

ATTACHMENT A

# ATTACHMENT A

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**



## Summary of submissions to the public exhibition, 87 Bay Street Glebe

#	ID	Issues raised	City of Sydney Response
1	Community Group #1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sydney LEP 2012 has only recently been gazetted, and so this project would need very strong justification coming so soon after.</li> <li>• The impetus and justification for this project is the Glebe Affordable Housing Project, which is considered inappropriate.</li> <li>• Proposed density exceeds current controls and existing situation several times over.</li> <li>• Proponent's claim that Glebe is wealthy (in the Location IQ report) cannot be supported – it is a diverse community with much social housing – and this diversity should be protected.</li> <li>• There are a number of nearby residential conversions of warehouses, often heritage buildings, which have all been achieved by staying within the existing envelope, and to lower heights than proposed for 87 Bay Street.</li> <li>• Distances to public transport are quite large.</li> <li>• Access to amenities is difficult because of traffic volumes.</li> </ul>	<p><b>City of Sydney Response</b></p> <p>Noted. This site was not considered as part of the City Plan process that led to Sydney LEP 2012, as that was a translation of existing controls into a consistent and standardised approach.</p> <p>The transition of this precinct was raised as an outcome of Sustainable Sydney 2030, and explored further in the Hill Thallis Feasibility and Urban Design Report (2009). This Proposal results in a lower floor space ratio than the 4.0:1 recommended in that Report.</p> <p>The objective of the Proposal is to facilitate redevelopment to make appropriate use of available land outside of heritage conservation areas in response to an LGA-wide demand for additional and diverse housing.</p> <p>The Proposal includes 7.5% of residential floor space as affordable housing, on-site and in perpetuity. In combination with the adjacent Housing NSW development, which includes affordable housing as well as social and market housing, the Proposal seeks to maintain social diversity within the area.</p> <p>Noted. The buildings on the site are not suitable for conversion to residential dwellings.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to bus services on Broadway; within 500m of a light rail stop; and less than 1km from Central Station. It is considered that access to public transport within a reasonable distance is good.</p> <p>There are traffic lights at the corner of the site, which allow for easy crossing of the roads.</p>

2	Community Group #2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The entire area is regularly flooded.</li> <li>Proposal should be reduced in scale.</li> <li>Consultation is taking place after Council has already approved the proposal on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2012.</li> <li>The site is not suitable for rezoning to allow housing due to location near busy intersection. Best use is the one that's there and which is well- integrated into community.</li> <li>The Affordable Housing Study, which makes the case for affordable housing provision, is misleading and deficient. The basis for figures used in the report is questioned, including house price increase; rent rate increases; dwelling type breakdowns and choices. Disagrees with report statement that the proposal would be consistent with surrounding uses; and that a concentration of high rise would be a poor planning outcome.</li> </ul>	<p>Development applications will need to satisfy the stormwater management and flood management provisions of <i>Sydney Local Environmental Plan 20102</i> and <i>Sydney Development Control Plan 2012</i>. The Flood and Stormwater Study that accompanies the Proposal has assessed the risks and recommended planning controls to manage them.</p> <p>The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing outside of heritage conservation areas. The building envelopes on the site have been configured to protect local amenity, including sunlight access to proposed and existing adjacent housing.</p> <p>The Proposal has not been approved by Council. At the October meeting Council endorsed the Proposal for the purpose of public exhibition.</p> <p>The site is zoned B4 Mixed Uses under <i>Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012</i>, and so housing is already permissible.</p> <p>Sustainable Sydney 2030 identifies a need for diverse housing opportunities, including affordable housing, across the LGA. This site provides an excellent opportunity to use tools available within the planning framework to deliver 7.5% of residential development as affordable housing, on-site and in perpetuity.</p> <p>The overall density proposed would be around 3.7:1 (3.85:1 with a design excellence bonus). This is comparable to other urban renewal areas within the City of Sydney and is appropriate given the location of the site, its access to amenities, transport, and employment. Amenity impacts as a result of taller buildings are managed through the building envelopes in the planning controls.</p>
---	--------------------	--	--

