

## ATTACHMENT C

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS AND  
RESPONSES FROM THE CITY OF SYDNEY**



## 904 Bourke Street, Zetland

### Submissions to public exhibition and response from City of Sydney

### Planning Proposal and draft amendment to *Sydney Development Control Plan 2012* - Exhibited from 17 February 2015 to 16 March 2015

#### *Glossary of terms*

CSPC – Central Sydney Planning Committee  
 FSR – Floor Space Ratio  
 LGA – Local Government Area  
 RFDC – Residential Flat Design Code  
 SDCP 2012 – Sydney Development Control Plan 2012  
 SLEP 2012 – Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<b>Resident submissions</b>		
<b>Local resident</b>	In favour of the draft amendment.	Noted.  <b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b>
	Resident permit parking should be provided on the new street proposed to be delivered on the site. Car parking is extremely limited in the local area, particularly at times when services are held at the mosque at 932-934 Bourke Street. Several properties on the southern side of Bourke Street have neither rear lane access nor access to continuous on-street parking near their property due to the operation of timed clearways.	<p>The City's Neighbourhood Parking Policy was adopted by Council in May 2014 and applies to all areas of the LGA, excluding Central Sydney. The policy establishes a range of parking controls and permits to guide the management of parking across the LGA.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Parking Policy seeks to mitigate the impact of new development on congestion, and to support the viability of public transport services, by limiting access to on-street parking. Generally this means that residents of new multi-unit apartment buildings are ineligible for parking permits. This limits traffic congestion from new developments and protects existing on-street parking from excessive demand. This particular policy has been in place since May 1996 in the former South Sydney Council area, within which 904 Bourke Street is situated.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Parking Policy also recommends parking controls for new streets in urban renewal areas such as the proposed street at 904 Bourke Street. The recommended control is 2P 8am – 8pm 7 days per week. This control allows reasonable access for short visits without the need for permits. As a general policy the City does not extend the boundary of existing permit areas to include newly created streets. This approach has been taken across other urban renewal sites in the City including the Lachlan precinct and Harold Park.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment, which are the subjects of this public exhibition, do not seek to amend the Neighbourhood Parking Policy.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	The proposed	SLEP 2012 identifies the maximum number of off-street car

