as they provide habitat for possums; provide shade and provide visual screen from site. Trees seem to be deeply rooted in cliff face which if removed could cause subsidence which may affect property's foundation. Relevant trees – 143-146 and 141-150</li> <li>Green corridor along The Crescent significant, part of local environment and planted by the local community</li> </ul>	<p>Council's Tree Unit has assessed the trees proposed for removal and raise no objections subject to the retention of significant trees and compliance with conditions, which have been included in the recommendation.</p> <p>Trees along The Crescent within the property boundary are required to be removed to enable the development. However, these trees will be retained for as long as possible and only removed as needed.</p> <p>Prior to clearing any trees approved for removal, pre-clearance surveys are proposed to be undertaken and the process is set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) submitted. This will ensure that any fauna found can be relocated prior to clearing of vegetation.</p> <p>Conditions are imposed in relation to cliff stabilisation and compliance with recommendations of geotechnical assessments submitted.</p>
Flora and Fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reference to fauna surveys or detailed reference to the management of native animals or loss of habitat as a result of the proposal</li> <li>Impact on bats and micro-bats and frogs as a result of tree removal</li> <li>Where is evidence of pre-clearance surveys?</li> <li>Where are fauna/endangered or threatened species surveys?</li> <li>Measures in place to provide any animals with safe habitat during construction</li> <li>Native plants and not exotics, as proposed, should be planted to support wildlife and biodiversity</li> <li>Recent commitment by council and residents to increase habitat for local endangered Blue Wren has not been integrated into site, undermining these efforts. Commitment needed to contiguous planting to encourage this and other species</li> <li>Proposed planting of similar trees of similar height do not create habitat for local indigenous wildlife</li> </ul>	<p>Prior to clearing any trees approved for removal, pre-clearance surveys are proposed to be undertaken and the process is set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) submitted. This will ensure that any fauna found can be relocated prior to clearing of vegetation. It is noted that pre-clearance surveys were prepared and submitted in association with tree removal approved under the demolition DA. A condition has been imposed requiring the same in association with any tree clearing approved under this DA.</p> <p>The future embellishment of the public open space by Council will have regard to appropriate species selection and establishing habitat corridors.</p>

Construction Impacts	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Noise and Hours</b></p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise impacts should be reduced by limited hours</li> <li>• No weekend work should be allowed</li> <li>• Residents will be subject to years of noise and quality of life will suffer</li> <li>• Sound barrier needed immediately - wire fence provides no sound barrier at all</li> </ul>	<p>In order to mitigate noise and impacts associated with the proposed works, only Council's standard hours for construction-type activities outside the CBD will be allowed, that is between 7.30am and 5.30pm Monday to Friday and between 7.30am and 3.30pm Saturday. In order to further reduce impacts as much as possible, hours that intrusive/very loud equipment will be used are restricted to between 9.00am and 3.30pm, Monday to Friday with a 1 hour respite period required to reduce noise impacts. On Saturdays, noisy equipment is only allowed to be used between 9am and 1pm. No work is allowed on Sundays or public holidays.</p>
<p><b>Construction Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nelson St / Chapman Rd / Johnston's Creek Bridge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ objection to continued use of Nelson St access during construction works</li> <li>○ Construction traffic using this entrance causes a barrier to the existing green corridor</li> <li>○ impacts on pedestrians, cyclists and park users</li> <li>○ trucks can barely get around the roundabout at The Crescent</li> <li>○ unfair that such high impacts/use at the northern end of site</li> <li>○ access should be curtailed until the new signalised intersection can be operational / new road off The Crescent needed now</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Trucks associated with construction should not use Wigram Rd</li> <li>• Ross St should not be used for trucks, other access points should be used</li> <li>• Staff should park on site for duration of development and not located along the southern side but away from residents</li> </ul>	<p>The use of Wigram Rd (and Ross St) as the predominant truck entry is not ideal and less suitable than the use of the Nelson St / The Crescent entry. The issues include the narrowness of Wigram Road, the dense residential character of the surrounding streets and the sight distances exiting Ross St, which are compromised to some degree by existing street trees.</p> <p>Consistent with the recommendations of the submitted Noise and Vibration Management Plan, the predominant truck entry will be from Nelson St, which is more suitable having regard to the width of The Crescent, the larger separation between residential properties and the location of commercial and light industrial adjoining the Nelson St / Chapman Rd entrance.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, to alleviate some of the impacts associated with the reliance on the Nelson St access, it is proposed to allow 2 vehicles a day to enter and exit the site via Ross St. This is typically for trucks that cannot enter via the Johnston's Creek Bridge. This is an increase from 1 vehicle a day which was allowed under the demolition DA.</p> <p>It is noted that "truck" is a heavy vehicle greater than 4.5</p>