# ATTACHMENT A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is flood affected, with flood waters exceeding 300mm on two occasions recently.</li> <li>• The stormwater reports have not considered the loss of soil and vegetation on the upstream Housing NSW site.</li> <li>• It has not considered impact on surrounding development</li> <li>• Flooding may endanger basement parking and ground floor premises.</li> <li>• There will be a loss of street parking on Wentworth St and Bay St. Inadequate parking creates problems for the whole community.</li> <li>• The report assumes social housing generates no traffic provision.</li> <li>• The report has not considered the proposed Housing NSW development and the traffic it will generate.</li> <li>• Noise and fumes from traffic and activities at the Bay St depot and on Wentworth Park Road will lead to poor amenity.</li> <li>• Solar access will be compromised for around 30% of units.</li> <li>• The 33m/13 storey height limit is incompatible with heritage surroundings.</li> <li>• Existing development will be visually overwhelmed and the Cowper St houses will be overshadowed</li> <li>• FSR should match density controls over the rest of Glebe (0.7:1).</li> <li>• High rise development has no place in Glebe due to heritage character.</li> </ul>	<p>Development applications will need to satisfy the stormwater management and flood management provisions of <i>Sydney Local Environmental Plan 20102</i> and <i>Sydney Development Control Plan 2012</i>. The Flood and Stormwater Study that accompanies the Proposal has assessed the risks and recommended planning controls to manage them. The Study includes assessment of impacts from the adjacent Housing NSW development.</p> <p>Nothing in the Proposal would lead to a loss of street parking on Wentworth Street. The Traffic Impact Assessment examined the cumulative impacts of traffic from the Proposal and the Housing NSE development, and found that the intersection impacts would be minimal.</p> <p>Amenity of the proposed development will be protected through controls in Sydney Development Control Plan 2012. Testing shows that the overshadowing caused by the higher building elements would not cause any overshadowing to the existing dwellings on Cowper Street, when measured at 21 June between 10am and 2pm. The dwellings on the site, and those on the adjacent Housing NSW site, would satisfy the amenity objectives of the Residential Flat Design Code with at least 70% receiving a minimum of 3 hours direct sunlight in mid-winter.</p> <p>The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing outside of heritage conservation areas. The building envelopes on the site have been configured to protect local amenity, including sunlight access to proposed and existing adjacent housing.</p> <p>The Proposal is outside of the heritage conservation area. The provision of additional housing in such locations means</p>
--	--	--

# ATTACHMENT A

3	Community Housing Provider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally, recognition of the challenges in providing affordable housing and the negative impacts on the City due to a lack of housing affordability.</li> <li>• Support for the proposed model of inclusionary zoning to facilitate affordable housing with the housing to be built by the developer.</li> <li>• VPA definition of public benefit does not include delivery of the Affordable Housing Lot or Building.</li> <li>• The provision of affordable housing under the VPA is not a public benefit because a CHP would be making a substantial funding contribution.</li> <li>• On-site provision of affordable housing 'in perpetuity' creates an asset risk for the CHP as it cannot adjust its asset portfolio to meet market needs. In perpetuity should be considered on a LGA-wide basis, rather than restricted to one site.</li> </ul>	<p>the City can increase protection on heritage conservation areas and preserve the character and amenity of residential villages.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The VPA definition of public benefit is related to clause 5.2 of the Planning Agreement which stipulates the actions Council can take to ensure the developer's works deliver the anticipated public benefit outcome. It is not intended to limit the concept of public benefit as it applies in the Proposal.</p>
---	----------------------------	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The term 'dedicated' as used in the Council resolution should mean that the proponent cannot receive any monetary considerations for the housing.</li> <li>• The Location IQ report comparison with the Green Square contribution scheme is incorrect and misleading; particularly the use of the Green Square levy to establish a benchmark monetary contribution for comparison.</li> <li>• Should the landowner/developer attempt to provide the affordable housing contribution off-site, the VPA must ensure that any monetary contribution would be sufficient to supply the 7.5% of affordable housing.</li> <li>• There is no nexus between the provision of 7.5% affordable housing and the proposed density increase. AH is expected to be largely paid for by CHP.</li> <li>• Purchasing floor space at a discount is attractive to a CHP but not a public benefit in planning terms.</li> <li>• The VPA should be amended to ensure no monetary contribution can be paid in exchange for the affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<p>The term dedicated is used to indicate that land is set aside for particular specified purposes, and carries no implication that it will be without monetary exchange. In this instance the use of a public positive covenant will ensure the land is dedicated to the purposes of affordable housing. If the affordable housing were to be handed to a Community Housing Provider free of charge, considerable less affordable housing would be provided, if any at all.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that not all of the cost of providing the affordable housing is borne by the landowner. The <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> establishes what constitutes material public benefit for the purpose of planning agreements. It notes that material public benefit, to be used towards a public purpose, can include 'the provision of (or recoupment of the cost of providing) affordable housing'. The proposed model for affordable housing involves the recoupment of some of the costs involved in the provision of affordable housing, and so should properly be considered a public benefit.</p> <p>The provision of the affordable housing on-site and in perpetuity ensures that there is a local public benefit commensurate with the increase in permissible density and any additional local impacts. If the affordable housing was provided in another location within the LGA, then this local link would not be evident and the nexus between the increase in permissible development and the public benefit would be considerably weakened.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of the figure of '7.5% affordable housing' is misleading as it is derived from CHP funds, and not from the</li> </ul>	<p>The figure of 7.5% represents the amount of affordable housing that will be provided, and is therefore an accurate</p>	

