

ATTACHMENT C

**SUBMISSIONS TABLE – VARIOUS SITES IN
WATERLOO AND ALEXANDRIA**

Submissions Table - Various Sites in Waterloo and Alexandria

#	Submitter	Issues Raised	Response
Waterloo Park			
1	Local Resident	<p>Rezoning</p> <p>Raises concerns about the rezoning from R1 General Residential to B4 Mixed Uses.</p> <p>Notes the current R1 zone allows a range of housing types and supports non-residential uses that provide facilities or services. As well, existing purely non-residential businesses can continue to operate under existing use rights in the Waterloo Precinct.</p> <p>Such an approach gives the community more control and certainty over the area and allows each development to be properly considered on a case by case basis.</p> <p>There are already redevelopments underway simultaneously in the precinct. The rezoning as proposed has the potential to cause further rapid and concurrent redevelopment in the area which would pose its own issues.</p>	<p>The purpose of the proposed rezoning is to reflect the mixed use character of the precinct and to accommodate its transitional character, where some residential redevelopment has occurred alongside compatible businesses such as fashion headquarters and outlets, showrooms, warehouses and information technology uses.</p> <p>The zone objectives for both the R1 General Residential and B4 Mixed Uses zones, amongst others, seek to encourage a mix of non-residential uses. However, the B4 zone allows for a greater variety of compatible non-residential uses and will generate more activity. A B4 zoning in the Waterloo Park Precinct will allow for the continued operation of existing businesses which are well established and appropriate in this area, adjacent to the Green Square Town Centre. It will also allow development that is exclusively residential, such that the properties currently used solely for residential purposes will not be affected by a change from R1 to B4. Further, it will continue to allow for future residential development capitalising on proximity to Waterloo Park.</p> <p>Importantly, a key objective of the B4 Mixed Uses zone is to provide for a mixture of compatible land uses, integrating suitable business, office, residential, retail and other development in accessible locations. This objective guides the consideration of development applications on a case by case basis.</p> <p><i>No amendment is recommended.</i></p>
<p>Increase in height control – Impact on views and sun access</p> <p>Objects to additional height control relating to site 1A, 3-5 and 7-11 Allen Street (west of George Street) because it has the potential to impact views and causing overshadowing.</p>			<p>The recommended height increase from 15 metres to 22 metres will reflect the built form of surrounding mixed use residential development recently constructed or approved. This existing built form often has four and six storey buildings, with the lower building heights fronting the street.</p>

#	Submitter	Issues Raised	Response
		<p data-bbox="820 938 1099 1711">Consideration of Other Factors</p> <p data-bbox="879 994 938 1711">Notes that the Planning Proposal to rezone and to allow additional height control does not fully consider other factors including:</p> <ul data-bbox="970 1361 1054 1653" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="970 1361 995 1653">• traffic and congestion, <li data-bbox="995 1361 1021 1653">• access, and <li data-bbox="1021 1361 1046 1653">• parking 	<p data-bbox="197 91 325 938">The draft DCP amendment provides more detail on the built form configuration requiring an east-west street wall height of four storeys. This wall height will create an appropriate pedestrian scale along Allen Street and allow for solar access to the south.</p> <p data-bbox="357 91 544 938">An increase in building height from 15 metres to 22 metres will facilitate a four and six storey mixed use/residential development without adverse environmental impact. An indicative built form is shown in the main body of the officer's report at Figure 4. Such arrangement would ensure development can comply with <i>NSW Residential Flat Design Code</i> requirements for overshadowing, overlooking and building separation.</p> <p data-bbox="576 91 727 938">With respect to impact on views, the Sydney DCP 2012 requires development to provide "a pleasant outlook, as distinct from views from all apartments" (section 4.2.3.10). Views and outlooks from existing developments are to be considered in the site planning and massing of the new development.</p> <p data-bbox="759 568 785 938"><i>No amendment is recommended.</i></p>
2	<p data-bbox="1187 1711 1212 2051">18 Huntley Street, Alexandria</p> <p data-bbox="1238 1711 1326 2000">Mecone on behalf of 18 Huntley Street Landowner</p>	<p data-bbox="1238 938 1326 1711">Requests amendments to the exhibited DCP including, provisions to reflect clause 7.20 of the Sydney LEP 2012, residential use on Sydney Park Road frontage and change of building envelopes and setbacks.</p> <p data-bbox="1358 938 1425 1711">The changes are requested to optimise design flexibility and to take into account the specific site conditions. The changes requested seek</p>	<p data-bbox="1238 506 1264 938">Specific comments are provided below.</p> <p data-bbox="970 170 1029 938">The proposed rezoning will not change any development parameters that impact on traffic, access and parking.</p> <p data-bbox="1061 170 1086 938">A detailed assessment of impacts on traffic, access and parking will be undertaken at development application stage.</p> <p data-bbox="1118 568 1144 938"><i>No amendment is recommended.</i></p>