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	development should provide off-street car parking for the majority of its residents.	<p>parking spaces that may be provided to service particular land uses. The objective of setting maximum limits is to minimise the amount of vehicular traffic generated by new development. The number of off-street car parking space is calculated based on the type of land use, the number of dwellings (in the case of a residential development), the gross floor area (in the case of non-residential development) and the proximity of the site to public transport, goods and services.</p> <p>The number of off-street parking spaces permitted at 904 Bourke Street will depend on the total number of dwellings and area of non-residential floor space proposed and these figures will not be finalised until the Development Application stage. It is therefore not possible to stipulate at this stage how many off-street parking spaces may be delivered. Notwithstanding this, any future Development Application will be assessed against the maximums permitted under SLEP 2012 and consent will not be granted to development which exceeds the maximums.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment do not seek to amend the existing controls in SLEP 2012 which regulate the maximum permissible number of off-street car parking spaces.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
<b>Local resident</b>	Objection to overshadowing of the subject property by the proposed development.	<p>The subject property is adjacent to the existing vehicular driveway to 904 Bourke Street and backs on to the proposed public open space. It is situated to the north of all proposed buildings on 904 Bourke Street.</p> <p>The City's Urban Design Study 2014 includes analysis and illustrations of overshadowing resulting from the proposed development on 21 June on pages 26 to 33. For the purposes of the study, the adjacent sites at 890-898 Bourke Street and 888 Bourke Street are assumed to be developed to the maximum height permitted under SLEP 2012. As such, the shadow diagrams illustrate a 'worst case scenario' of overshadowing. The figures on pages 28 to 30 show that overshadowing of the subject property at 9am and 10am is caused by the maximum permissible building envelope at 890-898 Bourke Street. This Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment does not seek to amend the planning controls for that site. It is further noted that a Stage 1 Development Application for that site is currently being assessed by the City and overshadowing of adjacent properties will be considered as part of this assessment. The figures on pages 29 and 30 illustrate that from 11am to 2pm, overshadowing of the submitter's site is caused by structures on the site itself.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment do not result in any additional overshadowing of the subject property.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>Concern about dirt, dust and noise created by future construction on the site. What assurances will be put in place by the developer to mitigate these impacts?</p>	<p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment seek to establish appropriate planning controls including building height and density and more detailed public domain design controls including for example the location of public spaces and setbacks to private development. Prior to any future development in accordance with the new controls if approved, a Development Application will be required. It is at this stage that specific construction details will be known and the potential impacts of construction be able to be assessed. Should development consent be issued at this Development Application stage, the potential impact of dust and noise caused by construction will be addressed through conditions of consent that must be satisfied by the applicant.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>How long will construction of the proposed development take?</p>	<p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment, which are the subjects of this public exhibition, seek to establish an appropriate framework of planning controls at 904 Bourke Street. Subject to approval by Council and the CSPC, these controls will come into force later in 2015 following the legal drafting process. Future development and construction on the site will be subject to the developer obtaining development consent. The development consent process is separate to the plan making process. Timing of submitting a Development Application and future staging of construction will be determined solely by the developer. At this stage, there is no indication of proposed timing.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>There is a step down in level from the proposed park at 904 Bourke Street to the directly adjacent rear yard of the submitter's property. Concern that this could lead to safety, privacy and amenity issues.</p>	<p>The difference in level between the proposed park and the adjacent rear yards of properties fronting Bourke Street is known to Council.</p> <p>The City's Urban Design Study 2014 sought to establish the optimum location for a public park at 904 Bourke Street. The identified location is reflected in the Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment. The location was selected as it is a consolidated, regular shape, receives excellent year round solar access, integrates well with the existing mature Moreton Bay fig tree on the site and provides a buffer between low scale terrace dwellings on adjacent sites and proposed more intense development at 904 Bourke Street.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment, however, only provide a future location for the park and are not intended to provide detailed design guidance. Should the Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment be approved by Council and CSPC, the City will develop a concept design for the park which will be used in determining the final design. A key consideration in developing this concept design will be the interface between the park and adjacent dwellings and private open space including ensuring that the safety, security, privacy and amenity of residents is protected.</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b>
<b>Local resident</b>	The proposed tall buildings may lead to overlooking and compromised privacy.	<p>Generally, the Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment seek to ensure that future development on the site will provide a transition in height, with lower buildings of 3 storeys at the southern and western site boundaries. To ensure that the site maintains reasonable development potential, the draft controls also include some taller buildings. The tallest building in the north-eastern half of the site is 12 storeys, while the tallest building in the south-western part is 7 storeys. The 12 storey building is situated approximately 84 metres from the rear boundary of dwellings on Elizabeth Street at its nearest point. The 7 storey building is situated approximately 43 metres from the same rear boundaries at its nearest point.</p> <p>For reference, the RFDC includes recommendations for building separations to provide, in part, visual privacy for existing residents. For buildings of 9 storeys and above the recommended separation between habitable rooms or balconies is 24 metres and for buildings between 5 and 8 storeys the recommended separation is 18 metres. The separation distances achieved between existing dwellings on Elizabeth Street and these buildings at 904 Bourke Street, as noted above, exceeds these recommendations.</p> <p>As such, the distance between existing residential dwellings and proposed development is considered appropriate to ensure that existing residents' privacy and amenity will be maintained.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	The proposed development will result in further congestion and overcrowding of the existing small, peaceful and quiet suburb	<p>While it is noted that the site is currently occupied by small commercial and light industrial units, the current primary planning controls under SLEP 2012 and SDCP 2012 permit redevelopment of the site for residential uses, up to a potential FSR of 2:1. This has been the case since the making of SLEP 2012 in December 2012 and under the previous planning controls, South Sydney LEP 1998 and South Sydney DCP 1997. As such, redevelopment of the site to accommodate a residential infill scheme at a density of approximately 2:1, with a commensurate residential population, has been envisaged in the planning controls for a number of years.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal does not seek to amend the zoning applicable to the site, B4 Mixed Uses, which permits residential development as noted above. The Planning Proposal seeks to reconfigure the current FSR controls to reflect the potential floor space achievable on the site within the City's preferred built form outcome. The current control under SLEP 2012 comprises 1.5:1 'base' FSR plus up to an additional 0.5:1 FSR where community infrastructure is also provided. On top of this, up to an additional 10% FSR may be awarded where a proponent undertakes a competitive design process and demonstrates design excellence. As such, the current</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>controls permit up to 2.2:1 FSR. The Planning Proposal seeks to retain the 1.5:1 'base' FSR, reduce the additional FSR achievable through clause 6.14 (community infrastructure in Green Square) of SLEP 2012 from 0.5:1 to 0.25:1, introduce an additional 0.25:1 FSR for 'storage' and/or 'commercial' uses to be provided solely within the basement, and retain the additional 10% FSR for design excellence. As such, the draft controls permit up to 2.2:1 FSR, however, the restriction on use of 0.25:1 of this FSR means that the potential residential floor space delivered on the site would be less than envisaged by the current controls. This is to ensure that a built form outcome appropriate to the site can be realised.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, the density of future development on the site, as expressed by the FSR control, and hence the number of potential future residents, is not increased as a result of the Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the fact that residential density is not being increased on the site, the City requested the owner commission a high level traffic and parking report. This report is at Attachment A. The report reviews the existing road network and traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site, reviews existing public transport services, estimates the traffic generation potential of future development and assesses the traffic implications of the Planning Proposal in terms of road network capacity. The report finds that development under the controls put forward by the Planning Proposal would not result in unacceptable traffic implications in terms of road network capacity. A more detailed traffic study will be required at the Development Application stage.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
Local resident	The proposed increase in building heights from 4 storeys to 12 storeys is excessive and not in keeping with the adjoining heritage conservation area terrace dwellings.	The City's detailed Urban Design Study established a principle of providing a transition in building heights from the centre of the site near the adjacent Emerald Park development down towards the site boundaries, particularly the boundary with McPherson Lane. The draft controls respect this principle by effectively splitting the site into two sections either side of the pedestrian green link. The north-eastern section accommodates taller buildings of 8 storeys, including a 12 storey tower, which integrates with and provides a suitable transition to the 9, 10 and 12 storey buildings of the adjacent Emerald Park development. The 12 storey tower is situated approximately 90 metres from the rear boundaries of the Zetland Estate Conservation Area dwellings on Elizabeth Street and this is considered an acceptable separation. The south-western section accommodates lower buildings of 6 and 7 storeys fronting the park and green link, stepping down to a 3 storey maximum height fronting McPherson Lane. These lower heights provide for a suitable transition and integration with the single and two storey dwellings backing onto the lane.

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>In addition to the general principle of providing a transition in heights, the specific building heights have been established through rigorous testing of a number of different options. This testing has included detailed overshadowing analysis to ensure that properties backing on to McPherson Lane and the communal open space at Emerald Park receive adequate solar access and view analysis to ensure surrounding properties retain an appropriate outlook.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>The proposed development would exacerbate existing congestion on Bourke Street and O'Dea Avenue.</p>	<p>Notwithstanding the fact that residential density is not being increased on the site, the City requested the owner commission a high level traffic and parking report. This report is at Attachment A. The report reviews the existing road network and traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site, reviews existing public transport services, estimates the traffic generation potential of future development and assesses the traffic implications of the Planning Proposal in terms of road network capacity. The report finds that development under the controls put forward by the Planning Proposal would not result in unacceptable traffic implications in terms of road network capacity. A more detailed traffic study will be required at the Development Application stage.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Construction of the proposed street would create further congestion. The proposed street should be configured to ensure it allows access for residents but does not become a short cut for traffic driving through the area.</p>	<p>SDCP 2012 currently requires provision of a street through the site connecting Bourke Street with McPherson Lane. The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment seek to realign this street so that it connects Bourke Street with O'Dea Avenue. A major disadvantage of the street as envisaged under the current SDCP 2012 is the poor pedestrian amenity and safety that would be experienced at the connection with McPherson Lane and the steep required grade such a future street. The connection with McPherson Lane would also provide a potential future route for through traffic to bypass busier roads and use lower order streets such as Merton Street, creating undesirable amenity impacts on these residential streets. The proposed realignment is preferable as it would not connect with McPherson Lane, would intersect with Bourke Street at a more suitable location and would take advantage of the existing Sydney Water easement over 904 Bourke Street. As such, the proposed street realignment is considered the most appropriate way of providing access to the site.</p> <p>Should the draft controls be approved, the detailed design of the new street will be determined at a later stage of the development process. The broad principle of providing local access while discouraging through traffic will be reflected in the design. It should be noted that the potential for city bound traffic travelling north on Bourke Street using the new street as a short cut is very low given the delay that would likely be experienced waiting to turn right off</p>



# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>Bourke Street into the site and then right on to O'Dea Avenue out of the site. Notwithstanding this, traffic calming, threshold treatments, speed limiting and different turn bans will all be considered as part of the future detailed design to ensure through traffic in the opposite direction is discouraged.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>The proposed road should be restricted to allow parking only by residents to ensure that it is not used for commuter parking.</p>	<p>The City's Neighbourhood Parking Policy was adopted by Council in May 2014 and applies to all areas of the LGA, excluding Central Sydney. The policy establishes a range of parking controls and permits to guide the management of parking across the LGA.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Parking Policy seeks to mitigate the impact of new development on congestion, and to support the viability of public transport services, by limiting access to on-street parking. Generally this means that residents of new multi-unit apartment buildings are ineligible for parking permits. This limits traffic congestion from new developments and protects existing on-street parking from excessive demand. This particular policy has been in place since May 1996 in the former South Sydney Council area, within which 904 Bourke Street is situated.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Parking Policy also recommends parking controls for new streets in urban renewal areas such as the proposed street at 904 Bourke Street. The recommended control is 2P 8am – 8pm 7 days per week. This control allows reasonable access for short visits without the need for permits. As a general policy the City does not extend the boundary of existing permit areas to include newly created streets. This approach has been taken across other urban renewal sites in the City including the Lachlan precinct and Harold Park.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment, which are the subjects of this public exhibition, do not seek to amend the Neighbourhood Parking Policy.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
<p><b>Local resident</b></p>	<p>The proposed increase in building heights from 15 metres to 45 metres is excessive and not in keeping with the adjoining heritage conservation area terrace dwellings.</p>	<p>The City's detailed urban design study established a principle of providing a transition in building heights from the centre of the site near the adjacent Emerald Park development down towards the site boundaries, particularly the boundary with McPherson Lane. The draft controls respect this principle by effectively splitting the site into two sections either side of the pedestrian green link. The north-eastern section accommodates taller buildings of 8 storeys, including a 12 storey tower, which integrates with and provides a suitable transition to the 9, 10 and 12 storey buildings of the adjacent Emerald Park development. The 12 storey tower is situated approximately 90 metres from the rear boundaries of the Zetland Estate Conservation Area dwellings on Elizabeth Street and this is considered an acceptable separation. The south-western section</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>accommodates lower buildings of 6 and 7 storeys fronting the park and green link, stepping down to a 3 storey maximum height fronting McPherson Lane. These lower heights provide for a suitable transition and integration with the single and two storey dwellings backing onto the lane.</p> <p>In addition to the general principle of providing a transition in heights, the specific building heights have been established through rigorous testing of a number of different options. This testing has included detailed overshadowing analysis to ensure that properties backing on to McPherson Lane and the communal open space at Emerald Park receive adequate solar access and view analysis to ensure surrounding properties retain an appropriate outlook.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>The proposed development would exacerbate existing congestion in the area.</p>	<p>Notwithstanding the fact that residential density is not being increased on this site, the owner and developer of the site commissioned a high level traffic and parking report in support of the Planning Proposal. This report is at Attachment A. The report reviews the existing road network and traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site, reviews existing public transport services, estimates the traffic generation potential of future development and assesses the traffic implications of the Planning Proposal in terms of road network capacity. The report finds that development under the controls put forward by the Planning Proposal would not result in any unacceptable traffic implications in terms of road network capacity. It should be noted that a more detailed traffic study will be required by Council at the development application stage.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Concerned that the new street will become a short cut for those driving through the area. This will add to local congestion and will be hazardous for users of the adjacent local park.</p>	<p>SDCP 2012 currently requires provision of a street through the site connecting Bourke Street with McPherson Lane. The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment seek to realign this street so that it connects Bourke Street with O'Dea Avenue. A major disadvantage of the street as envisaged under the current SDCP 2012 is the poor pedestrian amenity and safety that would be experienced at the connection with McPherson Lane and the steep required grade such a future street. The connection with McPherson Lane would also provide a potential future route for through traffic to bypass busier roads and use lower order streets such as Merton Street, creating undesirable amenity impacts on these residential streets. The proposed realignment is preferable as it would not connect with McPherson Lane, would intersect with Bourke Street at a more suitable location and would take advantage of the existing Sydney Water easement over 904 Bourke Street. As such, the proposed street realignment is considered the most appropriate way of providing access to the site.</p> <p>Should the draft controls be approved, the detailed design</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>of the new street will be determined at a later stage of the development process. The broad principle of providing local access while discouraging through traffic will be reflected in the design. It should be noted that the potential for city bound traffic travelling north on Bourke Street using the new street as a short cut is very low given the delay that would likely be experienced waiting to turn right off Bourke Street into the site and then right on to O'Dea Avenue out of the site. Notwithstanding this, traffic calming, threshold treatments, speed limiting and different turn bans will all be considered as part of the future detailed design to ensure through traffic in the opposite direction is discouraged.</p> <p>Should the draft controls be approved, the design of the public park will be progressed at a later stage of the development process and particular consideration will be given to pedestrian safety and amenity at the interface between the park, the street and the green link.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
Local resident	Support for the proposed development	<p>The City's Neighbourhood Parking Policy was adopted by Council in May 2014 and applies to all areas of the LGA, excluding Central Sydney. The policy establishes a range of parking controls and permits to guide the management of parking across the LGA.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Parking Policy seeks to mitigate the impact of new development on congestion, and to support the viability of public transport services, by limiting access to on-street parking. Generally this means that residents of new multi-unit apartment buildings are ineligible for parking permits. This limits traffic congestion from new developments and protects existing on-street parking from excessive demand. This particular policy has been in place since May 1996 in the former South Sydney Council area, within which 904 Bourke Street is situated.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Parking Policy also recommends parking controls for new streets in urban renewal areas such as the proposed street at 904 Bourke Street. The recommended control is 2P 8am – 8pm 7 days per week. This control allows reasonable access for short visits without the need for permits. As a general policy the City does not extend the boundary of existing permit areas to include newly created streets. This approach has been taken across other urban renewal sites in the City including the Lachlan precinct and Harold Park.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment, which are the subjects of this public exhibition, do not seek to amend the Neighbourhood Parking Policy.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	and park as it will be a substantial improvement on current outlook from submitter's rear yard on to fence and warehouse.	<b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b>
	Support for proposed taller buildings being located in the northern part of the site and transition to 3 storey development fronting McPherson Lane.	Noted <b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b>
	Concern about privacy/overlooking from 3 storey buildings in to rear yard.	The separation between the rear boundary of the submitter's property and the proposed 3 storey building fronting McPherson Lane is approximately 11 metres. For buildings of up to 4 storeys the RFDC recommends 12 metres separation between habitable rooms but does not specify separation between a habitable room and a private open space. However, given the RFDC recommendation and the fact that the landscaped setback to the 3 storey development will include planting for screening, the separation is considered acceptable. Issues of overlooking and privacy will be required to be addressed in detail at the Development Application stage. <b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b>
<b>Local resident</b>	Support for the proposed park and the location of taller buildings away from existing terrace dwellings. The park should be as large as possible and should not be reduced in size.	Noted <b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b>
	The proposed building to the south of the proposed park should be reduced in height from 6 storeys to 3 or 4 storeys and should be of a terrace typology to provide a more appropriate transition.	The City's detailed Urban Design Study established a principle of providing a transition in building heights from taller buildings near the Emerald Park development to the north, down towards lower buildings near the Zetland Estate Conservation Area to the south and west. This principle was used to establish appropriate building heights across the site and these heights were tested to ensure that compliance with standards in the RFDC on solar access and building separations can be satisfied.  A height control of 6 storeys to the south of the park is appropriate given the significant separation to existing dwellings to the north offered by the public park of approximately 43 metres. A reduction of this building from 6 storeys to 3 or 4 storeys and a requirement for a terrace typology would result in an unreasonable reduction in development potential across the site but would not deliver a substantially greater transition.