	<p>increase in density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The affordable housing contribution as currently proposed cannot be supported for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It is not financially sustainable</li> <li>○ It is reliant on significant subsidy from the CHP sector.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>representation of the public benefit. Having the affordable housing provided on-site and in perpetuity makes a clear link between the increase in permissible density and the public benefit to be provided. While it is noted that the mechanism proposed may have implications the operational model of some Community Housing Providers, it is considered that it is achievable given other models of affordable housing provision and management.</p>
4	<p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning proposal contains a provision that stipulates a minimum non-residential component of FSR 0.75:1.</li> <li>• The submission contends this be changed to FSR 0.35:1 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landowner has received advice that it may be difficult to lease the commercial space.</li> <li>• The landowner would like greater flexibility to respond to market demands.</li> <li>• The commercial space would be less attractive than other space on the market.</li> <li>• More residential space would also provide for more affordable housing space (160 m2)</li> <li>• Architectural testing has indicated it is feasible to accommodate the changes within the envelope: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Follows SEPP 65</li> <li>○ Maintains high degree of street activation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The original request in November 2011 to change the planning controls included a minimum non-residential component of 1.5:1 at the suggestion of the landowner. This was decreased to 0.75:1 following further representation made by the landowner in October 2012, and after careful consideration of the effects on the built form that would follow from a change to the development mix. Commercial development does not have the stringent separation and apartment depth standards that are applied to residential development, and as a consequence fills a building envelope more efficiently.</p> <p>The building envelope for the site described in the Development Control Plan has been configured to protect the amenity of proposed development to the south of the site, while providing flexibility in the detailed design and the location of taller building elements that would be required to achieve design excellence. The submission on behalf of the landowner contends that the full development potential of the site can be realised within the building envelope in the Development Control Plan even with a reduced</p>



commercial floor space component.

The Design Report submitted by the landowner in support of the Proposal describes a built form outcome that has a predominant street wall of 6 storeys to Wentworth Park Road, with a number of taller 9 storey elements orientated in a north-south direction. This is the Proposal that was placed on public exhibition, and displayed to the community at the public drop-in meeting. It would reflect the built form recommended in the Hill Thallis Study, intended to produce a co-ordinated built form outcome across the precinct; and also the proposed development on the adjacent Housing NSW site. It would allow light and views through the site breaking up what could otherwise be an overbearing street wall to Wentworth Park.

The landowner's submission indicates that to realise the full development potential, while replacing commercial floor space with residential, would require a 9-storey street wall for the 110 metre length of the Wentworth Park Road frontage, and to a significant portion of Bay Street and Cowper Street. This 9-storey street wall is not consistent with the recommendations of the Hill Thallis Study; not consistent with the landowner's Design Report and other materials submitted to support the Proposal's exhibition; not consistent with the proposed built form of adjacent development; and would not allow for an outcome with a high standard of architectural expression. This is a significant variation in the built form and is not supported.

