

ATTACHMENT C

ATTACHMENT C

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED
DURING THE PUBLIC EXHIBITION AND
RESPONSES FROM THE CITY**

**North Rosebery Precinct
Summary of Submissions and Response from the City
Planning Proposal and draft amendment to Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 - Exhibited from 30 July 2013 to 27 September 2013**

Submitter	Issue Category	Issue	City of Sydney Response	Recommended changes to controls
Local Residents Local Resident	High density	Objection to high density housing "flooding into" Rosebery from the North	<p>The North Rosebery precinct has been zoned to allow mixed uses, which includes residential development, for several years. In this regard, the Planning Proposal does not allow uses that were previously prohibited.</p> <p>In terms of density, the current controls allow for development with a floorspace ratio (FSR) of 1:1 across the whole precinct (with the exception of two sites on Epsom Road where a control of 1.5:1 applies). On top of this 'base' FSR, an additional amount of FSR may be achieved for the provision of Community Infrastructure under clause 6.14 of <i>Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012</i> (Sydney LEP 2012). This additional amount is 0.5:1 for all sites in the precinct. Applicants need to express an interest in accessing this additional Community Infrastructure Floorspace at Development Application stage. The amount of additional floorspace accessed and the community infrastructure delivered by the applicant are formalised through a Voluntary Planning Agreement. As such, public benefit will be secured as additional floorspace is accessed.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal allows for some small increases in density where detailed urban design analysis undertaken by the City has shown that these increases still result in an acceptable built form outcome. In terms of building scale, the predominant heights are 5 and 6 stories with taller 8 and 10 storey buildings in the north of the precinct and lower three storey buildings in the south of the precinct. Where increases in FSR are proposed, the amount of potentially achievable community infrastructure floorspace has been increased, rather than the 'base'. This means that no site in the precinct gets any density increase as a matter of right, rather they must provide additional community infrastructure to access this floorspace. As such, any increases in density over and above what is already permissible under the current controls will result in significant public benefit in the form of new streets, pedestrian links, landscaped setbacks and open space for example.</p> <p>Furthermore, some small decreases in density have been proposed on sites in the south of the precinct. These decreases are proposed to ensure sensitive integration with the neighbouring Rosebery Estate.</p>	None
Developer friendly	The proposal is as attractive as possible to developers at the expense of 'ghettoising' the suburb and devaluing existing properties	<p>The effect of development on the market value of neighbouring properties is not a planning consideration.</p> <p>It should be noted, however, that the proposed controls envisage a precinct that is highly permeable with a human scale; has a mix of building heights to maximise visual variety and maximise solar access; comprises important street trees and landscaped setbacks; retains important heritage development to ensure a sense of place and link to the past; and includes active uses at ground floor, individual apartment entries, pedestrian links and public open space to ensure a high level of pedestrian activity throughout the day and night. In addition, the City's design excellence provisions will achieve high quality buildings and public domain design. It is expected that these controls will lead to a vibrant, high quality precinct, not a ghetto.</p>	None	
Open Space	The proposal will only provide token quantities of shared recreational areas	<p>The amount of public open space identified in Sydney LEP 2012 and Sydney DCP 2012 for the North Rosebery Precinct has been informed by the findings of the 'Open Space and Recreational Needs Study' This study was adopted by Council in 2007. The study</p>	None	

Submitter	Issue Category	Issue	City of Sydney Response	Recommended changes to controls