Construction Impacts	
Issue	Response
<b>Summary</b>	<p>tonnes. Other associated vehicles will enter and exit the site from Ross St, including staff vehicles.</p> <p>It is currently proposed to bring forward the delivery of the new signalised road entry so that it is delivered within 12 months of occupation of Precinct 1. This is earlier than previously proposed (with Precinct 3). The timing for the delivery of the new signalised intersection is discussed in the report.</p>
Dust	<p>A CEMP was submitted with the application and outlines measures which will be adopted to minimise potential dust impacts and air pollution as a result of the proposed works. Conditions of consent are imposed in relation to asbestos management, on-site vehicle cleansing to prevent dirt and the like being transferred to surrounding roads and the covering of loads.</p> <p>Conditions also require soil stabilisation on completion of earthworks, such as mulching or grassing type treatments, to assist in control of potential airborne dust and dirt impacts.</p>
Excavation	<p>Dilapidation reports are required for properties that immediately adjoin the site along the cliff, including 26 Arcadia Road.</p>
Other	
Issue	Response
Affordable housing	<p>Site 6A is proposed to be dedicated to Council for affordable housing. The site area of 2,500sqm exceeds the area required by the VPA of 1,000sqm. Plans have indicated that the GFA up to the maximum of 5,500sqm can be accommodated within complying envelopes.</p>
	<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supported</li> <li>• Should begin at the same time as Mirvac begins Precincts 1 &amp; 2 - most urgently needed part of the development.</li> <li>• The developer should identify the exact location and amount of land to be dedicated before the DA process begins.</li> <li>• Should be more than 10%</li> </ul>

Other	
Issue	Response
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The parcel of land proposed for affordable housing is situated on the corner of Wigram Rd and The Crescent which is the noisiest corner of the development. This is not entirely appropriate for seniors housing.</li> <li>Concern that the 4-5% affordable housing target can be achieved on the proposed parcel of land (too small). The developer should undertake a concept plan to ensure it can work.</li> <li>Definition of 'key worker' is too limited</li> <li>High pricing of apartments means the developer is courting the overseas developer, not local owner occupiers.</li> </ul>	<p>The site is required to be dedicated to Council 60 days after the registration of the first plan of subdivision</p>
<p><b>Staging</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection to consideration of development in separate sections – plans for whole site required</li> <li>Precinct 1 and 2 DAs being assessed in isolation – cumulative impacts wont be considered</li> <li>Issues become diluted when DAs are considered into multiple phases and only incremental impacts, not total, will be considered</li> <li>No detail on what the rest of the buildings will look like</li> <li>Should condition that the whole development be completed within 5 years to assist housing affordability</li> <li>Public domain, streets, public open space should be in place before residential building commences</li> <li>The developer is purposely submitting DAs in a piecemeal manner so they can maximise leverage to get more out of the site than originally approved eg. an access road to Maxwell Road.</li> </ul>	<p>The Stage 1 DA is a Masterplan that will guide the development in the future. The assessment of the Stage 1 DA has considered the development as a whole but given the scale of the development it is proposed to be delivered in stages. This is allowed under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and is supported. Appropriate conditions are recommended in relation to staged delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>Building design is subject to detailed Stage 2 DAs.</p>
<p><b>Public Art</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indigenous art sculpture walk in public open space</li> <li>Statue commemorating the former harness racing use should be located in the parkland</li> </ul>	<p>A Public Art Strategy has been submitted and appropriate conditions are recommended.</p>
<p><b>Stormwater / Flooding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about flooding that occurs in the area</li> <li>Planned water retention of only 25% should be improved</li> <li>Increase requirement for on-site integrated stormwater retention</li> </ul> <p>Impact of development on natural watercourse that is a sink to the canal</p>	<p>Council engaged an independent flooding and stormwater consultant to peer review the Stage 1 and remediation DAs. The consultant has advised that the development has been and is being held to the highest possible standard in regard to Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD), stormwater and flooding considerations. For example, stormwater systems exceed DCP design criteria of 5 year ARI. Instead the development as currently proposed caters for events up the largest possible, i.e. the PMF.</p>