# ATTACHMENT A

		<p>The requirement of a minimum of a floor space ratio of 0.75:1 to be used for non-residential purposes is also consistent with the City's policy of securing an adequate supply of employment-generating floorspace. The City has to demonstrate that it can meet the targets set under the previous Metropolitan Strategy in terms of jobs growth. We do this through planning controls such as land use zoning and floor space ratio controls which ensure delivery of sufficient floorspace for employment uses.</p> <p>The proposed reduction in the minimum commercial floor space is not supported.</p>
5	Ind. 1	Noted
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for affordable housing provision</li> <li>• Too many flats</li> <li>• No open space</li> <li>• Road/drive is the only open space. Should be more open space for playing kids and walking dogs.</li> <li>• Will make traffic on Bay St worse</li> <li>• Small flats will be occupied by elderly – but public transport is 500m away.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposal will allow for an appropriate level of housing opportunities given the site is outside of a heritage conservation area and has good access to jobs, transport and amenities.</p> <p>The site is directly across Wentworth park Road from the regional open space of Wentworth park and additional open space on the site would add little to local amenity.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken to support the Proposal examined the cumulative impacts of traffic from the Proposal and the Housing NSE development, and found that the intersection impacts would be minimal.</p> <p>The residential development is not targeted to an elderly population.</p>
7	Ind. 3	<p>Council has consulted actively with the community during the process. Council officers have attended meetings of the Glebe Society and the Coalition of Glebe Groups to discuss</p>

# ATTACHMENT A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council and the developer have already done a deal.</li> <li>• Buildings are too high and will overshadow development to the south and west</li> <li>• Will be an eyesore in the suburb</li> <li>• It would be too dense – under existing controls permissible floorspace would be 3500m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Unsympathetic with scale and design of nineteenth century suburb</li> <li>• Will contribute to destruction of heritage values of Glebe</li> <li>• Combined with adjacent Housing NSW site will lead to massive increase in traffic</li> </ul>	<p>the Proposal It has kept the community informed of the public exhibition and other consultation activities through a letterbox drop to 1600 addresses. In response to community concerns Council has undertaken an extended exhibition period of 60 days and included a public drop-in session within that time to allow the community to discuss the Proposal directly with Council officers. The Proposal materials have been made available on the City’s website, and at the One Stop Shop and Glebe Library.</p> <p>The Planning Agreement has been placed on exhibition for the purpose of receiving community submissions. Council will consider those submissions before executing the Planning Agreement of approving the Proposal.</p> <p>Testing shows that the Proposal would not overshadow the adjacent development on Cowper Street when measured on 21 June between 10am and 2pm.</p> <p>Any development application would need to go through a competitive design process to ensure a built form outcome that is compatible with surrounding development and displays design excellence.</p> <p>The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing outside of heritage conservation areas. The building envelopes on the site have been configured to protect local amenity, including sunlight access to proposed and existing adjacent housing.</p> <p>The Proposal is outside of the heritage conservation area. The provision of additional housing in such locations means the City can increase protection on heritage conservation areas and preserve the character and amenity of residential villages.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken to support the Proposal examined the cumulative impacts of traffic from the Proposal and the Housing NSE development, and found</p>
--	--	--

# ATTACHMENT A

			that the intersection impacts would be minimal.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will lead to loss of street parking</li> <li>Will increase demand on existing street parking</li> </ul>	Nothing in the Proposal will lead to a loss of street parking.
8	Ind. 4	As above	Parking rates for future development application will need to comply with Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012
9	Ind. 5	As above	As above
10	Ind. 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic - Developments will bring extra traffic</li> <li>Affordable housing - 7.5% is lamentable. Majority of the underprivileged will need to be shoved out west.</li> <li>Built form - no problems here - not incompatible with others</li> <li>other - it is a lie to propagate... "profits and benefits" will be ploughed back into the community</li> </ul>	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken to support the Proposal examined the cumulative impacts of traffic from the Proposal and the Housing NSE development, and found that the intersection impacts would be minimal.</p> <p>An affordable housing provision of 7.5% is considered to be a significant contribution to the targets established in Sustainable Sydney 2030</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
11	Ind. 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic - Very important - not possible to make much worse. Mitchell St residents pay to park on own street. Walking and crossing streets will be more difficult and area progressively more child unfriendly</li> <li>Affordable housing - Not appropriate as area has a lot of public/social housing.</li> <li>Built form - Height is a problem - shadow and density</li> </ul>	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken to support the Proposal examined the cumulative impacts of traffic from the Proposal and the Housing NSE development, and found that the intersection impacts would be minimal.</p> <p>Affordable housing is targeted at key workers who would otherwise not be able to remain within the LGA. It is an important factor in maintaining a strong economy and strong communities through providing for diverse residential opportunities.</p> <p>The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing outside of heritage conservation areas. The building envelopes on the</p>