			<p>recommended 6,000 square metres of open space in the precinct, including one area of at least 3,000 square metres. The North Rosebery precinct review has resulted in a slight increase in the total amount of open space to 6,050 square metres. This will be delivered across two parks which will be 'local' in nature; one central park of 4,500 square metres and one linear park of 1,550 square metres.</p> <p>This open space has been designed to cater for the needs of the immediate local community that will populate the Precinct over a number of years. Furthermore, there are a number of other existing and proposed open spaces in close proximity to the North Rosebery precinct. These include Turruwul Park in Rosebery, the future Gunyama Park in the Epsom Park precinct and future parks on the former RTA site on the western side of Rothschild Avenue and the Dolina site to the east of Dalmeny Avenue..</p>	None
	Traffic	The proposal will greatly increase traffic	<p>The City is commissioning a precinct specific traffic study to assess the impact that redevelopment of the North Rosebery precinct will have. The study will include recommendations for traffic management measures designed to mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>It should be noted that this study follows previous traffic and transport studies undertaken for the Green Square Urban Renewal Area over several years to address travel demand managements including the Zetland Area Traffic Study 2005 and the Green Square Transport Management and Accessibility Plan 2008 which is currently being updated by Transport for NSW.</p>	None
Precinct Landowners				
<p>Landowner 95-102 Dalmeny Avenue and 50-54 Rosebery Avenue, Rosebery</p>	<p>Planning Proposal</p>	<p>Supports the proposed amendments as set out in the Planning Proposal.</p>	Noted	None
	Public Domain	<p>The street on the northern boundary of the subject site required under provision 5.7.1.1 is located half on this land and half on the site to the north. Is this an error? If this is the intended location, the DCP should clarify Council's expectations for the treatment of each half until such time that the street is full dedicated to Council.</p>	<p>The location of the proposed street in the draft DCP is accurate. It has been located to straddle the boundary of the subject site and the site to the north in order to ensure that the burden of dedication is equally and fairly distributed between landowners. It is recommended that an indicative cross section is added to the draft DCP which illustrates Council's expectation for the dedicated land in the event that the entire 7m dedication is not achieved concurrently.</p>	<p>Include a new cross section in the draft DCP amendment to illustrate Council's expectations for treatment of the dedicated land in the interim.</p>
	Active Frontage	<p>Provision 5.7.3 (2) of the draft DCP requires an active frontage along part of the Rosebery Avenue frontage of the subject site and it is assumed that this is to factor in the potential childcare centre identified in the same provision. Isolated retail premises are not commercially viable.</p>	<p>The intent of the active frontage along part of the site fronting Rosebery Avenue required by provision 5.7.3 (2) of the draft DCP is to contribute to the creation of a 'community node' around the local park. Retail or other active uses at ground floor are preferred in this location. The potential childcare facility identified on the North Rosebery Building Typology and Uses' map could form part of this area of active uses. Further, it is noted that a retail premises would not be isolated in this location due to the requirement for other active frontages in the vicinity.</p>	None
	Setbacks	<p>Provision 5.2.10 (and accompanying figure 5.43) of the adopted DCP requires a hill setback along the area of active frontage to Rosebery Avenue. Provision 5.7.2.1 requires a 3m landscaped setback. Council's intention for this setback should be clarified.</p>	<p>Section 5.7 of the draft DCP contains provisions specific to development in the North Rosebery precinct. As such, setbacks should be provided in accordance with provision 5.7.2.1.</p>	None

Submitter	Issue Category	Issue	City of Sydney Response	Recommended changes to controls
		<p>Provision 4.2.5.4 of the adopted DCP allows for a maximum 1.2m ground floor level above the street. This is inconsistent with provision 5.7.2.1 (see typical ground floor condition figure) of the draft DCP which allows for a maximum 1m</p> <p>Request that the 1.2m maximum setback should be required.</p>	<p>The introduction to Section 5 of Sydney DCP 2012 states that where there is an inconsistency between Section 5 and any other section of Sydney DCP 2012, Section 5 applies to the extent of the inconsistency. The reason for this is that other sections of Sydney DCP 2012 contain generic provisions whereas Section 5 contains precinct-specific provisions resulting from detailed master planning. As such, provision 5.7.2.1 applies.</p>	None