Other		Response	
Issue	Summary		
Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Onsite supermarket essential to maintain amenity and reduce traffic and parking congestion.</li> <li>Impact on local schools – need more schools – Council should liaise with DEC to ensure public education available</li> <li>How will sewerage be managed from site – Sydney is at over capacity</li> <li>Further child care needed</li> </ul>	<p>Non-residential uses are proposed within the Tram Sheds.</p> <p>Technical studies and consultation with government authorities has shown there is sufficient capacity at local schools.</p> <p>The DA proposes the necessary infrastructure and approvals will be required from Sydney Water before works begin.</p> <p>The requirements of the Child Care Centre DCP have been addressed in the report.</p>	<p>Non-residential uses are proposed within the Tram Sheds.</p> <p>Technical studies and consultation with government authorities has shown there is sufficient capacity at local schools.</p> <p>The DA proposes the necessary infrastructure and approvals will be required from Sydney Water before works begin.</p> <p>The requirements of the Child Care Centre DCP have been addressed in the report.</p>
Notification and Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure of Council to notify many affected residents</li> <li>Information on website provided in an unusable format, dozens of files for each precinct etc</li> <li>The public seems to have been ignored by developer and Council.</li> <li>Community involvement at the planning stage is crucial to ensure it becomes a functional and successful space</li> <li>Unhappy with community meetings held by the developer and concerns that resident's concerns not fed through</li> </ul>	<p>The Stage 1 DA, along with DAs for remediation and Stage 2 DAs for Precincts 1 and 2 were exhibited concurrently between August and October 2011. Given the scale of the development, the exhibition period was extended by 2 weeks (the DAs were notified for 7 weeks in total) and the notification radius extended from 75m required by the DCP to 200m. Over 1,800 residents were notified (including residents in Leichhardt Council).</p> <p>The amount of documentation that formed part of the exhibition was unavoidable and is commensurate with the size of the development. To provide more time for residents to go through plans and documents, the exhibition period was extended. All submissions received have been considered in the assessment of the DA.</p>	<p>The Stage 1 DA, along with DAs for remediation and Stage 2 DAs for Precincts 1 and 2 were exhibited concurrently between August and October 2011. Given the scale of the development, the exhibition period was extended by 2 weeks (the DAs were notified for 7 weeks in total) and the notification radius extended from 75m required by the DCP to 200m. Over 1,800 residents were notified (including residents in Leichhardt Council).</p> <p>The amount of documentation that formed part of the exhibition was unavoidable and is commensurate with the size of the development. To provide more time for residents to go through plans and documents, the exhibition period was extended. All submissions received have been considered in the assessment of the DA.</p>
Stairway access to Toxteth Rd, Boyce St and Arcadia Rd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not supported</li> <li>Would facilitate parking by Harold Park residents and visitors on those streets</li> <li>Handy escape for burglars</li> <li>Disturbance or residential amenity, potential drunken behaviour from people going to the site from Glebe Point Rd</li> <li>Existing stair access already exists at Boyce St</li> </ul>	<p>No stair access is proposed as part of this DA.</p> <p>However, it is noted that improving access to the future park is a DCP objective and stair connections to the Toxteth Estate are permitted under the DCP. This will be considered as part of Council's future embellishment works to the park.</p>	<p>No stair access is proposed as part of this DA.</p> <p>However, it is noted that improving access to the future park is a DCP objective and stair connections to the Toxteth Estate are permitted under the DCP. This will be considered as part of Council's future embellishment works to the park.</p>

Other	
Issue	Response
<p><b>ESD</b></p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No focus on sustainable living</li> <li>Green Building Council's Green Star – Multi Unit Residential v1 green star rating tool should be applied</li> <li>The development should be a showcase low-carbon development. Council should get independent advice regarding energy efficiency. The development should have district generation, large scale building-integrated PV, and all buildings designed as being highly energy efficient.</li> </ul>	<p>The BASIX Bonus provision provides an incentive for 50% water reduction and 25%-30% reduction in greenhouse emissions which is over and above current standards. Other planning controls contribute to sustainability through car share, bicycle infrastructure, water sensitive urban design, mixed use development, improve access to public transport, restrictive car parking rates, open space and local fauna habitat.</p>
<p><b>Plans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Centennial Apartments (115 Wigram Rd) not identified as residential building on any of Mirvac's plans, but "business"</li> <li>AECOM's sustainability report also shows it as "business"</li> </ul>	<p>The planning controls were prepared and the DA has been assessed on the basis that Centennial Apartments is residential. It is noted that the site is zoned business which accounts for the notations.</p>
<p><b>Pre-selling units</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that preparation, including demolition, taking deposits on units, has occurred without Council's knowledge and tacit approval before the issues have been considered and approval given.</li> </ul>	<p>Council has no control over apartment sales.</p>