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>Concern that proposed number of parking spaces will not be sufficient to meet the requirements of new residents and visitors. This will exacerbate existing parking problems in the area. Recommend that greater number of underground parking spaces is included in further planning stages.</p>	<p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p> <p>SLEP 2012 identifies the maximum number of off-street car parking spaces that may be provided to service particular land uses. The objective of setting maximum limits is to minimise the amount of vehicular traffic generated by new development. The number of off-street car parking space is calculated based on the type of land use, the number of dwellings (in the case of a residential development), the gross floor area (in the case of non-residential development) and the proximity of the site to public transport, goods and services.</p> <p>The number of off street parking spaces permitted at 904 Bourke Street will depend on the total number of dwellings and area of non-residential floor space proposed and these figures will not be finalised until the Development Application stage. It is therefore not possible to stipulate at this stage how many off-street parking spaces may be delivered. Notwithstanding this, any future Development Application will be assessed against the maximums permitted under SLEP 2012 and consent will not be granted to development which exceeds the maximums.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment do not seek to amend the existing controls in SLEP 2012 which regulate the maximum permissible number of off-street car parking spaces.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
<b>Local resident</b>	<p>The new location of the proposed park is supported as it will provide a large and well-shaped space with good utility and accessibility. The size should not be reduced.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Undergrounding of power lines and upgrading of street lighting on Navins Lane should be imposed as a condition of consent on any future development application. This would improve the amenity along Navins Lane and provide a clearer connection between the proposed park and adjacent sites which is critical to its success and use.</p>	<p>Noted. Required upgrades to the public domain surrounding the site will be considered as part of a future Development Application.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>During heavy rain, overland flow from the high point near Cook Lane flows along McPherson Lane onto Navins Lane and onto Elizabeth Street. This situation may be exacerbated by the proposed development. Runoff from the proposed development needs to be managed to prevent additional flow onto the lanes.</p>	<p>Noted. Required upgrades to the public domain surrounding the site and management of stormwater runoff will be considered as part of a future Development Application.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Supportive of the general approach to locate taller buildings away from the adjoining Zetland Estate Heritage Conservation Area. Recommend that to further minimise overlooking and provide greater transition, the proposed 6 storey building to the south of the proposed park should be reduced to 5 storeys. Also the upper level setback to 7 storeys should be increased to provide a greater setback and transition.</p>	<p>Support for general approach to building heights is noted.</p> <p>The City's detailed Urban Design Study established a principle of providing a transition in building heights from taller buildings near the Emerald Park development to the north, down towards lower buildings near the Zetland Estate Conservation Area to the south and west. This principle was used to establish appropriate building heights across the site and these heights were tested to ensure that compliance with standards in the RFDC around solar access and building separations can be satisfied.</p> <p>A height control of 6 storeys to the south of the park is appropriate given the significant separation to existing dwellings to the north offered by the public park of approximately 43 metres. A reduction of this building from 6 storeys to 5 storeys and a greater upper level setback would result in an unreasonable reduction in development potential across the site but would not deliver a substantially greater transition or reduction in overlooking.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Strong support of the proposed prohibition on vehicle access to the site from any part of McPherson Lane.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
<b>Local resident</b>	<p>Objection to a maximum height of 12 storeys. 6 storeys would be a more fitting blend between Emerald Park and the Zetland Estate Heritage Conservation Area. Privacy of rear yard would be compromised by development at this height.</p>	<p>The City's detailed Urban Design Study established a principle of providing a transition in building heights from the centre of the site near the adjacent Emerald Park development down towards the site boundaries, particularly the boundary with McPherson Lane. The draft controls respect this principle by effectively splitting the site into two sections either side of the pedestrian green link. The north-eastern section accommodates taller buildings of 8 storeys, including a 12 storey tower, which integrates with and provides a suitable transition to the 9, 10 and 12 storey buildings of the adjacent Emerald Park development. The 12 storey tower is situated approximately 90 metres from the rear boundaries of the Zetland Estate Conservation</p>