		<p>Provision 4.2.5.4 of the adopted DCP requires a 3m primary building setback. This is inconsistent with provision 5.7.2.1 of the draft DCP which requires 2.5m</p> <p>Request that the 2.5m primary setback should be required.</p>	<p>The introduction to Section 5 of Sydney DCP 2012 states that where there is an inconsistency between Section 5 and any other section of Sydney DCP 2012, Section 5 applies to the extent of the inconsistency. The reason for this is that other sections of Sydney DCP 2012 contain generic provisions whereas Section 5 contains precinct-specific provisions resulting from detailed master planning. As such, provision 5.7.2.1 applies.</p>	None
		<p>Provision 4.2.5.4 of the adopted DCP requires a 4m setback from boundary to glassline. This is inconsistent with provision 5.7.2.1(2) of the draft DCP which requires a 4.2m setback from boundary to glassline</p> <p>Request that the 4m boundary to glassline setback should be required.</p>	<p>The introduction to Section 5 of Sydney DCP 2012 states that where there is an inconsistency between Section 5 and any other section of Sydney DCP 2012, Section 5 applies to the extent of the inconsistency. The reason for this is that other sections of Sydney DCP 2012 contain generic provisions whereas Section 5 contains precinct-specific provisions resulting from detailed master planning. As such, provision 5.7.2.1 (2) applies.</p>	None
		<p>Provision 4.2.5.4 of the adopted DCP requires a private open space deck up to 2m deep. This is inconsistent with provision 5.7.2.1(2) of the draft DCP which requires a 1.2m deck.</p> <p>Request that the 1.2m deck dimension should be required.</p>	<p>The introduction to Section 5 of Sydney DCP 2012 states that where there is an inconsistency between Section 5 and any other section of Sydney DCP 2012, Section 5 applies to the extent of the inconsistency. The reason for this is that other sections of Sydney DCP 2012 contain generic provisions whereas Section 5 contains precinct-specific provisions resulting from detailed master planning. As such, provision 5.7.2.1 (2) applies.</p>	None
<p>Landowner 5-13 Rosebery Avenue and 25-55 Rothschild Avenue, Rosebery</p>	<p>Strategic importance of the site</p>	<p>This subject site is strategically very important due to its size (4.9ha) and proximity to Green Square Station and the future Green Square Town Centre. It has the potential to transform and enhance the character and amenity of North Rosebery. The proposed controls in their current form do not recognise this strategic importance and will act as a barrier to the redevelopment of the site and as a result the wider precinct.</p>	<p>The strategic importance of this site was identified by the City in the very early stages of the planning control review process. During the review process, City staff met with the landowner's representatives to brief them on the objectives of the review and to discuss their longer term intentions for their landholding. The proposed controls were developed with input from, and in consultation with, the landowner and their consultant team.</p> <p>The proposed controls recognise the strategic importance of the site and aim to encourage redevelopment that is appropriate to the context of the site in terms of floorspace, height and bulk. The controls as recommended represent an appropriate balance of private development potential, amenity to surrounding properties and community benefit.</p>	None
	<p>FSR and commercial viability</p>	<p>The 'base' FSR for the subject site should be amended to at least 2:1 (Turner and Associates urban design analysis)</p>	<p>Under the proposed controls, this site could potentially achieve in the region of 1.92:1 FSR. This would comprise a 'base' FSR of 1:1, a potential additional 0.75:1 under the Community Infrastructure floorspace provisions of <i>Sydney Local Environmental Plan</i></p>	None

Submitter	Issue Category	Issue	City of Sydney Response	Recommended changes to controls
		<p>illustrates how this can be achieved); the proposed 'base' FSR of 1:1 has no sound planning justification and does not support the commercially viable redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>A number of sites further from the Green Square Train Station have a higher 'base' FSR than the subject site and this is at odds with the planning principle of higher densities within a walkable distance of centres.</p>	<p>2012 (clause 6.14) and a potential 10% additional floorspace under the Design Excellence provisions of the same LEP (clause 6.21). Urban design testing undertaken by the City has shown that in order to achieve an FSR any higher than this on the site, building heights would need to be increased to a level where they have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of neighbouring sites and the precinct more widely. As such, the proposed controls are considered appropriate for the site.