# ATTACHMENT A

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>other - The area needs work and physical activity opportunities. This cannot be looked at separately from the one behind (Housing NSW)</li> </ul>	<p>site have been configured to protect local amenity, including sunlight access to proposed and existing adjacent housing.</p> <p>The Proposal includes the requirement for a non-residential floorspace to encourage employment opportunities. The site is very close to regional open space with recreation al opportunities also available at the nearby Ian Thorpe Aquatic Centre.</p>
12	Ind. 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic - Public transport should be facilitated/encouraged to minimise car increase in the area.</li> <li>Affordable housing - % provision may be highest negotiated but it still seems low</li> <li>Built form - Densification of the inner-city area is inevitable</li> <li>other - will there be any communal focus or connection with the heritage and history of Glebe? Influx of so many new units in the area will change character significantly.</li> </ul>	<p>The controls within <i>Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012</i> aim to encourage public transport use.</p> <p>An affordable housing provision of 7.5% is considered to be a significant contribution to the targets established in <i>Sustainable Sydney 2030</i></p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The site is outside of the heritage conservation area. Providing housing in such locations allows for increased protection of existing conservation areas and the character and amenity of residential villages.</p>
13	Ind. 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic - impacts are too great</li> <li>Affordable housing - should have more substantial provision to address affordable housing need</li> <li>Built form - Height is not appropriate for Glebe and that area in particular</li> </ul>	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken to support the Proposal examined the cumulative impacts of traffic from the Proposal and the Housing NSE development, and found that the intersection impacts would be minimal.</p> <p>An affordable housing provision of 7.5% is considered to be a significant contribution to the targets established in <i>Sustainable Sydney 2030</i>.</p> <p>The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing outside of heritage conservation areas. The building envelopes on the site have been configured to protect local amenity, including sunlight access to proposed and existing adjacent housing</p>
14	Ind. 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic – conjunction of traffic flow with the Housing NSW site</li> </ul>	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken to support the Proposal examined the cumulative impacts of traffic from</p>

# ATTACHMENT A

15		<p>the Proposal and the Housing NSE development, and found that the intersection impacts would be minimal.</p> <p>An affordable housing provision of 7.5% is considered to be a significant contribution to the targets established in Sustainable Sydney 2030.</p> <p>The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing outside of heritage conservation areas. The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing outside of heritage conservation areas. The building envelopes on the site have been configured to protect local amenity, including sunlight access to proposed and existing adjacent housing</p> <p>The Proposal includes a provision for affordable housing, which when combined with the proposed mix of affordable, social, and market housing on the adjacent Housing NSW site will allow for a diversity of housing options.</p>
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing - where do unprivileged fit-in? How do we solve the homeless? Does anyone care?</li> <li>Built form - do we really need high-rise</li> <li>other - there should be housing that caters for the needs of all.</li> </ul>	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken to support the Proposal examined the cumulative impacts of traffic from the Proposal and the Housing NSE development, and found that the intersection impacts would be minimal.</p> <p>There is no \$1.7m levy due on the site. As part of a future development application, the developer will be required to pay the appropriate development contribution in accordance with the City's Development Contributions Plan.</p> <p>Testing shows that the Proposal would not overshadow the adjacent development on Cowper Street when measured on 21 June between 10am and 2pm.</p>
Ind. 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic - outrageous, esp when combined with Housing NSW plans</li> <li>Affordable housing - The developer should pay the \$1.7m levy like everyone else. Their promises aren't worth the paper they're written on.</li> <li>Built form - Extreme overshadowing</li> </ul>	