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>Area dwellings on Elizabeth Street and this is considered an acceptable separation. The south-western section accommodates lower buildings of 6 and 7 storeys fronting the park and green link, stepping down to a 3 storey maximum height fronting McPherson Lane. These lower heights provide for a suitable transition and integration with the single and two storey dwellings backing onto the lane.</p> <p>In addition to the general principle of providing a transition in heights, the specific building heights have been established through rigorous testing of a number of different options. This testing has included detailed overshadowing analysis to ensure that properties backing on to McPherson Lane and the communal open space at Emerald Park receive adequate solar access and view analysis to ensure surrounding properties retain an appropriate outlook.</p> <p>Based on the draft controls, the separation between the submitter's rear boundary and the nearest new building is approximately 43 metres. This building is 7 storeys with a 6 storey street frontage height. The distance between the rear boundary and the 12 storey building is approximately 65 metres. The RFDC recommends separation of 18 metres between habitable rooms and balconies for buildings between 5 and 8 storeys and 24 metres for buildings 9 storeys and above. The separation between future buildings on 904 Bourke Street and the submitter's property are well in excess of these recommendations and as such there will not be unacceptable privacy impacts.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Object to proposed increase in FSR from 1.5:1 to 2.2:1. This will lead to high density residential development with no community spirit and instead a transient rental population. What community benefit is expected to offset the increase in FSR?</p>	<p>The Planning Proposal does not seek to amend the zoning applicable to the site, B4 Mixed Uses, which permits residential development. The Planning Proposal seeks to reconfigure the current FSR controls to reflect the potential floor space achievable on the site within the City's preferred built form outcome. The current control under SLEP 2012 comprises 1.5:1 'base' FSR plus up to an additional 0.5:1 FSR where community infrastructure is also provided. On top of this, up to an additional 10% FSR may be awarded where a proponent undertakes a competitive design process and demonstrates design excellence. As such, the current controls permit up to 2.2:1 FSR. The Planning Proposal seeks to retain the 1.5:1 'base' FSR, reduce the additional FSR achievable through clause 6.14 (community infrastructure in Green Square) of SLEP 2012 from 0.5:1 to 0.25:1, introduce an additional 0.25:1 FSR for 'storage' and/or 'commercial' uses to be provided solely within the basement, and retain the additional 10% FSR for design excellence. As such, the draft controls permit up to 2.2:1 FSR, however, the restriction on use of 0.25:1 of this FSR means that the potential residential floor space delivered on the site would be less than envisaged by the current controls. This is to ensure that a built form outcome appropriate to the site can be realised.</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>Should the draft controls be approved by Council and the CSPC, community infrastructure that may be delivered as part of any future development will be determined at the Development Application and Voluntary Planning Agreement stage. The draft DCP amendment identifies the location of the public park, new street and green link. It is anticipated that future development of the site will involve dedication and embellishment of these public spaces.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Rear yard privacy at the submitter's property will be compromised by the aspect of proposed development and activity in the proposed public park.</p>	<p>The rear boundary of the submitter's property is approximately 43 metres from the proposed 7 storey building on 904 Bourke Street at its nearest point. This separation is far in excess of the 25 metres separation recommended in the Residential Flat Design Code and as such the impact on rear yard privacy is not considered unacceptable.</p> <p>The urban design study undertaken by Council in 2014 sought to establish the optimum location for a public park at 904 Bourke Street. The identified location is reflected in the Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment. The location was selected as it is a consolidated, regular shape, receives excellent year round solar access, integrates well with the existing mature Moreton Bay fig tree on the site and provides a buffer between low scale terrace dwellings on adjacent sites and proposed more intense development at 904 Bourke Street.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment, however, only provide a future location for the park and are not intended to provide detailed design guidance. Should the Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment be approved by Council and CSPC, the City will develop a concept design for the park which will be used in determining the final design. A key consideration in developing this concept design will be the interface between the park and adjacent dwellings and private open space including ensuring that the safety, security, privacy and amenity of residents are protected.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Object to the new alignment of the proposed street. This should be amended to act as a 2-way access road from O'Dea Avenue to allow access to development but should not connect through to Bourke Street. The entrance to 904 Bourke Street should be for pedestrians and cyclist</p>	<p>SDCP 2012 currently requires provision of a street through the site connecting Bourke Street with McPherson Lane. The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment seek to realign this street so that it connects Bourke Street with O'Dea Avenue. A major disadvantage of the street as envisaged under the current SDCP 2012 is the poor pedestrian amenity and safety that would be experienced at the connection with McPherson Lane and the steep required grade such a future street. The connection with McPherson Lane would also provide a potential future route for through traffic to bypass busier roads and use lower order streets such as Merton Street, creating undesirable amenity impacts on these residential streets. The proposed realignment is preferable as it would not</p>



# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>only and integrate with the park.</p> <p>How will the proposed new street integrate with the existing street network? What traffic management measures, such as light or turn bans, will be introduced?</p>	<p>connect with McPherson Lane, would intersect with Bourke Street at a more suitable location and would take advantage of the existing Sydney Water easement over 904 Bourke Street. The alignment as suggested by the submitter would require provision of street through 888 Bourke Street. The timeframe for redevelopment of this site is unknown and 904 Bourke Street is highly likely to redevelop prior to any development at 888 Bourke Street. This alignment would therefore not allow vehicular access to 904 Bourke Street and is therefore unviable. As such, the proposed street alignment is considered the most appropriate way of providing access to the site.</p> <p>Should the draft controls be approved, the detailed design of the new street will be determined at a later stage of the development process. The broad principle of providing local access while discouraging through traffic will be reflected in the design. It should be noted that the potential for city bound traffic travelling north on Bourke Street using the new street as a short cut is very low given the delay that would likely be experienced waiting to turn right off Bourke Street into the site and then right on to O'Dea Avenue out of the site. Notwithstanding this, traffic calming, threshold treatments, speed limiting and different turn bans will all be considered as part of the future detailed design to ensure through traffic in the opposite direction is discouraged.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Concern that the proposed development will exacerbate existing high demand for on-street parking. What assurances do existing residents have that they can comfortably park within a reasonable distance from their home?</p>	<p>The City's Neighbourhood Parking Policy was adopted by Council in May 2014 and applies to all areas of the LGA, excluding Central Sydney. The policy establishes a range of parking controls and permits to guide the management of parking across the LGA.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Parking Policy seeks to mitigate the impact of new development on congestion, and to support the viability of public transport services, by limiting access to on-street parking. Generally this means that residents of new multi-unit apartment buildings are ineligible for parking permits. This limits traffic congestion from new developments and protects existing on-street parking from excessive demand. This particular policy has been in place since May 1996 in the former South Sydney Council area, within which 904 Bourke Street is situated.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Parking Policy also recommends parking controls for new streets in urban renewal areas such as the proposed street at 904 Bourke Street. The recommended control is 2P 8am – 8pm 7 days per week. This control allows reasonable access for short visits without the need for permits. As a general policy the City does not extend the boundary of existing permit areas to include newly created streets. This approach has been taken across other urban renewal sites in the City including the Lachlan precinct and Harold Park.</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment, which are the subjects of this public exhibition, do not seek to amend the Neighbourhood Parking Policy.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>More detail on the transition between the proposed public park and the rear yards of properties fronting Bourke Street. How will safety and amenity be protected? Will planting, fencing and excavation be introduced?</p>	<p>The urban design study undertaken by Council in 2014 sought to establish the optimum location for a public park at 904 Bourke Street. The identified location is reflected in the Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment. The location was selected as it is a consolidated, regular shape, receives excellent year round solar access, integrates well with the existing mature Moreton Bay fig tree on the site and provides a buffer between low scale terrace dwellings on adjacent sites and proposed more intense development at 904 Bourke Street.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment, however, only provide a future location for the park and are not intended to provide detailed design guidance. Should the Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment be approved by Council and CSPC, the City will develop a concept design for the park which will be used in determining the final design. A key consideration in developing this concept design will be the interface between the park and adjacent dwellings and private open space including ensuring that the safety, security, privacy and amenity of residents is protected.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>What measures will be put in place to mitigate construction impacts and damage to property during construction?</p>	<p>The Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment seek to establish appropriate principle planning controls including building height and density and more detailed public domain design controls including for example the location of public spaces and setbacks to private development. Prior to any future development being undertaken, a Development Application process will need to be undertaken. It is only at this stage that specific construction details will be known and the potential impacts of construction be able to be assessed. Should development consent be issued at this later stage, the potential impact of dust and noise caused by construction will be addressed through conditions of consent that must be satisfied by the applicant.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
<p><b>Urbis – On behalf of JQZ (owner of 904 Bourke Street)</b></p>	<p>The draft controls propose a maximum 12 storey tower. Assessment of whether a 15, 14 or 13 storey tower could be accommodated on the site has not been undertaken by Council despite consultant</p>	<p>Between April and December 2014 the City worked with JQZ and their consultant team to develop and test public domain and built form outcomes for the site. This included for example options with more than one tower and options with a tower greater than 12 storeys. Some of the options tested are documented in the City's Urban Design Study at Attachment G. Each option was modelled to understand the impact on solar access to public open space and neighbouring private open spaces. Each option was also assessed as to whether it respected the a general principle</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>team contention that such built form would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding locality</p>	<p>of providing a height transition, to what degree it integrated with the surrounding context and to what degree the perception of scale was minimised from the edges of the site. Four options were presented to the Design Advisory Panel in September 2014 and their feedback was incorporated into the final preferred scheme.</p> <p>The detailed process of design, testing, consultation and refinement resulted in the building heights as shown in the draft controls. The building height maps allow for a variety of building heights across the site from 3 storeys in the south, 8 storeys in the north and a single 12 storey tower in the centre of the site. Building heights in excess of these would not achieve an appropriate transition in height and would not integrate with the surrounding context satisfactorily.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Buildings fronting the south-eastern part of McPherson Lane are proposed to be 3 storeys in height. Given the 4m variation between street level and the subject site, a height limit of 15m will be required in the LEP to allow this built form outcome. The height in metres map should be amended from 12m to 15m.</p>	<p>The preferred built form outcome for the site includes a 3 storey form fronting the entire length of McPherson Lane. However, given the variation between street level and the site, this 3 storey form will appear as only 2 storeys from the southern part of McPherson Lane with the ground floor being accessed down steps from the street as indicated in section drawings in the draft DCP amendment. It should be noted that the overshadowing analysis of this part of the development assumed a 3 storey form along the entire lane, as measured from the existing ground level.</p> <p>The LEP height and building storey height are measured from existing ground level. As such, a height limit of 12 metres in the LEP, as measured from the existing ground level, not from the surrounding higher street level, will be sufficient to accommodate a 3 storey building and an increase to 15 metres is not required or supported.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p> <p>Figure '6.xx: Street frontage height in storeys' indicated a street frontage of between 2 and 3 storeys along McPherson Lane. Part of the southern portion of McPherson Lane is indicated as 3 storeys on this map. This is a drafting error and given the change in level at this part of the site, the street frontage height will likely be closer to 2 storeys. To rectify this error, it is proposed to remove the street frontage height in storeys control from the entire length of McPherson Lane. In practice, the street frontage will be dictated by the combination of the maximum 3 storey overall height control and the topography of the site and a specific street frontage control for this part of the site is not necessary.</p> <p><b>Amend 'Figure 6.xx: 904 Bourke Street, Zetland – Street frontage height in storeys' in the draft DCP amendment at Attachment B as described above and detailed in the table of changes.</b></p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>The proposed wording of the clause relating to commercial and/or storage premises floorspace within the basement should be amended to refer to this floorspace being accommodated "wholly beneath the existing ground level" rather than "wholly within the basement". This will provide flexibility to ensure that 'openings' to allow access and adequate amenity can be provided without being discounted from the 0.25:1 FSR.</p>	<p>Since the public exhibition of draft planning controls for 904 Bourke Street, JQZ have undertaken feasibility and design analysis of the potential basement floor space. In recent discussions, they have indicated that they wish to pursue a design where an 'opening' is provided at ground level to allow pedestrian access down to uses at basement level.</p> <p>'Basement is defined in Sydney LEP 2012 as <i>"the space of a building where the floor level of that space is predominantly below ground level (existing) and where the floor level of the storey immediately above is less than 1 meter above ground level (existing)"</i> While the design of the potential 'opening' and basement uses is not resolved and still at a conceptual stage, the City considers that a development of the type proposed by JQZ could be defined as within the 'basement' and thus could benefit from the specific 0.25:1 FSR for uses solely within the 'basement'. In correspondence with the City, Urbis has agreed that the change requested in their submission is no longer necessary.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Support the intention of the Planning Proposal to allow calculation of any Design Excellence floor space on the basis of the total floor space of future development including any commercial floor space in the basement.</p>	<p>Noted. While this was already the intention of the Planning Proposal, and was clearly noted in Part 2 of the exhibited draft, it is proposed to amend the Planning Proposal to further clarify that the additional 0.25:1 achievable in the basement is to be included in the total floor space when calculating a potential 10% FSR bonus for demonstrating Design Excellence.</p> <p><b>Amend 'Part 2 – Explanation of Provisions' in the Planning Proposal at Attachment A as described above and detailed in the table of changes.</b></p>