</p> <p>If the 'base' FSR was increased to 2:1, the potential total FSR when taking into consideration clause 6.14 Community Infrastructure Floorspace and 6.21 Design Excellence of Sydney LEP 2012 could be up to 2.75:1. The landowner has not presented the City with any urban design testing which demonstrates how an acceptable built form outcome could be achieved at this much higher density. An alternative to this would be to remove the site from the area to which clause 6.14 of Sydney LEP 2012 applies (thus removing the additional 0.5:1 that the site could secure for the provision of Community Infrastructure). This would result in less community infrastructure and public benefit being delivered with a relatively high density development and is not an appropriate outcome, nor is it in the public interest.</p> <p>With regard to commercial viability, it is noted that several sites in the precinct and in the surrounding area have redeveloped or are proposing to redevelop at FSRs similar to that achievable on the subject site (and in some cases lower FSRs). These include the Valentino development on the corner of Epsom Road and Rothschild Avenue at 2:1, the Dolina development at 2:1, the development of the former RTA site on Rothschild Avenue at 1.6:1, 18 Primrose Avenue at 1.49:1 and 57 Rothschild Avenue at 1.39:1.</p> <p>Higher densities within walkable distances of good transport links is an important planning principle, however, it is not the only consideration when determining an appropriate FSR for a specific site. A detailed urban design study was undertaken to determine an appropriate FSR for the subject site. Site specific constraints and context means that density will not always increase with proximity to a station in a totally uniform manner.</p>	
Lack of certainty		Given that the community infrastructure floorspace of 0.75:1 and the 10% design excellence floorspace bonus are awarded at the discretion of Council, the only certainty is the 1:1 base FSR. This lack of certainty will prohibit redevelopment.	The site is subject to the same degree of certainty as any other site to which the Community Infrastructure and Design Excellence provisions (clause 6.14 and 6.21) of Sydney LEP 2012 apply. These schemes are outlined in respective guideline documents published by the City.	None
Height		Building heights as set out in the Planning Proposal are overly prescriptive and will stifle innovation. Any concerns about neighbourhood amenity and scale can be addressed through DCP controls – this is the purpose of the DCP. It is not possible to assume that Council's urban design analysis has identified the only potential development option.	Urban design analysis to determine appropriate building heights was undertaken in consultation with the landowner and with their input	None
Dedication		Dedication to Council of land required for the park, streets and other public domain is a burden that is unlikely to be offset by the base FSR controls as proposed.	Prior to redevelopment, urban renewal precincts such as the North Rosebery precinct are often characterised by their large, unbroken street blocks and poor public domain amenity. The subject site is a good example of such a site. Dedication to Council of land is necessary to ensure that open space, streets, pedestrian and cycle links and road widening where necessary can be achieved. These improvements to the public domain	None

Submitter	Issue Category	Issue	City of Sydney Response	Recommended changes to controls
		<p>It is unclear whether the dedications will be offset against any Section 94 contributions. Clarification is sought.</p>	<p>significantly enhance the amenity of the site and the precinct more widely and enable its transformation into a vibrant new neighbourhood.</p> <p>The City responded by email to address the issue of potential Section 94 offsets on 28 October 2013. The correspondence clarified that future delivery of public domain improvements on the site and dedication of land to Council may be offset against future Section 94 contributions.</p>	
	Land identified for park	<p>Height controls on the land identified for the park have been significantly reduced from 15m to 3m. Irrespective of the use of the land, strongly object to changes which may impact land value.</p>	<p>This approach to identifying land for open space (setting a 3m height limit) has been used for the other urban renewal areas in Sydney LEP 2012.</p> <p>Furthermore, FSRs are calculated prior to dedication and therefore there is no loss of floor space.</p>	None
