

ATTACHMENT C

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

Submitter	Issue Category	Summary of submission point	City of Sydney response	Recommended changes to controls
Public Authorities Transport for NSW	Transport- Pedestrian Access	TfNSW supports the provision of pedestrian access to the Aquatic Centre and Gurnyama Park site being provided from Joynton Avenue and the proposed Zetland Avenue.	Noted	None
	Buses	<p>The location and operation of vehicular access ways to any parking that is proposed to be provided on all the sites affected should not impact upon the existing bus services and bus stops in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>Consideration must be given to any potential impact to regular bus services operating in this area (Epsom Road, Joynton Avenue, proposed Zetland Avenue extension) and the greater vicinity from any proposed development on all the sites affected, including the additional on-site parking and associated traffic and any drop off areas. Should any impacts be identified, the measures proposed to mitigate these must be committed to being enforced.</p>	Noted. Sydney buses and Transport for NSW will be consulted in relation to any changes or impact on the Sydney buses network to ensure any issues are identified and that measures are proposed for mitigation, where required.	
	Transport Interchange	The Transport interchange on Zetland Ave should be referred to as a "potential future transport interchange".	It is the City's intention that a transport interchange be provided on Zetland Avenue- the language used reflects that intention.	None
Roads and Maritime Services (RMS)		RMS has reviewed the proposal and raises no objection.	Noted.	None

Submitter	Issue Category	Summary of submission point	City of Sydney response	Recommended changes to controls
<p>Randwick City Council (RCC)</p>	<p>Community</p>	<p>Site is adjacent to Randwick LGA , so these changes are particularly relevant to Randwick's community.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
	<p>Road Layout</p>	<p>Concerns that south side of proposed Gunyama Park no longer has a street frontage with consequent negative design aspects. A major potential view corridor will now be blocked by buildings and the southern end of the park will be less publicly accessible, therefore less secure. Zetland Avenue will now be only direct east-west corridor, restricting pedestrian/vehicle and cyclist activity in the precinct and damaging viability of this being an 'urban destination'</p>	<p>Concerns are noted, however the changes to the original proposed street layout, in particular the realignment of Rose Valley Way, are necessary to accommodate the requirements of Sydney Water to ensure that the construction of buildings over the stormwater drain does not occur.</p> <p>The DCP includes requirements for an 'active edge' with some retail/café strip for the development south of Gunyama Park and the City has been aware of these issues in developing the brief and assessing the design competition for the Aquatic Centre and Gunyama Park.</p> <p>North-south cycle links to and through Gunyama Park will help to activate the space together with the two street frontages to Zetland Avenue and George Julius Avenue.</p>	
	<p>Concerns about easements</p>	<p>Council has concerns about the 9 metre wide north-south easement for public access that will connect Rose Valley Way to Gunyama Park (from Fuse Street) as it may be confusing whether this is public or private space. These concerns apply also to the easement between Joynton Avenue and Pony Race Streets and RCC recommends these be formally identified as public property.</p> <p>RCC supports the outdoor dining strip noted at Figure 5.46 (Dedications and Easements), but only if it fronts a public road.</p>	<p>The City Council will work with developers for both of these sites to deliver these public easements and for them to read as publicly accessible. Concerns regarding legibility and safety will be addressed through appropriate surface treatments, lighting and signage that clearly identify the land as public space.</p> <p>Concerns noted, but as mentioned above, the road layout responds to the requirement for development not to occur above the stormwater drain. Any additional</p>	

Submitter	Issue Category	Summary of submission point	City of Sydney response	Recommended changes to controls
			<p>road to the south of the park would be superfluous to requirements and would substantially restrict the ability to deliver development on the two development sites south of Gunyama Park.</p>	
	<p>Gunyama Park and Aquatic Centre</p>	<p>RCC appreciates the City's commitment to community facilities and open space to support growth in the Green Square Area.</p> <p>RCC does not believe that a Mixed Use (B4) zone is necessary to cater for the uses anticipated in Gunyama Park. The range of uses permissible under the (RE1) zone appear more appropriate to the City of Sydney's intentions for Gunyama Park.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. However 106-116 Epsom Road (which includes the north east portion of the future Gunyama Park) is currently zoned Mixed Use (B4) and is intended to be transferred to the City. Zoning the remainder of the site Mixed Use would maintain a consistency in zoning across the precinct. It would also allow a flexibility for commercial uses that is currently not permissible under the Infrastructure zone.</p> <p>For the site 94-104 Epsom Road (which includes the south east portion of Gunyama Park) the intention is for mixed use development, except for the area being dedicated to Gunyama Park.</p> <p>Therefore, a B4 zoning is considered more appropriate to apply across the precinct to enable more flexibility in the staging of development and until land amalgamations have occurred and park boundaries defined. This can be revisited in the future.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
		<p>RCC supports the design excellence process for the Aquatic Centre.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
		<p>RCC also supports the incentives for sustainable transport use to and from the Aquatic Centre but notes that some users will need to drive. It is considered important that the parking study</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

Submitter	Issue Category	Summary of submission point	City of Sydney response	Recommended changes to controls
		being commissioned by the city recognises the needs of these users.		
<p>Landowners Design Collaborative for Suttons Motor Group.</p>		<p>For Lot 2, the LEP Height Map has been amended to reduce the north-eastern corner of the building from 40m to 35m. The respondent raises an objection to this as there does not appear to be a clear rationale for doing this. Nearby corner locations have maximum heights of between 40 and 70m, so a 40m standard would be consistent with the prevailing pattern.</p> <p>The permitted height at the western boundary has increased from 18 m to 27m.</p>	<p>The LEP height map has been corrected to reflect the controls set out in the DCP height map, which permits 10 storeys to be built on the north-eastern corner. A 10 storey limit was the original intent of the planning controls.</p> <p>A 35 metre LEP height limit permits 10 storeys whereas a 40 metre height limit may permit 11 storeys. The DCP height map shows that additional height (above the 10 storey and 35 metre height limits) may be added to the north-eastern corner if Design Excellence is achieved, however this would be considered as a variation to the LEP controls.</p> <p>It is noted that the permitted height at the western boundary of the Suttons site has increased from 18 m to 27m. There will be no overall loss of development potential for the site as a result of the proposed minor height change.</p>	
		<p>For Lot 7, the building footprint and height of development permitted on the southern part of that lot is reduced reflecting the proposed changes to the street layout.</p>	<p>The intention for this portion of the site is for it to accommodate a street: Rose Valley Way. Development would not be permissible due to the location of a stormwater drain underneath the proposed street.</p> <p>This was also the intention in the current Sydney DCP 2012, as clearly indicated in the height map at Figure 5.67, and the LEP has been corrected to illustrate this.</p>	

ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Issue Category	Summary of submission point	City of Sydney response	Recommended changes to controls
			Under the DCP, a building would not have been permitted on this site; therefore there is no loss of development potential.	