# ATTACHMENT A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• other - Heritage values should be preserved – it's what draws people to Glebe. The site should have an FSR of 0.7:1 and 40% landscaping as with other residential development in Glebe</li> </ul>	<p>The Site has been assessed as having little heritage value and is outside of heritage conservation areas. The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing envelopes on the heritage conservation areas. The building envelopes on the site have been configured to protect local amenity, including sunlight access to proposed and existing adjacent housing.</p>
16	<p>Ind. 12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - Wentworth St too narrow for parking and additional traffic flow. Government bus service needed along Wentworth Park Road.</li> <li>• Affordable housing - Council should just tell developers their requirements - suggest 20%.</li> <li>• Built form - too high and too many people. Shops won't thrive here just nail parlours and convenience stores.</li> <li>• other - people who buy in here will not become part of Glebe society. Glebe will eventually be destroyed which is what government and the council want.</li> </ul>	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared to support the Proposal has found that there will not be a significant impact from the Proposal.</p> <p>The need for new government bus services are re-assessed periodically by Transport NSW in response to changes in population and in usage requirement.</p> <p>An affordable housing provision of 7.5% is considered to be a significant contribution to the targets established in Sustainable Sydney 2030.</p> <p>The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing outside of heritage conservation areas. The building envelopes on the site have been configured to protect local amenity, including sunlight access to proposed and existing adjacent housing.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - proposal is unconvincing in its presentation of traffic impacts</li> </ul>	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with industry best practice, and uses a Paramics model to assess complex interactions between traffic generation and intersection congestion. The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared to support the Proposal has found that there will not be a significant impact from the Proposal.</p>

# ATTACHMENT A

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing - provision of affordable housing is welcome. But it should not be used to buy permission to build up to 9 storeys</li> <li>Built form - Height not appropriate for Glebe and its heritage values. Density is excessive especially taking into account the Housing NSW site.</li> <li>other - no mention of flood mitigation. Prime example of gouging profit from a site with little regard for heritage, amenity and community quality of life. Council should reject this.</li> </ul>	<p>The provision of affordable housing on site and in perpetuity to ensure that any additional local impacts from the increase in permissible density is offset by a commensurate provision of public benefit. Additional public benefits will include upgrades to the public domain, a through site link between Wentworth Park Road and Wentworth Street, and sustainability measures.</p> <p>The scale of the Proposal is considered appropriate given the opportunity to provide for additional housing outside of heritage conservation areas. The building envelopes on the site have been configured to protect local amenity, including sunlight access to proposed and existing adjacent housing.</p> <p>Development applications will need to satisfy the stormwater management and flood management provisions of <i>Sydney Local Environmental Plan 20102</i> and <i>Sydney Development Control Plan 2012</i>. The Flood and Stormwater Study that accompanies the Proposal has assessed the risks and recommended planning controls to manage them.</p> <p>The Proposal is outside of heritage conservation areas and will allow for increased protection of the character and amenity of residential villages.</p>
18	Sydney Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the proposed scale and site area are minor, no specific comments at this stage. More detailed capacity and servicing comments will be provided at the Development Application and Section 73 application stage.</li> </ul>	Noted
19	Sydney Catchment Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No implications – no comments</li> </ul>	Noted
20	Ausgrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer will need to consider protection of Ausgrid assets during construction</li> <li>Further discussion will be required to determine electricity supply requirements, including substations and easements</li> </ul>	Noted



# ATTACHMENT A

21	Leichhardt Municipal Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledges that the planning proposal would lead to public benefit – affordable housing; public domain improvements; site sustainability.</li> </ul>	Noted
22	Family and Community Services – Housing NSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the City’s initiatives to provide affordable housing through innovative planning mechanisms</li> </ul>	Noted
23	Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides support for the Proposal on heritage grounds.</li> <li>Notes that specific controls should be developed to ensure a sensitive and balanced built form outcome for the site.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Development Control Plan prepared for the site contains built form controls, including a building envelope, to ensure that future development is in sympathy with its context. In addition, future developments will need to go through a competitive design process to ensure the Proposal exhibits design excellence and considers its surroundings in its design</p>