	Amalgamation	<p>There is no planning justification for requiring amalgamation of the two lots that form the subject site. Provision 5.7.5 of the draft DCP amendment is overly onerous, will serve as a barrier to redevelopment of the site and places at risk the possibility of the local park being delivered.</p>	<p>The draft DCP requires amalgamation of the two lots that make up the subject site to ensure that an acceptable urban design outcome is achieved, particularly with regard to height of buildings and transition in height. Through the amalgamation of two lots the maximum FSR can be achieved as floorspace for the lot containing future dedicated land is in effect transferred to the other lot.</p>	None
	Setbacks	<p>The reduction of the required 10m setback and dedication to a 2m setback and dedication to Rothschild Avenue is supported.</p> <p>Are setbacks measured from the new property boundary created following the dedication of 2m to Council?</p> <p>Further clarification on which setbacks are applicable to the subject site is requested.</p>	<p>The reduction of this setback was discussed with the landowner during the review process and support for this reduction is noted.</p> <p>All setbacks are to be measured from the new property boundary created as a result of the dedication as per provision 5.2.10(3) of Sydney DCP 2012.</p> <p>Section 5.7: Green Square – North Rosebery of the draft DCP amendment contains provisions specific to sites in the Precinct, including the subject site. 'Figure 5.xx: North Rosebery Public Dedication' (referred to in provision 5.7.1.3) identifies parts of the site that are required for dedication to Council. 'Figure 5.xx: North Rosebery Setbacks' (referred to in provision 5.7.2.1) identifies required setbacks that are retained within the private property boundaries.</p>	None
	Local park location	<p>The locality statement (Section 2.5.9) in the draft DCP should be amended to remove reference to a specific location for the park. Alternatively, it should be amended to include a statement which allows identification of an alternate location provided it satisfies the intended purpose and amenity of the park.</p> <p>Principles (e) and (f) of Section 2.5.9, Section 5 Catchment Area Guidelines, Figure 5.33 and 5.39 should be amended to the same effect.</p>	<p>The City's detailed urban design analysis and meetings with landowners have led to the development of a structure plan that locates the local park at the north west corner of Rosebery Avenue and Crewe Place. This is considered the best location for the local park as it provides excellent amenity to surrounding properties, receives good solar access, has three public road frontages and will contribute towards the development of a community node at this location. As such, the references to a specific location for the local park throughout the draft DCP amendment are considered appropriate.</p>	None
	Views towards Central Sydney	<p>Principle (h) of Section 2.5.9 is excessively onerous and unclear and should be deleted.</p>	<p>This principle aims to protect views towards the Sydney CBD from the public open space located on the northern side of Kimberley Grove and has been in Sydney DCP 2012 since it was adopted by Council in 2012. The draft DCP amendment adds clarity to the principle by requiring that views are protected through employing a transition in height from north to south. The principle is considered important as it aims to protect a view corridor that is</p>	None

Submitter	Issue Category	Issue	City of Sydney Response	Recommended changes to controls
	Development to respond to industrial heritage	Principle (i) of Section 2.5.9 is unclear and impractical given the transformation of the precinct is already underway and should be deleted.	Buildings at 1-3 Rosebery Avenue and 23-25 Rosebery Avenue are listed as heritage items in Sydney LEP 2012. The intent of Principle (i) in the draft DCP amendment is to encourage future development on or adjacent to these sites to consider the heritage value of the items and to take inspiration from them. 24 Rothschild Avenue is an example of sympathetic adaptive reuse which respects the industrial heritage of the area while providing for more contemporary uses. While it is acknowledged that the transformation of the precinct is already underway, a unique sense of place based partly on the industrial heritage of the area can still be fostered.	None
	Transition in scale to south of precinct	Principle (j) of Section 2.5.9 is unclear. Where does the 'south' of the precinct begin?	It is envisaged that the type of development referred to in this principle would generally occur on the smaller lots in extreme southern part of the precinct. The subject site is not affected by this principle.	Recommended that Principle (j) of Section 2.5.9 is amended to refer to the specific area of the Precinct to which it applies.