<p>to better facilitate design excellence in the future development of the site and in particular achieve the FSR incentive to a competitive design process for design excellence</p>	<p>DCP to reflect Clause 7.20 of Sydney LEP</p> <p>Seeks inclusion of provisions for a site specific DCP to satisfy provisions 7.20 in the Sydney LEP.</p>	<p>Clause 7.20 of Sydney LEP 2012 outlines matters to be provided in a site-specific DCP. This includes matters such as site suitability for development, built form, environmental impacts such as overshadowing and access and circulation on the site. Clause 7.20 is supported by clause 3.3.8 of Sydney DCP 2012 which describes appropriate documentation to support and inform a site-specific DCP.</p> <p>It is only at the time when considering a Stage 2 (detailed) development application that the consent authority can determine whether the requirements under clause 7.20 of Sydney DCP 2012 or an equivalent Stage 1 development application can be waived. It is not appropriate to include in the DCP a provision that would act to waive clause 7.20 requirements.</p> <p>Council officers have been in discussions with the landowner to develop more detailed DCP provisions. These are informed by the documentation included in the landowner's submission on the public exhibition.</p> <p><i>More detailed provisions are recommended in the draft DCP amendment.</i></p>
	<p>Residential uses on Sydney Park Road</p> <p>Requests to remove DCP provisions that require non-residential uses on the Sydney Road frontage.</p> <p>Requests residential development be permitted on this frontage Justification includes design of residential spaces that can provide suitable residential amenity at the ground level.</p> <p>States that the Sydney Park Road frontage does not provide a viable space for commercial uses given its isolation from other businesses and pedestrian traffic, and absence of on-street parking and commercial attractors. A commercial viability assessment is provided to support this claim.</p>	<p>The statements about the viability of commercial uses are noted. However non-residential uses on the Sydney Park Road frontage are preferred at ground level to act as a buffer for residential uses above.</p> <p>If residential uses are to occur along Sydney Park Road frontage, buildings should incorporate appropriate design measures to address potential noise and pollution. Measures may include setback, screening, double glazing and the like.</p> <p>Although non-residential uses are preferred, residential uses may be appropriate in this frontage if they are adequately setback and have appropriate acoustic screening and treatment to address amenity. For residential uses a setback of 1.5 meters at 50% of the frontage with the setback for the other half of the frontage being three meters. The setback will provide opportunity for articulation of the buildings along the frontage. This</p>