	<p>The 'Building Types' figure in the draft DCP amendment is considered unreasonably restrictive and unnecessary. Recommend this figure is removed.</p>	<p>'Figure 6.xx: 904 Bourke Street, Zetland – Building types' in the draft DCP amendment at Attachment B specifies where different building types, such as apartments, maisonettes and duplexes, should be delivered across the site. Similar figures apply in other urban renewal sites and areas in the LGA including Epsom Park, Ashmore and North Rosebery. Including provisions which require different building types in the DCP ensures a variety of housing stock is provided across the LGA and encourages social diversity. The requirement for maisonettes, duplexes or SOHOs fronting McPherson Lane ensures that development will further integrate with the adjacent terraces of the Zetland Estate Heritage Conservation Area. Removal of this figure is not supported.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
	<p>Recommend that the proposed vehicle access point to the development is amended to be 'indicative' to ensure</p>	<p>The controls as exhibited reflect the approach taken to mapping required vehicle access points in other urban renewal sites in the City. However, given that this specific location has not been extensively tested, it is appropriate to provide some flexibility in this instance so that an appropriate location can be established at the development</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	reasonable flexibility is allowed at the development application stage.	<p>application stage. It is proposed to amend the map to indicate where vehicular access to underground parking should not be provided and leave a zone within which a single access can be provided.</p> <p><b>Amend 'Figure 6.xx: 904 Bourke Street, Zetland – Access and Circulation' in the draft DCP amendment at Attachment B as described above and detailed in the table of changes.</b></p>
	<p>A 3m landscaped setback should not be required where a dedication for new road and/or footpath widening is also proposed. This additional setback is considered unnecessary and unreasonable. The developer commits to providing ground level open space to a depth of approximately 2.5m and 1.8m footpath widening to provide adequate separation.</p>	<p>Landscaped setbacks are identified in the draft DCP amendment to achieve a number of objectives: providing visual relief, a pleasant and green outlook and privacy for new development through appropriate planting within the setback; providing visual privacy for adjacent dwellings; providing adequate building separations; and improving the amenity of the public domain at ground level.</p> <p>The draft controls propose a 3 metre wide landscaped setback fronting all new development, as indicated in 'Figure 6.xx: 904 Bourke Street, Zetland – Setbacks' of the draft DCP amendment at Attachment B. Section drawings are also included in the draft DCP amendment indicating how the building interface should be designed. This design varies throughout the site based on the level change between street and the site, but typically includes a 3 metre landscaped setback, and a ground floor open deck between the property boundary and the glass line at ground and first floor.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the requirement for 3 metre wide landscaped setbacks as indicated in the exhibited controls. This dimension provides enough width, in conjunction with an appropriate depth for deep soil planting, to accommodate a tree with a narrow form that is able to reach a height of approximately 6 metres. This would provide a canopy that assists with the objectives of the landscaped setback as outlined above including visual privacy and pleasant outlook for both the development and adjacent sites. Reducing this setback would restrict planting opportunities and inhibit achievement of these objectives. Furthermore, it is critical that this setback is provided at street level, as indicated in the section diagrams in the draft DCP amendment. If the level at which trees are planted is lowered to match the ground floor private open space, where this is lower than the street level, this would limit the vertical proportion that the tree canopy could act as a visual buffer.</p> <p>As such, no change to the private setbacks as exhibited in the draft DCP amendment is proposed.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p> <p>In considering the above, the City has undertaken further detailed analysis of the condition along McPherson Lane. 'Figure 6.xx: 904 Bourke Street, Zetland – Public dedication' of the draft DCP amendment at Attachment B</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>indicates dedication of a 1.8 metre wide strip of land along the entire length of McPherson Lane for footpath widening. When combined with the existing 0.8 metre wide footpath along the lane, this would result in a 2.6 metre wide footpath. Given the lower order nature of this lane, a 2.6 metre wide footpath is considered over and above requirements. It is proposed to reduce the width of dedication from 1.8 metres to 1.2 metres. This would result in a total footpath width of 2 metres. This dimension is in accordance with requirements of the City's Street Design Code.</p> <p>It is noted that this 0.6 metre reduction in dedication will result in the built form being 0.6 metres closer to the rear boundary of properties backing on to McPherson Lane. The average separation from the primary building line of new 3 storey development to the rear boundary of existing properties will be approximately 10.2 metres. Although the RFDC does not provide recommendations for minimum separation between buildings less than 4 storeys in height (as a reference it recommends a separation of 12 metres for buildings of 4 storeys or more) a distance of a minimum of 10.2 metres, when combined with the visual screening afforded by tree planting within the landscaped setback is considered sufficient to provide visual privacy to the rear yards and habitable rooms of properties backing onto McPherson Lane.</p> <p><b>Amend 'Figure 6.xx: 904 Bourke Street, Zetland – Public dedication' and relevant section drawings in the draft DCP amendment at Attachment B as described above and detailed in the table of changes.</b></p>
	<p>The green link should be reduced in width from 14m to 12m as this will still allow adequate separation between buildings.</p> <p>The requirement for the green link to be dedicated to Council should be deleted.</p> <p>The characterisation of the link as a green link should be removed and replaced with the term 'through site link'.</p> <p>The green link should be marked as pedestrian only, not pedestrian and cycle link, due to level changes across the site.</p>	<p>The City's intention is that this area of the site acts not only as an important connection through the site and to adjacent sites, but as an important secondary open space to the main park. The term green link is used as this best describes the desired future character of the area as a well landscaped space with significant planting that offers opportunities for passive recreation.</p> <p>It is noted that a reduction in width of the green link from 14 metres to 12 metres would still allow for 18 metres separation between habitable rooms of buildings on either side and that this separation would comply with recommendations of the RFDC. However, this reduction in width would result in the loss of 179sqm of open space (from 1213sqm to 1034sqm total area). Given the important secondary function of the green link as a secondary public open space, this reduction is not appropriate.</p> <p>The City's preferred outcome is for the upper stratum of the green link to be dedicated to Council, as indicated in the exhibited draft controls. Dedication to Council and future maintenance of the green link by the City is also the best way of ensuring the space reads as public and not private and is appropriately maintained.</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
		<p>Given the uncertainties around the final design of the link, and the interface with properties on either side, it is not considered appropriate to remove the possibility of the link being designed in such a way that cycle access may be accommodated. The final design of the link, including access arrangements and grading, will be determined at the Development Application stage and informed by the City's own public domain codes.</p> <p>Since the public exhibition of draft controls, JQZ have undertaken feasibility and design analysis of the potential basement floor space allowed by the Planning Proposal. In recent discussions, they have indicated that they wish to pursue a design where part of the green link is used as an 'opening' to allow pedestrian access to commercial units situated below ground level. The design of this opening is not fully resolved and still at a conceptual stage. Given these uncertainties, the City is not in a position to form a judgement on whether this type of development is appropriate on this site.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is considered appropriate to allow a degree of flexibility to ensure that if a suitable design is proposed, its realisation should not be unduly restricted. As such, it is recommended that existing provisions and figures which characterise the green link as a space for passive recreation and serving the important function as a secondary public open space be retained, but that wording is included which makes reference to a potential future opening in the draft DCP amendment within the green link. These recommended additions seek to ensure that the primary function of the green link as a public open space and pedestrian connection is not detrimentally affected if an 'opening' is to be introduced in a future development scheme.</p> <p><b>Amend provisions relating to the green link in the draft DCP amendment at Attachment B as described above and detailed in the table of changes.</b></p>
<b>Public authority submissions</b>		
<b>Sydney Water</b>	<p>No objections to proposed height and FSR amendments.</p> <p>The proposed development includes underground car parking under the public park. It should be noted that Sydney Water has significant underground infrastructure in this area, namely the</p>	<p>Sydney Water state that the Planning Proposal includes underground car parking under the area to be dedicated as public park, which is incorrect.</p> <p>The plan, submitted by Sydney Water, illustrating the alignment of the 'City Tunnel' shows that it is located wholly underneath areas proposed for public park and street rather than proposed buildings. As such, the Planning Proposal and draft DCP amendment do not present an impediment to a future easement being registered on title.</p> <p>These issues will be further investigated and resolved at later planning stages.</p>

# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>heritage listed 'City Tunnel'. The relationship between these will need to be further investigated in later planning stages.</p> <p>Sydney Water may require an easement to protect this asset prior to any redevelopment of the site.</p>	<p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
<b>Transport for NSW</b>	<p>The Planning Proposal has minimal impact.</p> <p>The proposed modified street network may have impacts on traffic flows and road safety along Bourke Street and O'Dea Avenue. It is recommended that a road safety and traffic assessment should be undertaken at the appropriate development application stage.</p> <p>Details of future traffic management measures, measures to promote sustainable transport and measures to manage construction traffic should all be required at development application stage.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As with all major developments, details of traffic and transport management measures and any road safety issues will be considered and established as part of the detailed development application process.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>
<b>Roads and Maritime Services</b>	<p>No objections to the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>Council should give consideration to consolidating access points on Bourke Street and providing adequate separation between intersections.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The current controls in Sydney DCP 2012 require provision of a street connecting the southern part of McPherson Lane with Bourke Street. This street runs through 904 Bourke Street and 890-898 Bourke Street. The existing driveway to 904 Bourke Street would be approximately 20m south of this new street. The draft DCP amendment seeks to realign the street and consolidate the existing driveway with the new street to provide a single intersection. This consolidated access point is located an approximately equal distance between the Bourke Street intersections with O'Dea and Elizabeth.</p> <p><b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b></p>



# ATTACHMENT C

Submitter	Summary of matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<b>Sydney Airport Corporation</b>	No objection to Planning Proposal. It should be noted that any building on the site taller than 51 AHD will require referral to the Federal Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development for a determination and that any structure over 45.72m above existing ground level height will require prior approval from the Civil Aviation Authority.	Noted.  <b>No change to the exhibited controls is recommended.</b>