	Street Hierarchy and Layout	The principle of mid-block connections and a more permeable neighbourhood is supported.	Noted	None
	Through site links	The through site links required by map sheet 18 are unclear. Clarification is sought on which cross sections are applicable and which cross sections apply to the pedestrian/cycle lane and green link.	The through site links map sheet 018 shows the location and extent of proposed through site links. Cross sections illustrating indicative layouts of different streets, lanes and links are provided in Section 5.7 of the draft DCP amendment and are cross referenced in provision 5.7.1.1 and in 'Figure 5.xx: North Rosebery Street Hierarchy'.	None
	Active Frontages	Active frontage to park – given that there is no street frontage here, it is unlikely that these will be commercially viable and there is a high risk of them being not active. Request that the active frontage requirement not extend the full length of the park.	Active edges are required through DCP controls where the City's aim is to activate the area. Requiring active edges in areas directly fronting public open space is an approach taken elsewhere in other urban renewal areas in the LGA including the Ashmore and Epsom Park precincts. This is an appropriate response to the challenge of activating these spaces at different times of day and providing a safe environment. In addition it assists in ensuring that the public open space directly adjacent to the building is not perceived by the public as privatised.	None
	Urban strategy map	'Tall buildings' as illustrated in the Urban Strategy Map are vague and greater clarity is required on the intended massing and scale. Further clarity is also required on 'non-residential ground floor uses'.	Figure 5.xx: North Rosebery Urban Strategy is schematic in nature. It is designed to give a high level overview of the structure of the precinct and the location of defining elements such as open space, streets, higher and lower buildings and important heritage items. Greater clarity on the massing and scale of what is referred to as 'Tall Buildings 7-10 Storeys' can be found in Figure 5.xx: North Rosebery Height in Storeys for example.	None
	Circulation	Clarity required on the definition and purpose of an integrated car park as required by Figure 5.xx: North Rosebery Circulation in the draft DCP amendment.	Two different types of active ground floor use are encouraged through the draft DCP amendment. 'Non-Residential Ground Floor Uses' is indicated where commercial and retail uses at ground floor are encouraged to activate the street and where residential uses are discouraged due to the poor level of amenity to which they would be subject. 'Retail/Commercial Uses on Ground Floor' is indicated where commercial and retail uses are encouraged to activate the street but where residential uses, if designed well and with individual entries, may be acceptable.	None
			An integrated car park is one which services a number of different buildings as indicated from a single entry. The intent of providing an integrated car park in this location is to minimise the amount of potential vehicle footprint crossings. These locations are indicative and alternative locations may be proposed at the development application stage.	

Submitter	Issue Category	Issue	City of Sydney Response	Recommended changes to controls
	Design Excellence	<p>Clarification sought that 10% design excellence bonus would be based on the FSR of 1.75:1 (i.e. base + bonus).</p> <p>Object to the overly prescriptive nature of the additional height. This limits other design schemes.</p>	<p>A separate planning proposal to clarify the application of the design excellence provisions of Sydney LEP 2012 (clause 6.21) is being progressed by the City. The intent of this planning proposal is to allow the design excellence floor space to be calculated based on the sum of floor space resulting from the FSR within the FSR map plus any applicable community infrastructure floorspace.</p> <p>Detailed urban design analysis has determined the preferred location for any additional height that may be awarded as part of a competitive design process. This preferred location is indicated in Figure 5.xx: 5-13 Rosebery Avenue Design Excellence Competition Site. It should be noted that the locations of additional height shown are preferred and that alternatives will be assessed on merit (see provision 5.7.6 of draft DCP amendment)</p>	None