<p>will result in an interesting façade which breaks up the rhythm of the building whilst providing opportunity for amenity screening and treatments.</p> <p><i>The draft DCP amendment includes provisions to reflect the residential and non-residential alternatives along the Sydney Park Road frontage.</i></p>	<p>The proposed six storey addition to fill the gap along the western site boundary would bring the building bulk forward towards Huntley Street. This would detrimentally impact on the low scale character of the Cooper Estate Conservation Area which is predominantly one and two storeys.</p> <p>A building envelope of three storeys, with a two storey street wall height, is appropriate along the Huntley Street frontage to respond to the character of the Conservation Area. Given that the development's frontage to Huntley Street acts as a visual termination of Lawrence Street, it should reflect the pattern and rhythm of the surrounding terraced properties with a low scale fine grain, 'town house' style.</p> <p>In addition, it would have additional overshadowing impact on the property adjacent to the west. The proposed six storey envelope to fill the gap is therefore not supported.</p> <p>A three storey envelope to fill the gap which matches the Huntley Street envelope may be appropriate, however, if demonstrated through design excellence. The draft DCP amendment Height of Buildings diagram shows this as the location where the design excellence floor space incentive may be achieved.</p> <p><i>A potential design excellence envelope is shown in the draft DCP amendment.</i></p>	<p>Sydney Park Road Frontage</p> <p>As mentioned, if residential uses are to occur they should provide appropriate screening and measures to mitigate noise and pollution.</p> <p>In addition where residential uses are to occur, they should be setback to provide a semi-public space that interfaces with the public domain and adds</p>
<p>Change of Building Envelope – Northern / Western Boundary</p> <p>Requests that the gap between the building envelopes along the western site boundary and northern Huntley Street frontage be removed by amending Figure 6.37. Proposes the gap be filled with a six storey envelope.</p> <p>The amendment is justified with an urban design assessment to show additional amenity within the development by allowing access to a roof top garden on the Huntley Street envelope and building bulk as seen from Huntley Street.</p> <p>States that the additional built form to the western elevation is minor.</p>	<p>Building Setbacks</p> <p>Sydney Park Road Frontage</p> <p>Requests the minimum building setbacks in Section 4.2 of the Sydney DCP 2012 apply along with an additional site specific allowance for the basement to encroach into the minimum setback if deep soil landscaping across the whole site complies with the DCP control.</p>	

<p>to the amenity of residents and passive surveillance of the public domain. The revised draft DCP amendment includes an additional provision that requires for residential uses a building setback of 1.5 meters for 50% of the frontage with the remaining being 3 meters. This will provide architectural articulation along the frontage whilst providing opportunity for amenity screening and treatments.</p> <p><i>An amendment is recommended in response to the submission.</i></p> <p>Basement Setback on Sydney Park Road</p> <p>Section 4.2.2.1 <i>Setbacks</i> of Sydney DCP 2012 states that underground parking structures, balconies and bay windows may encroach into the front setback by a maximum of 1metre.</p> <p>Council officers have considered the request for a departure from the general DCP provision in the context of the amount of deep soil landscaping that may be achieved on the site. An underground parking structure that encroaches on the front setback would reduce the opportunity for deep soil planting. In recognition of the site constraints the revised draft DCP amendment includes a site-specific provision that allows the flexibility to depart from the general DCP provision only where the development exceeds the required minimum area of deep soil landscaping across the site.</p> <p><i>An amendment is recommended in response to the submission.</i></p>	<p>The setback is justified by an air quality and traffic noise assessment to demonstrate that a further additional setback on Sydney Park Road would not achieve significantly better amenity for units.</p> <p>Basement Setback on Sydney Park Road</p> <p>Requests basement setback encroach more than one metre into the minimum setback on the Sydney Park Road frontage in order to provide adequate and feasible basement car parking.</p> <p>The request is justified on the basis that of the triangular-shaped site which has limited depth and groundwater constraints to excavation coupled with the need to provide adequate car parking. A structural engineering statement is provided to demonstrate the structural limitations to basement levels on the site.</p>	<p>The setback is justified by an air quality and traffic noise assessment to demonstrate that a further additional setback on Sydney Park Road would not achieve significantly better amenity for units.</p> <p>Basement Setback on Sydney Park Road</p> <p>Requests basement setback encroach more than one metre into the minimum setback on the Sydney Park Road frontage in order to provide adequate and feasible basement car parking.</p> <p>The request is justified on the basis that of the triangular-shaped site which has limited depth and groundwater constraints to excavation coupled with the need to provide adequate car parking. A structural engineering statement is provided to demonstrate the structural limitations to basement levels on the site.</p>
<p>Public authority</p>	<p>3 Roads and Maritime Services (RMS)</p>	<p>No objection 'in principle'.</p> <p>The proposed amendments will not raise any significant traffic related matters that require remedial action.</p> <p>At development application stage more detailed comments may be provided from RMS.</p>