	Trees	<p>The landowner is unaware of any arborist report on the health of the existing trees. It is noted that the retention of the trees may not be practical. There is therefore no basis for requiring a 15m setback. Furthermore, where is the 15m setback measured from?</p>	<p>As part of the review of the controls for the precinct, a Tree Management Officer at the City undertook an assessment of the row of Hills Fig trees on the northern boundary of the subject site. The assessment considered the health and condition of the trees and their contribution to the amenity of the area. As part of the assessment, the average Tree Protection Zone was calculated to be 15m as measured from the centre of the tree trunks. The Tree Management Officer recommended that a setback of 15m be instated to ensure the trees are adequately protected above and below ground.</p> <p>Given that the trees are in excess of 5m in height, they are protected by the Tree Management Controls (clause 5.9 in Sydney LEP 2012 and provision 3.5.3 in Sydney DCP 2012). As such, any works to remove the trees would require Council approval.</p>	None
<p>Landowner 1-3 Rosebery Avenue and 45-55 Epsom Road, Rosebery</p>	Community Infrastructure Floorspace	<p>Request confirmation that the subject site will automatically qualify for the 0.75:1 community infrastructure floorspace because the future development of the site will involve dedication of a new 'public road'.</p>	<p>An email was sent to clarify this issue on 28 October 2013. The correspondence confirmed that sites do not automatically qualify for floorspace subject to clause 6.14 Community Infrastructure Floorspace and that this additional floor space is achieved through the Voluntary Planning Agreement process.</p>	None
	Height	<p>The draft controls propose a 3 storey height limit at the corner of Spring Street and Epsom Road. This should be increased to 5 storeys or at least 4 storeys to provide a strong street address comparable with the built form across Spring Street</p>	<p>Detailed urban design testing has been undertaken for this site. The landowner and their consultant team met with City staff to discuss the testing and presented alternative urban design options. The building heights as recommended in the draft DCP amendment and draft planning proposal are the result of this detailed work and are considered appropriate for the site. It should be noted that the existing building at 1-3 Rosebery Avenue is listed as a heritage item in Sydney LEP 2012 and the proposed controls respond to both the heritage significance of the item, the existing streetscape and the wider precinct context.</p>	None
	FSR	<p>The maximum permissible FSR on the subject site (assuming the full 0.75:1 community infrastructure floorspace is accessed and 10% design excellence bonus on top of this is achieved) is 1.925:1. To ensure that the preferred scheme for the site is feasible, the base FSR should be amended to be 1:1 to ensure that the total FSR achievable through clauses 6.14 and 6.21 is 2.035:1.</p>	<p>The landowner's preferred scheme was presented to City staff and was one of many potential schemes considered. The building heights and FSRs as recommended in the draft DCP amendment and draft planning proposal are the result of a review of this scheme and other detailed urban design testing undertaken by the City and are considered appropriate for this site. It should be noted that the existing building at 1-3 Rosebery Avenue is listed as a heritage item in Sydney LEP 2012 and the proposed controls respond to both the heritage significance of the item, the existing streetscape and the wider precinct context.</p>	None
<p>Landowner 3-11 Primrose Avenue, Rosebery</p>	FSR	<p>Objection to the reduction of community infrastructure floorspace achievable under clause 6.14 from 0.5:1 to 0.25:1 for the subject site (thus reducing the total achievable FSR from 1.5:1 to 1.25:1) on</p>	<p>The City has undertaken a detailed urban design review of different options for this site including the option submitted by the landowner on 6 November 2013. The controls as exhibited for this site are considered appropriate. The scheme submitted by the landowner did not achieve required setbacks to Rosebery Avenue and did not achieve the same height transition achieved by the exhibited controls. As such, it is</p>	<p>The side setback as required by the draft DCP amendment is recommended to be increased from 2 metres to 3 metres.</p>

Submitter	Issue Category	Issue	City of Sydney Response	Recommended changes to controls
		the basis that it reduces the possibility of a flexibility design outcome on the site. Submit that a total 1.5:1 can be achieved on the subject site while maintaining appropriate setbacks and transitions in scale to the adjoining low density properties	recommended that the controls be retained as exhibited with the exception of a minor increase to the side setback from 2 metres to 3 metres. This is to comply with minimum BCA separation requirements.	
	DCP Controls	The site specific building height and setback controls as set out in the DCP amendment are overly restrictive and inhibit a flexible design outcome on the subject site.	The height controls as illustrated in the draft DCP amendment represent the preferred design outcome as identified by the City's detailed urban design analysis. However, provision 5.7.2(3) of the draft DCP amendment states that "... alternative building layouts may be considered within each street block provided it achieves better amenity for new and existing development and the public domain". As such, the draft DCP amendment allows an acceptable degree of flexibility.	None
Public Authorities				
Randwick City Council	Traffic and transport	Development allowable under the draft controls will have a direct traffic impact on the key east-west connection of Epsom Road/Lenthall Street. Concerned about the increasing levels of traffic within the West Kensington area of the Randwick LGA.	<p>The City is commissioning a precinct specific traffic study to assess the impact that redevelopment of the North Rosebery precinct will have and recommend traffic management measures to mitigate these impacts. The study will examine the current and anticipated future performance of key intersections in the precinct including the intersections between Epsom Road and Rothschild Avenue, Rosebery Avenue and Dalmeny Avenue.</p> <p>It should be noted that the draft controls are a refinement of existing controls and the additional amount of dwellings amounts to approximately 400.</p> <p>Transport for NSW is undertaking a review of the Green Square Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (known as the TMAP2) and Roads and Maritime Service are working towards creating a Metropolitan wide mesoscopic model. The findings of these broader studies may include recommendations for measures to manage impacts on the Epsom Road/Lenthall Street corridor. Randwick City Council should liaise directly with Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Service regarding these studies.</p> <p>The TMAP2 is a project being managed by Transport for NSW. The original TMAP included consideration of east-west connections. Randwick City Council should liaise directly with Transport for NSW to discuss the scope of the update to the original TMAP.</p>	None
		The scope of the updated Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP2) being prepared by Transport for NSW should be expanded. It should address improved east/west public and active transport connections to ease traffic pressure on Todman Avenue and Lenthall Street.		None
		The findings of the traffic study being commissioned by City of Sydney should be forwarded to Randwick City Council for information on completion.	This request is noted. The traffic study will identify potential impacts of the redevelopment of North Rosebery and recommend traffic management measures to mitigate these impacts.	None
	Public domain	The introduction of finer grain street blocks, and improved permeability is supported.	Noted	None
		New pedestrian and cycle lanes should be integrated into the regional bike network to encourage wider use of sustainable transport.	New pedestrian and cycle lanes are designed to integrate into the regional bike network.	None

Submitter	Issue Category	Issue	City of Sydney Response	Recommended changes to controls
		Query whether the 6,050 square metres of proposed open space will sufficiently cater for the recreational needs of the existing and new community.	<p>The amount of public open space proposed for the North Rosebery Precinct has been informed by the findings of the 'Open Space and Recreational Needs Study'. This study was prepared for the City of Sydney by an independent consultant and adopted by Council in 2007. The study recommended 6,000 square metres of open space in the precinct, including one area of at least 3,000 square metres. These amounts were previously included in South Sydney Development Control Plan 1997 and carried forward into the <i>Sydney Development Control Plan 2012</i> (Sydney DCP 2012). The North Rosebery precinct review has resulted in a slight increase in the total amount of open space to 6,050 square metres. This slightly increased amount is considered appropriate for the existing and estimated future community.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are a number of other existing and proposed open spaces in close proximity to the North Rosebery precinct. These include the existing Tocumwul Park to the south of the precinct and future parks at the former RTA site, the Dollina and Overland Gardens sites and the Epsom Park precinct.</p>	None
Transport for NSW	Community facilities	Other community facilities such as child care centres should be encouraged through appropriate planning measures.	The proposed amendment to Sydney DCP 2012 for the North Rosebery precinct includes a preferred location for a new childcare centre within the precinct. Furthermore, Section 4.4.4 of Sydney DCP 2012 contains provisions designed to encourage provision of child care centres where appropriate.	None
City of Botany Bay Council	None	<p>The planning proposal is largely consistent with the assumptions in the updated TMAP. TfNSW will continue to work with the City to further investigate measures identified in the TMAP to support growth in Green Square.</p> <p>No concerns or comments</p>	Noted	None